

STUDIA CERANEA



Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre

for

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

Vol. 1, 2011



STUDIA CERANEA

Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre

for

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

1, 2011



University of
LODZ

Łódź 2011

Studia Ceranea
Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Center for the History and Culture of the
Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe
1, 2011

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,
Karolina Krzeszewska (Secretary)

Address of the Editorial Board

ul. Kopcińskiego 8/12 pok. 1.29
90-232 Łódź, Polska
www.ceraneum.uni.lodz.pl
s.ceranea@uni.lodz.pl

Editorial Council

Hana Gladková (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 of Toruń), Stefano Parenti (Pontifical Atheneum of St. Anselm, Rome), Rustam Shukurov (Lomonosov Moscow State University), Yuri Stoyanov (University of London)

Reviewers

Adelina Angusheva-Tihanov (University of Manchester), Krystyna Bartol (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań), Jarosław Dudek (University of Zielona Góra), Shaun Tougher (Cardiff University), Martin Hurbanič (Comenius University in Bratislava), Srđan Pirivatrić (Institute for Byzantine Research, Belgrade)

Linguistic editors

for English – Frederick Lauritzen, for Russian – Ivan Petrov, for Italian – Stefano Parenti

Edition is financed by:



URZĄD MIASTA ŁODZI
www.lodz.pl

The City of Łódź Office
Dean of the Faculty of Philology, University of Łódź, Poland
Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and History, University of Łódź, Poland

Cover designed by

Sebastian Buzar

On the cover: Fragment of a peacock-arch with the dedicatory inscription (cf. *Greek Anthology*, I, 10, 30–31: [ἄσσα δὲ σὴ θε]σπείθεα δώματα τεύχει [οὐδ' αὐτῆ δεδάηκας]); Anicia Juliana's Church of St. Polyuctus in Constantinople, 524–527 A.D. (Archaeological Museum, Istanbul, nr inv. 71.115 T)

Recommended by

Łódź University Press

ul. W. Lindleya 8, 90–131 Łódź, Polska

Printed by
Tip-Top Publishing House
102, Vasil Levski blvd,
1527 Sofia, Bulgaria

Printed in Bulgaria

© Copyright by Ceraneum, Łódź 2011

All rights reserved.

ISSN 2084-140X

TABLE OF CONTENTS

From the Editorial Board	5
--------------------------------	---

ARTICLES

MACIEJ KOKOSZKO, KATARZYNA GIBEL-BUSZEWSKA, <i>Kandaulos: the Testimony of Select Sources</i>	11
GEORGI MINCZEW, <i>John Chrysostom's Tale on How Michael Vanquished Satanael – a Bogomil text?</i>	23
MIROSLAW J. LESZKA, <i>The Monk versus the Philosopher: From the History of the Bulgarian-Byzantine War 894–896</i>	55
ELKA BAKALOVA, <i>The Perfect Ruler in the Art and Literature of Medieval Bulgaria</i>	71
SŁAWOMIR BRALEWSKI, <i>The Porphyry Column in Constantinople and the Relics of the True Cross</i>	87
MAŁGORZATA SKOWRONEK, <i>The First Witnesses. Martha, Longinus and Veronica in the Slavic Manuscript Tradition (Initial Observations)</i>	101
TERESA WOLIŃSKA, <i>Constantinopolitan Charioteers and Their Supporters</i>	127
DIMO CHESHMEDJIEV, <i>Notes on the Cult of the Fifteen Tiberioupolitan Martyrs in Medieval Bulgaria</i>	143
KIRIŁ MARINOW, <i>In the Shackles of the Evil One: The Portrayal of Tsar Symeon I the Great (893–927) in the Oration 'On the Treaty with the Bulgarians'</i>	157
ANNA-MARIA TOTOMANOVA, <i>A Lost Byzantine Chronicle in Slavic Translation</i> ..	191
IVELIN IVANOV, <i>Tsar Samuel Against Emperor Basil II: Why Did Bulgaria Loose the Battle with the Byzantine Empire at the Beginning of the 11th Century</i>	205

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>Apokryfy syryjskie. Historia i przysłowia Achikara. Grota skarbów. Apokalipsa Pseudo-Metodego</i> , trans. A. TRONINA, ed. A. TRONINA, M. STAROWIEYSKI – MAŁGORZATA SKOWRONEK	215
Иван Божилов, Анна-Мария Тотоманова, Иван Билярски, <i>Борилов Синодик. Издание и превод</i> – JAN MIKOŁAJ WOLSKI	218
URSZULA WÓJCICKA, <i>Literatura staroruska z elementami historii kultury dawnej Rusi</i> – ZOFIA BRZOZOWSKA	222
<i>Uczniowie Apostołów Słowian. Siedmiu Świętych Mężów</i> , ed. MAŁGORZATA SKOWRONEK, GEORGI MINCZEW – MIROŚLAW J. LESZKA, KIRIŁ MARINOW	226
ANDREJ ŠKOVIERA, <i>Svätí Slovanskí Sedmopočetníci</i> – GEORGI MINCZEW	228
<i>Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym. Miasto i ludzie w okresie wczesnobizantyńskim</i> , ed. MIROŚLAW J. LESZKA, TERESA WOLIŃSKA – BŁAŻEJ CECOTA	230
PIOTR ŁUKASZ GROTOWSKI, <i>Święci wojownicy w sztuce bizantyńskiej (843–1261). Studia nad ikonografią uzbrojenia i ubioru</i> – TERESA WOLIŃSKA	232
RAFAŁ KOSIŃSKI, <i>The Emperor Zeno Religion and Politics</i> – MIROŚLAW J. LESZKA	235
Анна-Мария Тотоманова, <i>Из историята на българския език</i> – IVAN PETROV	236
Abbreviations	239
Guidelines for the authors	243

From the Editorial Board

The scholarly journal presented here, entitled *Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe*, is a periodical supervised by the above-mentioned institution – *Ceraneum* for short – a unit brought to life by decision of the Senate of the University of Łódź in February 2011.

Professor Waldemar Ceran (1936–2009) was among the most prominent figures in the Polish humanities, especially in the field of Byzantine studies. He was for many years the director of first the Department, then the Chair of Byzantine History, University of Łódź – the first and largest of such academic units in Poland. Throughout his long-lasting and prosperous academic career, he performed a number of significant duties. In particular, he was the director of the Institute of History, University of Łódź, as well as the president (subsequently honorary president) of the Commission of Byzantine Studies at the Committee of Ancient Culture, Polish Academy of Sciences (the Polish national committee of the *Association Internationale des Études Byzantines*). He was the immediate student and closest collaborator of Prof. Halina Evert-Kappesowa, the doyen of Byzantine studies in Łódź. He received substantial specialized training from such foreign masters of the field as Prof. Paul Lemerle or Prof. Nina V. Pigulevskaya. Professor Ceran, an expert on the history of the Byzantine Empire in its entire temporal extent and diverse aspects, specialized in the history of Antioch during Late Antiquity, the relations between the Church and the Byzantine state as well as the history of the Mount Athos monasteries. An outstanding polymath and enthusiast of the classical languages. An unparalleled speaker and lecturer. An indefatigable propagator of ancient and medieval history (especially of the Byzantine Empire). An exceptionally well-mannered man of amiable disposition. An idol and mentor of a whole group of scholars, reviewer of numerous doctoral, habilitation and professorial theses. Thus, the decision to name the newly founded Centre after Him seemed only natural to the founding members. Besides, the creation of *Ceraneum* in a way fulfils the aspirations of Professor Ceran himself. He devoted all his life to developing the Byzantine studies community in Poland and popularizing the research on the history of the Eastern Roman Empire.

The founders of *Ceraneum*, as well as of the newly created journal, are the employees of two academic units of the University of Łódź: the Department of Byzantine History and the Unit of Palaeoslavistic Studies and Folk Culture. The cooperation of the two units started in 2008 and was originally connected with organizing a se-

ries of open lectures, aimed at presenting the scholars' research to a wider audience as well as at inviting the leading Polish and European authorities on Byzantine and Palaeoslavistic studies. So far, fourteen such lectures have been arranged. The noticeable interest they have aroused (not only among the teaching staff, but also the students and doctoral students of the University of Łódź), as well as the integration of the Łódź communities of specialists in history and Slavic studies that they have brought about, have caused the contacts to intensify and develop into a closer form of partnership. Specifically, a decision was made to form an interdepartmental research unit, designed to investigate the broadly defined history, religion and culture of the Mediterranean Basin, especially the area of the Byzantine Empire and *Slavia Orthodoxa*. To this end, the scope of the unit's research interests was extended so as to include other disciplines from among the humanities and the social sciences.

As a result, the application to found the interdepartmental Centre was filed to the Senate of the University of Łódź by the deans of as many as four faculties: the Faculty of Philosophy and History, the Faculty of Philology, the Faculty of International and Political Studies and the Faculty of Law and Administration. The basic tenet of the founders of *Ceraneum* is the interdisciplinary character of scientific inquiries, linking diverse fields of research and encompassing miscellaneous methodological principles. These objectives likewise apply to the scientific journal under discussion. Thanks to this, we hope to arrive at a more holistic perspective of the history of the aforementioned geographic/cultural region, as well as to provide scholars working on different aspects of history and culture with an opportunity of a direct exchange of ideas, both within *Ceraneum* itself and in the associated publications.

In order to live up to these assumptions, the activities centred around *Ceraneum* are to include editing the yearly *Studia Ceranea* alongside a series of monographs (*Seria Ceranea*), as well as organizing meetings (conferences, symposia etc.) designed to integrate the community of specialists studying the history of the Byzantine Empire and the South and East Slavs. The scholarly level and the objects of the research conducted will be supervised by the Advisory Board of *Ceraneum*, created by decision of the Rector of the University of Łódź. The board comprises several dozen distinguished scholars from various European research centres (including Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Rome, Sofia, Belgrade and Moscow). Moreover, the members of the editorial council of *Studia Ceranea* (similarly conceived as an international body, comprising scholars from Poland and abroad) have already been appointed.

The first volume of *Studia Ceranea* is including the above-mentioned lectures delivered at the University of Łódź by the members of both founding units, as well as the Polish and international guests. In this manner, readers will have the chance to acquaint themselves with the results of almost three years of organizational and editorial effort of the members of the Department of Byzantine History and the Unit of Palaeoslavistic Studies and Folk Culture. Thus, the texts have been presented here in

chronological order, reflecting the pace of our co-operation (from Maciej Kokoszko's lecture delivered 17 XII 2008 to Ivelin Ivanov's given 24 V 2011).

Studia Ceranea being designed as an international journal, contributions in the standard conference languages will be accepted (English, French, German, Russian and Italian). In the era of an absolute domination of the English language, which is slowly becoming the *lingua franca* of all kinds of scientific research, it was our intention not to abandon the centuries-long linguistic traditions of the European humanities. In this fashion, we expect to honour the heritage of the most significant national schools in the relevant fields of study, as well as the linguistic sensitivity of the contributing scholars, stemming from diverse scientific communities, not all of which prefer English as the basic code of communication. This is also an expression of our profound conviction that the disciplines we are interested in require a solid command of at least the few most crucial languages in which the research on the Eastern Roman Empire has been carried out. Furthermore, we have resolved to accept papers pertaining to the history of the Mediterranean and the Slavic area within the chronological limits from the 1st through the 17th century AD. Thus, the task that the editorial council of *Studia Ceranea* has set before itself is the gradual creation of a scientific journal, interdisciplinary in character, which will offer specialist articles, reviews and notes on newly published monographs. Along these lines, we will attempt to cross the limits of the narrow specializations restricted to Byzantine or Slavic studies; the papers contributed would represent various aspects of the Late Ancient, Byzantine and Slavic culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe, which – we claim – forms an integrity, for all its diversity. Consequently, *Studia Ceranea*, relying on the respectable earlier models provided by other periodicals devoted to similar issues, will endeavour to utilize the methodology and achievements of related disciplines employed in the studies on Late Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Modern Era. The journal is ready to face the challenges associated with contemporary humanistic thinking.

We wish to express our sincere hope that the yearly *Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe* will arise interest among the international scholarly community, effectively becoming a forum for exchanging information and a vehicle of academic discussion.

We cordially invite all interested Readers to future meetings on the pages of *Studia Ceranea*.

Georgi Minczew
Miroslaw J. Leszka
Małgorzata Skowronek
Kiril Marinow
Andrzej Kompa
Karolina Krzeszewska

ARTICLES

Maciej Kokoszko, Katarzyna Gibel-Buszevska (Łódź)

KANDAULOS. THE TESTIMONY OF SELECT SOURCES¹

The literary and antiquarian activities of Photius² and Eustathius of Thessalonica³ have enriched our knowledge with an abundance of valuable information, constantly used by historians, including the ones who attempt to unveil the mysteries of Greek gastronomy⁴. It is worth noticing that the history of food is an area of historical research which is becoming more and more popular with researchers and the phenomenon encompasses not only the growing interest in ancient gastronomy⁵, but also in the history of food in

¹ The article is a preliminary version of the paper already published in BZ (M. KOKOSZKO, K. GIBEL-BUSZEWSKA, *The term kandaulos (κάνδαυλος) / kandylos (κάνδυλος) in Lexicon of Photius and Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem of Eustathius of Thessalonica*, BZ 104, 2011, p. 125–145). The subject has been also treated in the Polish paper by the same authors entitled *Termin kandaulos (κάνδαυλος) / kandylos (κάνδυλος) na podstawie Λέξεων συναγωγῆς Φωκίστου oraz Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Eustacjusza z Tessaloniki* (VP 30, 2011, p. 361–373; the article is a Polish equivalent of the present paper, with only minor bibliographic changes) and in a study by Maciej Kokoszko published under the title *Dieta średniowiecznego Bizancjum? Krótka historia kandaulos (κάνδαυλος) / kandylos (κάνδυλος) na podstawie Λέξεων συναγωγῆς*, [in:] *Człowiek w średniowieczu. Między biologią a historią*, ed. A. SZYMCZAKOWA, Łódź 2009, p. 53–63. Some methodological references to the importance of the source basis made use of in the above mentioned studies for the history of food as well as the subject itself have also been made in M. KOKOSZKO, K. GIBEL-BUSZEWSKA, *Pamięć o luksusie antyku w dziełach pisarzy bizantyńskich. Tradycja kuchni greckiej*, [in:] *Sympozja kazimierskie poświęcone kulturze świata późnego antyku i wczesnego chrześcijaństwa*, vol. VII, *Pamięć i upamiętnienie w epoce późnego antyku*, ed. B. IWASZKIEWICZ-WRONIKOWSKA, D. PRÓCHNIAK, A. GŁOWA, Lublin 2010, p. 233–240.

² O. JUREWICZ, *Historia literatury bizantyńskiej. Zarys*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk–Łódź 1984, p. 152–156, 163–166; IDEM, *Focjusz*, [in:] *Encyklopedia kultury bizantyńskiej*, ed. O. JUREWICZ, Warszawa 2002 (cetera: EKB), p. 178–179; N.G. WILSON, *The Scholars of Byzantium*, London–Cambridge Mass. 1996, p. 89–119.

³ O. JUREWICZ, *op. cit.*, p. 245–246, 259; M. ANGOLD, *Church and society in Byzantium under the Comneni (1081–1261)*, Cambridge 1995, p. 179–196; N.G. WILSON, *op. cit.*, p. 196–204; H. CICHOCKA, *Eustacjusz z Tesaloniki*, [in:] EKB, p. 169.

⁴ Their data was also made use of in our paper entitled *Focjusz a kuchnia grecka czyli kilka słów o abyrtake (ἀβυρτάκη)*, VP 28, 2008, p. 495–504.

⁵ It is enough to point out to a few examples from the last few years – J. WILKINS, *The boastful chef. The discourse of food in ancient Greek comedy*, Oxford 2000; M. GRANT, *Roman Cookery. Ancient Recipes for Modern Kitchens*, London 2002; J.P. ALCOCK, *Food in the ancient world*, Westport–London 2006; S. GRAINGER, *Cooking “Apicius”. Roman Recipes for Modern Kitchens*, Blackawton–Totnes 2006. It should be noted that there also appeared a very good new edition of Apicius (*Apicius. A critical edition with an introduction and an English translation of the Latin recipe text Apicius*, ed. Ch. GROCOCK, S. GRAINGER, Blackawton–Totnes 2006 [cetera: *Apicius. A critical*]) and Anthimus (*ANTHIMUS, De*

Byzantium⁶. However, despite the constant development of the above-mentioned studies, the scientific research field still remains virtually boundless. The situation of inadequate research has so far concerned the famous ancient delicacy called *kándaulos/kándylos*, and the present article attempts to fill in this gap in our knowledge.

The name of the dish mentioned by both the patriarch and the bishop of Thessalonica is present in Greek literature in the form of two basic varieties. *Kandylos* (κάνδυλος), i.e. the term used by Photius⁷, appears also in the works of Aristophanes⁸, Euangellus⁹, Hesychius¹⁰, Cercidas¹¹, Menander¹², Plutarch¹³, Pollux¹⁴ and in the *Suda*¹⁵. On the other hand, the

observatione ciborum. On the observance of foods, ed. M. GRANT, Blackawton–Totnes 2007).

⁶ A manifestation of which are several interesting papers published over the last five years, v. A. DALBY, *Flavours of Byzantium*, Blackawton–Totnes 2003; *Food and cooking in Byzantium. Proceedings of the symposium “On food in Byzantium”*. Thessaloniki Museum of Byzantine Culture 4 November 2001, ed. D. PAPANIKOLA-BAKIRTZI, Athens 2005; *Feast, fast or famine. Food and drink in Byzantium*, ed. W. MAYER, S. TRZCIONKA, Brisbane 2005; *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. They complement a fundamental, in this field, work by Phaidon KOUKOULES (*Βυζαντινῶν βίος καὶ πολιτισμὸς*, vol. V, *Αἱ τροφαὶ καὶ τὰ ποτά. Τὰ γεύματα. Τὰ δεῖπνα καὶ τὰ συμπόσια*, Ἀθήναι 1952), Thomas WEBER's work (*Essen und Trinken in Konstantinopel des 10. Jahrhunderts, nach den Berichten Liutprands von Cremona*, [in:] J. KODER, T. WEBER, *Liutprand von Cremona in Konstantinopel. Untersuchungen zum griechischen Sprachschatz und zu realienkundlichen Aussagen in seinen Werken*, Wien 1980 [= *Byzantina Vindoboniensia*, 13], p. 71–99), Johannes KODER's output (*Gemüse in Byzanz. Die Versorgung Konstantinopels mit Frischgemüse im Lichte der Geoponika*, Wien 1993 etc.), Ewald KISLINGER's (*Les chrétiens d'Orient: règles et réalités alimentaires dans le monde byzantin*, [in:] *Historie de l'alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 325–344), and the results of epistolographic research of Apostolos KARPOZILOS (*Realia in Byzantine Epistolography X–XII c.*, BZ 77, 1984, p. 20–37; *Realia in Byzantine Epistolography XIII–XV c.*, BZ 88, 1995, p. 68–84).

⁷ *Photii patriarchae Lexicon*, κ, κάνδυλος, ed. C. THEODORIDIS, vol. I, Berlin–New York 1982 (cetera: PHOTIUS, *Lexicon*).

⁸ ARISTOPHANES, *Pax*, 123, [in:] ARISTOPHANE, ed. V. COULON, M. VAN DAELE, vol. II, Paris 1924; v. *Scholia in Aristophanis pacem vetera et recentiora Triclinii*, 123 d, 1–2, [in:] *Scholia in Aristophanem*, vol. II.2, *Scholia in Vespas, Pacem, Aves et Lysistratam*, ed. D. HOLWERDA, Groningen 1982 (cetera: *Scholia in pacem*).

⁹ *Athenaei Naucraticae Dipnosophistae*, XIV, 644 d–e (52, 11–23, KAIBEL), [in:] *Athenaei Naucraticae Dipnosophistarum libri XV*, ed. G. KAIBEL, vol. I–III, Lipsiae–Berolini 1887–1890 (cetera: ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*).

¹⁰ *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, κ, κάνδυλος, 646, 1–2, ed. M. SCHMIDT, vol. I–V, Ienae 1859–1868 (cetera: HESYCHIUS, *Lexicon*).

¹¹ CERCIDAS, fr. 18, [in:] *Collectanea Alexandrina*, ed. J.U. POWELL, Oxford 1925, col. 2, 15.

¹² ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XII, 517 a (12, 44–46, KAIBEL); MENANDER, fr. 397, 10–11, [in:] *Menandri reliquiae selectae. Fragmenta longiora apud alios auctores servata*, ed. F.H. SANDBACH, Oxford 1972.

¹³ *Plutachi Quaestiones convivales*, 664 a, 5, [in:] *Plutarchi moralia*, ed. C. HUBERT, vol. IV, Lipsiae 1938 (cetera: PLUTARCH, *Quaestiones convivales*).

¹⁴ *Iulii Pollucis Onomasticon*, VI, 69, ed. I. BEKKER, Berolini 1846.

¹⁵ *Suidae lexicon*, κ, Κάνδυλος, 303, 1–2, ed. A. ADLER, vol. I–IV, Lipsiae 1928–1935 (cetera: *Suidae lexicon*).

variant which Eustathius of Thessalonica¹⁶ was familiar with, i.e. kandaulos (κάνδαυλος), has been preserved in *opera* of Alexis¹⁷, Philemon¹⁸, Hegesippus of Tarentum¹⁹ and Nicostratus²⁰. Athenaeus of Naucratis records both the above-mentioned versions, which is, of course, a direct result of the very nature of his work²¹. The third option, i.e. kondylos (κόνδυλος), has been recorded only once and appears in the scholia to Aristophanes' *Peace*²².

The Photius' lexicon entry is very short, concentrating on the ingredients of *kándaulos/kándylos* as well as giving the name of the author who mentioned the delicacy in his work:

κάνδυλος σκευασία ὀψοποιοικὴ μετὰ γάλακτος καὶ στέατος καὶ μέλιτος ἔνιοι δὲ διὰ κρέως καὶ ἄρτου καὶ τυροῦ. οὕτως Ἄριστοφάνης.

kandylos: a dish made from milk, animal fat and honey and, as others claim, from meat, bread and cheese. This is exactly the dish Aristophanes was familiar with.²³

The fragment of Eustathius' work referring to the analysed topic is more extensive and apart from a recipe for the dish, it also includes a few remarks regarding its origins:

Νῦν δὲ μνηστέον ἱστορίας δηλοῦσης ὅτι τε ἡδυπάθειαν οἱ Μήγονες, ταῦτ' οὖν οἱ Λυδοί, ἐφίλου, ὅθεν, φασί, καὶ Ἄνακρέων τὸν ἡδυπαθῆ Ἰουδοπαθῆ ἔφη, καὶ ὅτι βρώμα παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐρητο κάνδαυλος, παρώνυμον ἴσως τῶ παρ' αὐτοῖς τυράννω Κανδαύλῃ, καθὰ καὶ ἄλλα τῶν ἐδεσμάτων ἐξ ἐτέρων κυρίων ὀνομάτων ἐφίλου καλεῖσθαι, ὡς καὶ οἱ Νικόλαοι. φέρεται οὖν ἐν τοῖς Ἀθηναίου, ὅτι κνηστῶ, οὐ τυρῶ, ἀλλὰ ἄρτω καὶ Φρυγίῳ τυρῶ, ἀνήθω τε καὶ ζυμῶ πίονι ἐφθού κρέως συνόντος, Λυδικὸν ἐγένετο ἔδεσμα κάνδαυλος καλούμενος. περὶ οὗ φησιν Ἀλεξίς, ὡς κάνδαυλον ἐὰν παραθῶσι, προσκατεδῆ τοὺς δακτύλους.

Now it is worth mentioning the tradition saying that the Meonians, i.e. Lydians, loved luxury; that is why Anacreon referred to the people who loved comfort as “the ones with a liking analogous to that of the Lydians.” It is also said that it was they who invented kandaulos and this term goes back to the name of their ruler Candaules, as this tribe used to coin their terminology from proper names. This was the case with the so-called *Nikolaoi*; Athenaeus in his work remarks that kandaulos was a Lydian

¹⁶ Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes, ed. M. VAN DER VALK, vol. IV, Leiden 1987, p. 180, 16–23 (cetera: EUSTATHIUS OF THESSALONICA, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*).

¹⁷ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XII, 516 d–f (12, 14–34, KAIBEL).

¹⁸ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XII, 516 f (12, 35–40, KAIBEL); PHILEMON, fr. 60, 3, [in:] *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*, ed. T. KOCK, vol. II, Leipzig 1884 (cetera: *Comici Attici*).

¹⁹ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XII, 516 d (12, 11–14, KAIBEL).

²⁰ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XII, 517 a (12, 41–43, KAIBEL); NICOSTRATUS, fr. 17, 1–3, [in:] *Comici Attici*, vol. II, Lipsiae 1884.

²¹ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS quotes the authors who name the discussed dish.

²² *Scholia in pacem*, 123 d, 1–2. V. above.

²³ PHOTIUS, *Lexicon*, κ, κάνδυλος. English translation by M.K., K.G.

dish consisting of grated (not cheese, but) bread, Phrygian cheese, dill and meat in fatty broth. Alexis claimed that “when you are treated to *kandaulos* (you eat it so vigorously that you never even notice) your fingers are nibbled to the bone”.²⁴

The fragment of *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* written by Eustathius of Thessalonica clearly indicates that in the Greeks’ awareness and, as we interpret it, as late as in Byzantine times, it was quite obvious that *kándaulos/kándylos* had been borrowed by the Hellenes from the Lydians, and the name of this dish was traditionally associated with the Lydian ruler Candaules²⁵, the predecessor of Gyges²⁶. It is worth adding here that the history of the two rulers, which is only referred to by Eustathius of Thessalonica in the fragment, is very dramatic and is told in detail by Herodotus of Halicarnassus, whose narrative concentrates on the revenge taken by the last Heraclid’s, i.e. Candaules’ spouse who felt her feelings were hurt by her husband²⁷. It is also worth remembering that the information provided by Eustathius of Thessalonica is the most comprehensive and the pieces of data included in this work have never been questioned by any other author²⁸.

Even though neither Photius nor the bishop of Thessalonica explain how *kándaulos/kándylos* appeared in Greek cuisine, it may be suggested that it was the Ionians who acted as intermediaries in this process. This hypothesis is supported by natural closeness of the latter to the Lydians. It is equally worth taking into account that Greek tradition attributed to the Ionians features analogous to the ones

²⁴ EUSTATHIUS OF THESSALONICA, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, IV, 180, 16–23. English translation by M.K., K.G.

²⁵ EUSTATHIUS OF THESSALONICA, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, IV, 180, 19–20. His *Commentaries* mentioned in N.G. WILSON, *op. cit.*, p. 197–199. Eustathius’ works has been a rich source for those who have discussed the history of Greek gastronomy. In J.A. KELHOFFER, *The diet of John the Baptist. “Locust and wild honey” in Synoptic and Patristic interpretation*, Tübingen 2005, p. 73 (information regarding diet of John the Baptist): M. GRÜNBART, *Store in a cool and dry place: perishable goods and their preservation in Byzantium*, [in:] *Eat, drink...*, p. 42–43 (the restocking of the pantry); J. KODER, *Stew and salted meat – opulent normality in the diet of every day?*, [in:] *ibidem*, p. 59–60 (information regarding meat-smoking) etc.

²⁶ Candaules, mentioned above, is also known as Sadyattes or Myrsilus. He ruled over Lydia for some time before 680 B.C. In P.N. URE, *The origins of tyranny*, Cambridge 1922, p. 137–138; S. PRZEWORSKI, *Dzieje i kultura Azji Mniejszej do podboju perskiego*, [in:] *Wielka historia powszechna*, ed. J. DĄBROWSKI et al., vol. I, *Pradzieje ludzkości i historia państw wschodu*, Warszawa 1935, p. 696; D. ARNAUD, *Starożytny Bliski Wschód. Od wprowadzenia pisma do Aleksandra Wielkiego*, trans. M. RYSZKIEWICZ, K. WAKAR, Warszawa 1982, p. 219–222; T.F.R.G. BRAUN, *The Greeks in Egypt*, [in:] *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. III.3, *The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C.*, ed. J. BOARDMAN, N.G.L. HAMMOND, ²⁽⁷⁾Cambridge 2006 (1982), p. 36; cf. G. DANZIG, *Rhetoric and the Ring: Herodotus and Plato on the Story of Gyges as a Politically Expedient Tale*, GR 55, 2008, p. 169–192.

²⁷ HERODOTE, *Histoires*, I, 7, 3 – 12, 9, ed. P.-E. LEGRAND, Paris 1932 (cetera: HERODOTUS, *Historiae*); cf. Y. HUGHES DOMINICK, *Acting Other: Atossa and Instability in Herodotus*, CQ 57, 2007, p. 433–436.

²⁸ Cf. the testimony of Athenaeus of Naucratis, which is later used by the bishop of Thessalonica himself (Λυδικὸν ἐγένετο ἔδεσμα κάνδαυλος) – EUSTATHIUS OF THESSALONICA, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, IV, 180, 22–23; ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XII, 516 c (12, 9–10, KAIBEL).

which were supposed to characterize Candaules' subjects, i.e. inclination to luxury. This suggestion appears to be confirmed by a fragment of a Menander's comedy in which an affluent Ionian, getting ready to eat this dish, is depicted. Though there is no mention of the costliness of the dish ingredients, the *kándaulos/kándylos* referred to by the playwright must have been an exquisite one because it had an extraordinary property – notably, it enhanced one's love powers, which surely made it look more attractive to those who were affluent enough to afford it and who generally did not share the moderation (at least) postulated by the European Greeks²⁹. What is more, the very Ionian about to consume the delicacy is depicted as a rich person.

Pinpointing the hypothetical date of the creation of *kándaulos/kándylos* was made possible thanks to the completion of excavation works in Sardis, the capital of ancient Lydia, or, more precisely, as a result of the publication of Crawford Greenewalt's analysis of what was discovered therein³⁰, i.e. 25 deposits (consisting of a pot, a small jug, a mug, a shallow dish and a knife). What is especially significant in the context is that the pots contained bone leftovers which, as it was determined, belonged to puppies less than three months old.

In his book Greenewalt claims that those finds must be interpreted in accordance with select written sources having a connection with the above-mentioned Candaules³¹. Having analysed the data, the scholar argues that the ruler was nicknamed after one of the Lydian gods, notably, the ruler of the underworld, whose name was Candaules (or Candaulas). Subsequently, Greenewalt quotes the tradition recorded by Hipponax³² and John Tzetzes³³ to remind that the name of the divinity is in fact a telling term and means "he who smothers dogs/puppies". Finally, Greenewalt concludes by suggesting that the deposits show leftovers after ritual feasts during which the dogs' meat was prepared for consumption.

The Greenewalt's hypothesis was later developed in a David Harvey's³⁴ article. The author draws our attention to the fact that some reference to dogs is also found in the legendary life of Cyrus the Great, the conqueror of Lydia, which is also to be found in

²⁹ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, IV, 132 e–f, 9, 19–30; XII, 517 a (12, 44–46, KATBEL); MENANDER, fr. 397, 10–11; v. also P. PRAY BOBER, *Art, culture and cuisine. Ancient and medieval gastronomy*, Chicago–London 1999, p. 109.

³⁰ C.H. GREENEWALT, *Ritual dinners in early historic Sardis*, Berkeley 1976, passim.

³¹ C.H. GREENEWALT, *op. cit.*, p. 52–54.

³² *Kynanches* (κυνάγχης) – HIPPONAX, fr. 3 a, 1, [in:] *Iambi et elegi Graeci*, ed. M.L. WEST, vol. I, Oxford 1971.

³³ *Skylopniktes* (σκυλοπνίκτης) – Ioannis Tzetzae *historiarum variarum chiliades*, VI, 482, ed. T. KIESSLING, Hildesheim 1963. Works of Tzetzes were partially analysed for their possible use in a history of gastronomy by Anthoullis A. DEMOSTHENOUS (*The scholar and the partridge: attitudes relating to nutritional goods in the twelfth century from the letters of the scholar John Tzetzes*, [in:] *Feast, fast...*, p. 25–31).

³⁴ *Lydian specialties, Croesus' golden baking-woman, and dogs' dinners*, [in:] *Food in antiquity*, ed. J. WILKINS, D. HARVEY, M. DOBSON, Exeter 1995, p. 273–285.

the work of Herodotus of Halicarnassus³⁵. Harvey highlights the fact that Mithradates' wife's name, i.e. the name of young Cyrus' foster mother, was, in the Median/Persian language, Spaco (Σπακώ), which the author of *Histories* translates by means of the Greek term Kynó (Κυνώ) – 'the bitch'³⁶. Harvey claims that, due to the fact that the finds interpreted by Greenwalt come from the half of the 6th century B.C., one might risk a conclusion that the sacrificing of young dogs served as a means of averting the danger (imminent in the 540s B.C.) of the Persian invasion on Lydia, personified by Cyrus, the young and energetic ruler of the Medians and the Persians³⁷.

We do not possess any precise data regarding the period when *kándaulos/kándylos* found its permanent place in European Greece. Since in accordance with our knowledge, the oldest Greek author mentioning this dish was Aristophanes³⁸, one may suppose that his 5th century audience tasted this delicacy or at least was aware of its existence. If we are right, one can also conjecture that *kándaulos/kándylos* had been accepted by the Hellenes even before this date. Moreover, one may also come to the conclusion that this dish had not become widely popular by Hellenistic times, since it was the period when many culinary novelties were being introduced to Greek gastronomy and since it was exactly the time when the artistic activity of the majority of the ancient authors mentioning the delicacy was in its heyday³⁹.

³⁵ The author writes that Cyrus was foretold to Astyages, the Median ruler and Cyrus' grandfather, in a prophetic dream to be the conqueror of the Medes. In order to avoid the fate, Astyages ordered to kill the baby. The sentence was not executed since Harpagus, the man charged with the mission, felt stings of remorse. As a result, the child was taken in by Mithradates, a herdsman, and his wife Spaco, who raised him to the moment when he was recognised by Astyages and was granted a safe return to Astyages' court – HERODOTUS, *Historiae*, I, 107, 1 – 116, 21.

³⁶ HERODOTUS, *Historiae*, I, 110, 4–7; v. D. ARNAUD, *op. cit.*, p. 217–217; P. BRIANT, *From Cyrus to Alexander. A history of the Persian empire*, trans. P.T. DANIELS, Winona Lake 2002, p. 31–50.

³⁷ D. HARVEY, *op. cit.*, p. 283–284. Harvey believes that the date of the conquer of Sardis should be moved to around 544 B.C. Issue discussed in J. CARGILL, *The Nabonidus Chronicle and the fall of Lydia*, AJAH 2, 1977, p. 97–116, H.T. WADE-GERY, *Essays in Greek history*, Oxford 1958, p. 166, an. 3.

³⁸ K. KUMANIECKI, *Historia kultury starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, Warszawa 1977, p. 177–179.

³⁹ Regarding the specific character of work of Athenaeus of Naucratis cf. B. BALDWIN, *Athenaeus and his work*, AClaS 19, 1976, p. 21–42; M. KOKOSZKO, *Ryby i ich znaczenie w życiu codziennym ludzi późnego antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (III–VII w.)*, Łódź 2005 [= Byzantina Lodziensia, 9], p. 8–10 (collected works); A. LUKINOVICH, *The play of reflections between literary form and the sympotic theme in the „Deipnosophistae” of Athenaeus*, [in:] *Symptica. A symposium on the symposium*, ed. O. MURRAY, Oxford 1994, p. 263–271; *Athenaeus and his World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, ed. D. BRAUND, J. WILKINS, Exeter 2000. The Hellenistic period was full of culinary novelties, which sometimes created a sort of (either permanent or ephemeral) trends in the culinary art – J. WILKINS, S. HILL, *The sources and sauces of Athenaeus*, [in:] *Food in antiquity...*, p. 437, an. 4. Some of famous at that time delicacies were discussed in M. KOKOSZKO, *Historia kuchni antycznej i bizantyńskiej. Sos karyke (καρύκη). Komentarz do Chronografii Michała Pselloza*, PNH 5.2, 2006, p. 167–178, especially 170–171 (period of spreading among the Greeks); IDEM, K. GIBEL, *Focjusz a kuchnia...*, p. 495–504, especially 501 (spreading among the Greeks). Some of them found their place as a permanent element of culture, not only dietetic, but also symbolic – K. GIBEL,

We know only a sketchy recipe for *kándaulos/kándylos*. This lack of precision is typical of the times when cooks were mostly slaves and gastronomic literature was created by scholarly dilettantes. On the other hand, we are also aware that there existed more than one version of the dish discussed as, according to Athenaeus of Naucratis (quoting Hegesippus of Tarentum⁴⁰), there were three separate variations of this delicacy⁴¹. Unfortunately, the author of *Deipnosophists* himself quotes⁴² only one recipe whose differentiating feature was the addition of meat to *kándaulos/kándylos*. One should at the same time remember that this recipe can be detected later in Byzantine tradition and is quoted in the lexicon compiled by Hesychius, Photius' work, the *Suda* and *Commentarii* compiled by Eustathius of Thessalonica. The second variation was well-documented as early as in the 2nd century A.D. by Pollux and is subsequently mentioned in the lexicons written by Hesychius, the quoted entry by Photius and in the *Suda*. The preserved data indicates that the second recipe referred to a sweet version of the dish. Regrettably, we do not know anything about the character of the third variety.

We shall start our research into the recipe for *kándaulos/kándylos* from the variation which included meat as one of the ingredients. Photius describes this type as a dish prepared *διὰ κρέως καὶ ἄρτου καὶ τυροῦ*. It is unfortunate that the erudite gives no detail about the kind of meat used for this dish by the Greeks. There is little indication that it would come from puppies, although the Greeks did not turn their noses up at this kind of meat⁴³. It is even recommended by the author of *De morbis popularibus*⁴⁴ as well as mentioned by Galen in *De alimentorum facultatibus*⁴⁵. Since, however, there is no mention in Greek culinary and medical literature that dog meat was a delicacy⁴⁶, let us formulate a hypothesis claiming that, by the time the dish established itself in the Greek

Symbolika jedzenia w wybranych pismach Jana Chryzostoma na przykładzie derywatów od karyke (καρύκη), [in:] *Byzantina Europaea. Księga Jubileuszowa ofiarowana profesorowi Waldemarowi Ceranowi*, ed. M. KOKOSZKO, M.J. LESZKA, Łódź 2007 [= *Byzantina Lodziensia*, 11], p. 121–131.

⁴⁰ Hegesippus of Tarentum is dated to that period – F. BILABEL, *Kochbücher*, [in:] *RE*, vol. XXI, col. 935–937. A. DALBY, *Siren Feasts. A History of Food and Gastronomy in Greece*, London 1996, p. 111; IDEM, *Food in the Ancient World from A to Z*, London–New York 2003, p. 174. HARVEY (*op. cit.*, p. 277) does not date him at all.

⁴¹ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XII, 516 c (12, 10, KAIBEL).

⁴² After abovementioned Hegesippus of Tarentum.

⁴³ Regarding the issue of dogs used as food, v. F.J. SIMOONS, *Eat not this flesh. Food avoidances from prehistory to the present*, Madison–London 1994, p. 200–252, especially 223–227, 232–236 (Greek world), 246 (regarding the issue of interpretation of the findings from Sardis); J. WILKINS, S. HILL, *Food in the ancient world*, Malden–Oxford 2006, p. 144; J. ROY, *The consumption of dog-meat in classical Greece*, [in:] *Cooking up the past. Food and culinary practices in the Neolithic and Bronze Age Aegean*, ed. C. MEE, J. RENARD, Oxford 2007, p. 342–353, especially 350.

⁴⁴ *De morbis popularibus (Epidemiae)*, VII, 1, 62 – 12, [in:] *Oeuvres completes d'Hippocrate*, ed. E. LITTRE, vol. V, Paris 1846; v. J. ROY, *op. cit.*, p. 347–348.

⁴⁵ *Galenii de alimentorum facultatibus*, 664, 16 – 665, 5, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. D.C.G. KÜHN, vol. VI, Lipsiae 1823 (cetera: GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*).

⁴⁶ Cf. the James ROY's (*op. cit.*, p. 348–350) conclusions.

culinary art, dogs had been replaced, for instance, by small rodents. The conjecture finds corroboration in the data provided by Hesychius, who in his lexicon stated that hare meat was used as an ingredient of the dish discussed (διὰ λαγῶων)⁴⁷.

Hegesippus' recipe (later repeated almost verbatim by Eustathius of Thessalonica) states that the meat was cooked or stewed before being added to the dish. The statement is corroborated by the fact that the recipe for *kándaulos/kándylos* included stock or gravy, *dzomós* (ζωμός), i.e. a condiment which must have been a result of cooking the meat. We can also conjecture that the meat was not lean since the *dzomós* is referred to as "fatty", *píon* (πίων)⁴⁸. Photius also claims that animal fat ([μετὰ] στέατος) was used in *kándaulos/kándylos*, but he mentions it only in the hypothetical recipe for the sweet variety. Therefore, we are unable to determine whether the analogous procedure of adding *stear* equally applied to the meat version of this dish.

All the authors inform that an adequate amount of Phrygian cheese was also added to *kándaulos/kándylos*. The Phrygian cheese was a special variety produced from a mixture of donkey and horse mares' milk and the product was renowned enough to be fleetingly mentioned by Aristotle himself in his *Historia animalium*⁴⁹. Some modern authors have speculated that the end-product of Greek cheese-makers had an intensive aroma and savoury taste and, therefore, it has been suggested that it was similar to the famous English Stilton⁵⁰. However, we have no evidence whatsoever that this analogy is correct. One may also speculate that the cheese was added in chunks as this is the best procedure to melt it down and mix homogeneously with other liquid ingredients of *kándaulos/kándylos*. John Wilkins and Shaun Hill⁵¹, the famous connoisseurs of Greek gastronomy and specialists in the field, seem to be in favour of this idea. One must suppose that the liquefied cheese ensured the silky texture of the gravy and, if salted⁵², it would also provide this dish with its final flavour.

The preserved recipes clearly show that bread was a vital ingredient of this dish.

⁴⁷ HESYCHIUS, *Lexicon*, κ, κάन्दυλος, 646, 1.

⁴⁸ It is also probable that olive oil might have been added to the stock.

⁴⁹ ARISTOTE, *Histoire des animaux*, 552 a, 27–29, ed. P. LOUIS, vol. I, Paris 196; v. A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 80; V. ESSEX CHEKE, *The story of cheese-making in Britain*, London 1959, p. 70; P.F. FOX, P.L.H. MCSWEENEY, *Cheese: An overview*, [in:] *Cheese. Chemistry, physics and microbiology*, vol. I, *General aspects*, ed. P.F. FOX, P.L.H. MCSWEENEY, T.M. COGAN, T.P. GUINEE, Amsterdam–Boston–Heidelberg et al. 2004, p. 1–18; R. SCOTT, R.K. ROBINSON, R.A. WILBEY, *Cheesemaking practice*, New York 1998, p. 2 etc.

⁵⁰ J. DORAN, *Table traits, with something on them*, Edinburgh–Dublin 1859, p. 33. Stilton is a famous kind of white or blue cheese, produced from non-skimmed milk in Melton Mowbray and the surrounding areas (Leicestershire, Derbyshire i Nottinghamshire). Regarding such cheese, v. A. DAVIDSON, *The Oxford companion to food*, Oxford 1996, p. 754–755; T. HICKMAN, *The history of Stilton cheese*, Stroud 1996, passim.

⁵¹ Compare a contemporary recipe, based on tradition – J. WILKINS, S. HILL, *Food in the ancient...*, p. 278.

⁵² A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 80–81.

The fact of using this condiment ([ἐξ] κνηστοῦ ἄρτου) is confirmed by Hegesippus' tradition⁵³, and it was Eustathius of Thessalonica himself who very pointedly highlighted this ingredient (ὅτι κνηστῶ, οὐ τυρῶ, ἀλλὰ ἄρτω) as well⁵⁴. The very wording of his narrative suggests that the product was ground or grated. However, it is worth reminding here that there existed a particular kind of bread called *knestós* (κνηστός), which was mentioned by Artemidorus of Ephesus⁵⁵. Still, the data we possess is too limited to definitely confirm that the Artemidorus' *knestós ártos* was exactly the variety to have been exclusively utilised in the dish discussed.

It is really difficult to define the role played by this ingredient in the dish. Two basic facts may be assumed. Firstly, we may interpret its role as a simple thickening agent. The premise for such an interpretation is adding to the *kándaulos/kándylos* sweet version, as it was described by Pollux, an ingredient called *amylum* (ἄμυλον)⁵⁶, i.e. starch⁵⁷, which is a substance thickening a dish but not altering its final taste or texture⁵⁸. In accordance with this hypothesis, bread and *amylum* would have been ingredients of an analogous property, i.e. thickeners. On making such an assumption, one may come to a further conclusion that the dish, after the grated bread having been added to it, simmered until its uniform consistency was achieved or was baked in a *kribanon* (κρίβανον), an *ipnós* (ιπνός) or in a dish covered with hot charcoal (*thermospodium / cinis calidus*)⁵⁹. Here we must mention one more thing – if that was the case, the bread used for *kándaulos/kándylos* must have been kneaded from finely ground flour⁶⁰ whose characteristic (including flavour) was fairly neutral. On the other hand, it is equally pos-

⁵³ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XII, 516 d (12, 13, KAIBEL).

⁵⁴ EUSTATHIUS OF THESSALONICA, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, IV, 180, 21.

⁵⁵ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, III, 111 d (76, 25–26, KAIBEL). Also v. HESYCHIUS, *Lexicon*, κ, κνηστός, 3119, 1.

⁵⁶ GALEN WAS INTERESTED IN THE PROPERTIES OF *amylum* (*De alimentorum facultatibus* 500, 4–16).

⁵⁷ A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 349.

⁵⁸ C. GROCOCK, S. GRAINGER, *A glossary to Apicius*, [in:] *Apicius. A critical...*, s. 330–331; D.L. THURMAND, *A handbook of food processing in classical Rome. For her bounty no winter*, Leiden–Boston 2006, p. 166, 171.

⁵⁹ Pots made of porous clay burnt frequently, thus spoiling the taste of dishes. What is more, when heated on a standard hearth, the pots received heat only from below, which resulted in frequent burning of dense ingredients located at the bottom of the pot. Roasting in an oven would result in a more even heating of the dish. Such idea is proposed by Hesychius, who defines *kándaulos/kándylos* by using a term *pemma edodimon* (πέμμα ἐδώδιμον) – HESYCHIUS, *Lexicon*, κ, κάνδυλος, 646, 2. In. C. GROCOCK, S. GRAINGER, *op. cit.*, p. 362. Roasting methods compared in A. CUBBERLEY, *Bread-baking in Ancient Italy. Clibanus and sub testu in the Roman world: Hereinafter thoughts*, [in:] *Food in Antiquity...*, p. 55–68; R.I. CURTIS, *Ancient food technology*, Leiden–Boston–Köln 2001, p. 368–369; J. FRAYN, *Home Baking in Roman Italy*, *An* 52, 1978, p. 28–33; J. LIVERSIDGE, *Roman kitchens and cooking utensils*, [in:] *The Roman cookery book. A critical translation of „The art of cooking” by Apicius for use in the study and the kitchen*, ed. B. FLOWER, E. ROSENBAUM, London–Toronto–Wellington–Sydney 1958, p. 29–38.

⁶⁰ It must have been wheat flour, which contains a high dose of gluten.

sible that *amylum* was added only to the sweet variety of *kándaulos/kándylos*, and its meaty type included considerably tangible bread particles, which, while releasing starch, only additionally thickened the entire consistency⁶¹. Surely, taking into account the second case, a sort of bread made of coarsely ground grain would have been a much better option for an ancient or Byzantine cook⁶².

The preserved recipes show that the main spice added to *kándaulos/kándylos* was *anéthon* (ἀνήθρον). However, we possess no specifications regarding its amount and form. For instance, we do not know which parts of this plant were used – seeds or green parts or both. Still, either of those would have caused different gustatory effects. To be quite frank, we cannot even determine whether the recipe included dill (*Anethum graveolens*)⁶³ or fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*)⁶⁴. Both these plants originated in Central Asia, and, having spread in Asia Minor and Europe⁶⁵, were popularly used for the purpose of the Greek culinary art. Both, however, could have had a slightly different effect upon the final flavour of the dish. The first variety would have added freshness to the aroma of the delicacy and made its taste slightly sweet and at the same time spicy, while the other would have provided the dish with a liquorice-like aroma and ensured a higher intensity of gustatory experience. It is worth mentioning here that Wilkins and Hill suggest using anise (*Pimpinella anisum*) in the dish, since it would have additionally enhanced the latter effect⁶⁶.

The sweet variety of *kándaulos/kándylos* is described in the literature with similar precision, and the most comprehensive source of knowledge regarding this variant of the dish is Julius Pollux's *Onomasticon*. The lexicographer states that this delicacy was made from cheese ([ἐξ] τυροῦ), milk ([ἐξ] γάλακτος), starch (ἐξ ἀμύλου) and honey ([ἐξ] μέλιτος). One may surmise that also Phrygian cheese⁶⁷ was used, as no author mentions any other variety. The cheese was surely melted in hot milk while the starch served as an additional thickening agent. Finally, honey made the dish taste sweet. It is worth stressing that almost all of the above-mentioned ingredients could also be later found in various configurations in Byzantine sources. Hesychius preserved a recipe enlisting honey, cheese and milk⁶⁸; Photius remembered about

⁶¹ Barley bread might also have been an option in this case.

⁶² K.D. WHITE, *Cereals, Bread and Milling in the Roman World*, [in:] *Food in Antiquity...*, p. 38–43, especially 41–42. Athenaeus of Naucratis names various kinds of breads, known in antiquity, in the 3rd book of his *Deipnosophists*. Recently, an interesting and informative study of the processing of grain products was presented by Dionysios STATHAKOPOULOS (*Between the field and the palate: how agricultural products were processed into food*, [in:] *Eat, drink...*, p. 27–38).

⁶³ A. DALBY, *Dangerous tastes. The story of spices*, London 2002, p. 110, 128; M. TOUSSAINT-SAMAT, *Histoire de la nourriture naturelle et morale*, Paris 1997, p. 647.

⁶⁴ A. DALBY, *Dangerous...*, p. 52, 58, 105, 111, 128; M. TOUSSAINT-SAMAT, *op. cit.*, p. 648.

⁶⁵ A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 116–117.

⁶⁶ J. WILKINS, S. HILL, *Food in the ancient...*, p. 278.

⁶⁷ It is probable, however, that it could have been any other kind of cheese.

⁶⁸ δὲ... γάλακτος καὶ τυροῦ καὶ μέλιτος... – HESYCHIUS, *Lexicon*, κ, κάνδυλος, 646, 1–2.

milk and honey and also added animal fat, *stear*⁶⁹; the *Suda*, however, mentions only honey and milk⁷⁰.

We do not know the final shape of the dish, or dishes. The ingredients suggest that the meat variety was semi-liquid and similar to modern stew or fricassee. Hesychius stated that *kándaulos/kándylos* was a kind of pastry (pie) and in order to precisely depict this concept, he used the term *pémma* (πέμμα)⁷¹. This data is complemented by the scholia to *Peace*, whose author called the dish a kind of pastry (or pie), i.e. *eidós plakoúntos* (εἶδος... πλακοῦντος)⁷². Aristophanes suggests that *kándaulos/kándylos* was served with bread⁷³. It is easily understandable since this dish had never been a staple part of the diet but a slightly exotic *ópson* (ὄψον), i.e. an addition to the basic foodstuffs. However, it is difficult to state whether the habit of serving this dish with bread concerned all the varieties of the delicacy discussed⁷⁴. We may guess that the final appearance of the sweet variety was similar to modern blancmange or thick custard. It is also possible that, after cooling down, starch and fat⁷⁵ made the second variety of *kándaulos/kándylos* hard enough to slice it or cut into portions.

Common reports of ancient⁷⁶ and Byzantine⁷⁷ authors clearly show that *kándaulos/kándylos* was a sophisticated and exquisite dish. This classification was not determined by high prices of its ingredients⁷⁸ but, as one may suppose, by its Eastern origin and overall Greek culinary tradition. Anyway, this delicacy is always mentioned in the context of lavish feasts or preparations for such⁷⁹. The moralists surely noticed the risks coming from its consumption. Even Menander, as we have mentioned above, included it in the list of aphrodisiacs, and Plutarch located it, next to *abyrtáke* (ἀβυρτάκη) and *karýke* (καρύκη), in the catalogue of dishes, being a contradiction to the Greek gastronomic and national tradition⁸⁰. This opinion was so deeply-rooted in the Greek awareness that even Eustathius of Thessalonica, as it has been alluded to, still regarded *kándaulos/kándylos* as a symbol of luxury and gluttony invariably associated with culinary imports from the East⁸¹.

⁶⁹ μετὰ γάλακτος καὶ στέατος καὶ μέλιτος – PHOTIUS, *Lexicon*, κ, κάνδυλος.

⁷⁰ διὰ μέλιτος καὶ γάλακτος... – *Suidae Lexicon*, κ, κάνδυλος, 303, 1.

⁷¹ HESYCHIUS, *Lexicon*, κ, κάνδυλος, 646, 2. The explanation of the lexicographer is too brief for unequivocal conclusions. In our opinion, the term itself may point to the fact that all the ingredients of the dish were subjected to high temperature (for example, in a kind of an oven or in a *kribanon* – compare above).

⁷² *Scholia in pacem*, 123d, 2. Such interpretation is provided also by Andrew DALBY (*Food...*, p. 188).

⁷³ ARISTOPHANES, *Pax*, 123.

⁷⁴ Such doubt concerns also the sweet variety.

⁷⁵ Especially fat mentioned by Photius; v. A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 349.

⁷⁶ Cf. contexts which mention *kandaulos*.

⁷⁷ Cf. the opinion of Eustathius of Thessalonica.

⁷⁸ Undoubtedly, the most luxurious ingredient was meat.

⁷⁹ For example, EUANGELLUS (v. the above-mentioned fragment) and PHILEMON (v. the above-mentioned fragment).

⁸⁰ PLUTARCH, *Quaestiones convivales*, 644 b, 5–11; v. J. WILKINS, *The boastful chef...*, p. 265–267.

⁸¹ It is worth adding that the symbolic meaning of eating still remains a rewarding area of scientific

As far as the Byzantine period is concerned, information regarding the consumption of *kándaulos/kándylos* is disappointingly scarce. There is no direct data available which proves its important role in the diet. Therefore, we have to make do with circumstantial evidence provided in the lexicographers' entries and literary comments. In our opinion, they prove at least the everlasting interest in this delicacy. The dish itself would not have been mentioned if the term *kándaulos/kándylos* had only been a dead word and the taste or aroma of this delicacy had long been forgotten. There were still courts, including the imperial one⁸², which promoted the consumption of luxurious foodstuffs that were regarded as the indicators of the social status and power⁸³. Even if it had not been the case, without the Byzantium knowledge about *kándaulos/kándylos*, the history of the Greek cuisine would be much poorer now.

Abstract. The current study attempts to trace the history and retrieve the recipe of a specific dish called *kándaulos/kándylos*. It was a Greek delicacy developed in Lydia and named after a Lydian ruler, known by the name Candaules. The dish was (by means of the Greek Ionians in habiting Asia Minor) borrowed by the Greeks to have been established in the areas of the southern Balkan Peninsula by the 5th c. B.C. It became especially popular in the Hellenistic period. The testimony of the sources provides us with the information on two specific varieties of *kándaulos/kándylos*. The first was savoury and included such ingredients as cooked meat, stock, Phrygian cheese, breadcrumbs and dill (or fennel). The other recipe included milk, animal fat, cheese and honey. The dish is reported by the authors of the sources to have been costly and indicating the social status of its consumers. Although there is enough evidence indicating its popularity in antiquity, we lack reliable evidence showing that *kándaulos/kándylos* was still served in Byzantine times. However, Byzantine authors preserved the most detailed literary evidence on the delicacy.

Maciej Kokoszko

Katedra Historii Bizancjum
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. A. Kamińskiego 27a
90–219 Łódź, Polska
mkokoszko@komandor.pl

Katarzyna Gibel-Buszevska

Katedra Historii Bizancjum
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. A. Kamińskiego 27a
90–219 Łódź, Polska
meluzyna7@wp.pl

study, proofs of which are recently published works of Katarzyna GIBEL (cf. above), Anthony EASTMAN, Liz JAMES (*Eat, drink... and pay the price*, [in:] *Eat, drink...*, p. 175–189), and Mary B. CUNNINGHAM (*Divine banquet: the Theotokos as a source of spiritual nourishment*, [in:] *Eat, drink...*, p. 235–244).

⁸² Some circumstantial evidence leads to the Macedonian court, especially to the kitchen of emperor Constantine VIII, who was not only a gourmet but also an amateur cook, at least according to Psellus. Cf. MICHAEL PSELLUS, *Chronographie ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976–1077)*, II, 7, 4, ed. É. RENAULD, Paris 1926, vol. I. The exact issue was mentioned in M. KOKOSZKO, *Historia...*, p. 167–168, 177–178.

⁸³ Recently, a brilliant analysis of emperor's feast as a representation of imperial authority has been published by Simon MALMBERG (*Dazzling dining: banquets as an expression of imperial legitimacy*, [in:] *Eat, drink...*, p. 75–89).

Georgi Minczew (Łódź)

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM'S TALE ON HOW MICHAEL VANQUISHED SATANAEL – A BOGOMIL TEXT?¹

I. Manuscripts and studies.

This still not properly investigated Old Bulgarian literary monument (also known as *How Michael Vanquished Satanael*, *The Tale of the False Antichrist* and *The Fight of Archangel Michael and Satanael*) first came to light in the 1930s, through Jordan Ivanov's edition based on late copies from *Punčo Codex* (1796) from the collection of the St.St. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia (НБКМ no. 693) and the so-called *Prvan Vlčov Codex* (1820), stored at the Church Historical and Archival Institute of the Bulgarian Patriarchate in Sofia (ЦИАИ no. 232). J. Ivanov was the first to claim that *The Tale...*² reflected the dualist views of the Bulgarian Bogomils³. The early 1980s saw the publication of two studies reporting a newly discovered copy of the monument (roughly two hundred years older). In the 1981 announcement, Anisava Miltenova provides an edition of *The Tale...* based on a copy from a late 16th century codex of mixed content (ЦИАИ no. 1161)⁴, describing it as the first version, reflecting an "earlier state of the text"⁵. A further, little-known Serbian version of *The Tale...*, found in manuscript no. 82 from the monastery in Nikoljac and described by Vladimir Mošin, is also referred to here⁶.

One more study by A. Miltenova also appeared at around the same time, expressing the opinion that *The Tale...*, as a work featuring an interesting plot, is a text connected with the ideological views of Bogomil communities, but was not designed for the 'Perfect'; rather, it was meant for the ordinary, 'non-consecrated' adepts of the heretic movement⁷.

¹ A variant of the text, entitled *Един богомилски текст? Слово на св. Йоан Златоуст за това, как Михаил победи Сатанаил*, has been published in Pbg 34.4, 2010, p. 18–46.

² [The term 'tale' is used here to render Slavic *slovo* (literally 'word') – MM.]

³ Й. ИВАНОВ, *Старобългарски разкази*, София 1935, p. 18–25.

⁴ А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифът за борбата на архангел Михаил със Сатанаил в две редакции*, СЛ 9, 1981, p. 98–113.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 99.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 113. Cf.: В. МОШИН, *Гирилски рукописи у манастиру Никољуцу код Бијелог поља*, ИЗ.ОИИЦГ 18, 1961, p. 704. Text edition: Т. ЈОВАНОВИЋ, *Траг апокрифа о борби са ђаволом у српској народној књижевности*, КњЈ 43.3/4, 1995, p. 33–55.

⁷ А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Неизвестна редакција на апокрифа за борбата на Архангел Михаил със*

A number of years later, the same indefatigable student of this text published – in collaboration with Dmitrije Bogdanović – a new, Serbian version of the work, even older (dating back to the 14th century), though unfortunately fragmentary⁸. The precise attribution of the text (based on the extant part of the ending) is in fact, a difficult task; far-reaching differences exist between this and all the other known Slavic variants:

F. 145: стратиже **Михаиле** поч'то скръбьнь исы, властелин'к мои прьви кнрономе поч'то скръбиши ѿ пронорьлив'кьмь Сатанаил'к како онь оставить тее'к. а ти убивень до конца. тогда Михаиле рече: владыко азъ зато скръбень исмь господь глагола кѣмо слыши архистратиже Михаиле мочиты хоще родь члов'кчь сотона нь не в'ечно боудеть и створи... пророцы апостолы и мученицы иерарьсы и поустынныкы. и оумножоу число ангель мнѡхъ. тогда слышавь **Михаиле** и дасть славоу богоу въ в'еки ам'нь⁹

According to the authors, the excerpt belongs to the so-called 'first', oldest version, dating back to the 13th century, and shares common features with the copy known from ЦИАИ no. 1161. The two resemble each other as far as the content is concerned: the latter text also mentions (albeit in a different place) Archangel Michael not comprehending why God never ultimately deprived Satanael of his power to do evil. Prior to entrusting Michael to recovering the robe, wreath and sceptre, God explains that he is not irrevocably stripping Satanael of his force so that the latter can do evil for a further seven ages – until the end of the world, when the righteous shall be separated from the unjust. Following the final victory of good over evil, God will create a new, just world¹⁰. It remains to be seen whether the preserved excerpt from Savina monastery can be ascribed to the so-called 'first' version in view of its formal and linguistic characteristics.

Donka Petkanova utilizes the ЦИАИ no. 1161 manuscript as the basis for her Modern Bulgarian translation of the work, but she imports the title *The Tale of the False Antichrist, Godless Satanael, How He Was Subdued by Archangel Michael, the Leader of All Angels* (Слово за лъжливия Антихрист, безбожния Сатанаил, как го плени Архангел Михаил, воевода на всички ангели) from the *Punčo Codex*. In the commentary, she questions J. Ivanov's assertion about the text's ultimate Bogomil origin; she remarks that "the work probably cannot be regarded as truly Bulgarian, since it contains ideas and motifs also known from other apocrypha"¹¹.

Сатанаил, [in:] *Литературознание и фолклористика. Сборник в чест на акад. Петър Динев*, София 1983, p. 121–128. Abbreviations in the text have been resolved according to the orthographical principles of the so-called Resavian recension of the Old Church Slavonic language, which the copy of *The Tale*... represents.

⁸ Д. БОГДАНОВИЋ, А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифният сборник от манастира Савина XIV в. в сравнение с други подобни южнославянски ръкописи*, АрП 1, 1987, p. 3–27.

⁹ Quoted after: Д. БОГДАНОВИЋ, А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 15–16.

¹⁰ А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифът за борбата*..., p. 100, 113.

¹¹ *Стара българска литература в седем тома*, vol. I, *Апокрифи*, ed. Д. Петканова, София 1982, p. 41–48.

In 2005, Tomislav Jovanović published his Serbian translation of the text under the title *The Fight of Archangel Michael and Satanael* (*Борба арханђела Михаила са Сатанаилом*)¹². As the basis for the translation of the so-called first version, the Serbian scholar chooses the text of ЦИАИ no. 1116 (following the edition by A. Miltenova)¹³, whereas the second version is translated from the text of the manuscript from Nikoljac monastery, no. 82 (following her own 1995 edition)¹⁴.

The so-called first version, as found in the codex ЦИАИ no. 1161, served as the basis for a new translation of *The Tale...* into Polish¹⁵.

Another scholar to have taken part in the discussion 'for or against' the Bogomil connections is Klimentina Ivanova. According to her, the presence of quotations from John Chrysostom's anaphora (ТВОЯ ѿ ТВОИХЪ ТѢБѢ ПРИНОСИТЪ ЕСТЬ, ѿ ВСѢХЪ И ЗА ВАСЬ; ТѢБѢ ПОЕМЪ, ТѢБѢ БЛАГОСВЕЩЕМЪ. БЛАГОДАРИМЪ ТЕ, ВЛАДИКО ВСЕДРЪЖИТЕЛЪ, МОЛИМЪ ТИ СЕ БОЖЕ НАШЪ)¹⁶ renders the assumption concerning the heretic provenience of the text rather problematic, as the Bogomils rejected the sacraments and the Orthodox rite; thus *The Tale...* cannot have been written by a 'Perfect' Bogomil¹⁷.

Recently, the issue of the originality or non-originality of the work has been raised in two studies: by Olga Afinogenova¹⁸ and Małgorzata Skowronek¹⁹.

The Russian scholar, publishing a similar Greek pseudo-canonical work (long known to specialists in Byzantine literature)²⁰, puts forth an interesting hypothesis concerning the relation between the Slavic and the Greek texts:

¹² *Апокрифи старозаветни према српским преписима (Стара српска књижевност у 24 књиге, књига 23, 1 том)*, ed. Т. Јовановић, Београд 2005, p. 99–113.

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 486.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 486–487.

¹⁵ The first Polish translation of the work, based on the texts known since the times of J. Ivanov: *Siedem niebios i ziemia. Antologia dawnej prozy bułgarskiej*, ed. T. DĄBEK-WIRGOWA, Warszawa 1983, p. 22–27. The new translation by A. MICHAŁOWSKA in: *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006, p. 12–25.

¹⁶ А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифът за борбата...*, p. 104. Further quotations from *The Tale...* in both versions will follow this edition, however with simplified spelling, resolved abbreviations and superscript letters (including word-final ones) appearing in the normal line of type, without special indication.

¹⁷ К. ИВАНОВА, *Един литургичен паралел към апокрифа „Как Михаил победи Сатанаил“*, [in:] *Civitas divina-humana. In honorem annorum LX Georgii Bakalov*, София 2004, p. 397–404.

¹⁸ О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *Греческий вариант апокрифа о борьбе архангела Михаила и Сатанаила*, *SeS* 3/4, 2006, p. 329–348.

¹⁹ M. SKOWRONEK, „Świat cały ma Cię za obrońcę”. *Michał Archanioł w kulturze Słowian prawosławnych na Bałkanach*, Łódź 2008.

²⁰ In a Greek codex of mixed content, dating back to 1542, stored in the Vatican Library under the signature Vat. Gr. 1190a, the work is structurally close to the two Slavic versions. The Greek *Tale...* is to be found in the BHG under the signature no. 1288n, entitled Λόγος τοῦ ἀρχιστρατήγου Μιχαήλ, ὅταν ἐπῆρεν τὴν στολήν. Text description: A. ERHARD, *Überlieferung und bestand der hagiografischen und homiletischen Literatur der Griechischen Kirche*, vol. III, Leipzig 1937, p. 870–871.

Явных признаков того, что греческий текст представляет собой не оригинал, а перевод со славянского, мною не обнаружено. Однако вероятность того, что перед нами именно перевод славянского богомильского апокрифа на мой взгляд выше, чем самостоятельное существование апокрифа на греческом языке, хотя последнее исключить нельзя²¹.

Especially noteworthy in O. Afinogenova's study is the parallel with Balkan sacred painting that she points out, namely the visualization of *The Tale...* in the St. Archangel Michael Church in Lesnovo, dating back to the middle of the 14th century²².



ill. 1

On the other hand, in her analysis of the structure of the work, the Polish Paleo-Slavicist shows the connection between *The Tale...* and the Biblical story (as well as the canonical depictions) of the leader of the heavenly armies as the intermediary and defender of the cosmic harmony established by the Lord. At the same time, she notices that elements of “dualist Gnostic thought” may be detected in the text²³.

²¹ О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 330.

²² [See ill. 1] O. Afinogenova publishes the fresco entitled *The Fall of Satan* after: С. Габелић, *Византијски и поствизантијски циклуси арханђела XI-XVIII в.*, Београд 2004, p. 94, ill. 102. On the iconography related to the fight between Archangel Michael and Satan cf. subchapter VI.

²³ M. SKOWRONEK, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

The above survey of editions and studies devoted to the monument does not aspire to being exhaustive – encyclopaedia entries or historical works in which *The Tale...* is analysed in the context of Bogomil writings have not been included²⁴. Nevertheless, even the studies mentioned in the preceding provide a fairly complete picture of the history of the text and the wide range of hypotheses based on its analysis:

– the time of the creation of the Slavic text: 14th cent.; according to A. Miltenova – 13th cent. The five known extant copies of the work have been ascribed by the scholar to two ‘versions’, the relationship between them being close and evident. The older one is represented by the variants found in the manuscript from Savina monastery (?) as well as ЦИАИ no. 1161; the more recent one by the copies stemming from Nikoljac monastery, the *Punčo Codex* as well as ЦИАИ no. 232. The older texts represent the Serbian recension of the Old Church Slavic language, the newer ones come close to the Bulgarian one. The small number of existing copies makes it impossible to determine exactly when “before the 14th century” the Slavic text was completed; however, some indirect evidence for the existence of an earlier translation/compilation, possibly associated with the first stage of the reception of pseudo-canonical literature in Bulgaria, is provided by the increase of interest in the cult of the leader of the heavenly armies during the reign of prince Boris-Michael – particularly in the diocese administered by St. Clemens of Ohrid²⁵;

– the relation to the Greek text: on the macro-textual level, similarities can be seen between the Slavic and the Greek texts (especially in the construction of the plot), which makes the editor of the Greek work – O. Afinogenova – claim that the latter might actually be a t r a n s l a t i o n of the Slavic text, since it only dates back to the half of the 15th century. To support her hypothesis, Afinogenova also adduces a number of arguments referring to the micro-textual level (the affinities between particular phrases), which, however, do not appear clinching. The claim is rather bold and would be regarded as a sensation in both Byzantine and Paleo-Slavic studies – if there is indeed truth in it, since the similarities are scarce, and translations from Slavic into Greek are – generally speaking – exceptionally rare. Rather, the Slavic *Tale...* probably got translated in Bulgaria or Serbia no later than towards the end of the 12th or in the first decades of the 13th century from a Byzantine work which is yet to be discovered. It is conceivable that the text does not constitute a close translation but rather a compilation of a number of works, provided with some ‘personal’ commentary by the translator (a well-known practice in the world of the Balkan Slavs,

²⁴ Cf. А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Слово за лъжливия Антихрист*, [in:] *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник*, ed. Д. Петканова, Велико Търново 2003, p. 466; Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Богомилството в България*, София 1981, p. 213–214; Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Богомилството*, София 1993, p. 157–158.

²⁵ Д. ЧЕШМЕДЖИЕВ, *Към въпроса за култа на княз Борис-Михаил в средновековна България*, ИП 1999, 3/4, p. 158–176.

especially in the sphere of pseudo-canonical literature). As for the Greek text from Vat. Gr. 1190a, it appears to represent a copy of a thematically related, but ultimately different Greek literary monument;

– the discussion ‘for’ or ‘against’ the Bogomil origin of *The Tale...* There is no unquestionable evidence proving that the work stems from a heretic environment. The dualist elements in the text cannot be treated like an evident, direct confirmation of its Manichaean ancestry. Old dualist Gnostic ideas permeate later monuments in the entire Christian East; cosmogonic and anthropological depictions, as well as Gnostic angelology of a markedly dualist character, mix into pseudo-canonical works – and even if the latter have been considered heretic, it would be an overstatement to ascribe them to Bogomilism. Moreover, some of them, superficially ‘Christianized’, found use in the official rite. In the particular case at hand – that of *The Tale...* – it would perhaps be necessary to take into account the quotations from the holy Liturgy, which provide the work with ostensible ‘canonicity’ and render it appropriate for liturgical use.

In order to resolve the question about the degree to which *The Tale...* mimics earlier, pseudo-canonical patterns known from Byzantine literature and whether it can be viewed as a ‘Bogomil work’, one should first analyse the text (alongside its Greek counterpart of similar content) in a wider context of the Judeo-Gnostic tradition and the Byzantine-Slavic heretic, pseudo-canonical and heresiological literature. And since both versions of the Slavic text are genetically related, they are treated as variants of one and the same work in the following; preference will normally be given to the older version.

II. The plot of the Slavic and Greek *Tale...*

The Tale... may be regarded as a paraphrase of Isaiah 14, 12–15 – the passage on the fall of the Son of the Dawn from heaven, as well as an apocalyptic angelomachy against the Old Testament beast (Revelation 12, 7; 20, 1–3). The text boasts a well-thought-out composition as well as a quite moving narration, in particular in the passages describing the Commander of the heavenly armies’ stay on earth and the cosmic battle between the good and the evil principle – both on earth and in the vast spaces of heaven.

The Slavic text according to ЦИАИ no. 1161; Nikoljac no. 82; the <i>Punčo Codex</i> ; ЦИАИ no. 232 (following the editions by A. Miltenova i T. Jovanović)	The Greek text according to Vat. Gr. 1190a (following the edition by O. Afinogenova)
1. Jesus Christ (!) creates the world, the angels, paradise and man. Satanael envies man of being the master of all creation and cannot bear the fact that even the angels bow down to him. Satanael’s refusal to bow down to Adam becomes the reason of his fall.	1. The initial part is more rhetorical in character; God creates the world. The cause of Satanael’s downfall is pride. Quotations from the Psalms, Luke 14, 11, Luke 18, 14 and Matthew 23, 12 introduce the idea of a future punishment for the haughty Satanael.

<p>2. Satanael's resolution to cut his ties to the Lord, win over the angels to his side, steal "the robe woven for God, the widely worshipped wreath plaited for God and the sceptre of the angelic armies", set a throne above the tops of the clouds, make himself like the Most High²⁶. Satanael as a demiurge: after his downfall he creates his heavens – a dark sun, a dark moon and stars.</p>	<p>2. Satanael lies to some of the heavenly armies and comes down to earth. He determines to forge his own heavens, where he intends to set his throne and make himself like the Most High. As a punishment, "The Lord and our God Jesus Christ" deprives him of his angelic look (as well as his robe) and takes his glory away from him. A fragment is missing from the text at this point – without doubt Satanael decides to steal the heavenly robe.</p>
<p>3. God the Father summons four archangels: Michael, Gabriel, Uriel and Raphael, reveals Satanael's transgression to then and orders Gabriel to come down to earth and retrieve the robe woven for God, the widely worshipped wreath plaited for God and the sceptre of the angelic armies. Gabriel refuses, terrified by the might of the deadly-looking Satanael: "one hundred ells long, and fifty ells broad²⁷; his lips like a great table, his gaze like a viper's, and with three heads".</p>	<p>3. The missing text probably contained a passage recounting the Lord's monologue on Satanael's crimes and Gabriel's task to come down to earth. <i>The Tale...</i> continues at the moment in which Gabriel declines to obey God's order, because "[Satanael's] leg measures six spans, his insatiable throat – two spans, his jaw is like a limitless abyss, and his teeth like huge rocks in this chasm".</p>
<p>4. At this point the Lord turns to Archangel Michael. Though fearing Satanael as well, he agrees to come down to earth and recover the robe woven for God, the wreath and the sceptre. However, he asks the Lord to be allowed to employ deceit (in order to outwit Satanael), since "if I do not lie to him, how am I going to outsmart him?". God blesses Michael, promising him that he would make the earth extremely hot, placing a cooling cloud above Michael's head.</p>	<p>4. The dialogue between the Lord and Archangel Michael is longer, though the message is retained: Michael consents to obey the order and recover the stolen angelic image and the robe, on condition that the Lord grants him the right to use his guile against Satanael and blesses the Archangel's wreath, using which he is to burn the evil and Satanael.</p>
<p>5. Michael descends to the second heaven, sharpens his sword, spreads out his 40-ell broad wings and comes down. Heavens and earth begin to tremor, the sea recedes, and Satanael's servants are filled with fright.</p>	<p>5. Michael takes hold of his sword, spreads out his 300-ell broad wings and descends to earth. All creation and the earth shake. The Antichrist commands his minions to face Michael, but they cannot stand the unimaginable heat and the sight of the Archangel.</p>

²⁶ Cf. Isaiah 14, 13–14: *You said in your heart, 'I will ascend to the heavens; I will raise my throne above the stars of God; I will sit enthroned on the mount of assembly, on the utmost heights of Mount Zaphon. I will ascend above the tops of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High'* [This and all the following quotations from the Bible follow the *New International Version*, quoted after <http://www.biblica.com/bible/browse-books/> – M.M.].

²⁷ In the Punčo Codex the length is given as 100 ells, the breadth as 8 ells, while the neck measures 12 ells. No doubt the copyist confused Cyrillic н (50) with и (8).

<p>6. Archangel Michael deceiving Satanael. Michael praises the “artful” creation of Satanael (the heavens, bright sun and shining moon, beautiful stars and blowing wind) and tells him that he had run away from God, lured by the power of Evil. Delighted, Satanael orders the Archangel to be seated on a second throne, alongside his own, and takes him by the hand.</p>	<p>6. Michael “confesses” to Satanael that he has come to him drawn by the might of the demiurge, who has created a heavenly vault, stars, sun, clouds and pouring rains. In a long monologue, Satanael addresses the fallen angels, encouraging them to rejoice as “the first Archistratege of the invisible God” has now joined the unclean forces. In any case, differently than in the Slavic <i>Tale...</i>, Satanael is hesitant to receive the Archangel right away: he attempts to cunningly probe his sincerity.</p>
<p>7. God sends unbearable heat down to earth, at the same time placing a cooling cloud above Archangel Michael. The unclean forces, including Satanael, almost faint from the heat. They willingly accept Michael’s proposal to go to the lake to cool down. The Archangel is overjoyed, hoping that he will be able to capture Satanael and reclaim God’s insignia there.</p>	<p>7. Michael puts on the wreath blessed by the Lord and his godly glory blinds the demons. All of the Antichrist’s creation is burnt to ashes. Satanael suggests bathing in a lake hidden behind some rocks (one of which comes from the Biblical Valley of Josaphat) to cool down.</p>
<p>8. On their way to the lake, Satanael, still somewhat doubtful of Michael’s sincerity, orders his minions to keep watch of him. When the two stand by the lake, Satanael suggests that the Archangel enter the water first; Michael, however, refuses, as <i>no servant is greater than his master</i>. Satanael takes off the robe and wreath and puts down the sceptre, warning Michael not to deceive him and steal them. Following the first dive, he makes Michael swear that he will not run away. The latter, in accord with his licence to lie granted him by God, utters the oath. Then, Satanael dives once again and reaches the bottom of the lake, where he combats an enormous beast.</p>	<p>8. When they both arrive at the bank of the lake, the Antichrist offers Michael to enter the water first. Michael replies with words similar to those from the Slavic <i>Tale...: a servant is not greater than the one who commands him</i>. Satanael forces the Archangel to swear that he will not betray him – to which Michael consents. Subsequently, God’s messenger offers the Antichrist to hold his clothes. Satanael hands them over to him, dives, and appears on the surface; seeing Michael, he dives again, undisturbed.</p>
<p>9. Michael prays to the Lord, makes a sign over the lake and covers it with ice. He kills Satanael’s minions, grabs the robe, wreath and sceptre and flies towards the heavens, where the angels praise the Lord, while the earth tremors. Satanael hears the angels’ praising and understands that he has been deceived. He abandons the fight against the monster and attempts to return to the surface – to no avail. Then, he takes a huge rock, crushes the ice and flies up following Michael.</p>	<p>9. Michael prays to God, spreads out his wings and flies to the heavens. The Antichrist realizes that he has been outwitted and tries to get back to the surface of the lake, but it is covered by an enormous rock, on which Satanael hits and hurts his head.</p>

10. Satanael catches up with Michael in the third heaven and grabs him by the heel and the robe woven for God. Michael prays to the Lord for help and hears a voice advising him to strike Satanael's sight with his sword – which he does. As a result of the strike, Satanael falls into the abyss.	10. The Antichrist follows Michael, who prays to the Lord for help. God opens the heavens and leaves ajar the gates to paradise. Satanael, however, catches up with Michael and grabs him by the leg. Michael strikes him and the Antichrist falls down into the chasms of hell.
11. Michael hands the recovered insignia over to the Lord. The whole army of the angels rejoices at Michael's victory over the Evil.	11. Archangel Michael reaches the heavens, bows down to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, returns the <i>divine angelic robe</i> to the Lord, and God rewards him by appointing him as <i>the second God and judge, helper and commander of the armies</i> .

The comparison of the Slavic versions with the Greek one reveals far-reaching similarities on the level of the plot, but the texts differ significantly as far as the use of the language is concerned. As a result, it is difficult to determine that the Slavic text is a translation of the Greek or *vice versa*. Nonetheless, numerous traces of old Gnostic beliefs and Medieval Bogomil dualist views can be detected, demonstrating the connection with the Manichaean doctrines and heresies. Isolating them from the texts and analysing them in a broader context of Judeo-Christian heterodoxy is hardly a simple task – due to at least three reasons:

– firstly, Gnostic doctrines are so numerous (often contradictory) and formulated in such unclear, metaphorical and prophetic language that already the Church Fathers complained on how difficult it was to systematize them. St. Irenaeus of Lyons compares them to a many-headed hydra²⁸;

– secondly, Early Christian heresiologists, and subsequently Medieval Byzantine authors exert influence upon each other, so that characteristics drawn from older sources are not infrequently ascribed to Bogomilism and other Neo-Manichaean teachings;

– thirdly, both the Slavic and the Greek texts are literary, pseudo-canonical works, in which Christian elements (quotations from the Bible and the liturgy) – providing the texts with an ostensibly Orthodox character and transforming them into 'tales'²⁹ suitable for potential liturgical use – have been superimposed on heterodox doctrines.

Irrespective of any difficulties in the analysis of the texts, separating Gnostic ideas from Bogomil beliefs and the Orthodox liturgical context could facilitate an-

²⁸ IRENAEUS, *Adversus haereses*, I, 30, 15. Quoted after: *Five Books of S. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, Against Heresies*, ed. J. PARKER, Oxford 1872 [= A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, 42], p. 90.

²⁹ Cf. an. 1 – M.M.

swering the question concerning the ‘originality’ of the Bogomil teachings, as well as of the adaptation of heretic doctrines in the Medieval society.

III. Dualism. The ‘Invisible God’ and the creator of matter, Satanael-Antichrist.

In the Greek *Tale...*, the Almighty is customarily referred to as the ‘Lord’ (Κύριος), ‘Lord God’ (Κύριος καὶ Θεός) or ‘Our Lord Jesus Christ’ (Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός)³⁰. One single time Michael addresses the Lord using the word ‘Ruler’ (δέσποτα)³¹.

In both the first and second version of the Slavic *Tale...*, on the other hand, the creator of heaven and earth is Jesus Christ: Господь Богъ нашъ Исусъ Христосъ, Господь творць небъ и земли, всакому сазданію (ЦИАИ nr 1161)³²; Господь нашъ Исусъ Христосъ, цото є направилъ небо и земли ꙗ свичкіа свѣтъ... (the *Punčo Codex*)³³. Despite that, further in the text God is called “Father”, “Upper Father”, “Father Above” (вишнии отьць), “Lord”, “Ruler” (much more frequently than in the Greek text and not merely in the vocative):

И прости же владыко...; Рече Архангелъ Михаилъ: Владыко...; Тогда Михаилу благослови се в владыке...³⁴

It can be assumed that it was of little importance to the author of the Slavic text which person of the Holy Trinity was the creator of all things – differently than in the Greek version, which from the very outset carefully distinguishes between the Old Testament Creator (Lord God – Κύριος καὶ Θεός) and ‘Our Lord Jesus Christ’, who taught the apostles that *all those who exalt themselves will be humbled, and those who humble themselves will be exalted*³⁵ – a quotation absent from the Slavic *Tale...* If interconnections are to be sought between the dualist ideas of the ‘external God’ (God ‘from outside’), they are hardly detectable in the terms ‘Upper Father’, ‘Father Above’ – found infrequently, but not necessarily associated with heretic teachings, since they may be employed in Biblical and liturgical context.

Still, the Greek *Tale...* includes a passage which indubitably preserves traces of the ancient Gnostic faith in the good God, the God ‘from outside’, in opposition to the demiurge – often identified with the Hebrew Sabaoth (Yaldabaoth)³⁶ – the creator of

³⁰ О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 331–332.

³¹ *Ibidem*, p. 333.

³² А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифът за борбата...*, p. 99.

³³ *Ibidem*, p. 106.

³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 101.

³⁵ Luke 14, 11; Matthew 23, 12 (quotation from Luke).

³⁶ *Yaldabaoth* may mean ‘a parent of Sabaoth’ and “is a synonym of the Biblical God”, cf. П. СТЕФАНОВ, *Ялдаваот. История и учение на гностическата религия*, София 2008, p. 263. The book also provides a reliable survey of the literature on the creator of matter.

the despised matter. Having realized that Michael had decided to come to the earth, Satanael turns to the fallen angels, informing them that Michael has arrived, *the first Archistratege of the invisible God*: ὁ πρῶτος τοῦ ἀοράτου Θεοῦ ὁ μέγας ἀρχιστράτηγός³⁷.

Although no similar expression is found in the Slavic *Tale...*, other works, whose relation to the communities of the Bulgarian Bogomils is beyond doubt, do mention the 'invisible God'. It is the case e.g. in the *Secret Book*, where Satanael tempts the *angels of the invisible Father (angelos invisibilis Patris)*³⁸.

It has long been recognized that Late Ancient Gnosticism – irrespective of its internal diversity and the common inconsistencies among the particular schools – is a soteriological doctrine under strong influence of the Platonist and Neo-Platonist conception of eternal spiritual ideas and their material, spatial 'reflections'³⁹. Nevertheless, differently than the Platonists and Neo-Platonists, for whom the cosmos – consisting of widespread projections of spiritual ideas – is not evil from the beginning, Gnostic ideas are quite radical in their 'anticosmicity': it is not only creation and matter that are evil, but also the creator of matter – the demiurge, referred to in different ways by the various denominations. Two prominent hierarchs of the 2nd century, Basilides and Marcion, speak of a 'nonexistent', invisible God, a perfect Aeon, concealed and residing in the 'fullness' (*pleroma*), God-redeemer, the antithesis of the evil God-creator. The Gnostic monuments uncovered in 1945 in Nag Hammadi confirm the cosmic pessimism of the early dualist heresies. Both in the *Gospel of Philip* and in the short version of the *Apocryphon of John (The Secret Book of John)*⁴⁰, God is also called *the invisible, who is over the all*⁴¹.

This belief also reaches the Neo-Manichaean communities. In the 11th century, Michael Psellus, in his work *On the Operation of Demons* (also known as *A Treatise on Demons; De Operatione Daemonum, Περὶ ἐωεργείας δαιμονίων*), attributing eternal cosmic dualism to Mani, notes that the prophet "mistakenly contrasted god and God, the creator of evil and the creator of good, the ruler of evil on earth and the ruler of good in heavens"⁴².

³⁷ О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 335. O. Afinogenova translates: ...первый у невидимого Бога великий архистратиг (roughly ...the great Archistratege, first with the invisible God).

³⁸ Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги и легенди*, ed. photot., София 1970, p. 75. Polish translations: *Tajna księga*, trans. T. DĄBEK-WIRGOWA, [in:] *Siedem niebios i ziemia...*, p. 15–21; *Tajemna księga, czyli Zapytania Jana zadane w wieczerniku Królowi niebieskiemu*, trans. A. SARWA, [in:] A. SARWA, *Tajemna księga katarów*, Sandomierz 2006, p. 93–101. English translation: *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, ed. W. WAKEFIELD, A. EVANS, New York 1991, p. 458–464 (no. 56 B).

³⁹ Cf. e.g. G. QUISPEL, *Gnosis als Weltreligion*, Zürich 1951, p. 16–27; K. RUDOLPH, *Gnosis. The Nature and History of Gnosticism*, trans. R. MCLACHLAN WILSON, San Francisco 1983, p. 60–62.

⁴⁰ Berlin Codex (BG 8502, 2); Nag Hammadi codex III, 1. Quoted after: *The Apocryphon of John (II, 1, III, 1, IV, 1, and BG 8502,2)*, trans. F. WISSE, [in:] *The Nag Hammadi Library*, ed. J.M. ROBINSON, San Francisco 1990 (cetera: *The Apocryphon of John*), p. 104–123.

⁴¹ *The Apocryphon of John*, 1, 4. Cf. also: K. RUDOLPH, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

⁴² Most of Michael Psellus's work was made available in: P. GAUTIER, *Le 'De demonibus' du Pseudo-*

At around the same time, the Old Bulgarian author known as Presbyter Cosma cries: **ВѢЛИ' ЖЕ ѲРЕТИЦИ, КТО ОУКАЗА, ТАКО БОГЪ Н'ВЕСТЬ СОТВОРИАТЬ ТВАРИ ЕЕЮ ВСЕИД**⁴³. It could, therefore, be surmised that the phrase 'ὁ πρῶτος τοῦ ἀοράτου Θεοῦ ὁ μέγας ἀρχηστράτηγός' contains a certain Gnostic term for an 'invisible' God ruling in the pleroma, which 'infiltrated' the Greek *Tale*... but failed to find its way into either version of the Slavic text (more standard appellations of God the Father, drawn from the official literature, being preferred in the latter).

God's antagonist – the demiurge, known in the Slavic and Greek versions of the *Tale*... as 'Sataael' (more often in ЦИАИ no. 1161) or 'The Antichrist' (more frequently in the *Punčo Codex* and in the Greek text), basically corresponds to the concept of God's adversary, familiar from Gnostic texts and treatises by polemic Early Christian and Medieval heresiologists. The evil principle is not an eternally existent power (a view endorsed by radical dualists, e.g. the Manichaeans); Sataael belongs to the angelic army, he is even a *commander of the angels*⁴⁴ – this concept might have appeared in the Hebrew intertestamental apocryphal tradition⁴⁵ and was especially popular in the views of moderate Medieval dualists. The Tempter of the first humans was expelled from heavens (in the Slavic *Tale*... from ЦИАИ no, 1161, from the seventh heaven), leading part of the heavenly army after him. The demiurge creates his own, material cosmos on earth: a dark sun, moon and stars, subsequently placing his throne upon the clouds⁴⁶. This concept is still not absent from the oldest Gnostic writings as well; there, all elements of cosmos under the pleroma constitute the home of demons – archons or spirits. The throne of the highest archon, the creator of the visible universe, is located in the seventh heaven (alternatively, below it; in any case under the *pleroma*), while he himself rules his creation (seven heavens, earth and the hell under it). The closer to earth each of the seven heavens (associated with the seven planets) is, the worse, darker and more hostile towards the invisible God its archons (and the material world

Psellos, REB 38, 1980, p. 94–105. Bulgarian translation: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, Б. ПРИМОВ, Г. БАТАКЛИЕВ, *Богомилството в България, Византия и Западна Европа в извори*, София 1967 (p. 70). English translation (extracts) in: *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650 – c. 1450: Selected Sources*, ed. J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, Y. STOYANOV, Manchester 1998, p. 227–232.

⁴³ Quotation following: Ю.К. БЕГУНОВ, *Козма Пресвитер в славянских литературах*, София 1973, p. 306.

⁴⁴ ὁ μέγας στρατήγος τῶν ἀγγέλων, cf. О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 336.

⁴⁵ Cf. Ю. СТОЯНОВ, *Другият бог. Дуалистичните религии от Античността до катарската ерес*, София 2006, p. 83–84. Cf. also: П. СТЕФАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 259; the author, accepting the view of the renowned student of Gnosticism Hans Jonas, calls extreme dualism "Iranian" (more precisely, "Persian"), while the other variant is referred to as "Syro-Egyptian".

⁴⁶ The Greek *Tale*... is much more economical in relating the demiurgic functions of Sataael, who is characterized (in accord with the categories of Christian tradition) as an apostate, expelled by God due to his haughtiness. The evil principle merely swears that he will create heavens. О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

under their protection) are. Between the first heaven and earth, among the clouds, is located the kingdom of the mythical beast – Behemoth. The material world is to a Gnostic a world of violence, which can only be described negatively as “darkness” or “death”⁴⁷.

A comparison of Gnostic cosmogonic views with the two versions of the *Tale...* reveals certain affinities. Satanael is thrown down from the seventh heaven – the one closest to God. Following the act of creation – not unlike Behemoth – he places his throne upon the clouds, but he is able to penetrate the upper heavens as well. In the Slavic *Tale...*, Satanael follows Michael, reaches the third heaven and manages to grab the Archangel by his leg and right arm: **И трепетнѣ крыломъ своимъ и стигна ꙗ. емь небесе, и вхвати его за стѣпало и за деснѣ рѣкъ лоукавою своєю десницею**⁴⁸.

A hint pointing to the fact that the lower heavens were regarded as ‘unclean’, as the home of evil forces, is also present in the Slavic *Tale...* Prior to descending to earth, Archangel Michael stops briefly in the second heaven in order to sharpen his sword and prepare for the fight against Satanael:

Тогда Михаилу благослови се в владике цара и съниде на .б.-ро небо, и зе съмъртоносни мачъ свои, и наостри его. И простри крили свои .л. лакать въ ширинѣ, и потрѣви трѣвою своєю; и трепетнѣ крылома своимъ и поде съ небесниихъ висотѣ.⁴⁹

Thus, according to what is said in *The Tale...*, there is a boundary between the second and the third heaven to which God’s power reaches. The first heaven – and to a certain degree also the second – are already located in the sphere of Satan’s dominance.

In other pseudo-canonical works Satan’s kingdom also reaches above earth. In *The Vision of Isaiah, the Son of Amos* the prophet describes the way from the earth to the first heaven in the following way:

И възидохъ же и азъ и онъ на твърдь, и видѣхъ тоу брань соноу и силы его и противѣща съ благочестию и едино единого завидѣши; яко же естъ на земли, тако и на твърди⁵⁰

[And we climbed the firmament, he and I, and I saw a great fight there: Satan and his powers opposing that which is righteous, since one envied the other. For as it is on earth, thus it is

⁴⁷ K. RUDOLPH, *op. cit.*, p. 69–70.

⁴⁸ А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифът за борбата...*, p. 105.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 101.

⁵⁰ Edition of the copy from the so-called Uspienski Codex (12th cent.) in: Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги...*, p. 136; modern Bulgarian translation: И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Из старата българска книжнина*, t. I, София 1940, p. 146. The same translation was published in *Стара българска литература в седем тома*, t. I, *Апокрифи...*, p. 65. Polish translation: *Widzenie, które miał Święty Izajasz prorok, syn Amosa*, trans. I. ПЕТРОВ, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe...*, p. 53–61.

also on the firmament.^{51]}

The expression ‘НА ТЪВЪРЪДЪ’ refers to the “firmament” – certainly not the earthly, but the heavenly one – which is corroborated by the following phrase: *ТАКО ЖЕ ЕСТЬ НА ЗЕМЛИ, ТАКО И НА ТЪВЪРЪДИ*; thus also in the Latin text of the *Vision...*:

Ascendimus ego et ille super firmamentum, et vidi ibi prelium magnum sathane et virtutem ejus, resistantem honoratæ Dei, et unus erat prestantior alio in videndo, quia sicut est in terra, tanto est in firmamento...⁵²

The belief that the demiurge is the creator of the visible heavens was exceptionally robust in Bogomil communities. In his 12th century polemic with the dualists (also called Manichaeans in the text) of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, St. Hilarion of Moglena cries in anger:

НѢЦѢИ ЖЕ ѿ ВАС И ТО САМОЕ НЕБО, И ПЪКЕ ВЪ НЕМЪ ВЪСЕ, ТВОРЕНІА ВРАЖІА БЫТИ ГЛАГОЛАТЬ. ЯЩЕ ОУБО ЕСТЬ НЕБО ПО ВАШЕМОУ СЛОВОУ ДѢЛО ЛЖКАВААГО, КАКО БЛАГЫЙ БОГЪ НА НЕБЕСЕ ПОЧИВАЕТЪ, СЪДЪБАНЫХЪ ѿТ ЛЖКАВААГО⁵³.

[Some of you even speak of heaven itself and everything that is in it that it is a creation of the Enemy. So if heaven, according to your words, is the work of the Evil One, how can the good God reside in heavens created by the Evil One?^{54]}

The Bulgarian bishop’s indignation is only natural: he takes as his basis the quotations from the Holy Scripture and interprets them literally, concluding that the heavens cannot have been created by the devil if God abides in them. This is a logical opinion of an adversary of the dualist heresy, who cannot have known that the Gnostic demiurge rules over as many as seven heavens, associated with the seven planets.

It is not inconceivable that the passage from the Slavic *Tale...* reflects some more archaic beliefs that infiltrated Greek literature – beliefs according to which the authority of the evil archon is limited to the lower heavens. This cosmogonic vision was widespread enough to survive in all Neo-Manichaean communities of the Balkan Peninsula.

The angelomachy is depicted in a different way in the Greek *Tale...* Fighting also takes place in the air, but no particular heaven is specified – God bends the heav-

⁵¹ [Translated from the original and the Polish translation by I. Petrov to be found in: *Widzenie, które miał Święty Izajasz prorok, syn Amosa*, trans. I. PETROV, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe...*, p. 55 – M.M.].

⁵² Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги...*, p. 137.

⁵³ E. KALUŽNIAKI, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375–1393)*, London 1971, p. 34.

⁵⁴ [Translated from the original as well as the Polish translation by the author – M.M.].

ens, their doors are opened, and Michael, having struck the Antichrist in the head, enters through them and stands in front of God's throne:

καὶ ἔκλιναν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ ἠνοίχθησαν αἱ πύλαι τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ ἐδέχοντο τὸν λειτουργιὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῶν ἄνω ταγμάτων καὶ ταξίαρχην τῆς δυνάμεως Κυρίου⁵⁵.

The Greek phrase is, in a way, closer to the Gnostic beliefs concerning the demiurge's sovereignty over all spheres of the heavens – up to the *pleroma*.

As has already been said, both the two Slavic version of *The Tale...* and the Greek text feature a paraphrased Biblical quotation legitimizing Satanael's resolution to found his kingdom in the highest:

You said in your heart, 'I will ascend to the heavens; I will raise my throne above the stars of God; I will sit enthroned on the mount of assembly, on the utmost heights of Mount Zaphon. I will ascend above the tops of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High' (Isaiah 14, 13–14).

The same quotation recurs in heretic and pseudo-canonical texts. In *The Secret Book (Interrogatio Joannis)* and both copies – from Vienna and Carcassone – Satanael's kingdom is located in the clouds: *...et cogitavit sedem suam ponere super nubis coelorum et volebat Altissimo similis esse*⁵⁶.

The phrase appears in a similar context in the Old Testament apocryphon called *On The Sea of Tiberias*⁵⁷, in the Slavic⁵⁸ and Greek⁵⁹ Palaea, as well as in later copies of pseudo-canonical works treating on cosmogony⁶⁰.

It is perhaps worth noting that the quote in question represents a topos, and its presence is by no means limited to heretic and pseudo-canonical texts. Attempting to compromise the Euchites' (Messalians') belief in the evil principle, Michael Psellus refers to the same quotation from the *Book of Isaiah*⁶¹.

A few decades later, Euthymius Zigabenus, at the beginning of his treatise entitled *Dogmatic Panoply of the Orthodox Faith, or The Armory of Dogmas (Panoplia*

⁵⁵ О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 339.

⁵⁶ Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги...*, p. 77.

⁵⁷ ...и помысли быти равенъ Богъ и помысли своєю гордостью: поставлю престолъ на облацехъ и вѣдъ подобенъ вышнему, Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги...*, p. 291.

⁵⁸ А. ПОПОВ, *Книга Бытия небеси и земли*, Санкт-Петербург 1881, p. 2. Cf. also: Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги...*, p. 69.

⁵⁹ Θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἔσομαι ὁμοῖος τῷ ὑψίστῳ, Cf. A. VASILIEV, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina*, Москва 1892, p. 189.

⁶⁰ И.Я. ПОРФИРЬЕВ, *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях*, Санкт-Петербург 1877, p. 86.

⁶¹ "[Satan – G.M.] boasted, *I have put my throne above the clouds, and, I shall be like the most High*" – *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 228. Cf. Also: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, Б. ПРИМОВ, Г. БАТАКЛИЕВ, *Богомилството в България...*, p. 71.

dogmatica, Πανοπλία δογματική) also quotes Isaiah 14, 13–14. Samael entices part of the angels with his promise: Θήσω, γὰρ, φησὶ, τὸν θρόνον μου ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν, καὶ ἔσομαι ὁμοιος τῷ Ὑψίστῳ, συνάπα⁶².

It can be assumed that Michael Psellus's work was familiar to Euthymius Zigabenus, and served as the source from which the latter carried over the quotation from the *Book of Isaiah* (14, 13–14). All the same, the presence of this very quotation in a whole array of heretic and pseudo-canonical works, in two versions of the Slavic *Tale...*, in the Greek pseudo-canonical text, as well as in two anti-heretic treatises shows that the Biblical text is being used as a *topos*, frequently resorted to in the polemic of the Medieval dualists with the official doctrine. Byzantine heresiologists may have been acquainted with dualist texts (variants of the Greek *Tale...?*) in which the Biblical passage from Isaiah served as an illustration of Satanael's decision to rebel against the Lord. An alternative explanation is also thinkable: they might have heard from Bogomil preachers an interpretation of Satanael's fall based on the quotation from Isaiah. One of the oldest Byzantine works, the letter of monk Euthymius of Acmonia against the dualist heresy of the Fundagiagites (Bogomils from Asia Minor) is constructed as an account of what the right-believing monk has heard from a certain heretic⁶³. Conversely, the treatise by Michael Psellus has the form of a dialogue, in which he the teachings heard from the heretics are recounted, after which the true nature of the heresy is exposed. Euthymius Zigabenus repeatedly uses expressions such as "they also say" in his treatise. The possibility that the persecutors of the heresies constructed their accusations basing themselves on the writings of their predecessors and the accounts orally transmitted among their opponents is not negligible, especially if one considers the fact that the Bogomils relied primarily on oral communication in their teachings, trying to win followers. In any case –

⁶² PG, vol. CXXX, col. 1296; *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 183; cf. also: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, Б. ПРИМОВ, Г. БАТАКЛИЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 74. The *Panoplia dogmatica* got translated into Slavic probably towards the end of the 14th century. We know of one (or two?) Slavic manuscripts from the end of the 14th – beginning of the 15th century, preserved in two fragments and containing parts of Euthymius Zigabenus's work. According to some authors (K. Ivanova), the translation was completed before the beginning of the 15th century, and it is most probably connected with the school of patriarch Euthymius. Cf.: К. ИВАНОВА, *О славянском переводе „Паноплии догматики” Евфимия Зигабена*, [in:] *Исследования по древней и новой литературе*, Ленинград 1987, p. 101–105. The hypothesis of the Trnovo translation is challenged by Nina Gagova, according to whom the translation, displaying linguistic features characteristic of Serbian, would stem from Mount Athos, cf. Н. ГАГОВА, *Владетели и книги. Участието на южнославянския владетел в проиводството и употребата на книги през Средновековието (IX–XV в.): рецепцията на византийския модел*, София 2010, p. 132–139.

⁶³ The letter, dating back to the beginning of the 11th century, published in: G. FICKER, *Die Phundagiagiten*, Leipzig 1908, p. 3–86. A Bulgarian translation following the above-mentioned edition in: FGHB, vol. X, p. 9–49. English translation: *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 143.

the fact that the same quotation is found again and again in an almost identical context in both heretic and anti-heretic writings makes it plausible that authors such as Michael Psellus and Euthymius Zigabenus had been exposed to written dualist texts treating on cosmology.

The majority of scholars analysing the commented texts speak of vestiges of moderate dualism in the Greek and Slavic *Tale*... In the dialogue between God and the angels (before Michael is given the mission to recover the stolen robe, wreath and sceptre), when they ask how long he is going to tolerate the impious deeds, the Lord answers in the following way:

Глаголъ вавль: егда Сатанаилъ съблазни се, ѿбеже и болезни въ прѣст на чловѣка положи, егоже азъ сътворихъ своими рукама; нъ и тѣ хоцеть частнѣ бити въ второе мое пришествіе... И потомъ сътвори другъ светь безъ данн, иже и бесъмрътни и безъскочани; и тѣи вѣдѣтъ радость и животь вѣдѣтъ.⁶⁴

When Michael entreats God for the utter destruction of the unclean force, He commands him: **Не тако, Михаиле, нъ яко рекохъ ти - .vi. сили дахъ емѣ прѣжде ѿннми ѿ него .ѣ. силь а остави емѣ .з. силь**⁶⁵. And further – according to the same (first) version of the *Tale*...: **Такъ сътвори Михаило, яко не дастъ емѣ Господь погѣбити Сатанаила до конца.**⁶⁶

Neither does evil exist eternally, nor will its rule be eternal. God has allotted seven ages⁶⁷ for Satan's kingdom. This is how the symbolism of the number in the second excerpt is to be understood: Michael deprives Satanael of five forces, leaving him with seven (i.e., the seven ages). After the apocalyptic combat at the end of times, a “world without days” will ensue, “immortal and infinite. There will be bliss and life in it”, which the righteous will enjoy, while the unjust will perish.

In the Greek *Tale*..., the angels do not ask the Lord for explanations this straightforwardly; even there, however, the idea of the ultimate triumph over evil is expounded clearly, and moderate dualism is again noticeable. Here, the elucidation does not assume the form of a question addressed to the Lord by the angels; God bespeaks Archangel Michael directly, saying:

καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ τὸ γένος τῶν ἀθρώπων καὶ ποιήσοθιν ὄπλον κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ καταργῶσιν αὐτον ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ ὕστερον κληρονομήσοθιν τὴν αἰώνιαν καὶ ἀτελεύτησον κόλασιν τὴν οὐκ ἔχουσαν τέλος⁶⁸.

⁶⁴ А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифѣт за борбата...*, p. 100.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 105.

⁶⁶ *Op. cit.*

⁶⁷ Or rather seven epochs, αἰών denoting here not the Gnostic ‘spiritual forces’, but an ‘epoch’.

⁶⁸ О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 333.

The views of moderate dualists were fairly well known to Byzantine heresiarches. In his *Panoplia dogmatica*, Euthymius Zigabenus emphasizes:

...дяволите имат голяма и непобедима сила да вредят. Срещу тях бил безсилен както Христос, така и заедно с Него Светият Дух, понеже Бог-Отец все още ги щадял и не им отнемал силата, но им е отстъпил управлението на целия свят чак до свършека му. И Синът отначало, изпратен на света, поискал пълното им премахване, но не го получил поради добротата на Отца⁶⁹.

The reader is once again left with the impression that the opponents of Neo-Manichean movements were quite well informed not only in orally transmitted stories, but also in texts – such as *The Tale...* – and, summarizing them, they provided literary fiction with the characteristics of ‘scientific discourse’.

IV. Christology and angelology. Archangel Michael – ‘the second God’.

Heterodox angelology is at pains to differentiate between dualist, cosmological and anthropological depictions of Gnostic and Neo-Manichean communities, since the spiritual powers participate in a cosmic drama: some of them will follow the evil archon in his downfall, and will take part in repairing the visible world rules by the demiurge – the creator of the human body. At any rate, the Slavic and Greek *Tale...* contain two episodes that can shed further light on pseudo-canonical angelology.

At the beginning of the Slavic *Tale...*, Satanael blames God for having elevated the newly created Adam and obliged the angelic armies to bow down to him. The evil archon’s outrage is so violent that he cries out: *АЗЪ ЖЕ ЗРЕТИ ЕГО НЕ МОГЪ, НИ ПОКЛОНИТИ СЕ ЕМЪ*.⁷⁰

It is through his hatred towards Adam that Satanael justifies his choice to lure the angelic armies and abandon the heavens. The Greek *Tale...* displays further-reaching ‘canonicity’ – there, the downfall of part of the spiritual powers is brought about by sheer pride and willingness to compete against God⁷¹.

Already in the Hebrew apocryphal tradition we find the story of the angels being discontent by Adam’s being appointed as the master of all spiritual powers and all created beings. In the opinion of Y. Stoyanov, the topic arises *in the apocryphal literature from the times of the Second Temple, and the history of the Observers’ sin is described in great detail – the fall of the evil angels is ascribed to cupidity, haughtiness*

⁶⁹ Д. АНГЕЛОВ, Б. ПРИМОВ, Г. БАТАКЛИЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 79. ...*The demons [...] have great and irresistible power to harm. Neither Christ nor the Holy Spirit with Him can stand against this, since the Father still spares them and does not take away their strength, but allows them the government of the whole cosmos until the consummation. When the Son was sent down into the world at the beginning, He asked for their complete destruction, but did not gain his request through the goodness of the Father – v. Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 191–192.

⁷⁰ А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифът за борбата...*, p. 99.

⁷¹ О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

or envy against Adam⁷². The origin of such texts is undoubtedly Judean; it is conceivable that they appeared in the times of the Second Temple, but at least in some of them Adam is envied not only by the 'Observers', but by all spiritual powers. A certain Hebrew legend⁷³ gives an account of how after the act of creation the live beings approached Adam with fright, mistaking him for the Creator. However, he reprimanded them and urged that they should go and bow down to God together. The Lord was so pleased with the deed that he dispatched angels to pay homage to Adam. So they did, roasting meat for him and bringing him wine. In an alternative variant of the legend, the angels serving Adam came to hate him because of his likeness to God, and attempted to scorch him with fire. The upset God stretched His arm over Adam and restored peace between him and the angels.

The intricate relations between the proto-human and the heavenly hierarchy are also reflected in Medieval Slavic writings. This issue is addressed in M. Skowronek's study⁷⁴. She adduces a quotation from a 17th-century Russian manuscript entitled **СЛОВО СТГО ИВАНА ФЕОДОГА. УСНОВАЕ НБѦ, И СОДАНІЕ ЗЕМЛИ, О СЪВЪОРОЕНІ ЯДАМИЕ, О СВѢЖЕЕ БОТОНАИЛОВЕ, СПАДШАГО С НБСЪ, И ѠГНАНИЕ ЯДАМОВО И РАГА.** God

ѠЕ КО ВСЕ ЧИНѦ АГГЛЪСКИ: ПЕВОМУ ЧИНѦ БОТОНАИЛѦ, И ДРЪГОМУ МИХАИЛУ, И ТРЕЕМУ ГАРИЛУ, ЧЕВЕТОМУ РАФАИЛУ, ПАТОМУ ОУРИЛУ, ДА ШЕД ПОКЛОНСА ЯДАМУ, И КОЖДЫ СЪ СВОИМЪ ЧИНѦ, У ВСѦ НИ ПО .Ѡ. ЧИНѦ, А ШНИ СЪ НБСНЫ ВОЕВОДЫ, ШЕШЕ ПОКЛОНИТИ ЯДАМУ.⁷⁵

Regrettably, the text is fragmentary and it is far from clear whether the angelic choirs are merely being enumerated or the conflict between them and Adam is being described; the latter interpretation is at least a possibility.

The other episode is connected with Archangel Michael's position in the heavenly hierarchy. At the end of the Greek *Tale...*, God, in exultation over the victory against evil, addresses the Archistratege, shouting: εστη Θεός δεύτερος.

Archangel Michael – 'the second God'? In order to comprehend the seeming paradox in this expression, it is once again indispensable to turn to the ancient Gnosis and the Medieval polemic literature.

In the Qumran apocrypha, Michael is the prince of light, the protector of the just against the kingdom of Belial. On the arrival of the "last age" and the "eternal world", Michael's authority will be augmented among the angels of Israel, and he will be elevated "over all creation"⁷⁶. His function as the guardian of the just is also high-

⁷² Ю. СТОЯНОВ, *Другият бог...*, p. 85.

⁷³ R. GRAVES, R. PATAI, *Hebrew Myths. The Book of Genesis*, Garden City 1964, p. 62.

⁷⁴ M. SKOWRONEK, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁷⁵ Manuscript description and edition of some excerpts from the text in: А.Т. БЫЧКОВ, *Описание церковно-славянских и русских рукописных сборников Императорской публичной библиотеки*, Санкт-Петербург 1882, p. 483–488.

⁷⁶ Ю. СТОЯНОВ, *Другият бог...*, p. 88–89.

lighted in the Old Testament tradition, e.g. in Daniel 12, 1.

Michael assumes an exceptional position among the angels already during the creation of the world, *not anymore as merely one of the thousands of beings praising God, but as someone possessing individual features. This is connected with his being entrusted with the role of a co-organizer of the world, alongside God or the remaining archangels*⁷⁷.

The special function of Michael as God's primary aide and intermediary between people and the Lord⁷⁸ leads to his 'deification' and identification with Christ. In his study on the cult of St. Nicholas in Rus', B.A. Uspensky provides a number of notable examples of the identification of Archangel Michael with Christ: in certain Medieval texts, the Archistratege is called the Son of God⁷⁹.

It appears that this belief was exceptionally vigorous in the Bogomil communities, since Euthymius Zigabenos remarks, that In the year 5000, God sent from his heart the Word, that is the Son, who is God. The heretics claim that this Word and son is archangel Michael. And his name will be angel of good council [Isa. 9.6.]. They believe that he is called archangel because he's more divine than the angels. And Jesus because he cures all weakness, and Christ – because he is anointed with flesh.⁸⁰

D. Angelov, linking (somewhat one-sidedly) the identification of Michael with Christ with the myth about Satanael's expulsion from the heavens, mentions the same fragment from the *Panoplia dogmatica*⁸¹.

Within the framework of the Judeo-Gnostic tradition, the Lord's call ἐσθι Θεός δεύτερος in the Greek *Tale...* may be elucidated. Michael's being promoted to the dignity of the 'archistratege' and the 'prince of light' in the texts from Nag Hammadi, his being appointed the defender of the just and of the chosen people in the Hebrew tradition, and finally his functioning as the intermediary between God and people (supplemented by the Christian faith) logically lead to his identification as the 'second God' and 'Son of God' in heterodox texts.

A thought-provoking breach of the canonical understanding of the spiritual nature is found at the end of the Slavic *Tale...* Heaven's armies stand in front of

⁷⁷ M. SKOWRONEK, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

⁷⁸ More on the functions of the Archangel in the Byzantine-Slavic tradition cf. in: M. SKOWRONEK, *op. cit.*, p. 175–180.

⁷⁹ Б.А. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Филологические разыскания в области славянских древностей*, Москва 1982, p. 24.

⁸⁰ FGHB, vol. X, p. 57: *In the year 5000 he sent from his heart the Word, that is the Son, who is God [...]. They [the heretics – G.M.] claim that this word and son is archangel Michael. 'For his name shall be the angel of good counsel' [Isa. 9, 6]. They believe that he is called archangel because he is more divine than the angels, Jesus because he cures all weakness, and Christ because he is anointed with flesh – Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 186.

⁸¹ Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Богомилството в България...*, p. 135.

Michael to extol him for his success against Satanael: И ВЕРДОВАХЪ СЕ ПРИХОДЕЩА И ЗРѢХЪ ЕГО ПОНИКЛА ЛИЦЕМЪ ЕГО ТАКО ЗНОТНО⁸²

The Archangel's countenance *stiffened as if from fatigue*. The further away he gets from the *pleroma* and the closer he is to earth, the more carnal and material he turns. He suffers from the heat sent by God just as the demons do, and after the fight with the Antichrist his face is burnt. This distinguishing feature of the Slavic text (there is no mention of Michael's face being *stiffened as if from fatigue* in the Greek version) is a commentary of sorts on the spiritual nature of the heavenly powers, which 'materialize' when coming into contact with matter.

During his journey 'downwards' to the earth, and back 'upwards' to the *pleroma*, Archangel Michael assumes the role of an arbitrator between the extra-terrestrial and the terrestrial: a function that was exclusively Satanael's prior to his fall (cf. *The Secret Book*, where Jesus explains to John that Satan covered the distance to the earth and back before deserting God)⁸³. Michael replaces the demiurge, albeit already as the souls' guide to the nether world – as the *psychopompos* – which is a distinctive characteristic of his cult, connected with the teachings on the soul in non-orthodox doctrines, but also remarkably popular in sacred writings and folk beliefs.

V. The robe, wreath and sceptre – an allegory of the soul.

Considerations on the soul assume a vital position in the Gnostic religion, being closely associated with the soteriology of ancient dualist teachings. Gilles Quispel writes: *Soteriology governs cosmology. Gnosis intends first of all to be a way, a way into the ego (Selbst), a way to God*⁸⁴. Or – to use the words of the Gnostic Valentinus – having come to itself, the soul heads towards the *pleroma*⁸⁵.

This time, the path – to the internal 'I' and simultaneously to the *pleroma* – is covered by the soul: the non-material spark of God, lost in the chaos and darkness of matter, in the carnal grave. The language of the Gnostic works, charged with symbolism and not always transparent, constructs an image of the soul by means of an antithesis: in its fall, it is 'defiled', enters the 'dark', 'murky' chaos of matter, after which it cleanses itself, clothing a white, shiny robe, and illuminates with God's light on its way towards the Creator.

In one of the Nag Hammadi manuscripts (II, 6), entitled *The Exegesis on the Soul*⁸⁶, the soul in its earthly life is identified with a harlot. Having fallen into the

⁸² А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифът за борбата...*, p. 105.

⁸³ Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги и легенди...*, p. 74.

⁸⁴ *Die Soteriologie beherrscht die Kosmologie. So will denn die Gnosis vor allem ein Weg sein, ein Weg zum Selbst, ein Weg zu Gott* – G. QUISPEL, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁸⁵ [D]er Geist, zu sich selbst gekommen, ist hinaufgeschwollen zum Pleroma – *ibidem*, p. 43.

⁸⁶ Cf. М.К. ТРОФИМОВА, *Историко-философские вопросы гностицизма*, Москва 1979, p. 110–121, 188–193. Cf. also: П. СТЕФАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 271–274. English translation and commentary in: *Gnostic Writings on the Soul: Annotated & Explained*, ed. A. P. SMITH, Woodstock Ver. 2007, p. 1–44.

hands of robbers, she is tempted and imprisoned. Her rebirth into a new life follows after a second turn to God, when – cleansed – she marries Him to find peace and eternal happiness in the pleroma.

The soul covers two paths – downwards, to the dark prison of the body and upwards, to the luminous residences of God. It embarks on the latter path after death, when the ‘luminous part’ is separated from the body. Gnostic texts borrow the notion of the soul’s journey to the afterworld from other sources. Customarily the soul is accompanied by an angel, who assists it in getting through the heavenly spheres, guarded by the archons. The angel, and in some texts – Jesus, is a ‘benevolent helper’, without whom the soteriological act is unattainable. The Redeemer pilots the soul to the *gates of knowledge*, ‘where the bright light is’⁸⁷.

Is the claim that the Slavic and Greek *Tale...* reflect the views of dualist heresies on the soul legitimate? In order to answer this question, it is necessary to analyse the symbols contained in the robe, wreath and sceptre, stolen by Satanael and given back to God following the cosmic struggle between Archangel Michael and the demiurge.

A comparison of the Greek text with its Slavic counterparts exhibits numerous discrepancies as far as the list of the stolen objects is concerned. The Greek *Tale...* merely mentions the “angelic robe”, “image of the angelic robe” or “divine angelic robe”. After the fall of Satanael,

ὁ Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός... ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς ἀγγελικῆς στολῆς καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτὸν ἄμορφον καὶ ἄδοξον.⁸⁸

Afterwards, God orders Michael to recover the “angelic image and robe” stolen by the Antichrist⁸⁹, while in his attempts to outwit Satanael on earth, the Archangel only speaks of the “angelic robe”: οἶδα ὅτι μεμηνῶς εἰς καὶ δύνασαι καὶ τῇ σῆ δύναστέα συνέλαβες τὴν ἀγγελικὴν⁹⁰.

In the final stages of the work, Archangel Michael gives the “divine angelic robe” (τὴν θεόμορφον καὶ ἀγγελικὴν στολὴν) back to the Holy Trinity⁹¹.

Both versions of the Slavic *Tale...* have longer lists of divine attributes. The robe becomes “woven for God”; similarly, the “wreath plaited for God” and “sceptre of the angelic armies” appear. Satanael swears that: И ВЪЗМѢ БОГОПЛЕТЕНИЮ ОДЕЖДѢ И ВЪСЬ ЧЪСТНИ БОГОПЛЕТЕНИ ВЪКНЦѢ, СКИПЕТРА АРЪХАНГЪЛЪСКИХЪ ЧИНОВЪ.⁹²

In the second version, further items are added: “прилики царски” – ‘royal signs’, ‘royal insignia’:

⁸⁷ K. RUDOLPH, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁸⁸ O. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 333.

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 334.

⁹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 339.

⁹² А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Апокрифът за борбата...*, p. 99.

ТА ДА ѿКРАДНЕМЪ БОГЪ БОГОТКАНА ПРЕМЕНА И СВЕТАИ БОГОПЛЕТЕНИ ВЕНЪЦЫ И ПРИЛИКИ ЦАРСКИ И СКИПТРИ АРЪХАНГЕЛСКИ ЧИНОВЕ...⁹³

Further in the text, the phrase “the robe woven for God, the widely worshipped wreath plaited for God and the sceptre of the angelic armies” recurs almost unaltered in the text of the first version, whereas the second has “royal signs, insignia” added. The latter sometimes become the signs of angelic choirs: *скиптри аѿгелски прилики*⁹⁴.

A literal reading of the Greek would link the phrases “angelic robe”, “image of the angelic robe” and “divine angelic robe” directly with the angels – an angelic robe as an allegory of the immortality and spirituality of the heavenly powers. The wrathful God sends Michael to recover the robe from the Antichrist, since the antagonist has been expelled from God’s army and is not entitled to wear the signs of immortality and spirituality. A view of this kind is also confirmed by the *Panoplia dogmatica*, which says, that after the act of creation, Samael had the same dress as He, who sat at His right hand and received honour next after Him.⁹⁵

The “image and robe” may be interpreted as an allegory of immortality and the non-material essence of the angelic army. It is most certain that the Slavic translator/compiler of the unknown Greek work (closely related with regard to the plot) understood the text in exactly this way, and added (or copied) – for greater clarity – the “robe woven for God”, wreath plaited for God and sceptre of the angelic choirs as the signs, or insignia, belonging to Archangel Michael – the commander of the heavenly army. Such an interpretation functions especially neatly in the later text of the *Punčo Codex*, where the enumerated objects are termed ‘прилики царски’; still, it must be stressed that the earlier Bogomil tradition describes the angelic robes, thrones and wreaths as attributes of angels. In *The Secret Book*, the Lord instructs the angels: *tollite vestimenta eorum. Et tulerunt vestimenta eorum et coronas eorum (et tronos eorum), omnibus angelis qui eum auderunt*⁹⁶.

One more plausible analysis comes to mind. Euthymius Zigabenus provides an interesting testimony on the beliefs of the Bogomils concerning the afterlife: they used to believe that the “Perfect” ones don’t die, but are changed, as if in sleep, and that they take off this covering of clay and flesh without pain, and put on the incorruptible divine robe of Christ.⁹⁷

⁹³ *Ibidem*, p. 106.

⁹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 108.

⁹⁵ FGHB, vol. X, p. 53. *They tell the story that the good God and Father, when He had created thousands upon thousands and ten thousands upon ten thousands of angels, had Samael as second to himself, his steward, who had the same dress and shape as He, who sat at His right hand and received honour next after Him – Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 204.

⁹⁶ Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги и легенди...*, p. 76.

⁹⁷ FGHB, vol. X, p. 79. *They say that people of this sort [the ‘Perfect’ Bogomils – G.M.] do not die,*

The “covering of clay and flesh” unmistakably refers to the body, which a Bogomil abandons after death to put on the “incorruptible and divine robe of Christ” – an allegory of the soul.

The words of Euthymius Zigabenus are corroborated by the heretic *Secret Book*. There, the creation of the first people is explained as a demiurgic act of Satan, who orders two angels to assume a clay body:

Et praetera excogavit et fecit hominem ad similitudinem ejus vel sui, et praecepit angelo tertii coeli in corpus luteum. E tulit de eo et fecit aliud corpus in formam mulieris, et praecepit angeli secundi coeli introire in corpus mulieris. Angeli vero ploraverunt videntes in se formam mortalem et esse dissimilis forma.⁹⁸

It is scarcely coincidental that the angels burst out crying having recognized that their spiritual nature is locked within a clay body, and that they consequently take on a mortal form.

The heretic cosmogony and cosmology often assume a literary form: *the interpretative method of allegory and symbolism, widely diffused in the ancient world, was freely employed. That is, a statement of the text was given a deeper meaning, or even several, in order to claim it for one’s own doctrine or display its inner richness*⁹⁹. This multifacetedness, metaphoricality and unclear symbolism of dualist heretic texts, so bemoaned by the Church Fathers, only grants limited possibilities of unravelling the meaning of their writings. This is especially true of the later literary monuments, only remotely echoing Gnostic ideas. Anyhow, the comparison of literary texts with other works from the period allows for a fairly comprehensive image of the Medieval Neo-Manichaean teachings on the soul. In the case at hand, two distinct interpretations come into question. According to the first, more literal one, the “angelic image and robe”, as well as the wreath and the sceptre, serve as an allegory of the spiritual nature of the angels and – simultaneously – the insignia of the Archistratege of the heavenly armies, who has vanquished the Antichrist. The second reading is an arcane heterodox commentary on the teachings on the soul: Michael-Christ is dispatched by the good God in order to free the ‘divine spark’, which has fallen into the matter, on earth, under the rule of the evil archon. Having liberated it, the guide of souls – the *psychopompos* – Michael-Christ leads it through the heavens and restores it to the pleroma.

but are changed, as if in sleep. They take off this covering of clay and flesh without pain, and put on the incorruptible divine robe of Christ – Christian Dualist Heresies..., p. 192.

⁹⁸ Ё. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги и легенди...*, p. 78.

⁹⁹ K. RUDOLPH, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

VI. The 'liturgization' of the Slavic *Tale*... The motif of the cosmic angelomachy in Medieval visual arts and folklore.

As has been mentioned above, K. Ivanova – analysing the liturgical quotations in *The Tale*... – reaches the conclusion that their presence in the text deals a fatal blow to the hypothesis positing the Bogomil provenance of the work. Indeed, all available sources (both heretic and anti-heretic) reaffirm the negative attitude of the Neo-Manichaean communities towards the church rite. Nevertheless, if we juxtapose the Byzantine *Tale*... with the Slavic versions, it turns out that the liturgical quotes are absent from the Greek text. Even if we endorse the (entirely likely) possibility that the latter represents a copy of another work – with similar content, but ultimately different than the Slavic *Tale*... – it appears most bizarre that it does not utilize a single liturgical quote, even in the concluding part, where the angels applaud Michael's deed as participants of the heavenly liturgy. Possibly, the justification for the presence of quotations from the anaphor of John Chrysostom's liturgy in the Slavic *Tale*... is to be sought elsewhere – namely in some later, fully conscious tampering with the text, aimed at making it more 'canonical'. It is quite believable that the original Slavic translation, following the unknown Greek text more or less literally, underwent a kind of 'liturgization' in its later revisions, performed in order to adapt it to the official rite. And since the celebration of the Synaxis of the spiritual powers is devoted precisely to the victorious fight of the heavenly armies against Satan, it may be inferred that the Slavic work – befittingly supplemented with liturgical quotes – could function as a sermon for this occasion. Needless to say, it is just as well imaginable that the Slavic text mimics the unknown Byzantine original; however, since no reference to the Orthodox religious practice is found at least in the only Greek work closely related to the Slavic *Tale*... known today, the notion of a later, 'liturgical' revision of *The Tale*... is not illogical.

The Tale... was no doubt heard in churches, well before the 14th century. If this had not been the case, it could not have been visualized in the St. Archangel Michael Church in Lesnovo, whose mural paintings were completed by 1349 [see ill. 2, ill. 3 - p. 48-49]. O. Afinogenova publishes a scheme of the fresco, following the 2004 publication by S. Gabelić¹⁰⁰, but this is not the only visualization of *The Tale*... In some of her other studies, Gabelić cites parallels with little-known icons, proving the interest in this topic at later times, in the region confined between Lesnovo, Skopje and Sarajevo¹⁰¹. According to the Serbian scholar, the iconographical cycle devoted to the

¹⁰⁰ С. ГАБЕЛИЋ, *op. cit.*, no. 102. Cf. also the illustrations in the article: О. АФИНОГЕНОВА, *op. cit.*

¹⁰¹ S. GABELIĆ, *The Fall of Satan in Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art*, Зор 23, 1993/1994, p. 65–74; С. ГАБЕЛИЋ, *Лесново*, Београд 1998, p. 94–96. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Prof. Elka Bakalova, who directed my attention to those publications, as well as the editor of the journal „Зорграф”, Dr. Miodrag Marković, for his permission to reproduce S. Gabelić's illustrations in the present study.



ill. 2

combat between Archangel Michael and the archon of evil is thematically divided into three parts: in the older depictions (of the first and second type) the visualization of the motif is associated with the Biblical story about the fight between the heavenly armies and the fallen angel. Here belong the frescos from Saint Sophia Cathedral in Kiev, from the monastery in Mirož (11th–12th cent.), the depiction on the metal doors in Monte Gargano (1076) and the south entrance to the cathedral in Suzdal (1230). The third type of visualization is the oldest and directly connected with the narrative of *The Tale*...

The oldest fresco from the Lesnovo monastery belongs to this very type. It features all the elements of the plot of the second part of *The Tale*... In a vertical order from top to bottom, the following scenes have been depicted: Satanael imprisoned under the ice in the lake; the struggle between Michael and Satanael – the naked antagonist is trying to wrest the white robe and crown from the Archangel's hands;



ill. 3

Michael offering the robe and the crown to the Lord. The following caption is placed above the image: [ПАДЕН]ИЕ И ПОМРАЧЕН[ИЕ САТАН]НАИЛОВО¹⁰².

S. Gabelić describes the scene in detail, providing parallels with its liturgical prototype from *The Tale...* In her earlier works, she points to other examples of the visualization of a cosmic angelomachy: from the icon from Skopje (1626) and the icon of the archangels Michael and Gabriel from Sarajevo (1723)¹⁰³. The icon from Skopje could be treated as a variant of the Lesnovo fresco – the same elements from the second part of *The Tale...* are present in it, while the composition is likewise exceptionally close: Satanael, emerging from the lake, stretches his arms towards Archangel Michael; the Archistratego flies toward the heavens, holding the robe and the crown; the adversary attempts to snatch them away from him; Michael gives the robe and the

¹⁰² С. ГАБЕЛИЋ, *Лесново...*, p. 95.

¹⁰³ S. GABELIĆ, *The Fall of Satan...*, p. 69–70.

crown back to God¹⁰⁴. On the other hand, the Sarajevo icon presents a divergent approach to the liturgical material. The two archangels Michael and Gabriel are found in the heavens, facing one another. Gabriel is holding a sword; Michael has the crown in his right hand, and a horn in the left, announcing the triumph over the powers of evil. Below, on earth, Satanael is raising the same crown above his head¹⁰⁵. Here, the iconographical history is more fragmentary and merely contains two of the plot's key elements: Satanael as the possessor of the crown stolen from God and the fortunate finale of Michael's battle against the adversary (the crown is returned to the heavens).

The popularity of *The Tale...* is clearly detectable from its reception in the folklore environment. South and East Slavic (Ukrainian) legends are known about the fight of an angel ('saint archangel', saint) with the devil, and even a Serbian folk song with a similar content¹⁰⁶. The folklore texts in fact represent the processed motif of Satanael stealing God's insignia, but with an etiological exegesis in the spirit of folk culture. Once again, all the vital components of the plot of the literary text are found here: the opponents trying to outsmart one another, the lake being covered with ice, and the heavenly angelomachy. Donka Petkanova takes notice of some of those stories¹⁰⁷, maintaining that *The Tale...* is the "most faithful source" of the folk legends¹⁰⁸.

The proximity of the orally transmitted folk tale and the plot of the literary *Tale...* is self-evident. Still, a number of non-trivial dissimilarities are also visible, 'objectifying' the folklore narrative and occasionally providing it with ethnocentric qualities. The opponents of the devil include: Jesus Christ¹⁰⁹, an angel¹¹⁰, Archangel Michael¹¹¹, St. Peter¹¹², John the Baptist or St. Sava¹¹³. The divine robe, wreath and

¹⁰⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 70, ill. 11.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibidem*, ill. 12.

¹⁰⁶ Цар Дуклјан и Крститељ Јован, [in:] В. КАРАЦИЋ, *Српске народне пјесме*, vol. II, Београд 1985, no. 17, p. 67–69.

¹⁰⁷ Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, *Апокрифна литература и фолклор*, Софија 1978, p. 171–182.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 174.

¹⁰⁹ Господ је дјаволом го делеле светом, [in:] Т. ВРАЖИНОВСКИ, *Народна митологија на македонците*, vol. II, Скопје–Прилеп 1998, no. 15. The legend was recorded in the Republic of Macedonia in 1995. Polish translation: *O tym, jak Pan Bóg i diabeł dzielili świat*, trans. А. КАВЕСКА, [in:] *Апокрыфу i legendy starotestamentowe...*, p. 228.

¹¹⁰ The legend was recorded in the 1950s in the Panagyurishte region (in Bulgaria). The story of the angelomachy belongs to a larger motif of the creation of the world, cf. *Българска народна поезия и проза*, vol. VII, Софија 1983, p. 137–139.

¹¹¹ Како је свети Рангел украо сунце од ђавола, [in:] *Српски Етнографски Зборник*, vol. CX-IV.4, *Српске народне приповетке и предања из Лесковачке области*, ed. Д.М. Ђорђевић, Београд 1988, no. 49, p. 468–469. Polish translation: *Jak Święty Archanioł ukradł diabłu słońce*, trans. А. КАВЕСКА, [in:] *Апокрыфу i legendy starotestamentowe...*, p. 232.

¹¹² Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги...*, p. 337–342. Ivanov publishes two variants of the legend: the first, recorded in Panagyurishte and later reprinted in the volume *Българска народна поезия и проза* (cf. fn. 109), and the second, recorded in Ustovo, at the beginning of the 20th century.

¹¹³ *Зашто у људи није табан раван*, [in:] В. ЧАЈКАНОВИЋ, *Српске народне приповетке*, Бео-

robe are substituted by the keys to hell, a document written for the devil by Adam, a standard¹¹⁴, and most often – the sun, stolen by the devil and brought down to earth. In a legend from the vicinity of Leskovac, the devil proudly carries the sun (stuck onto his sword) around his burnt earth, while in the text noted down by Veselin Čajkanović the devil – having stolen the sun – takes it to earth and installs it in a beech tree, so that it might shine exclusively for him. Especially interesting is the moment of exchanging the insignia in the Serbian song *Tsar Dukljan and John the Baptist*. The saint snatches the crown away from the emperor, but when he reaches the heavens, he gives the “shiny sun” (сјајно сунце) to God. Annoyed with this inconsistency, Vuk Karadžić notes below the line: *До сад свуда бјеше коруна (corona, круна), а овдје сунце!* [“So far it has been a crown everywhere, and here the sun!”], and subsequently publishes a legend in which Archangel Michael descends to earth to recover the sun stolen by the devil – a text remarkably close to the legend recorded around Leskovac¹¹⁵.

Most of the legends have an etiological ending: an explanation for the fact that human feet are not flat. Just before Saint Sava opened the gates of paradise, the devil caught him by the heel and ripped off a piece of flesh. Since then, human feet have had a small hollow. Saint John the Baptist – in the song and legend published by V. Karadžić – reaches the Lord injured as well.

The legend from Panagyurishte also features an etiological finale. The devil catches up with the angel in heaven, catches him by the heel with his claws, but he can no longer drag him back to earth, since the angel is already in God's domain:

Когато ангеля пристъпил със записа пред Бога, той куцал с левия крак и оплакал се Богу, че дявола му обезобразил ногата.

Нема нищо! – рекъл Дядо Господ. – Аз ща да направя на сичките хора така и теб не ще да е срамота.

От онова време е остало да ни са стъпалата вдлъбнати¹¹⁶.

град 1929, no. 162, 2. The legend was recorded in Serbia in the first years of the 20th century. Polish translation: *Dlaczego ludzie nie mają płaskich stóp*, trans. M. LEWIŃSKA, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starotestamentowe...*, p. 233.

¹¹⁴ *Как свети Иван взема от дявола знамето (How Saint John Took Away the Standard from the Devil)* – a legend from the vicinity of Sofia, published in: СБНУ 44, 1949, p. 485–486. Cf. also: Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, *Апокрифна литература и фолклор...*, p. 172.

¹¹⁵ В. КАРАЏИЋ, *op. cit.*, p. 68–69.

¹¹⁶ *Българска народна поезия...*, p. 139: *When the angel appeared with the document in front of God, he limped on his left leg and complained to God that the devil had deformed his leg. - Don't worry! - said Grandfather God. - I will do the same to all people, and you won't have to be ashamed.*

Since that time we have had hollows in our feet. The legends published by J. Ivanov end in an analogous fashion.

It is difficult to determine to what extent folk legends about the struggle of the good angel with the devil directly influenced literary or iconographical works. Still, their closeness is manifest – a fact that once again renders the established contrast between the folk (oral) narrative and the literary (written) tale rather dubious.

VII. Final remarks.

The study on the two Slavic versions of *John Chrysostom's Tale on How Michael Vanquished Satanael* and the Greek Λόγος τοῦ ἀρχιστρατήγου Μιχαήλ, ὅταν ἐπῆρεν τήν στολήν, though by no means aspiring to being viewed as complete, provides an impression of how pseudo-canonical texts functioned and disseminated across the Medieval Byzantine-Slavic cultural community.

The doubts regarding the time and place of the composition of the Slavic translation/compilation are yet to be clarified; in any case, this issue is not the principal topic of this study. Anyhow, taking into account the peculiarities of the historic and cultural situation in the Balkans after the 10th century, it can be supposed that the original text arose as early as before the 10th century and might possibly have been linked to the increasing interest in the cult of Archangel Michael in the First Bulgarian Empire, particularly in the Ohrid diocese. Such a location would be indirectly confirmed by the widespread attestation of the iconographic interpretations of *The Tale...* (Lesnovo, Skopje, Sarajevo), as well as the places where the folklore 'replicas' of the literary text have been recorded: Leskovac, the Skopje region, western Bulgaria.

I reckon, however, that the importance of the historical and textual remarks is outweighed by the comparative and typological analysis of *The Tale...* and the Greek work against the background of heterodox ideologies. Certain Gnostic ideas, connected with dualist cosmology, cosmogony, angelology and anthropology enter the Byzantine literature and culture from the Judeo-Christian world. Having undergone a transformation of sorts in the Neo-Manichaean communities of the Byzantine Empire and Bulgaria, they formed the foundations of the Medieval dualist cosmogony, angelology and anthropology. Spreading through oral and written transmission, the views on the invisible God, Archangel Michael as the 'second God', or the soul's journey to paradise become so popular that they are found not only in heretic texts, but also quoted almost verbatim in anti-heretic treatises.

The continuity of Gnostic beliefs in the Medieval Neo-Manichaean communities in the Balkan Peninsula is the cause for considerations regarding the established opinion on the originality of the Bogomil doctrine. The views of the world, the two principles, angels and the soul characteristic of Medieval heretics are in fact a transmission of old dualist myths, and it seems inappropriate to speak of 'original Bogomil theology'. Thus, the authors of anti-heretic treatises, speaking of Bogomil cosmogony, might have been right in referring to Early Christian heterodox

teachings, from where the Medieval heretics drew the story of the origin of the world and the origins in general.

The plot and later textual changes in the Slavic *Tale...* make its Bogomil origin doubtful. Furthermore, it is not possible to determine the extent to which works such as *The Tale...* were made use of in (moderate?) Bogomil communities. Still before the 14th century, the text underwent the processes of liturgization and folklorization, which is proved by the existence of liturgical quotations (absent from the Greek texts), the visualization of the plot in sacred space and the etiological legends on the fight between Archangel Michael and the devil.

The existence of ancient Gnostic ideas in the beliefs typical of the Balkan Neo-Manichaean heretic teachings, and their widespread occurrence in both high and low cultural texts of Medieval communities, show that any radical assessments of the purported mutual antagonisms in these domains are highly improper. Instead, the situation requires Medieval culture to be viewed as a broader, syncretic phenomenon, where the borders between the spheres of canonicity, pseudo-canonicity, heresy and folklore are not always clear-cut.

Illustrations:

1. *The Fall of Satan*, fresco from Lesnovo monastery, 1346 (after: S. GABELIĆ, *The Fall of Satan in Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art*, 3or 23, 1993/1994, ill. 10).

2. *The Fall of Satan*, an icon of Christ alongside the archangels Michael and Gabriel, Skopje, 1626 (after: S. GABELIĆ, *The Fall of Satan in Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art*, 3or 23, 1993/1994, ill. 11).

3. *The Fall of Satan*, an icon of the archangels Michael and Gabriel, Sarajevo, 1723 r. (after: S. GABELIĆ, *The Fall of Satan in Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art*, 3or 23, 1993/1994, ill. 12).

Abstract. The study is an attempt at a comparative analysis of two pseudo-canonical texts: the Slavic *Homily of John Chrysostom on How Michael Vanquished Satanael* (in two versions) and the Greek *Λόγος τοῦ ἀρχιεπιστοπάρχου Μιχαήλ, ὅταν ἐπήρεν τὴν στολήν* (BHG 1288n). Both texts, very close to each other in terms of the plot, relate an ancient *angelomachia* between a heavenly emissary and a demiurge expelled from the angelic hierarchy. When examined against the background of dualistic heterodox doctrines on the one hand, and compared to other medieval cultural texts (be they liturgical, iconographical or folkloric) on the other, these works enable insight into how heterodox and pseudo-canonical texts functioned and were disseminated in the medieval Byzantine-Slavic cultural sphere.

The Slavic *Homily...* is not genetically related to its Greek counterpart, which is only preserved in a lat, 16th century copy. Rather, it was composed before the 13th century on the basis of another, non-extant model with a content similar to the pseudo-canonical Greek *Homily...* It is probable to a certain degree that the emergence of the Slavic work is connected

with the growing interest in the cult of Archangel Michael in the First Bulgarian Empire, especially in the Diocese of Ohrid.

Certain Gnostic ideas related to dualistic cosmology, as well as cosmogony, angelology and anthropology spread from the Judeo-Christian world to Byzantine literature and culture. Having undergone a number of transformations in the neo-Manichean communities of the Byzantine Empire and Bulgaria, they formed the basis for medieval dualistic cosmogony, as well as angelology and anthropology. Circulated both orally and in written form, beliefs concerning the invisible God, Archangel Michael as a 'second God' and the soul's journey to Paradise became so widespread that they are not only found in heretic texts, but also cited almost *verbatim* in anti-heretic treatises.

The content and later textual modifications of the Slavic *Homily*... cast a doubt on the hypothesis concerning its Bogomil origin. Furthermore, it cannot be determined to what extent works such as the *Homily*... were made use of by (moderate?) Bogomil communities. Even before the 14th century, the text underwent the processes of liturgization and folklorization, as proven by the presence of liturgical quotations (absent from the Greek text), the visualization of the story in sacred space as well as the aetiological legends about Archangel Michael's fight against the Devil.

The existence of ancient Gnostic ideas in the beliefs propagated by neo-Manichean Balkan heretic teachings, as well as their widespread presence in "high" and "low" texts originating in medieval communities call for a more cautious evaluation of the mutual antagonisms between them. This raises the problem of a wider look at medieval culture, in fact a syncretic phenomenon, where the distinction between the canonical, the pseudo-canonical, the heretic and the folkloric is not always clear-cut.

Translated by Marek Majer

Georgi Minczew
Centrum Badań nad Historią i Kulturą
Basenu Morza Śródziemnego i Europy Południowo-Wschodniej
im. prof. Waldemara Cerana
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. Kopcińskiego 8/12 pok. 1.29
90-232 Łódź, Polska
georgi.minczew@gmail.com

Mirosław J. Leszka (Łódź)

THE MONK VERSUS THE PHILOSOPHER FROM THE HISTORY OF THE BULGARIAN- BYZANTINE WAR 894–896

The discussion presented herein should begin by explaining the title it was given: who is the figure termed ‘the Monk’ and to whom does the title of ‘the Philosopher’ refer? This is not, of course, a particularly puzzling mystery; nevertheless, an explanation is in order in this case. The Monk is, of course, Symeon, the Bulgarian ruler (893–927), while the Philosopher is the Byzantine emperor Leo VI (886–912), who went down in history under this cognomen. Sometimes, he is attributed the moniker of the Wise. Thus, the discussion shall be devoted to the clash between these two men, and not the confrontation the world of knowledge with the world of faith. Both rulers were deeply religious and in equal measure, as one might assume, gifted with something that should be called *sophia* – wisdom. Firstly, however, I would like to explain myself as regards one more thing, namely, the expression “from the history of war”. I have to disappoint those of my readers who reached for the text hoping to learn the course of the war between Bulgaria and Byzantium in the years 894–896, that they would be told about the issues of organization, armament and tactics of both armies. No. Such knowledge is not to be found in this paper. However, this does not mean that military issues are to be absent entirely. No. It will not be so, either. I will present the outcome of the war, but only to the extent that I will need it in order to present a matter which lies at the heart of my argument, namely, how Symeon and Leo the Philosopher looked at this war, what place it took in their life experiences, and, finally, how it was inscribed in the concept of relations between countries whose inhabitants follow the same religion.

In the case of the Bulgarian-Byzantine war of 894–896, we are in a very fortunate position, as the main characters this paper describes spoke about it, and – what is particularly important – some of their writings on the subject survived. Although these are not long texts, still, they provide a unique source when it comes to issues of Bulgarian-Byzantine relations. Leo VI devoted some of his thoughts to it, which he included in his work entitled *Tactica*¹, constituting a military manual,

¹ *The Tactica of Leo VI*, ed. et trans. G.T. DENNIS, Washington 2010 (cetera: *Tactica*).

while Symeon left behind three letters² written at the time of warfare. I will return to these two sources later in the text.

Here, I shall briefly present the fate of my heroes until the moment when they had to wage war against each other.

The Monk. Symeon was the third son of Boris-Michael. He was born around the mid-860s.³ As a teenager, was sent by his father to Constantinople, where, for about 10 years, he studied, while at the same time securing peaceful relations between Byzantium and Bulgaria, which had already been Christian but still remained uncertain and dangerous. Staying in the capital of the Byzantine Empire had undoubtedly a strong influence on the mentality of the future tsar. Not only did he receive a traditional classical education⁴, which made him half-Greek, as Liudprand of Cremona wrote⁵, he also had a chance to look at the life of Constantinople⁶, the city which was the embodiment of the power of the Empire, and the conquest of which became his chief purpose, once he became the ruler of Bulgaria.

Symeon, while in the Byzantine capital, took religious vows – in fact, he was preparing for a career as a man of the Church. His father, it seems, saw him as the future head of the Bulgarian Church⁷, for the independence of which he had been fighting so fiercely; the rule of the country was meant for Vladimir, Symeon's older brother. It should be noted that Symeon was well versed in theological matters. He broadened his expertise in this field also after returning to the country, which occurred in the late 880s. He settled then, as it is believed, in the monastery of St. Panteleimon at Preslav⁸. In 889, Boris-Michael resigned and handed the rule to Vladimir, but he betrayed his father by promoting paganism and pro-German foreign policy⁹. In that situation, in 893, Boris-Michael left the

² Léon Choerosphactès, *magistre, proconsul et patrice. Biographie – correspondance*, ed. et trans. G. KOLIAS, Athen 1939 (cetera: Leo CHOIROSPHACTES, *Ep.*). Letters from Symeon to Leo: 1, p. 77; 3, p. 79; 5, p. 81.

³ It probably took place between 863 and 865 – И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Цар Симеон Велики (893–927): Златният век на Средновековна България*, София 1983, p. 33.

⁴ More on the subject of Symeon and his fate until 893 – *ibidem*, p. 34–36; X. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *Младостта на цар Симеон*, София 2010, p. 10–49.

⁵ LIUDPRAND, *Antapodosis*, III, 29 (*Die Werke Liudprands von Cremona*, ed. J. BECKER, Hannover–Leipzig 1915).

⁶ More on the subject of Symeon's probable experiences during his stay in Constantinople – A. ILIEVA, T. ТОМОВ, *The Shape of the Market: Mapping the Book of the Eparch*, BMGS 22, 1998, p. 105–116.

⁷ J.V.A. FINE, *Early Medieval Balkans: a Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor 1983, p. 132; С. РЪНСИМАН, *История на първото българско царство*, trans. М. Пипева, София 1993, p. 115.

⁸ J.V.A. FINE, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

⁹ More on the subject of Rasate-Vladimir's rule and his fall – В. Пюзелев, *Княз Борис Първи*, Со-

monastery to which he had gone after his abdication and removed his son from the throne. Symeon was proclaimed the new ruler of Bulgaria.

Interestingly, although this is rarely – if ever – mentioned in this context, Symeon's abandonment of his monastic life was not met with universal approval. We have evidence of the criticism of this move. In the Slavic translation of John Moschus' *Limonarion*, dating from the turn of the ninth and tenth century, we read: (...) *glory and great fame to the tsar who resigns [of power] and becomes a monk (...) Indeed, and great shame and disgrace to a monk who leaves the cowl and becomes a tsar.*¹⁰

Indisputably, the seizure of the throne must have been a shock for him. His past life up to that point had not predestined him to take such a challenge. It seemed that he had been destined for a career as the clergyman and a scholar, for which he had been exceptionally well prepared and showed a great ability. In the Old Bulgarian literature, Symeon is compared to Ptolemy II (285–246), the founder of the Alexandrian library, and king David, a lover of art and literature¹¹. In his circle there were such writers of the Old Bulgarian culture as Clement of Ohrid, Naum, Constantine of Preslav or John the Exarch.

The Philosopher. Leo VI was born on September 19th, 866¹². He was the second son of Basil I. He was associated on the throne on July 30th, 870. The successor of his father was to be Constantine, it was not until his death in 879 that Leo was made Basil's successor. He began his independent rule on July 30th, 886. Leo received excellent education and demonstrated a predisposition for scholarly work. He was referred to as 'the wise' (*sophós*), he was a prolific writer and an erudite, but as it was also thought that he had the gift of prediction and prophecy. It is worth noting that he was compared to king Solomon¹³.

фия 1969, p. 459–470; Е. АЛЕКСАНДРОВ, *Интрониизирането на княз Симеон – 893 г.*, Рбг 15.3, 1991, p. 10–17; Х. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *Детронизацията на Владимир-Расате в плана на формата*, [in:] *Литература и култура*, София 1992, p. 84–93; И.Г. ИЛИЕВ, *Управлението на княз Расате (Владимир) (889–893). Един неуспешен опит за европейска преориентация във външната политика на България*, [in:] *Средновековна християнска Европа: Изток и Запад. Ценности, традиции, общуване*, ed. В. Гюзелев, А. Милтенова, София 2002, p. 407–410.

¹⁰ After: А. НИКОЛОВ, *Политическа мисъл в ранносредновековна България (средата на IX – края на X век)*, София 2006, p. 121. Although Symeon was no longer a monk, as a ruler he still kept simple and abstemious life to which he was used while living in the monastery.

¹¹ Р. РАШЕВ, *Отношението на преславските книжовници към бойните подвизи на цар Симеон*, [in:] *ИДЕМ, Цар Симеон. Шрихи към личността и делото му*, София 2007, p. 42–51; more on the subject of Symeon's library: Н. ГАГОВА, *Владатели и книги. Участието на южнославянския владетел в производството и употребата на книги през Средновековието (IX–XV в.): рецепцията на византийския модел*, София 2010, p. 40–79.

¹² More on the subject of the fate of Leo VI until his confrontation with Symeon – S. TOUGHER, *The Reign of Leo VI (886–912). Politics and People*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997, p. 42sq.

¹³ С. MANGO, *The Legend of Leo the Wise*, ЗРВИ 6, 1960, p. 59–93; S. TOUGHER, *The wisdom of Leo*

He wrote sermons and speeches. He was a hymnographer. He wrote, among other works, the hymn sung at the procession during which the relics of St. Lazarus were transferred to Hagia Sophia. He is the author of a military manual, *Tactica*. His influence is visible in the legislation. He also completed the work on the *Basilica* and new laws were included in the *Novels*¹⁴. It was in his time that the final version of *The Book of the Eparch* was completed¹⁵.

As may be gathered from the above arguments, my heroes had a lot in common: starting from their age, through education, intellectual ability, but also the fact that originally they had not been intended to inherit the throne.

The causes of the war. Boris-Michael had to recognize that Symeon was a good candidate for an executor of his political program. However, in a relatively short time after obtaining approval for his ascension from the assembly of Church officials and lay lords (the so-called Council of Preslav)¹⁶, Symeon decided on a military confrontation with the Byzantine Empire. What were the reasons? Apparently, the answer is simple, and was presented most clearly in the work functioning as *Theophanes Continuatus*:

A message came that Symeon, the archon of Bulgaria, will go up in arms against the *Romaioi*, with the following excuse (*próphasin*) to fight. Basileopator Zaoutzes had a eunuch, a slave named Musikos. He became friends with merchants, greedy for profit and money, coming from Hellas, named Staurakios and Kosmas. It was them, eager to benefit from trading with Bulgarians, that moved its place, through Musikos, from the capital to Thessalonica, and encumbered Bulgarians with [higher] taxes. When Bulgarians told Symeon about that, he presented the issue to the Emperor Leo. He, succumbing to the influence of Zaoutzes,

VI, [in:] *New Constantines. The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th–13th Centuries. Papers from the Twenty-sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, St. Andrews, March 1992*, ed. P. MAGDALINO, Aldershot–Brookfield 1994, p. 171–179; IDEM, *The Reign...*, p. 110sq; IDEM, *The imperial thought-world of Leo VI, the non-campaigning emperor of the ninth century*, [in:] *Byzantium in the Ninth Century. Dead or Alive*, ed. L. BRUBAKER, London 1998, p. 51–60; Д. ШЕПЪРД, *Владетел като учител, свещеник и мъдрец: византийският император Лъв VI и българският цар Симеон*, [in:] IDEM, *Неспокойни съседни. Българо-византийска конфронтация, обмен и съжителство през средните векове*, trans. Л. Генова, София 2007, p. 71sq.

¹⁴ G. OSTROGORSKI, *Dzieje Bizancjum*, trans. H. EVERT-KARPESOWA et al., Warszawa 1968, p. 194.

¹⁵ K. ILSKI, *Wstęp*, [in:] *Księga eparcha*, trans. et com. A. KOTŁOWSKA, Poznań 2010, p. 7.

¹⁶ The event usually dated to the year 893. Recently, the issue has been addressed by: А. КАЛОЯНОВ, *Преславският събор през 893 година – от предположенията към фактите за едно от най-значимите събития в историята на християнска Европа*, [in:] *Християнската идея в историята и културата на Европа*, София 2001, p. 101–113; IDEM, *Славянската православна цивилизация. Началото: 28 март 894 г., Плиска, Велико Търново 2007*, p. 54sq (the author dates the Council to 894) and М. СПАСОВА, *На коя дата и през кой месец се е провел Преславският събор от 893 година*, [in:] ПКШ, vol. VIII, Шумен 2005, p. 84–101 (who disagrees with A. Kalojanov's arguments and dates the beginning of the Council to February 893).

considered this to be nonsense. Thus, a frenzied Symeon took up arms and went against the *Romaioi*¹⁷.

This text, which is, to a large extent, repeated in other sources¹⁸, led scholars to conclude that the war between Bulgaria and Byzantium was primarily based on economy. Hence, some called it the first economic war in the history of medieval Europe. But was the very fact of moving the Bulgarian market from Constantinople to Thessalonica and introducing higher fees for Bulgarian goods so important that the Bulgarian ruler risked military conflict with his powerful eastern neighbour? Scholars usually agreed as to the fact that the move of Leo VI decidedly worsened the conditions for the Bulgarian merchants conducting trade with Byzantium. This was expressed on the one hand in raising its costs and not only due to the newly introduced fees, but also because of the increasing of the distance from the Danube Bulgaria to the new market in Thessalonica. Not only the route followed by merchants was longer, it also became more dangerous¹⁹. It would not, therefore, be surprising that they would turn to Symeon to defend their interests.

New light on the issue of the Bulgarian trade in Thessalonica was shed by two Greek scholars: Nikolaos Oikonomides²⁰ and Joannes Karayannopoulos²¹. The former believed that only a portion of trade was moved to Thessalonica, where high fees were applied to it. The latter, in turn, thought that the Bulgarian merchants were not moved from Constantinople to Thessalonica but excluded from among other merchants and charged with higher fees. Both scholars emphasize, therefore, not so much the issue of transferring the Bulgarian markets

¹⁷ THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, VI, 9, ed. B.G. NIEBUHR, rec. I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1838 (cetera: THEOPH. CONT.).

¹⁸ *Leonis Grammatici Chronographia*, rec. I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1842, p. 266–268 (it places greater emphasis than *Theoph. Cont.* on the greed of Byzantine merchants, who wanted to get rich at the expense of Bulgarians); *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, 133, 15, rec. S. WAHLGREN, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 2006, p. 275. Cf. *Tactica*, XVIII, 42; *Annales Fuldenses*, ed. G. PERTZ, [in:] MGH.SS, vol. I, p. 412. The last two accounts suggest that the reason for the outbreak of the war was the Byzantine-Hungarian alliance. More on the subject of these indications and problems with interpretation thereof – J. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *Byzantium, Bulgaria and the Peoples of Ukraine in the 890s.*, [in:] *Материали по археологии, истории и этнографии Таврии*, vol. VII, ed. А.Й. Айбабин, Симферополь 2000, p. 348, 350–353.

¹⁹ Г. ЦАНКОВА-ПЕТКОВА, *Първата война между България и Византия при цар Симеон и възстановяването на българската търговия с Цариград*, ИИИ 20, 1968, p. 174. These arguments are only valid if the Bulgarian merchants were indeed banned from Constantinople.

²⁰ N. OIKONOMIDES, *Le kommerkion d'Abydos, Thessalonique et la commerce bulgare au IX^e siècle*, [in:] *Hommes et richesses dans l'Empire byzantin*, t. II, VIII^e – XV^e siècle, ed. V. KRAVATI, J. LEFORT, C. MORRISSON, Paris 1991, p. 246–247 [= Réalités byzantines, 3].

²¹ J. KARAYANNOPOULOS, *Les causes des luttes entre Syméon et Byzance: Un réexamen*, [in:] *Сборник в чест на акад. Димитър Ангелов*, ed. В. Велков, София 1994, p. 58–60.

from Constantinople to Thessalonica, but charging the Bulgarian merchants with high fees.

An important question is: when did the change of the position of Bulgarian merchants in Byzantium occur? Some scholars situate this event in the year 893 or even the 894. G. Cankova-Petkova dated it as early as 889²², which she associated with the proclamation of Stylianos Zaoutzes, discussed in the above-mentioned *Theophanes Continuatus*, a Basileopator. However, this event, in the light of research by R.J.H. Jenkins, should be dated in August 891²³. T. Wasilewski, bearing in mind R.J.H. Jenkins' research, opted for the year 892 as the date Leo VI introduced disadvantageous decisions against Bulgarian trade²⁴. The outcome of research by scholars mentioned above lead to important conclusion that the issue of the worsening of the position of Bulgarian merchants occurred in Byzantium during the reign of Vladimir-Rasate – and Symeon inherited it from his predecessor.

Scholars are also not in agreement as to what led Leo VI, following the promptings of his advisers (assuming the reliability of sources). There are several standpoints that can be listed. Firstly, the emperor's decision should be understood as a repression against Bulgarians, which was, according to some, a response to Vladimir's anti-Byzantine policy or, as others claim, a reaction to the elimination of the Greek language and priests from the Church of Bulgaria²⁵. Symbolic expression of the latter process would be making, by the decision of the Council of Preslav of 893, the Slavonic language the language of both the state and the Bulgarian Church²⁶. The second viewpoint places the move of Leo VI in the sphere of his economic policy, one aspect of which was promoting the development of Byzantine trade, not only in the largest of its centers – Constantinople²⁷.

²² Г. ЦАНКОВА-ПЕТКОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

²³ R.J.H. JENKINS, *The chronological accuracy of the „Logothete” for the years A.D. 867–913*, DOP 19, 1965, p. 104.

²⁴ T. WASILEWSKI, *Bizancjum i Słowianie w IX wieku. Studia z dziejów stosunków politycznych i kulturalnych*, Warszawa 1972, p. 223. The author believed that the war began before 17 May 893, although military action was taken in the spring of 894 (in this respect, the Polish researcher follows the findings of – among others – Г. Цанкова-Петкова, *op. cit.*, p. 178).

²⁵ Е.г. В. ВАЧКОВА, *Симеон Велики – пътят към короната на Запада*, София 2005, p. 53–54. Proponents of this view place Leo's VI decision on the Bulgarian trade in time of the rule of Symeon.

²⁶ The belief that the Council of Preslav of 893 made the decision to make the Slavic language “official”, despite the lack of serious source grounds, is strongly present in scholarship. Arguments denying the validity of this view – T. WASILEWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 212; J. KARAYANNOPOULOS, *op. cit.*, p. 54. Proponents of this view inevitably date the “mercantile affair” to the year 893. See also the discussion by А. НИКОЛОВ (*op. cit.*, p. 115–123) devoted to the basic issues addressed at the Council – the authorization of the elevation of Symeon.

²⁷ Г. ЦАНКОВА-ПЕТКОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 172–174; cf. J. KARAYANNOPOULOS, *op. cit.*, p. 54sqq.

Proponents of the third perspective follow the letter of the source quoted above, explaining the actions of Leo by his susceptibility to environmental influences.

Byzantium' one-sided decision to introduce new conditions of trade²⁸, which had not been approved by the Bulgarians, had to provoke a response from Symeon. It seems that he was not interested settling these issues by force, since he had undertaken negotiations with Byzantium²⁹. The unyielding attitude of the Byzantines was what finally pushed him to take military action. However, was the decision to go to war merely a consequence of the desire to protect the interests of Bulgarian merchants? In general, answer to this question is provided in the source cited above. An anonymous author wrote very clearly that the issue of the merchants was only a *πρόφασιν* – a pretext for Symeon to take action. The Bulgarian ruler was provoked by the Byzantines to take military action because they, without any prior discussion, had imposed unfavorable business conditions on the Bulgarian merchants and not wanting to withdraw this decision, compromised the authority of the Bulgarian ruler. Symeon, being at the beginning of his rule, could not afford to leave this matter unattended. He had to demonstrate that he was a strong ruler, capable of defending interests of his subjects and the independence of his own state. Some scholars believe, however, probably overly modernizing the issue, that Symeon wanted to show his subjects clearly that despite his strong ties with Byzantium and the aura of a return to good neighbourly relations with it, he was not a Byzantine nominee³⁰. The proponents of the view that the Byzantines reluctantly, if not even with overt hostility, looked at the development of the Bulgarian Church independent of Constantinople and the dynamic growth of Slavic literary culture, show Symeon's strong reaction as a desire to defend the nascent Bulgarian Slav identity³¹.

Whatever the personal motives of Symeon's decision to undertake military operations, it seems that he was forced to it by the unyielding attitude of the Byzantines. What was its cause? It seems that Leo VI did not appreciate the new Bulgarian ruler, thinking that at the beginning of the rule, he would not take on

²⁸ Some scholars believed that Leo's move broke the rules of the peace treaty between Bulgaria and Byzantium. The problem is, however, that we do not know of any regulation of Byzantine-Bulgarian relations, in which Constantinople would be indicated as the only place in Bulgarian-Byzantine trade (J. KAYANNOPOULOS, *op. cit.*, p. 54).

²⁹ Some scholars believe that Symeon had not exhausted all possibilities of a peaceful settlement of the dispute (M. WHITTON, *The Making of Byzantium, 600–1025*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1996, p. 286; P. ПАШЕВ, *Цар Симеон*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Цар Симеон. Штрихи...*, p. 52–53; see also S. TOUGHER, *The Reign...*, p. 173–174), thereby suggesting that the Bulgarian ruler for some reason pushed for war. It is impossible to accept the view of J. KARAYANNOPOULOS (*op. cit.*, p. 61) that Symeon, from the beginning of his rule sought *la création d'un «Saint Empire de la Nation Bulgare» avec pour capitale la Nouvelle Rome* and sought a pretext to launch a war with Byzantium.

³⁰ J. SHEPARD, *Symeon of Bulgaria-Peacemaker*, ГСУ.НЦСВПИД 83.3, 1989, p. 16.

³¹ В. ВАЧКОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 31–33, 54.

such a risky solution as war. The emperor certainly knew that Symeon was not prepared by Boris-Michael to the role of the ruler, which was most clearly evidenced by the fact that even while in the Byzantine capital, he became a monk. After returning from Constantinople, he stayed in the monastery and was not involved in the court life. Leo could believe that the recent monk would not willingly go to war with the Empire because of something which, from the perspective of Constantinople, was a relatively trivial issue.

The war. After Leo's negative reaction to the request made by Symeon, the Bulgarian ruler marched with his army against the Byzantines³². Against him, Leo sent an army under the command of strategates Procopios Krinites. The confrontation took place in eastern Thrace, which then was a part of Macedonia. The Byzantines were defeated. The expedition leader was killed along with many soldiers. There is no basis for determining losses. It seems that the Bulgarians were also decimated in this battle and consequently they returned to their own territory. In the context of this Byzantine-Bulgarian clash, an episode appears which shows Symeon in a seemingly surprising light. According to some Byzantine sources, Khazars, who were a unit of the palace guard, fell into the hands of Symeon. Some of them died during the battle and some, at the behest of the Bulgarian ruler, had their noses cut off and were sent to Constantinople³³. This act of cruelty was probably calculated to discourage the Byzantines from further acts of war and starting negotiations. This also indicated that the former monk would act firmly and would not hesitate to use even such drastic methods, which were far from the ideals of Christianity. On the other hand, one could say that Symeon showed some leniency because the Khazars' lives were spared. There is one more important element, namely the action was taken against Khazars and not against Christians – Byzantines. Symeon did not want to offend the Byzantines' pride and excluded from his "surgical" actions his brothers in faith. If Symeon believed that he would exert pressure on the Byzantines and force them to make peace, he made a mistake. Let us once again listen to the author of *Theophanes Continuatus: The Emperor, when he saw them, he angrily sent Nicetas called Skleros to the Danube with dromons to gain the favor of the Turks with gifts in order to fight Symeon*³⁴.

Nicetas Skleros persuaded Arpad and Kusan, the Magyar chieftains (they are disguised under the name of *Turks*) to invade Bulgaria. Hungarians were to be transported to the north-east Bulgaria using the Byzantine fleet, while from

³² More on the subject of the course of war – Г. ЦАНКОВА-ПЕТКОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 178sq; T. WASILEWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 223–226; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 88–94; Д. АНГЕЛОВ, С. КАШЕВ, Б. ЧОЛПАНОВ, *Българска военна история от Античността до втората четвърт на Х в.*, София 1983, p. 255–263.

³³ Even the Khazars of the Emperor Leo's heteria squad were taken captive by Symeon, he had their noses cut off to disgrace the Romaioi and sent them to the capital – ТЕОФН. КОНТ., VI, 9.

³⁴ ТЕОФН. КОНТ., VI, 9.

the south the campaign was to be taken by the ground forces of the Byzantines.

The question of the use of Hungarians against the Bulgarians was a problem for the Byzantines. Magyars were heathens. Pitching them against the Christian Bulgarians, Byzantines' brothers in faith, was a move that at first glance was difficult to justify. And it was this very matter that Leo VI addressed, finding justification for this step. In his military treaty *Tactics*, the emperor referred to the issue of using the pagan Magyars to fight the Bulgarians. He decided that spilling Christian blood is undoubtedly wrong but thanks to the Divine Providence which sent pagan allies of Byzantium against the Bulgarians who broke the peace, the *Romaioi* did not defile themselves voluntarily with the blood of their brethren in the faith³⁵. The emperor – who was aware that the responsibility for the outbreak of the war rested not only on the Bulgarians and that using pagans against them was a wrong move for religious reasons – found the best excuse possible. It was God's will. Reality showed that a shared religion did not protect against an armed confrontation between Bulgarians and Byzantines, but the emperor thought that it did not have to mean that this would not be so in the future. The decision, made reluctantly – which needs to be emphasized – to use the pagans was an attempt to blur the responsibility for the spilling Christian blood and was to be a chance for lasting peaceful relations in the future. The emperor explicitly writes that he would not be arming against the Bulgarians and present methods of fighting them because in doing so he would act against God who does not want bloodshed among brothers in faith. An argument rationalizing this reasoning is an assertion that the Bulgarians do not want war either and they promise that they would listen to the *Romaioi* advice³⁶.

Leo VI wrote these words after the war of 894–896 had ended, knowing its outcome – let us add that it was disadvantageous to the Byzantines. The impression remains that it was only the failure that led him to conclude that the Bulgarians are a dangerous opponent with whom it is better to seek an agreement than be at war. For an author of a military manual and a man regarded as wise and having the ability to predict the future – the assertion is not very revealing. The emperor must have known that in the past the Byzantines had often been defeated by the Bulgarians.

Following the subsequent course of the war, it seems that Symeon, in turn, was learning relatively quickly and acquired experience, although this does not mean that the ultimate success came easily. We must recall the dramatic episodes associated with fighting with Hungarians. During their first intervention in Bulgaria, Symeon's army was shattered, and he had to take refuge in the fortress Mundraga (perhaps Tutrakan, or the fortress on the island Ploska). Hungarian

³⁵ *Tactica*, XVIII, 42.

³⁶ *Tactica*, XVIII, 44.

army did not have infantry and besieging machines, therefore, they did not attempt to conquer Bulgarian fortresses. Hungarians were satisfied with their spoils of war and returned to their homes. The second invasion of Hungary followed a similar course (in the spring or summer of 895). Again, the action was successful, although the Bulgarians tried to prevent them from getting across the Danube. This time, Symeon fled and took refuge in Dorostolon. Perhaps, as the last time, Hungarians settled for their loot and returned to their homes. It is worth noting that these dramatic events forced Boris-Michael to leave his monastery and support his son.

Symeon's ability to draw conclusions and learn may be demonstrated by the following facts. When, in a situation difficult for Symeon, threatened by the Hungarian and Byzantine army, Leo VI sent an emissary in the person of the Quaestor Konstantinakes, the Bulgarian ruler, rather than go into negotiations, ordered him imprisoned. The move was, as can be judged, calculated on waiting out the situation which was not very favorable for the Bulgarians. It clearly indicated that Symeon would negotiate peace only if he is in a position to achieve favorable terms thereof. Another fact. Following the Byzantine footsteps, Symeon looked for allies. He found them in the form of Pechenegs, who were pagans, and whom he pitched against Hungarians, also pagans, with whom he could not cope for some time. It should be noted, without jumping to any hasty conclusions, however, that Symeon decided not to direct pagans against Christians, as Leo VI did. In the spring of 896, a Bulgarian-Pechenegian expedition was organized against the Hungarian lands, which turned out to be successful. Hungarians were forced to leave their existing lands and resettle in the middle reaches of the Danube basin, where they live today. About the same time another Byzantine envoy was sent to Symeon.

The Byzantine emissary was Leo Choerosphaktes, descended from aristocracy, and related to the imperial family through his wife. In his youth, he received an excellent legal education and for many years he had played an important role at the imperial court³⁷. Symeon treated him just like his predecessor, the Quaestor Konstantinakes, namely, he ordered him imprisoned in the fortress Mundraga, not even meeting with him. From Mundraga, Leo wrote to Symeon. Eleven of his letters to Symeon survived, and, what is of particular interest, so

³⁷ More on the subject of Leo's career, see G. KOLIAS, *Biographie*, [in:] *Léon Choerosphactès...*, p. 15–73; М.А. ШАНГИН, *Византийские политические деятели первой половины X века*, [in:] *Византийский сборник*, ed. М.В. Левченко, Москва–Ленинград 1945, p. 228–248; R.J.H. JENKINS, *Leo Choerosphactes and the Saracen Vizier*, [in:] *IDEM, Studies on Byzantine History of the 9th and 10th Centuries*, London 1970, art. XI, p. 167–175; P. MAGDALINO, *In Search of the Byzantine Courtier: Leo Choerosphaktes and Constantine Manasses*, [in:] *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*, ed. H. MAGUIRE, Washington 1997, p. 146–161.

did three letters of the latter addressed to Leo³⁸. Copies of these letters were created at the end of the tenth or early eleventh century, and they were discovered in the late nineteenth century on Patmos³⁹. The correspondence concerned the issue of the release of the Byzantines, who were in captivity in Bulgaria and begins with a letter from Symeon to Leo written after 7th June in the year 896⁴⁰. In order to achieve this, Leo Choirosphaktes refers to something that today could be called humanitarianism and, at that time, was described by the term *φιλανθρωπία* and which the Byzantine ascribes to Symeon. In his letters, he describes Symeon as the most people-loving among the archons⁴¹, speaks of his kindness to the people⁴². Is this only a measure calculated to stir the conscience of Symeon? Or was it an expression of the Byzantine doctrine of power, according to which one of the basic attributes of a ruler should be *φιλανθρωπία*? And finally, perhaps it was a reflection of the real opinion that Symeon had in Byzantium? The question to this last question at first glance appears to be negative. Although between the seizing of power by Symeon and Choirosphaktes' mission only a short period of time passed, surely, the actions of the Bulgarian archon during this period could not become the basis for such an opinion to arise. One might say perversely that the symbolic expression of his kindness to people was the mutilation (cutting off noses) of the Khazars serving in the Imperial Guard, and who found themselves in Bulgarian captivity. But surely, it would be too great a simplification. Perhaps, the ground for the opinion about Symeon's kindness to the people was the fact that just until recently he had been a monk, what had to attest to his religiousness which entails the love of one's neighbour. Certainly, the memory of that was overshadowed during the war but Choirosphaktes could recall it while not being read by Symeon only as a flatterer. Undoubtedly, the view of Symeon's philanthropy, functioning in reality, perfectly harmonized with the Byzantine model of a ruler⁴³, which, as can be judged, was deeply embedded in the consciousness of

³⁸ Leo CHOIROSΦAKTES, *Ep.* Letters of the Byzantine envoy to Symeon: 2, p. 77; 4, p. 79–81; 6, p. 81–83; 7, p. 83; 8, p. 83–85; 9, p. 85; 10, p. 85–87; 11, p. 87; 12, p. 89; 13, p. 89; 14, p. 91.

³⁹ E. АЛЕКСАНДРОВ, *Документи дипломатической практики первого болгарского государства*, Pbg 12.3, 1988, p. 16.

⁴⁰ G. KOLIAS, *op. cit.*, p. 33–34; *Testimonia najdawniejszych dziejów Słowian. Seria grecka*, vol. 4, *Pisarze z VIII–XII wieku*, ed. A. BRZÓSTKOWSKA, W. SWOBODA, Warszawa 1997, p. 157 (cetera: *Testimonia 4*).

⁴¹ Leo CHOIROSΦAKTES, *Ep.* 2, p. 77 (*αρχόντων φιλανθρωπότεατε*); 4, p. 79.

⁴² Leo CHOIROSΦAKTES, *Ep.* 7, p. 83; 9, p. 85. In letter 6 (s. 81–83) he writes explicitly: *You protect justice [while maintaining] the kindness to people, w h i c h m a n y e m p h a s i z e* [spaced out by M.J.L.].

⁴³ Leo CHOIROSΦAKTES even urged Symeon to follow the Byzantine emperor – *Ep.* 2, p. 77. W. SWOBODA is right, contrary to the opinion of Bulgarian scholars (Π. ΑΝΓΕΛΟΒ, *България и българите в представите на византийците (VII–XIV век)*, София 1999, p. 196 – without quoting any arguments, he repeats Zlatarski's thesis), arguing that the expression “divine father”

the Bulgarian archon.

These considerations do not mean at all that Choiosphaktes, frequently mentioning Symeon's philanthropy and making it the chief argument to persuade him to release the prisoners, was convinced of it himself. Three surviving letters of the Bulgarian ruler had to leave him disillusioned. In the first letter from Symeon, he suggests that he would release prisoners if the Emperor Leo succeeds in predicting his decision on the issue⁴⁴. In the subsequent letter he states that he would not release the prisoners because the emperor failed to predict his ruling on the matter⁴⁵ and, what is significant, states: *Even your emperor and meteorologist do not know the future*⁴⁶. One may think that this idea was not born in the mind of Symeon only when writing the second letter, which is something that Choiosphaktes also could consider. In response to this letter, he is trying to justify the view that the meaning of his letter was misread by secretaries, and the emperor's special expertise lies in peaceful proceedings⁴⁷. In the last preserved letter, Symeon writes: *Magister Leo, I have not promised you anything as regards the prisoners; I said nothing to you [about it]; I shall not send [them] especially because we do not know exactly [what awaits us] in the future*⁴⁸. After such a pronouncement, Choiosphaktes had no illusions, that is if he still had any, as to Symeon's kindness to the people and certainly to the Byzantines.

The fact that he had no such illusions is evidenced by the tone of his letters. It would be stating the obvious to say that in his correspondence, Leo could not afford to show the recipient in unfavorable light. This does not mean that he did not make allusions between the lines that his assessment of Symeon is not positive. The letter 9, the Byzantine envoy wrote: *We do not believe, therefore, that you are bad and this is why we can be pleasantly treated, and as we are loved we can achieve that which we find pleasant*⁴⁹.

should be understood as emperor Leo VI, not Symeon's own father, Boris-Michael – *Testimonia* 4, p. 157, an. 3. This is clearly demonstrated by the use of this term in the later portion of the correspondence – e.g. *Ep.* 13, p. 89; *Ep.* 14, p. 91. As it is known, in the Byzantine family of rulers, the Bulgarian archon was called the "spiritual son".

⁴⁴ Symeon mentions in this letter that Leo VI had foreseen a Sun eclipse at one point, not only when it would occur but also how long it would last (*Ep.* 1, p. 77). In letter 3 (s. 79) he calls Leo a meteorologist. The term refers to a person well versed in disciplines such as astrology and astronomy.

⁴⁵ *Ep.* 3, p. 79.

⁴⁶ *L. cit.* This direct reference to Leo VI is filled with aversion. This is not necessarily surprising as it is difficult to expect a positive attitude to the ruler of the country with which one is at war. In this case, however, a note of envy can be detected of the fame of a scholar which surrounded Leo VI.

⁴⁷ *Ep.* 4, p. 79–81. Cf. W. SWOBODA – *Testimonia* 4, p. 157–158, an. 5.

⁴⁸ *Ep.* 5, p. 81. It seems that this last phrase expresses Symeon's distrust as to the peaceful intentions of the Byzantines.

⁴⁹ Leo CHOIOSPHAKTES, *Ep.* 9, p. 85.

This sentence, I think, is the key to understanding the attitude of Leo to the Bulgarian ruler. The Byzantine does not believe, of course, only in the texts of his letters, the evil to be inherent in Symeon. He postulates that by depicting Symeon in a good light, with flattery, he will be able to achieve his purpose. Therefore, he is searching Symeon's explicitly hostile words referring to the Byzantines, for even minor inconsistencies, or a possibility of formulating another interpretation, positive for the Byzantines, providing perspective of sustaining the hope of achieving the objective. Leo seems to be blind and deaf to the consistent position of the Bulgarian ruler⁵⁰. He sees the influence of Providence, which, according to Leo, prevents Symeon from being hostile towards the Byzantines and thus doing evil not only do the latter, but also to himself⁵¹. The reader, watching Leo attempts, with each subsequent letter concludes that to the Byzantine envoy, Symeon is a man of treacherous and deceitful nature. It also seems that the Byzantine envoy treats Symeon's deeds in terms of a personal insult. In letter 13, Leo writes that he is not offended by the fact that Symeon suggests to emperor something that he denies himself. He calls himself a slave to the emperor and says, I think, with sarcasm: *As for us, you shall make sure not only that we are not sad as those who have not been pushed, but you shall even bring us honor for the successful representation*⁵².

If the issue of prisoners had been solved in a direct correspondence between the emperor and Symeon, there would not be any merit by Leo. His mission would have ended with his personal failure.

The correspondence between Leo and Symeon makes an impression, at least from the viewpoint of the former, an intellectual entertainment of a kind, a play with words, although its subject is very serious. The Bulgarian ruler in this game is the party dictating terms, while Leo exerts all his eloquence to find a way out of the seemingly hopeless situation. Letters of these two people only in some places resemble "normal" diplomatic correspondence. Symeon, making conditions impossible to fulfill, not only wants to gain time, as some scholars believe, but he is clearly mocking his interlocutor, indicating that he would decide on the conditions of a possible settlement with the Byzantines. How else can one treat the

⁵⁰ Particularly symptomatic in this context was Symeon's letter which Leo mentions in letter 14 (p. 91). This letter, as it seems, made earlier agreements invalid; it is disown by the Byzantine envoy due to the fact that it was not bearing the sign of the cross. Leo treats the letter as a joke and hypocritically expresses admiration for the intelligence of Symeon, who by the omission of the cross clearly suggested that the letter does not reflect his true intentions.

⁵¹ Leo CHOIROSPHAKTES, *Ep.* 8, p. 83–85: *Here is God who puts you to the test and sets the hand in motion so that it writes one thing instead of another in an ambiguous way, in spite of you, or rather, almost in your favor.* Cf. letters 10–12, p. 85–89, in which Leo constructs a thesis that one's true intentions do not necessarily have to be explicitly expressed in words.

⁵² Leo CHOIROSPHAKTES, *Ep.* 13, p. 89.

request that the emperor Leo VI predicts whether he – Symeon – releases or does not release the Byzantine captives. It is obvious here, even apart from whether the Bulgarian ruler believed in the ability of Leo VI to predict the future that no matter what the Byzantine emperor said, Symeon would still say that this is a mistake. The Bulgarian's action was calculated, I think, for bargaining the best conditions of the agreement by showing that, in fact, he was not particularly interested in negotiating. At the same time, the reader inevitably concludes that to Symeon, the correspondence with Leo Choirospaktes was of no special importance. The Byzantine envoy was interned by the Bulgarian archon, his freedom of action was limited, and also the flow of information was certainly not sufficient to carry out a diplomatic mission. We also know that Symeon carried direct correspondence with the emperor⁵³ and as its result, an agreement was reached⁵⁴. Overestimating the importance of Leo Choirospaktes' mission is a consequence of, as often happens, the state of the sources. His letters survived but it did not happen to the correspondence between Symeon and Leo VI. In addition, Leo made himself an advertising of a kind, because in a letter 23, addressed to Emperor Leo VI, from his exile, he recalls his diplomatic achievements, including a mission to Symeon. He writes in it that it the release of 120 thousand Byzantines who had been in Bulgarian captivity was his success⁵⁵.

The correspondence between Symeon and Leo Choirospaktes shows the former as a skillful political player, maybe even cynical, capable of employing a variety of methods to achieve his goals. On the other hand, he can be seen as an intellectual who takes pleasure in conducting correspondence with the undoubtedly sophisticated Leo. It is, after all, doubtful for the Byzantine envoy to be creating his intricate arguments if they were not to be understood for their intended recipient. When an agreement was reached between Symeon and Leo VI, the Byzantine envoy was released and returned to Constantinople, accompanied by a *kaukhan* Theodore, Symeon's envoy. The Bulgarian envoy was to return to his homeland with the Bulgarian prisoners, whom the emperor ransomed from the hands of Hungarians. Negotiations conducted on this occasion did not end with

⁵³ Leo CHOIROSPAKTES, *Ep.* 13, p. 89. Leo CHOIROSPAKTES writes about it himself: *You have informed his father and the emperor that you would return – as I have recently learned – the prisoners kept in captivity.* This passage clearly proves that the Byzantine envoy belatedly learned about Symeon's actions undertaken for the agreement with the emperor. Cf. S. TOUGHER, *The Reign...*, p. 180.

⁵⁴ S. TOUGHER, *The Reign...*, p. 180. More on the subject of methods employed by Symeon in diplomacy – E. АЛЕКСАНДРОВ, *Дипломатическоправна практика на цар Симеон*, Век 1988, 2, p. 15–25.

⁵⁵ Leo CHOIROSPAKTES, *Ep.* 23, p. 113. Leo mentions three envoys. Regarding the first one, he mentions that he took many captives from Bulgaria and signed a peace treaty. Although W. SWOBODA (*Testimonia* 4, p. 159, an. 24) rightly noted that it is not at all obvious that this information concerns the Bulgarian mission, the letter still leaves the impression that all the Bulgarian missions were successful, which was the personal merit of Leo Choirospaktes.

the signing of peace treaty and the truce was soon broken by Symeon. Both sides were gearing up for the final battle. In late summer or early fall, Symeon once again went to the north-eastern Thrace. Leo VI sent an army against him commanded by Leo Katakalon, *domestikos ton scholon*, and Theodosius, patrician and protovestiarius. The battle took place at Boulgarophygon, a village whose location has not been established so far. The battle ended with the Bulgarian victory. Patrician Theodosius died and the Byzantine army was scattered. Arab sources reported that Symeon went to Constantinople. However, it seems that they confuse it with the events of the year 913, when, indeed, Symeon went on an expedition to Constantinople. This battle ended the war conflict. The result of the Bulgarian success was probably signing of a peace treaty, in which the Byzantines agreed that the Bulgarian markets be returned to Constantinople and agreed to paying an annual tribute⁵⁶.

Conclusion. The war of the years 894–896 showed that Symeon was not only a cabinet scholar and a former monk, but a statesman, a gifted leader, skillful and ruthless negotiator. This war made him realize his own strength and gave him an opportunity to test his skills as a leader and a ruler. The war also demonstrated to the Byzantines that the Bulgarians, although they were Christians, were still dangerous opponents⁵⁷. Leo VI, a wise man and a scholar suffered a great defeat in dealing with just as scholarly but much more determined and gifted with military talents Bulgarian ruler. The former Monk defeated the Philosopher. As it turned out, the of war 894–896 became a prelude to the great challenges that Symeon would throw to the Byzantine Empire in the future, when he attempted to build a new universal Slavic-Greek empire. His opponent, however, was not to be Leo VI.

Abstract. The article is devoted to a few problems: 1. how Symeon and Leo the Philosopher looked at the Bulgarian-Byzantine war of 894–896; 2. what place it took in their life experiences; 3. how it was inscribed in the concept of relations between countries whose inhabitants follow the same religion.

The war of the years 894–896 showed that Symeon was not only a cabinet scholar and a former monk, but a statesman, a gifted leader, skillful and ruthless negotiator. This war made him realize his own strength and gave him an opportunity to test his skills as

⁵⁶ T. WASILEWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 225–226; I. BOŽILOV, *A propos des rapports bulgare-byzantines sous le tzar Syméon*, BBg 8, 1986, p. 80; E. Κυριάκης, *Βυζάντιο και Βούλγαροι 7ος-10ος αι. Συμβολή στην εξωτερική πολιτική του Βυζαντίου*, Αθήνα 1993, p. 211–212.

⁵⁷ More information on the Byzantine hopes for peace with Bulgarians based on a common religion – M.J. LESZKA, *Stracone złudzenia. Religijny kontekst stosunków bizantyńsko-bułgarskich w latach 863–927*, [in:] *Religijna mozaika Bałkanów*, ed. M. WALCZAK-MIKOŁAJCZAKOWA, Gniezno 2008, p. 32–39.

a leader and a ruler. The war also demonstrated to the Byzantines that the Bulgarians, although they were Christians, were still dangerous opponents. Leo VI, a wise man and a scholar suffered a great defeat in dealing with just as scholarly but much more determined and gifted with military talents Bulgarian ruler. The former Monk defeated the Philosopher.

Translated by Katarzyna Gucio

Mirosław J. Leszka
Katedra Historii Bizancjum
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. A. Kamińskiego 27a
90-219 Łódź, Polska
mirleszka@poczta.onet.pl

Elka Bakalova (Sofia)

THE PERFECT RULER IN THE ART AND LITERATURE OF MEDIEVAL BULGARIA*

There is no surviving literary text of medieval Bulgaria that explicitly expresses the concept of the perfect ruler. Yet there are other sources, both verbal and visual, providing us with information on that issue. In this paper I try to present some of them, related to the image of the Bulgarian king Ivan Alexander (1331–1371). I focus on him mostly because the 14th century – an extremely important period in medieval Bulgarian culture – is still subject to unfinished research, scholarly discussion and re-assessment. On the other hand, Ivan Alexander is the only Bulgarian ruler whose images survived in great number. Chronologically, they cover almost the entire period of his relatively long and successful reign.

My long research on the king's images in Bulgarian medieval art has naturally led me to the written depictions preserved in Old Bulgarian manuscripts, among which the most detailed is the one contained in the famous encomium of the king, part of the *Sofia Psalter* (1337). This is a short text, included in the manuscript of a Psalter ordered by Ivan Alexander and written in the monastery of Kouklen, which is now kept in the library of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (and hence is known as the *Sofia Psalter*)¹. The encomium itself is interpolated after the psalms and the fifth song by Isaiah.

In his book *Портрет у српској средновековној книжевности* (Kruševac 1971), George Trifunović writes about this portrait as follows:

* The main part of this paper was written during my stay in Munich and Berlin within an 'Alexander von Humboldt' Grant. I owe special thanks to Prof. Franz Tinnfeld of the Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität München and Prof. Diether Reinsch of Byzantinisch-Neugriechisches Seminar der Freien Universität Berlin, with whom I had the chance to discuss some of the issues addressed here. The following versions of this paper have already been published: Е. БАКАЛОВА, *Портретът на Цар Иван Александър в Софийския песнивец: "реализъм" или компилация от тополи?*, [in:] *Словенско средновековно наслеђе. Зборник посвећен професору Ђорђу Трифуновићу*, Београд 2002, p. 45–58; ЕАДЕМ, *The Image of the Ideal Ruler in Medieval Bulgarian Literature and Art*, [in:] *Les cultes des saints guerriers et idéologie du pouvoir en Europe Centrale et orientale. Actes du colloque international 17 janvier 2004, New Europe College*, ed. I. BILIARSKI, R. PĂUN, Bucarest 2007, p. 34–81.

¹ For the newest research on this manuscript, together with all the preceding references, see Е. МУСАКОВА, *Кодикологически особености на Песнивеца на цар Иван Александър*, Pbg 26.2, 2002, p. 3–33.

У краткој похвали бугарском цару Ивану Александру, записаној на *Псалтиру* из 1337 године, писац саопштава и једну необичну појединост о усправном ходану са савијеним коленима. Преписвач псалтира и писац похвале као да међу општа места уноси и стварни особени податак: Господ нам је дао Ивана Александра „православнѣиша въ вѣсѣчъскыхъ, / старѣишинѣ же и воинначалника / и въ бранехъ крѣпѣ кааго, рачнтелна же / и благовѣшанва, рванѣнѣно доброзрѣчнаго и краснаго видомъ, колѣносъ/ жжта и правоходѣца, зрѣ сладѣко ђчесы на / вѣсѣхъ.²

The Bulgarian scholar K. Kuev is very deleted: this is a work by our own author who has the right to claim originality. Moreover, in his article, titled *The image of Ivan Alexander in medieval Bulgarian poetry* (sic!), Kuev calls this text an ‘solemn hymn’³. A bit later in vol. II of the edition *Old Bulgarian literature: Oratory prose*, L. Graševa attributes the encomium of king Ivan Alexander to the genre ‘oratory prose’⁴. These contradictory opinions of distinguished literary scholars about the specific genre and the originality of the text⁵ incited me to do my own research, the results of which I present in this paper.

First, I discuss the question of genre. It suffices to consider the treatise Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν by the famous sophist, orator and teacher of rhetoric, Menander of Laodicea (late 3rd – early 4th c.), in order to assure ourselves that our ‘encomium’ is constructed according to the precepts of the so-called βασιλικός λόγος (= a praise of the emperor).

I focus on this author, because his writings are used in the entire late Byzantine literature of praise and mostly in the so-called βασιλικός λόγος. According to Menander, any encomium of this kind: *It will thus embrace a generally agreed amplification (αὐξήσις) of the good things attaching to the emperor, but allows no ambivalent or disputed features, because of the extreme splendor of the person concerned*⁶. After the proem, depending on the occasion, the author should deal briefly or in more detail with

² Ђ.ТрифуновиѢ, *Портрет у српској средњовековној књижевности*, Крушевац 1971, p. 19.

³ К. КУЕВ, *ОбразѢт на Иван АлександѢр в среднобѢлгарската поезия*, [in:] *БѢлгарско средновековие. БѢлгаро-сѢветски сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф. И. Дуйчев*, София 1980, p. 256.

⁴ *Стара бѢлгарска литература*, т. II, *Ораторска проза*, sel. et ed. Л. Грашева, София 1982, p. 146–147.

⁵ The original text is published by: Б. ЦОНЕВ, *Славянски рѢкописи в БѢлгарската академия*, СББАН, 6, 1916, p. 10–11. See also Х. КОДОВ, *Опис на славянските рѢкописи в Библиотеката на БѢлгарската академия на науките*, София 1969, p. 11–16. The Bulgarian translation is made by И. ДУЙЧЕВ. *Из старата бѢлгарска книжнина*, т. II, София 1944, p. 69–72; also in: П. ДИНЕКОВ, К. КУЕВ, Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, *Христоматия по старобѢлгарска литература*, София 1961, p. 274–275; П. ДИНЕКОВ, *СтаробѢлгарски страници. Антология*, София 1966, p. 54–55.

⁶ From here on we use the bilingual edition: MENANDER RHETOR, ed. et trans. D.A. RUSSELL, N.G. WILSON, Oxford 1981, p. 76–77.

the emperor's native land (πατρίς) and his family (γένος), as well as with the extraordinary circumstances of his birth (γέννησις). However, since Menander's precepts vary, he notes: *If neither his city nor his nation is conspicuously famous, you should omit this topic, and consider whether his family has prestige or not. If it has, work this up...*⁷ What follows are the nature (φύσις), upbringing (ἀνατροφή) and attitudes of character (ἐπιτηδεύματα). This part should be separated from the emperor's deeds (πράξεις), which are the main subject-matter of the author. *You should divide – Menander continues – such 'actions' into times of peace and times of war, and put war first, if the subject of your praise has distinction in this*⁸. And further on, he adds: *Courage reveals an emperor more than do other virtues. If however, he has never fought a war (a rare circumstance), you have no choice but to proceed to peaceful topics*⁹.

What we said so far, makes it clear that the author of the encomium of Ivan Alexander did not by himself *finds it necessary to first depict the king's external image and only then to focus on his deeds*¹⁰, as Kuev thinks, but he was obviously familiar with the principles of constructing a praise of this kind, as short as it may be. That *the author's admiration is first of all due to the king's military success*¹¹ (K. Kuev) turns out to be an act of strictly following the compositional rules of that genre in Byzantine literature¹². Needless to say, our author has the particular advantage that Ivan Alexander really was victorious in war and he could "develop this in detail". It is precisely here that what is specific about the king himself *intrudes into the text* without changing *the system of pictorial means*, as L. Graševa justly points out regarding oratory prose, in her preface to the above-mentioned book¹³.

This interpretation is also confirmed by other elements of the text under discussion. For instance, Menander emphasizes that the emperor's deeds should be spoken of as the four cardinal virtues: courage (ἀνδρεία), justice (δικαιοσύνη), temperance (σωφροσύνη), and wisdom (φρόνησις). Humanity (φιλανθρωπία) is another imperial virtue worth discussing¹⁴. For this reason our text refers to Ivan Alexander not only as mighty in battle, but also as a "pious judge of orphans and widows" and comforter of his subjects (*who ... once having the king shall return to his home in sorrow?*).

Menander also prescribes a comparison of the king with Alexander the Great. In fact, at any moment (part) of the speech, the orator should use the method of com-

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 80–81.

⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 84–85.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 84–85.

¹⁰ K. Кyев, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 257.

¹² Menander points at this as follows: *You should also describe the emperor's own battles, and incest him with all impressiveness and knowledge, as Homer does for Achilles, Hector and Ajax*, see MENANDER RHETOR, *op. cit.*, p. 86–87.

¹³ Л. ГРАШЕВА, *По след към старобългарската ораторска проза*, [in:] *Стара българска литература...*, p. 19.

¹⁴ MENANDER RHETOR, *op. cit.*, p. 84–85.

parison (συγκρίσις) of the emperor with other great historical figures. Several times, Alexander the Great is suggested as a key figure of comparison: *we compare a reign as a whole and in sum with another reign, e.g., the reign of Alexander with the present one*¹⁵ (at one point, the king is named *our second Alexander*¹⁶).

Menander's rules of composing an epilogue to βασιλικός λόγος are also generally applied in one of the concluding passages of the encomium. *The epilogue* – Menander says – *should be elaborated by having regard to the scope of the subject, representing the inhabitants greeting the governor: 'We have come to meet you, all of us, in whole families, children, old men, adults, priestly clans, associations of public men, the common people, greeting you with joy, all welcoming thou with cries of praise, calling you our savior and fortress, our bright star'...*¹⁷ The praise should conclude with a prayer for the emperor's long reign, and then move on to his heirs¹⁸. So does our text: *Look, all you young and old, and raise your flags in combats for the glorious King of Bulgaria. Come forth, now you patriarchs and bishops, monks and ascetics, judges, slaves and freemen, dignitaries and all the king's men; and rejoice you with inexpressible joy... And further: Oh, Holy Trinity, save the Bulgarian King, protect and strengthen him, give him victory over his enemies and ... endow him with longevity.*

Here it is worth recalling that rhetorical techniques of praising the emperor were implemented before the Christianization and, consequently, Menander's rules were used by both pagan and Christian orators¹⁹. However, his encomiastic model was enriched and modified according to the needs of Christian propaganda. In the later Byzantine tradition, we find a new Christian layer of descriptive conventions. This "Christian discourse", as A. Cameron calls it²⁰, emphasizes the emperor's piety, humanity and generosity. The most important new element is the link between the Christian ruler and Christ who announced him as his earthly minister. This ideal adds new comparisons with biblical and Christian rulers, mainly with David, Solomon and Constantine.

The new elements can be found as early as Constantine's reign, for example in such an emblematic piece of Byzantine prose, as Constantine's encomium by Eusebius of Caesarea delivered on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the reign of

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 92–93.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 112–113, 186–187.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 100–101.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 94–95.

¹⁹ H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, München 1978, vol. I, p. 80, 88sq, 90–93, 105, 121sq, 132sq, 134; cf. G. BOWERSOCK, *Julian the Apostate*, London 1978, p. 37; D. RUSSELL, *Epideictic Practice and Theory*, [in:] MENANDER RHETOR, XI–XLVI. Cf. IDEM, *The panegyrist and their Teachers*, [in:] *The Propaganda of Power. The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, ed. M. WHITBY, Leiden–Boston–Köln 1998, p. 17–53 (with rich bibliography).

²⁰ *I mean by it all the rhetorical strategies and manners of expression that take to be particularly characteristic of Christian writing*, see A. CAMERON, *Christianity and Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*, Berkeley 1991, p. 5.

Constantinople's founder²¹. From then on, these elements vary in the great number of encomia of the subsequent Byzantine emperors. Moreover, it is precisely Constantine who became an idealized archetype of the Christian ruler, a symbol of the emperor's legitimacy and identity and a model for comparison²². From Tiberius to Michael VIII Palaeologus, who calls himself "a new Constantine", most Byzantine emperors either took the name "Constantine" or called themselves "a new Constantine". Recently, the well-known Byzantine scholar, Paul Magdalino, rightly titled a collection of papers "New Constantines. The Rhythm of imperial renewal in Byzantium 4th–13th c."²³

Thus Constantine not only became the standard image of Byzantine ideology, also shown in the specific genre of *Fürstenspiegel*²⁴, but was also set as a model for the rulers of all other orthodox (or just Christian) kingdoms. It suffices to recall Patriarch Photius' letter to the Bulgarian king Boris-Michael²⁵.

This, let us say Christian, layer is undoubtedly present in our text; it simply imposes itself on Menander's scheme. In the beginning the praise goes first to Christ who gave us a great leader and king of kings, the great Ivan Alexander, the most orthodox of all ... In the second part, after having compared the king with Alexander the Great, comes the comparison with Constantine: *It seems to me that our king appeared as a new Constantine among all kings in faith and piety, heart and character, carrying with himself the victorious Cross as his scepter. By showing this herald he repelled and dispelled all opposing forces of pride.* It is obvious that the main theme "worked out" in the encomium is the military success and the fortification of the kingdom, as a result of the king's deeds (a theme considered essential by Menander, as well). The comparison with Alexander the Great allows him to emphasize his military force,

²¹ EUSEBIUS, *Werke*, vol. I, *Oratio de laudibus Constantini (Tricennalia)*, ed. I.A. HEIKEL, Leipzig 1902. Cf. H.A. DRAKE, *In Praise of Constantine. A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Oration*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1976, p. 87 [III(5)]; p. 94 sq [VI(18)].

²² See especially O. TREITINGER, *Die oströmische Kaiser und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung in höfischen Zeremoniel vom oströmischen Staats- und Reichsgedanken*, Darmstadt 1956, p. 129–134; A. LINDER, *The Myth of Constantine the Great in West: Sources and Hagiographic Commemorations*, *SMed* 16, 1975, p. 43–95; H. HUNGER, *op. cit.*, p. 72, 249, 280, 286; A. KAZHDAN, "Constantine imaginaire". *Byzantine Legends of the Ninth Century about Constantine the Great*, *B* 57, 1987, p. 196–250; D. NICOL, *The Immortal Emperor*, Cambridge 1992; H. РАДОШЕВИЋ, *Константин Велики у "Царским говорима"*, *ЗРВИ* 33, 1994, p. 7–19. I owe gratitude to the recently deceased N. Radošević for her comments and suggestions.

²³ *New Constantines. The Rhythm of imperial renewal in Byzantium. 4th–13th c.*, ed. P. MAGDALINO, Aldershot 1955.

²⁴ H. HUNGER, *op. cit.*, 157–165; I. ŠEVČENKO, *Agapetus East and West: the Fate of Byzantine Mirror of Princes*, *RESEE* 16, 1978, p. 3–44; W. BLUM, *Byzantinische Fürstenspiegel. Agapetos, Theophylakt von Ochrid, Thomas Magister*, Stuttgart 1981, p. 102, 140; G. PRINZING, *Beobachtungen zu 'integrierten' Fürstenspiegeln der Byzantiner*, *JÖB* 38, 1988, p. 1–33.

²⁵ *You have done a deed which compares with the achievements of the great Constantine* (see English translation in: *The Patriarch and the Prince. The letter of Patriarch Photios of Constantinople to Khan Boris of Bulgaria*, ed. D. STRATIUDAKI-WHITE, J.R. BERRIGEN, Brookline Mass. 1982, p. 56).

while the comparison with Constantine, allows him to give the main reason for his victories. Needless to say, the comparison of Ivan Alexander with Constantine is also attested in other texts and in the fine arts, for example in the ossuary of the Bačkovo monastery, where the king's image is juxtaposed to the images of Sts. Constantine and Helen²⁶. In our text there are also other epithets and elements of praise, typical of the image of Byzantine emperors, such as *the most orthodox, philanthropous, merciful (benevolent)*, etc.²⁷

Related to the same Christian layer (but only to some extent) is the conclusion of the text, particularly the so-called 'chaeretisms' (*Rejoice! Rejoice!*) They are obviously influenced by the Akathistos hymn for the Virgin and by the praises of some Saints, known in Old Bulgarian literature, as noted by Kuev²⁸, as well as by an appeal to the Holy Trinity. As was said above, Menander prescribes that the epilogue should present the population praising the king. Besides, I note that the whole *mise en scène* of the exultant people, raising flags and singing victorious songs for the king, in fact representing all social classes, necessarily remind us of the *adventus* ceremony from Roman antiquity, preserved in the Middle Ages as a way of celebrating the triumphant return of the rulers (bishops and other holy persons, as well as holy relics). During this ceremony, the entire population – men, women, young and old, are greeting those who return with various gestures, acclaims and songs²⁹.

Here I add a few words on the description of the king's appearance. The standard descriptions of an emperor's appearance in Byzantine encomiastic literature are "ruddy, affable and handsome", inherited from the rhetorical model in antiquity³⁰.

As Maciej Kokoszko notes, the adjective "ruddy", describing the color of the emperor's face refers to his healthy blood, according to the ancient authors, as well as Origenes³¹. For instance, Anna Comnena says that the facial skin of Alexius I Comnenus was *white to ruddy*³². *Affable* means *eyes expressing goodness* and in dif-

²⁶ E. БАКАЛОВА, *Бачковската костница*, София 1977, p. 157–175; cf. *The Ossuary of the Bachkovo monastery*, ed. ЕАДЕМ, Plovdiv 2003, p. 118–119.

²⁷ И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Византийският василевс*, [in:] И. БОЖИЛОВ, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, Х. ДИМИТРОВ, И. ИЛИЕВ, *Византийските василевси*, София 1997, p. 26.

²⁸ К. КУЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

²⁹ E. KANTOROWICZ, *Laudes Regiae. Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1946; S. MACCORMACK, *Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: The Ceremony of Adventus*, *Hi* 21, 1972, p. 721–752. See also S. MACCORMACK, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 1981; M. MCCORMICK, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*, Cambridge 1986.

³⁰ The ancient models of describing the ruler's appearance used by Byzantine authors are treated in detail by: M. КОКОШКО, *Descriptions of the personal appearance in John Malalas' chronicle*, Łódź 1998 [= BL, 2] (with older literature).

³¹ ИДЕМ, *Orygenes fizjonomista? Kilka uwag na temat Przeciw Celsusowi I 33*, *VP* 21, 2001, p. 180–181.

³² ИДЕМ, *Kanon portretowania w historiografii bizantyńskiej na przykładzie portretu Boemunda w Aleksjadzie Anny Komneny*, *AUL.FH* 67, 2000, p. 70–71.

ferent versions is part of the description of Roman emperors and Byzantine basileis in John Malalas' Chronicle. (For example, Augustus is said to have *good eyes*)³³. In George Skylitzes we find the expression *full of goodness* ascribed to emperor Valentinianus eyes and also *good* and *grey-blue* for Tiberius's eyes.³⁴ *Handsome* is certainly related to the physique and proportions of the king's body, as the villains in the texts are described as misshapen and ill-proportioned³⁵. (For instance, Anna Comnena says that the body of Boemund of Tarento was shaped according to Policletus' canon)³⁶.

Such rules of presenting the emperor's appearance are typical of other Byzantine authors as well. As Michael Psellus says, the encomium should present *that which adorns the hero's soul, which adds beauty to his physique given to him by origin and illumination from above*³⁷. These requirements regarding the description of the emperor's appearance are also valid for other genres. For example, in his *Chronography*, Psellus talks of Basil II as merciless, stubborn, energetic, suspicious of all and ruthless³⁸, but when speaking about his appearance, he keeps to the encomiastic standard and follows the ancient traditions³⁹, despite his earlier assertions. Moreover this inconsistency is pointed out by the author himself who begins his description of the emperor's appearance as follows:

So much for his character. As for his personal appearance it betrayed the natural nobility of the man, for his eyes were light-blue and fiery, the eye-brows not overhanging nor sullen, not yet extended in one straight line, like a women's, but well-arched and indicative of his pride. The eyes were neither deep-set (a sign of knavishness and cunning), but they shone with brilliance that was manly⁴⁰.

Where are the emperor's vivid, individual traits?

Further on in our text we see the most discussed attributes of king Ivan Alexander: *with bent knees and a straight walk*. The difficulty results from the fact that they lie between the description of the king's appearance and his moral virtues. For the two subsequent determinations *looking sweetly with eyes on everyone* and *ineffable pious judge for orphans and widows* certainly refer to the important attributes *benevolence, humanity and justice* examined above. Here I shall only

³³ IDEM, *Descriptions of the personal appearance...*, p. 89.

³⁴ IDEM, *Imperial Portraits in George Kedrenos' Chronicle*, [in:] *Mélanges d'histoire byzantine offerts à Oktawiusz Jurewicz à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, Łódź 1998, p. 155.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 109, *passim*.

³⁶ IDEM, *Kanon portretowania...*, p. 65.

³⁷ Я. ЛЮБАРСКИЙ, *Михаил Пселл. Личность и творчество*, Москва 1978, p. 231. Cf. P. GAUTIER, "Basilikoi logoi" de Psellos, SG 33, 1980, p. 717–771, *passim*.

³⁸ *The Chronographia of Michael Psellos*, trans. E.R.A. Sewter, London 1953, p. 19, 27.

³⁹ M. КОКОШКО, *Platonic foundations of the portrait of Emperor Basil II in the Chronographia by Michael Psellos*, CPhil 2, 1995, p. 162–163.

⁴⁰ *The Chronographia of Michael Psellos...*, p. 27.

note in passing that in my view they also refer to the king's moral virtues. The bent knees which unambiguously remind us of the so-called proskynesis – the act of prostrating before Christ, emphasize the king's piety. I assume that here we find a Greek loan translation in Bulgarian κάμπτω τὰ γόνατα μου which literally means *I bend my knees* and is used for *I prostrate before God*. It suffices to recall the corresponding expression in St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, ch. 3, v. 14: Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατα μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (*For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*).

In the Bulgarian translation it runs: Затова прекланям колене пред Отеца на Господа нашего Исуса Христа... This meaning is confirmed by the commentaries on that passage in St. Paul. For instance, we read in Origenes:

[Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. Ωριγένης φησὶ] τὸ κάμπτειν τὰ γόνατα σύμβολόν ἐστιν ἄλλης γονυκλισίας τῆς γινομένης ἐν τῷ ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ὑποπεπτωκέναι αὐτῷ. τούτῳ γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος φησὶν ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμπτῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, καὶ λέγομεν μὴ πάντως τὰ ἐπουράνια ἔχειν σώματα γεγονατωμένα, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰ καταχθόνια ὁμοίως, πρὸς τούτοις οὐδὲ τὰς ἀπηλλαγμένας τούτου τοῦ σώματος ψυχάς.⁴¹

“[Origenes says]: Bending your knees symbolizes another kind of genuflecting, in submission to God and admission of His power. The apostle uses this expression to say that each knee should be bent in the name of Christ, of all those in heaven, on earth and in the underworld. On the other hand, we are used to saying, that those in heaven and those in the underworld have no bodies to kneel with, as well as the souls which became separated from their earthly bodies.”⁴²

From here on this expression occurs in many other texts as an exact quotation or periphrasis of St. Paul and is often related to, or replaced by, the Greek verb προσκυνέω, which has a similar meaning⁴³.

⁴¹ ORIGENES, *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam ad Ephesios*, sect. 15, 1-7 (Eph. 3, 14). Texts cited after *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

⁴² I thank Anna Lazarova for translating this passage from Greek to Bulgarian.

⁴³ See, for example, the following texts:

Athanasius, *De morbo et valetudine* (fr), p. 5, 9–14: Κορινθίους <β ἐπιστολῆ> Εἰ καὶ ὁ ἕξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἕσω ἀνακαινούται», ἐν δὲ τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους. Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατα μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ἐξ οὗ πάσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται, ἵνα δῶ ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ θθνάμει κραταιωθῆται διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἕξω ἄνθρωπον, κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρ.

Epiphanius, *Panarion* (56 *Adversus haereses*), vol. III, p. 274, 19–28: ἡ δὲ ἐκκλησία πεπίστευκεν ὅτι Θεὸς οὐ μόνον ἐστὶ κτίστης κτισμάτων (τούτο γὰρ Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ Ἕλληνες ἐπίστανται), ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ πατὴρ ἐστὶ μονογενοῦς, οὐ μόνον τὴν κτιστικὴν ἔχων ἐνέργειαν, ἀφ' ἧς κτήσστης νοεῖται, ἀλλ' καὶ ἰδίως καὶ μονογενῶς γεννητικὴν, καθ' ἣν πατὴρ μονογενοῦς ἡμῖν νοεῖται. τούτο γὰρ παιδεύων ἡμᾶς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος γράφει <τούτου γὰρ χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ἐξ οὗ πάσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται. <ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ γῆς πατέρες ὀνομάζονται>, καθ' ὁμοίωτα τῶν οἰκείων οὐσιῶν τοὺς υἱοὺς ἔχοντες, οὕτω καὶ πατὴρ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὀνομάζεται.

As for the *straight walk* which indisputably derives from the Greek ὀρθοποδέω ('to walk straight or in the right way'), it always refers to the notion of how the king should behave. I only give two examples. The first is taken from St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians, 2, 14: ἀλλ' τε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (*But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel...*). Another version of this expression in Greek is ὀρθὰ βαδίζειν. We find it in a homily on Mathew's gospel by St. John Chrysostom: Οὐ γὰρ οὕτω γενναίας καὶ νεανικῆς ἐστὶ ψυχῆς ὀρθὰ βαδίζειν καὶ διόλου τρέχειν...⁴⁴ The sense of the entire passage is the following: "It is not appropriate to such a noble but still youthful soul to walk straight (in the right way) and to run the whole way". The second part clarifies this notion: "... (to walk straight) and despite numerous laurels and victories, the greatest temptation to the soul, to be capable of returning to the right way".

The tradition we have followed so far and which we take to be related to our text, is undoubtedly a canon of approved topoi for praising the emperor (or king). But, as Paul Magdalino says, *the frequency with which the emperor was praised made the imperial image a stereotype. Yet it also ensured that the stereotype was infinitely variable*⁴⁵. I also quote L. Graševa who (long before Magdalino) writes in her preface to *The Oratory Prose: Each canonic art, such as ceremonial eloquence in the Middle Ages, achieves its esthetic norms through an unlimited number of variations*⁴⁶. For this reason we will not even find two completely identical imperial

Basilios, *De baptismo libri duo*, PG, vol. XXXI, col. 1561, 20–28:

Δια τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὁ Κύριος τοὺς γεννηθέντας ἐκ πνεύματος πνεῦμα γενέσθαι λέγει. Συμμεταρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ Ἀπόστολος, λέγων. «Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται». ἵνα δῶ ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι δια τοῦ Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἐσω ἄνθρωπον, κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστόν.

Or with a word 'προσκυνέω':

Septuaginta, *Paralipomenon I sive Chronicon I*, 19, 1 – 21, 3:

καὶ Σαλωμων τῷ υἱῷ μου δὸς καρδίαν ἀγαθὴν ποιεῖν τὰς ἐντολάς σου καὶ τὰ μαρτύριά σου καὶ τὰ προστάγματα σου καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τέλος ἀγαγεῖν τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ οἴκου σου. καὶ εἶπεν Δαυὶδ πάση τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Εὐλογήσατε κύριον τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν. καὶ εὐλόγησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία κύριον τὸν θεὸν πατέρων αὐτῶν καὶ κάμψαντες τὰ γόνατα προσεκύνησαν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ. καὶ ἔθυσεν Δαυὶδ τῷ κυρίῳ θυσίας καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν δλοκαθτώματα τῷ θεῷ τῇ ἑπαύριον τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας, μόσχους χιλίους, κριοὺς χιλίους, ἄρνas χιλίους καὶ τὰς σπονδὰς αὐτῶν καὶ θυσίας εἰς πλῆθος παντὶ τῷ Ἰσραηλ.

Basilios, *In ebriosos*, PG, vol. XXXI, col. 460, 48 – 461, 5:

Ἄσματα πόρνης φθέγγη, ἐκβαλὼν τοὺς ψαλμοὺς καὶ τοὺς ὕμνους, οὓς ἐδιδάχθης. Κινεῖς πόδας, καὶ ἐξάλλη ἔμμανῶς, καὶ χορευεῖς ἀχόρεθτα, δέον τὰ γόνατα κάμπτειν εἰς τὴν προσκύωσιν; Τίνας ὀδύρμαι; τὰς κόρας τὰς ἀπειρογάμους; ἢ τὰς ἐν τῷ ζυγῷ τοῦ γάμου κατεχομένας; Αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπανήλθον, τὴν παρθενίαν οὐκ ἔχουσαι. αἱ δὲ τὴν σωφροσύνην τοῖς ἀνδράσιν οὐκ ἐπανήγαγον.

⁴⁴ PG, vol. LVII, col. 342, 18.

⁴⁵ P. MAGDALINO, *The Emperor and His Image*, [in:] IDEM, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993, p. 418.

⁴⁶ Л. ГРАШЕВА, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

encomia, since none of them strictly follows Menander's rules. What Byzantine encomiasts and the Bulgarian author of king Ivan Alexander's praise derive from Menander and other sources is not an applied model, but a sum of structuring principles, motives and techniques which can vary innumerable. As Magdalino says, a successful encomium is the one that renews the old *topoi* through a skilled use of the hyperboles and comparisons.⁴⁷ I think that this is the case of king Ivan Alexander's praise in the *Sofia psalter*.

II

As noted above, Ivan Alexander is the Bulgarian ruler of whom we possess the greatest number of portraits. Here I consider two of them:

1. The earliest of them are preserved among the illuminations of the chronicle by Constantine Manasses (Vatican Library, *cod. Slavo 2*), dated to 1344–1345⁴⁸. In the middle of f.1, Ivan Alexander is depicted on a red subpaedaneum with an angel above him who places a second crown on his head. Christ is standing on the king's right side half-turned toward him, carrying a scroll in his hand. On his other side is the chronicle's author, Constantine Manasses. According to Hans Belting, the Byzantine text of the chronicle did not contain such an illumination and the Bulgarian illustrator used the chrysobouls of Byzantine emperors as a pattern without applying it directly. The fact that Christ is moved from the center and 'demoted' to the king's entourage excludes in itself the usage of a ready-made Byzantine pattern⁴⁹. Ivan Dujčev claims that the model of the Byzantine emperor Manuel I Comnenus was used as a pattern for the first illumination, since the chronicle was written in his time⁵⁰. However, I think that there was no Byzantine pattern comparing the Bulgarian king and king David as equals. This is also the conclusion drawn by Ivan Božilov who devotes a special research to the relation between the text and the illumination in Manasses' chronicle: *...the miniature illuminates the addition or, to be more precise, the replacement of the Greek text by a Bulgarian one on f. 91v; it mentions Ivan Alexander who is also depicted on the illumination. The fact that the Greek text names Manuel I Comnenus does not auto-*

⁴⁷ P. MAGDALINO, *op.cit.*, p. 418.

⁴⁸ B. FILOV, *Les miniatures de la Chronique de Manassès à la Bibliothèque du Vatican (Cod. Vat. Slav. II)*. Sofia 1927. Cf. ИДЕМ, *Миниатюрите на Манасиевата хроника във Ватиканската библиотека*, София 1937; I. DUJČEV, *The Miniatures of the Chronicle of Manasse*, Sofia 1963; ИДЕМ, *Миниатюрите на Манасиевата летопис*, София 1962; J. SPATHARAKIS, *The Portrait in Byzantine illuminated manuscripts*, Leiden 1976, p. 160–165, ill. 102–105; А. ДЖУРОВА, *Хиляда години българска ръкописна книга. Орнамент и миниатюра*, София 1981, p. 46, ill. 170. The newest edition: CONSTANTINE MANASSES, *Synopsis Chroniki. Codex Vaticano Slavo 2, 1344–45*, Атина 2007 (with participation of A. Džurova and V. Velinova), was unavailable.

⁴⁹ H. BELTING, *Das illuminierte Buch in der spätbyzantinischen Gesellschaft*, Heidelberg 1970, p. 21.

⁵⁰ I. DUJČEV, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

matically imply that there existed a Byzantine manuscript depicting the emperor.⁵¹ For this reason the illumination remains unique.

It is important to note that almost all recent research on the illumination in the Manasses chronicle draw the conclusion that no illuminated Byzantine manuscripts were used as a pattern for the Bulgarian one. Ivan Božilov is categorical on this:

the unknown authors produced a new book, differing from both the Greek (additions and titles) and the Bulgarian models, as well as from the Synodos and the Toulcha manuscripts (the Trojan parable and 79 illuminations); a new book designed for decorating the king's library, for the enjoyment of the members of the royal family and for offering the king's heirs a way into humanity's past – as it was seen by Constantine Manasses and as reworked by the anonymous Bulgarian authors⁵².

Even the less-categorical scholars think that the problem of the origin of the illuminations in the Vatican's Manasses Chronicle still remains unsolved⁵³.

2. Ivan Alexander's image on f. 91 is particularly interesting in regard to the notion of the perfect ruler. The Bulgarian king is depicted together with king David who blesses him, and an angel who gives him a spear symbolizing the divine origin of the king's power⁵⁴. On David's scroll there is a part of Psalm 21 which praises the king's power. Christopher Walter says: *It is the beginning of Psalm 20(21), that which is illustrated by a coronation in the Bristol, Theodore and Barberini Psalters, and which is paraphrased in the prayer recited by the patriarch in the rite of coronation. There is no doubt that we have here two successive stages of the same scene: the angel brings the crown and Tsar John Alexander wears the crown.*⁵⁵ This iconographic formula is genuinely Byzantine, although we possess no similar composition in Byzantine art. In the illumination in Manasses' chronicle, Ivan Alexander's image is not only directly compared to the 'portrait' of the biblical king, but also depicts the Bulgarian king as equal to David. This is indisputably impudent, similar to the introductory illumination, as we noted⁵⁶.

⁵¹ И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Ватиканският Манасий (Cod. Vat. Slavo 2). Текст и миниатюра*, ПИ 2, 1996, p. 11.

⁵² И. БОЖИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁵³ Б. ЦВЕТКОВИЧ, *О два минијатурама у Cod. Vatic. Slavo 2*, K36 9/10, 2003, p. 125. Cf. Б. ЦВЕТКОВИЧ, *За две минијатури в Cod. Vat. Slavo 2*, ПИ 1, 2000, p. 11–16.

⁵⁴ On that iconographic formula see В. ТЈУРИЋ, *Нови Исус Навин*, Зор 14, 1983, p. 5–16.

⁵⁵ С. WALTER, *The iconographical sources for the coronation of Milutin and Simonida at Gračanica*, [in:] *Византијска уметност почетком XIV века*, Београд 1978, p. 199.

⁵⁶ On the other images of Ivan Alexander in this manuscript see: Е. БАКАЛОВА, *Ктиторските портрети на цар Иван Александър като израз на политическата и религиозната идеологија на епохата*, ПИ 4, 1985, p. 45–57; ЕАДЕМ, *Society and Art in Bulgaria in the 14th century*, ВВг 8, 1986, p. 23–32. Cf. Т. VELMANS, *La Chronique illustrée de Constantine Manassès*, [in:] *Byzance*,

Concerning the comparison with David, already Menander emphasizes that the orator should use the technique of comparison (*συγκρίσις*) between the emperor and other historical figures. Actually, the essential aspect of Byzantine ideology is the construction of lasting formulas of virtuous rulers based on standard models and metaphors. These formulas are constructed mainly by the technique of comparison which, as Henry Maguire points out, is the main instrument of Byzantine rhetoric. Although the comparison is widely used in laic and religious literature, *the habit of comparison is very important for an understanding of Byzantine art, because it was especially applicable to visual media*⁵⁷

Eusebius of Caesarea already calls Constantine the Great “new Moses”, but also “savior of the chosen people” and “new David”. Interestingly, not every Byzantine emperor is compared to David. We may note a specific tendency to compare the emperors of the Comnenian dynasty with those – Justinian and Heraclius – related to the most glorious times of the Eastern Roman empire⁵⁸. Justinian was called “new David”, due to his building the St. Sofia cathedral, compared to the foundation of the Jerusalem temple⁵⁹. An episode of Heraclius’ military campaigns strongly resembles the battle between David and Goliath. Byzantine historians report that during the war with the Persian ruler Chosroes (627), Heraclius fought with general Rhazatis and decapitates his rival just like the biblical king⁶⁰. Stephen H. Wander finds another interesting proof of the comparison between emperor Heraclius’ victory over the Persian ruler and David’s victory over Goliath⁶¹. It is part of Fredegar’s chronicle, a Frankish author from Burgundy (7th c.) who describes the duel between Heraclius and Chosroes and calls the Byzantine emperor “a second David”.

According to Alexander Kazhdan, the imperial prestige of the Comnenoi is directly related to an unprecedented militarism⁶². Its most striking expression is to be found in the texts praising Manuel I Comnenus who, on Magdalino’s view, is the most celebrated of the Byzantine emperors⁶³. He is regarded as a model of all David’s virtues, lacking no attributes of the latter’s reign. There are numerous and concrete comparisons between Basil I of the Macedonian dynasty and David recalling the emperor’s military success. But the comparison with David has fur-

les Slaves et l’Occident: Études sur l’art paléochrétien et médiéval, London 2001, p. 175–230.

⁵⁷ H. MAGUIRE, *The Art of Comparing in Byzantium*, ArtB 70, 1988, p. 89.

⁵⁸ P. MAGDALINO, *The Emperor and His Image...*, p. 421.

⁵⁹ G. DAGRON, *Constantinople imaginaire, Étude sur les recueil des Patria*, Paris 1984, p. 293.

⁶⁰ NICEPHORUS, *Opuscula historica*, ed. C. de Boor, Lipsiae 1880, p. 19; THEOPHANES, *Chronographia*, ed. I. Classen, Bonnae 1851, p. 489–492.

⁶¹ S.H. WANDER, *The Cyprus Plates and the Chronicle of Fredegar*, DOP 29, 1975, p. 346.

⁶² A. KAZHDAN, *The aristocracy and the imperial ideal*, [in:] *The Byzantine aristocracy*, ed. M. ANGOLD, Oxford 1984, p. 43–57.

⁶³ P. MAGDALINO, *op. cit.*, p. 414.

ther aspects. Gilbert Dagron writes:

similarly to David who inherits Saul's kingdom, Basil replaces the hated emperor Michael III; similarly to David who, to redeem his bloody sin, lost his first-born son by Bathsheba but was later given a second son – “the wise Solomon”, Basil claimed that he lost his older son Constantine in 879 due to divine vengeance, and called his second son Leo “the wise”, although he did not much love him⁶⁴.

In the 13th c. Michael VIII Palaeologus, protector of Constantinople, was praised as „new David”, just as David protected Jerusalem⁶⁵. In the encomia of Andronicus II, the comparison between Constantinople and Jerusalem remains, while the emperor is rather compared to Plato⁶⁶. As far as I know, the comparison with David almost disappears in the 14th c. Neither John Cantacuzenus nor John V, nor Manuel II Palaeologus, are compared to David, let alone an emperor like John VII Palaeologus, whose activity *brought more damage than profit to the state*⁶⁷.

It clearly follows that both the comparison with Alexander the Great in Ivan Alexander's praise in the *Sofia psalter* and his comparison with David in the illumination in Manasses' chronicle reflect the historical situation in the third decade of the 14th c.

As we noted above, the first ten years of Ivan Alexander's reign (1331–1371) are a time of internal stability and successful military campaigns, due to which he is compared to the biblical king David. On 18th July 1331, he wins a great battle against the Roman army of Andronicus III Palaeologus and succeeds in taking back the territories lost earlier on. The treaty required the marriage of his first-born son and the Byzantine's young daughter Maria, which took place soon after⁶⁸. At the same time, Ivan Alexander managed to improve the relations with Serbia, as in 1332 his sister Helen married the Serbian king Stephen Dušan. Ivan Božilov writes:

When adding to these two political successes the liquidation of Belaur's rebellion in Vidin, it becomes clear that only a year after his coronation, Ivan Alexander kept full power in

⁶⁴ G. DAGRON, *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le „césaropapisme” byzantin*, Paris 1996, p. 206. V. Stanković writes: *Давидов пример је био близак свим царевима, који су престо усвоили своим способностима, захваљујући својој тѹхѹ а не крви, као што је Соломон био стални узор али и такмац у свим градителским подухватима цара* – В. СТАНКОВИЋ, *Цариградски патријарси и цареви. Македонске династије*, Београд 2003, p. 250.

⁶⁵ J. PREVIALE, *Un panegirico inedito per Michele VIII Paleologo (Vat. gr. 1409, ff. 270 r.-275 v.)*, BZ 42, 1959, p. 11.

⁶⁶ Н. РАДОШЕВИЋ, *Похвална слова цару Андронику II Палеологу*, ЗРВИ 21, 1982, p. 61–81.

⁶⁷ С. МЕШАНОВИЋ, *Јован VII Палеолог*, Београд 1996, p. 133.

⁶⁸ И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Второ бѹлгарско царство (1186–1393/96)*, [in:] И. БОЖИЛОВ, В. МУТАФЧИЕВА, К. КОСЕВ, А. ПАНТЕВ, С. ГРЊНЧАРОВ, *История на Бѹлгария*, София 1993, p. 109–110.

*Bulgaria and successfully healed the recent wounds (the defeat by Serbia and the territorial losses to the Byzantine empire)*⁶⁹.

However, in the fourth decade of the 14th c., during the civil war in Byzantium, the Bulgarian king was inexplicably passive, while Stephen Dušan took control of almost all Macedonia and proclaimed himself “king of all Serbian, Greek and Bulgarian lands”. It is obvious that this is one of the reasons why there are no literary or visual encomia of the king’s reign from this period. In fact, the situation in Bulgaria already changed in the second half of Ivan Alexander’s reign. From the fifth decade of the 14th c. on, there are many Bulgarian translations of Byzantine texts related to theological disputes favoring hesychasm. We know that Ivan Alexander not only supported the monks of Paroria but, in his ecclesiastic policy, also followed the famous hesychast Theodosius – a disciple of Gregory Sinaites and close to Callistus, patriarch of Constantinople. If we turn to the visual sources, we can notice that in the sixties, the king was no longer compared to David but to Constantine and Helen, as indicated by the narthex of the ossuary in Bachkovo monastery⁷⁰. The model patriarch Euthymius recommends to Ivan Šišman, Ivan Alexander’s heir, is that of Constantine the Great, as appears in his *Encomium of Constantine and Helen*.

In this context, we should emphasize that the comparison between Ivan Alexander and king David in the illumination of Manasses’ chronicle (1344–1345) is one of the last comparisons of the 14th c.⁷¹ Resulting from the same historical situation, we have another short praise of Ivan Alexander in the *Sofia psalter*, the so-called *Pesnivec*, ordered by the king in 1337, as well as his comparison with Alexander the Great in the *Encomium*. Both artifacts – the illumination and the encomium – are created about the same time and are related to the same historical situation **in this particular historical and ideological context**. A little later, at the beginning of the fourth decade of the 14th c., the historical situation changes significantly and the ideas underlying these artifacts are no longer actual.

Abstract. The paper is an attempt to provide some information about the concept of the perfect ruler, as saved in the literature and the fine arts of the medieval Bulgaria, and which are related to the name of the king Ivan Alexander. The first part of the text is of theoretical character, showing how the ancient Greek literature presents the ideal ruler. The second one

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 110.

⁷⁰ On Vačkovo see above, p. 26. On the later images of Ivan Alexander see E. Бакалова, *Ктиторските портрети...*, p. 45–57; ЕАДЕМ, *Society and Art...*, p. 23–32.

⁷¹ More fully on this issue see E. BAKALOVA, *King David as a Model for the Christian Ruler: Some Visual Sources*, [in:] *Biblical Models of Power and Law/Modèles bibliques du pouvoir et de la loi*, ed. I. BILIARSKI, R.G. PĂUN, Frankfurt am Main et al. 2008 [Rechtshistorische Reihe 366], p. 93–133.

points out the characteristics of the portrayal of Ivan Alexander, as saved in both literary monuments (praises of the king in the *Sofia psalter*, so-called *Pesnivec*, 1337), and iconographical ones (a famous chronicle by Constantine Manasses, 1345–1346).

Translated by Anita Kasabova and Vladimir Marinov

Elka Bakalova
Bulgarian Academy of Science
Khan Krum str 49
1142 Sofia, Bulgaria
elka.bakalova@gmail.com

Eulogy of the Bulgarian King Ivan Alexander in the *Sofia Psalter* of 1337

[...]

For as we have gathered let us praise God and sing a solemn song to Christ, the King – crown-giver and Lord of us all who has given to us the great commander and King of Kings, the great Ivan Alexander, the most orthodox of all, ... and leader in war, and mighty in battles, gracious, benevolent, pink-cheeked, kind-sighted, handsome in appearance, with bent knees and upright walking, gazing sweetly over all, righteous beyond words, judge of orphans and widows. Hence I will say, who, among us, after heaving seen the King, would return grieving to his home? In his military might he seems to me like a second Alexander of ancient times. Like him [Ivan Alexander] from the very beginning [of his reign] took many cities with fortitude and courage. So he appears before us, the great Ivan Alexander, ruling over all the Bulgarians, he, who has proven himself in difficult and hard battles; who has powerfully overcome the Greek King and when the latter was at a loss, he captured him and took the fortified towns: Nessebar⁷² and all of the Pomorie⁷³ together with Romania, as well as Bdin and all of the lower Danube even to the Morava river. The rest of the towns and villages, countries and countryside fell at his feet. And having captured all his enemies, he triumphed over them establishing a solid silence in the Universe. It seems to me that this King appeared as a new Constantine among the Kings in his faith and piety, heart and character, having as scepter the triumphant Cross; when bearing and showing this standard he drove away and dismissed all resisting and arrogant forces... No other since the first [Bulgarian] kings seems to me equal to this great King Ivan Alexander, Glory and Praise of all Bulgarians. Look, all you young and old, and raise your flags in combats for the glorious King of Bulgaria. Come forth, now you patriarchs and bishops, monks and ascetics, judges, slaves and free-men, dignitaries and all the king's men; and rejoice you with inexpressible joy and render glory to the great King Christ our God, the wreath-giver and raise to him your victorious song: Oh, Holy Trinity, save the Bulgarian King, protect and strengthen him, give him victory over his enemies and ... endow him with longevity, O Lord of us all. For I, while weaving joyful praises, say: Rejoice, o King of the Bulgarians, King of Kings. Rejoice chosen by God, rejoice o merciful, Rejoice, o crowned by God! Rejoice guarded by God! Rejoice leader in war-times! Rejoice, intercessor of the faithful! Rejoice Bulgarian Glory and Praise! Rejoice King Alexander! Rejoice Ivan! Rejoice, together with your pious spouse, Queen Theodora! Rejoice, together with your sweet children – Michael King, and Asen, and Sratzimir and Asen! Rejoice, o, town of Tarnovo! Rejoice his towns and countries! Rejoice thee and rejoice again for that you have such a King! Let God strengthen them in their power and let God offer them heavenly Kingdom, and let him settle them in the palace of heaven for ever, now and ever and unto ages of ages. Amen.

*translated from old Bulgarian by prof. Oleg Grabar,
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton 1999*

⁷² Messambria on the Black Sea.

⁷³ The Black Sea coast.

Sławomir Bralewski (Łódź)

THE PORPHYRY COLUMN IN CONSTANTINOPLE AND THE RELICS OF THE TRUE CROSS

The Porphyry Column standing in Constantinople has been given many names over the past centuries. It was called the Great Column, the Column of Constantine, at the end of the Byzantine Empire – The Column of the Cross. In today's Turkey, however, it is called the Burnt Column¹ or the Hooped Column. The multiplicity of the names itself indicates its long history. Erected during the reign of Constantine the Great in 324–330², it occupied a unique place in the history of Constantinople. It became a symbol of the city, featured in many legends. When the *Tabula Peutingeriana* was made, the original of which dates at the turn of the fourth and fifth century³, it showed the personification of Constantinople⁴ seated on a throne with an outline of a column on the right side, identified with the porphyry column of Constantine the Great⁵. The monument was an important landmark where imperial victories were celebrated. Triumphant procession would arrive at the Forum of Constantine to march around the Column chanting the canticle of Moses⁶. It was at the foot of the Column citizens would find salvation when their world, destroyed by enemies pillaging the city after breaking the defensive lines, would be turned into ruin. Later, it was believed that when the Turks would be storming the city, an angel with a sword will descend from the top of the Column and hand it to an unknown passer-by at the foot of the column, who will then lead the citizens of Constantinople and defeat the enemies⁷. This raises the question of the origins

¹ It was destroyed by fire on several occasions; the greatest one took place in 1779.

² *Chronicon Paschale* (ed. L. DINDORE, Bonnae 1832 [cetera: *Chronicon Paschale*], p. 528 [= CSHB]) and THEOPHANES (*Chronographia*, AM 5821, rec. C. DE BOOR, Lipsiae 1883, p. 28 [cetera: THEOPHANES]) date the erection of the statue on the Column in 328. This date is uncertain, however, see C. MANGO, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV^e–VII^e siècles)*, Paris 1985, p. 25, an. 14; S. BASSETT, *The Urban Image of Late Antique Constantinople*, Cambridge 2004, p. 68.

³ G. DAGRON, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974, p. 57.

⁴ K. MILLER, *Itineraria Romana, römische Reisewege an der Hand der Tabula Peutingeriana*, Stuttgart 1916, passim; J.M.C. TOYNBEE, *Roma and Constantinopolis in late-antique art from 312 to 365*, JRS 37, 1947, p. 143–144, pl. IX, 1–2; E. WEBER, *Tabula Peutingeriana*, Poznań 1998, p. 14, 20–21.

⁵ G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

⁶ R. JANIN, *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, Paris 1950, p. 82.

⁷ S. *Andreae Sali vita auctore Nicephoro, sancti direttore et confessario*, 224, [in:] PG, vol. CXI, col. 868; DOUKAS, *Historia Byzantina*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1834, p. 289–290 [= CSHB].

of legends associated with the Porphyry Column. It seems that its foundations were laid as early as in the Early Byzantine period. In this article, I am attempting to explain what that tradition entailed and how the awareness of the Column's special significance for Constantinople and its citizens was established in the Early Byzantium.

It should be emphasized that the Porphyry Column was inextricably linked with Constantinople, the city founded by emperor Constantine the Great on the foundations of the existing Byzantium upon the Bosphorus River. Sources indicate that the ruler had originally intended to establish his seat elsewhere. The list of probable locations includes Troy, Chalcedon, Sardica and Thessalonica⁸. Choosing Troy would mean a symbolic return to the roots, since the ancestors of Rome were believed to have originated from there. Constantinople, according to Sozomenus⁹ and Philostorgius¹⁰, was founded with divine inspiration, as the law contained in the *Code of Theodosius*¹¹ confirmed. According to the tradition associated with Eusebius of Caesarea, and thus dating back to the fourth century, the city of Constantine was dedicated to the God of martyrs¹², in the opinion of Sozomenus, who was writing about a hundred years later, to Christ himself¹³. In later tradition, on the other hand, it was associated with the Mother of God (Θεοτόκος) who was believed to have the city under her protection – the notion which was universally expressed in the eleventh century¹⁴.

By making Byzantium his seat and by naming it after himself, Constantine greatly expanded the urban area and conducted a series of construction works. He built city walls, the imperial loge at the hippodrome, the imperial palace and great alleys surrounded by porticos¹⁵. The urban plans completed at that time and quoted in sources included also

⁸ G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

⁹ SOZOMÈNE, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, II, 3, 3–4, ed. J. BIDEZ, Paris 1983 (cetera: SOZOMENUS), p. 238 [= SC, 306]: ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῷ ποιοῦντι νύκτωρ ἐπιφανεῖς ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησεν ἕτερον ἐπιζητεῖν τόπον. καὶ κινήσας αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον τῆς Θράκης πέραν Χαλικηδόνος τῆς Βιθυνῶν, ταύτην αὐτῷ οἰκίζειν ἀπέφηνε πόλιν καὶ τῆς Κωνσταντινίου ἐπωνυμίας ἀξιοῦν. ὁ δὲ τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγους πεισθεὶς τὴν πρὶν Βυζάντιον προσαγορευομένην εἰς εὐρυχωρίαν ἐκτείνας μεγίστοις τέχεσι περιέβαλεν.

¹⁰ PHILOSTORGIUS, *Kirchengeschichte. Mit dem Leben des Lucian on Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines arianischen Historiographen*, II, 9, ed. J. BIDEZ, F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1981 (cetera: PHILOSTORGIUS), p. 20–21 [= GCS, 21]: Ὅτι Κωνσταντίνον φησιν ὀκτῶ καὶ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ τὸ Βυζάντιον εἰς Κωνσταντινούπολιν μετασκευάσαι, καὶ τὸν περίβολον ὀριζόμενον βάδην τε περιεῖναι, τὸ δόρυ τῇ χειρὶ φέροντα. ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῖς ἐπομένοις ἐδόκει μείζον ἢ προσήκε τὸ μέτρον ἐκτείνειν, προσελθεῖν τε αὐτῷ τινα καὶ διαπυθάνεσθαι. «ἕως ποῦ, δέσποτα»; τὸν δὲ ἀποκρινάμενον διαρρήδην φάναι. «ἕως ἂν ὁ ἔμπροσθέν μου στῆ», ἐπίδηλον ποιοῦντα ὡς δύναμις αὐτοῦ τις οὐρανία προηγοῖτο, τοῦ πραττομένου διδάσκαλος.

¹¹ *Codex Theodosianus*, XII, 5, 7, ed. P. KRUEGER, Berolini 1923: *urbis quam aeterno nomine Deo iubente donavimus*.

¹² EUSEBIUS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 48, ed. F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1992 (cetera: EUSEBIUS), p. 98 [= GCS, 7]: καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ πόλιν τῷ τῶν μαρτύρων καθιέρου θεῷ.

¹³ SOZOMENUS, II, 3, 7, p. 240: ταύτην μὲν οὖν ὡσεὶ τινα νεοπαγῆ Χριστοῦ πόλιν.

¹⁴ G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 42. According to this author Constantinople was dedicated to Constantine himself. Cf. M. HURBANİČ, *História a mýtus. Avarský útok na Konštantinopol roku 626 v legendach*, Prešov 2010, p. 19–21 [= Byzantinoslovaca/monographiae, 2].

¹⁵ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 527–529.

the Forum of Constantine with the Porphyry Column. According to the account of Anna Comnena († 1153), it was clearly visible from all sides¹⁶. Raymond Janin thought that it was 50 meters high above the ground, and the core of the Column originally consisted of 9 cylindrical porphyry block joined together by a hoop imitating a laurel crown, which was meant to hide the actual joining point. According to Cyril Mango, on the other hand, the Column in the past was of a similar height as it is today, namely 37 meters. Today, it is a little lower, only 34.80 meters due to the difference in the levels of the ancient forum and the today's street¹⁷. He is also convinced that Raymond Janin was also mistaken as to the number of cylindrical blocks because he believes that there were seven at most – six visible today, and one walled up by the Turks, attempting to reinforce the construction of the Column after the fire which took place in 1779¹⁸.

According to the testimony of Anna Comnena, the Column was surmounted with a bronze statue facing the east¹⁹. Historiographers from earlier centuries, such as Philostorgius – the author of Church History from fifth century²⁰, Hesychius Illustrious²¹ – a historian and a biographer from the mid-sixth century, John Malalas – a chronicler from the same century²², or the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* from the mid-seventh century²³ – they all associate the depiction with emperor Constantine. Later sources identify the aforementioned statue as Apollo²⁴. It seems that it could be perceived differently; some people probably saw it as the emperor, others – as the god²⁵. Philostorgius indicated that „enemy of God accuses the Christians of worshiping with sacrifices the image of Constantine set up upon the porphyry column, of paying homage to it with lamp-lighting and incense or praying to it as to a god, and of offering it supplica-

¹⁶ ANNE COMNÉNE, *Alexiade*, XII, 4, 5, ed. B. LEIB, Paris 1968 (cetera: ANNA COMNENA): Περὶ τὰ μέσα τοῦ Κωνσταντινίου φόρου, χαλκοῦς τις ἀνδριάς ἴστατο καὶ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἀπέστραπτο ἐπὶ πορφύρου κίονος περιόπτου.

¹⁷ C. MANGO, *Constantinopolitana*, JDAI 80, 1965, p. 312–313.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 310–312; IDEM, *Constantine's Porphyry Column and the Chapel of St. Constantine*, [in:] IDEM, *Studies on Constantinople*, Aldershot 1993, art. IV, p. 104; Raymond JANIN (*op. cit.*, p. 84) dated the aforementioned works to 1701.

¹⁹ ANNA COMNENA, XII, 4, 5.

²⁰ PHILOSTORGIUS, HE, II, 9a; II, 17, app. 7, 7a.

²¹ HESYCHIUS ILLUSTRIOUS, *Patria Constantinopoleos*, 41, [in:] *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. T. PREGER, vol. I, Lipsiae 1901 (cetera: HESYCHIUS), p. 17: ἀνέστησαν δὲ καὶ αἱ δύο ἀψίδες πρὸς τῷ καλουμένῳ φόρῳ καὶ ὁ πορφύρου καὶ περιβλεπτος κίων, ἐφ' οὐπερ ἰδρῦσθαι Κωνσταντῖνον ὀρώμεν δικὴν ἡλίου προλάμποντα τοῖς πολιταῖς.

²² *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, XIII, 7, rec. I. THURN, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 2000 (cetera: MALALAS): καὶ φόρον μέγαν καὶ εὐπρεπὴ πάνυ, καὶ στήσας ἐν τῷ μέσῳ κίονα ὀλοπόρφυρον ἄξιον θαύματος, καὶ ἐπάνω τοῦ αὐτοῦ κίονος ἑαυτῷ ἔστησεν ἀνδριάντα, ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ αὐτοῦ ἀκτίνας ἑπτὰ.

²³ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 528: καὶ ἔστησεν ἐν μέσῳ κίονα πορφύρου μέγαν λίθου Θηβαίου ἀξιοθαύμαστον, καὶ ὑπεράνω τοῦ αὐτοῦ κίονος ἔστησεν ἑαυτοῦ ἀνδριάντα μέγαν, ἔχοντα ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ αὐτοῦ ἀκτίνας, ὅπερ χαλκούργημα ἦγαγεν ἀπὸ τῆς Φρυγίας.

²⁴ Since PSEUDO-CODINUS (*Patria Constantinopoleos*, 45, [in:] *Scriptores originum...*, vol. II, Lipsiae 1907 [cetera: PSEUDO-CODINUS], p. 174, 8).

²⁵ G. FOWDEN, *Constantine's Porphyry Column: the earliest literary allusion*, JRS 81, 1991, p. 130; C. MANGO, *Constantine's Column*, [in:] IDEM, *Studies on Constantinople...*, art. III, p. 6.

tions to avert calamities²⁶. Similar differences of opinion can be seen among scholars. According to Gilbert Dagron, it was the representation of Apollo that was placed on the Column²⁷. Raymond Janin argued that it was a statue of Constantine Helios bearing the features of Apollo²⁸. Adam Ziółkowski saw it as a statue of Christ, and Cyril Mango – a statue of Constantine, which the ruler commissioned for his Forum in Constantinople or for some other place outside the capital, where it was ultimately brought²⁹.

Sources are also not consistent as to the origin of the statue³⁰. John Malalas derived it from Troy³¹ but he mistakenly placed the latter in Phrygia because he was convinced that the city was founded by Tros, the king of Phrygia³². Troy was quoted as the place of the statue's origin by (after John Malalas) George the Monk³³ and John Zonaras³⁴, and Phrygia itself was quoted by the author of *Chronicon Paschale*³⁵; Michael Glykas maintained the same, indicating moreover a specific place in Phrygia – Heliopolis³⁶. Cedrenus, on the other hand, presented an original idea, arguing that a statue came from Athens and was made by Phidias³⁷. As can be expected, associating this particular statue with Troy, the statue which – along with the column on which it was placed – became a symbol of Constantinople, was not accidental. Thus, a reference was made to the tradition linking the protoplasts of Rome with Troy. It is possible that the statue was actually made there. It seems very likely, considering the account by Sozomenus on Constantine's original choice of Troy as the capital. Sozomenus even mentioned the commencement of construction work there. The statue could be made at that very time and, after the decision as to the location of the seat of the ruler changed, it was moved to a new place in Constantinople³⁸.

²⁶ PHILOSTORGIUS, HE, II, 17 (trans. Ph.R. Amidon, ed. 2007, p. 35).

²⁷ G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

²⁸ R. JANIN, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

²⁹ According to Adam ZIÓLKOWSKI (SOKRATES SCHOLASTYK, *Historia Kościoła*, I, 17, trans. S. KAZIKOWSKI, intr. E. WIPSZYCKA, comm. A. ZIÓLKOWSKI, Warszawa 1986, p. 111, an. 97) *This giant statue was in fact a statue of Christ as the Sun of the Faith, which explains why the relics were placed in it*. Cf. C. MANGO, *Constantine's Column...*, p. 3–4.

³⁰ G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

³¹ MALALAS, XIII, 7: ὅπερ χαλκούργημα ἤγαγεν εἰς τὸ Ἴλιον ἐστηκός, πόλιν τῆς Φρυγίας.

³² MALALAS, IV, 10: ἐν οἷς χρόνοις ἐβασίλευσε τῆς Φρυγίας ὁ Τρώος, ὃς ἐγένετο πατὴρ Ἰλίου καὶ Γανυμήδους. Οὗτος ἔκτισε πόλεις δύο, τὴν Τροίαν εἰς ὄνομα ἰδίων...; cf. C. MANGO, *Constantine's Column...*, p. 4.

³³ GEORGIUS MONACHUS, *Chronicon*, ed. C. DE BOOR, Lipsiae 1904 (cetera: GEORGIUS MONACHUS), p. 500 [= BSGR].

³⁴ *Ioannis Zonarae Epitome historiarum libri XIII–XVIII*, XIII, 3, 25–26, vol. III, ed. TH. BÜTTNER-WOBST, Bonnae 1897 (cetera: ZONARAS), p. 180.

³⁵ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 528; cf. above an. 22.

³⁶ MICHAEL GLYKAS, *Annales*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1836 (cetera: GLYKAS), p. 464 [= CSHB].

³⁷ GEORGIUS CEDRENUS, *Historiarum compendium*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1838, vol. I (cetera: CEDRENUS), p. 518 [= CSHB].

³⁸ C. MANGO, *Constantine's Column...*, p. 4. Gilbert DAGRON believes (*op. cit.*, p. 38) the origins of the statue to be an issue of significance. The combination of the dynasty's Apollonistic tradition with Troy as the original place of worship of the statue could indicate to Constantine's willingness of the unification of the Hellenistic with the Roman.

The statue probably resembled the image of *Sol Invictus* which appears on coins. If it was indeed a depiction of the emperor Constantine, he was probably portrayed in military attire³⁹. The figure on top of the Column had a crown on its head adorned with seven sun rays, which were later interpreted as the nails of Christ's Passion⁴⁰. In addition, in its left hand, it held a bronze globe⁴¹, surmounted by a winged Victoria, and, according to Nicephorus Callistus – with a cross, which apparently contained a relic of the Holy Cross⁴². As it seems, however, Callistus could be describing one of the subsequent globes. As a result of earthquakes, the first two came apart in the years 477⁴³ and 869⁴⁴. In the right hand, the figure was holding a spear (λόγχη), as attested by John Malalas⁴⁵, Theophanes⁴⁶ and Cedrenus⁴⁷ or a scepter (σκήπτρον), as Anna Comnena⁴⁸ maintained. In the iconography, the statue crowning the Column usually is holding a spear. This is consistent with the account given by Philostorgius, according to whom Constantine used a spear to mark the borders of the city (τὸ δόρυ τῆ χειρὶ φέροντα)⁴⁹. The attribute in question was to fall off from the statue during the earthquake of 541, as Theophanes argues⁵⁰, or 554, according to the accounts by Cedrenus and Malalas⁵¹.

In the account by Anna Comnena, the citizens of Constantinople called the statue Anthelios or Anelios and all efforts to replace this name with the name of the emperor Constantine failed⁵². Michael Glykas informs of the destruction brought by a lightning which struck in 1079, when three iron hoops were torn⁵³, probably

³⁹ According to Sarah BASSETT (*op. cit.*, p. 68), Constantine depicted on the statue was nude.

⁴⁰ JOHN MALALAS (XIII, 7) was the one to write of the seven rays, and after him – George the Monk (GEORGIUS MONACHUS, p. 500), while the rays as the nails used at the crucifixion of Christ are mentioned by PSEUDO-CODINUS (45, p. 174) and ZONARAS (XIII, 3); cf. C. MANGO, *Constantine's Column...*, p. 3; IDEM, *Constantine's Porphyry Column...*, p. 109.

⁴¹ ANNA COMNENA, XII, 4, 5.

⁴² NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS XANTHOPOULOS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, VII, 49 (cetera: NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS), [in:] PG, vol. CXLV, col. 1325 CD.

⁴³ THEOPHANES, AM 5970, p. 126: ἔπεσε δὲ καὶ ἡ σφαῖρα τοῦ ἀνδριάντος τοῦ Φόρου.

⁴⁴ LEO GRAMMATICUS, *Chronographia*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonnæ 1842 (cetera: LEO GRAMMATICUS), p. 254.

⁴⁵ MALALAS, XVIII, 118: ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ φόβῳ ἔπεσεν ἡ λόγχη, ἣν ἐκράτει τὸ ἀγαλμα τὸ ἐν τῷ φόρῳ Κωνσταντίνου.

⁴⁶ THEOPHANES, AM 6034, p. 222: ἔπεσε δὲ καὶ ἡ λόγχη, ἣν ἐκράτει ὁ ἀνδριάς ὁ ἐστὼς εἰς τὸν φόρον τοῦ ἁγίου Κωνσταντίνου.

⁴⁷ CEDRENUS, p. 656.

⁴⁸ ANNA COMNENA, XII, 4, 5: σκήπτρον μὲν κατέχων τῆ δεξιᾷ, τῆ δὲ λαιᾷ σφαῖραν ἀπὸ χαλκοῦ κατασκευασθεῖσαν. However, when Anna Comnena was writing her work, the statue had been absent from the Column for over forty years.

⁴⁹ PHILOSTORGIUS, II, 9, p. 21; cf. G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 38, an. 6.

⁵⁰ THEOPHANES, AM 6034, p. 222.

⁵¹ MALALAS, XVIII, 118; CEDRENUS, p. 656.

⁵² ANNA COMNENA, XII, 4, 5: Ἐλέγετο δ' οὐκ εἶναι οὗτος Ἀπόλλωνος ἀνδριάς. Ἀνθίλιον δὲ, οἶμαι, οἱ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου οἰκίητορες αὐτὸν προσηγόρευον. Ὁν ὁ μέγας ἐν βασιλεῦσι Κωνσταντίνος ἐκεῖνος καὶ τῆς πόλεως καὶ πατῆρ καὶ δεσπότης εἰς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ μετέθηκεν ὄνομα, Κωνσταντίνου αὐτοκράτορος ἀνδριάντα αὐτὸν προσειπῶν. Ἐπεκράτησε δὲ ἡ ἀρχήθεν τεθείσα προσηγορία τῷ ἀνδριάντι καὶ ἦτοι Ἀνθίλιος ἢ Ἀνθίλιος ὑπὸ πάντων ἐλέγετο; cf. PSEUDO-CODINUS, p. 257.

⁵³ GLYKAS, p. 617.

those which were mounted in order to reinforce the Column during the reign of Theodosius II in 416⁵⁴. On April 5th, 1106, a violent southern wind knocked the statue to the ground⁵⁵, causing casualties⁵⁶, which was treated as a bad sign by opponents of the ruling emperor, Alexius I Comnenus, an ill omen of the imminent death of the ruler. Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143–1180) had the monument repaired. On top of it ten rows of stones were laid, fused with concrete, and a marble block was placed there, probably giving it the shape of the Corinthian capitol. However, from that moment, the Column was topped with a cross instead of the statue⁵⁷. The emperor also had a commemorative inscription placed under the column, reading: *Manuel, the pious ruler, restored this God's work destroyed by time*⁵⁸. The column was bound with metal hoops, in the eighteenth century due to the threat of earthquakes.

The Column was placed on a high pedestal, which was in turn embedded on a broad a square platform with each side 8.35 meter wide⁵⁹. A drawing by Melchior Lorck, dating to 1561, suggests that the Column base was decorated with bas-relief known as *aurum coronarium*. However, no other source has been found to confirm it⁶⁰. According to Nicephorus Callistus, there were arches adjacent to the plinth of the Column on each side, which opened to the Forum of Constantine⁶¹. Raymond Janin was convinced that under one of these arches a small oratory was located – the Chapel of St. Constantine⁶², where each year official processions came⁶³. Earlier, it was believed that this oratorio was located at the base of the Column; however, research has shown that it was a solid structure⁶⁴. According to Cyril Mango, the chapel, probably built in the period of iconoclasm, was adjacent to the Column plinth on the north side. The aforementioned arches were added only during the renovation of the Column after the crash in 1106, when the wind from the south knocked the statue, causing much destruction and probably also damaging the chapel, which was never rebuilt. After the tenth century, the Chapel of Constantine is no longer mentioned in the sources. This is probably because at that time the emperor Constantine ceased to be regarded as the patron of the city and the empire, as that role

⁵⁴ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 573.

⁵⁵ ANNA COMNENA, XII, 4, 5. In the opinion of Raymond JANIN (*op. cit.*, p. 83) three cylinders were knocked off along with the statue, the notion, however, is rejected by Cyril MANGO (*Constantinopolitana...*, p. 310), arguing that there is no source information to confirm it.

⁵⁶ 10 people are said to have died on that occasion, cf. C. MANGO, *Constantine's Porphyry Column...*, p. 108.

⁵⁷ C. MANGO, *Constantinopolitana...*, p. 312.

⁵⁸ R. JANIN, *op. cit.*, p. 83: Τὸ θεῖον ἔργον ἐνθάδε φθαρὲν ἕρῳνῳ καινὴ Μανουὴλ εὐσεβῆς αὐτοκράτωρ.

⁵⁹ C. MANGO, *Constantine's Porphyry Column...*, p. 104.

⁶⁰ IDEM, *Constantinopolitana...*, p. 308–311.

⁶¹ NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, VII, 49.

⁶² *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*, I, 1, 24, ed. J. REISKE, Bonnæ 1829, vol. I (cetera: *De cerimoniis*), p. 29–30 [= CSHB].

⁶³ *De cerimoniis*, I, 10, 3.

⁶⁴ R. JANIN, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

was reserved for the Mother of God (Θεοτόκος)⁶⁵.

It is also thought that originally an altar was placed by the plinth of the Column situated in the ancient fashion over the *Mundus* (the image of the entrance to the underworld), where sacrifices were usually made to the underground gods. According to tradition, under the base of the column an archaic statue of Pallas was to be buried, called Palladium⁶⁶, secretly brought out of Rome by Constantine⁶⁷. It probably originated from the belief that the ruler wished to ensure good fortune for Constantinople. Thus, both cities during their prosperity were to be under the care of the same goddess. Perhaps the collapse of the Old Rome, which occurred in the fifth century, inspired the contemporary thought of losing the favor of Pallas to Constantinople – the New Rome. It also emphasized the continuity of the existence of Rome in its new form, as the city of Constantine was considered, as well as referred to the choice of the location for the new capital, which initially was supposed to be Troy⁶⁸.

It was said also that in the plinth, in the statue or atop of the Column various magic items and relics were concealed. John Diacrinomenus mentioned gold coins with the likeness of Constantine imprinted on them, which were a symbol of prosperity⁶⁹. Later Christian tradition late added the information of holy relics: a portion of the True Cross (*Vera Crux*), baskets from the multiplication of bread, a vase of holy oil (the chrism), Noah's axe handle, the rock from which water sprang at the command of Moses, nails from the Passion of Christ, relics of saints, wood from the crosses of the two thieves and pots of perfume⁷⁰. In this way, the Column became sacred in itself in the social consciousness.

Tradition has retained three dedications of late origin, which were to be placed

⁶⁵ C. MANGO, *Constantine's Porphyry Column...*, p. 109–110.

⁶⁶ PROCOPIUS CAESARIENSIS, *De bello Gothico*, I, 15, 14, [in:] *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*, ed. G. WIRTH, J. HAURY, Leipzig 1963, vol. II, p. 82: Κωνσταντίνον βασιλέα ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ, ἣ αὐτοῦ ἐπώνυμός ἐστι, κατορύξαντα θέσθαι; MALALAS, XIII, 7: ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Κωνσταντίνος ἀφελόμενος ἀπὸ Ῥώμης κρύφα τὸ λεγόμενον Παλλάδιον ξόανον, ἐθήκεν αὐτὸ εἰς τὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κτισθέντα φόρον ὑποκάτω τοῦ κίονος τῆς στήλης αὐτοῦ, ὡς τινες λέγουσι τῶν Βυζαντιῶν ὅτι ἐκεῖ κεῖται; *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 528: ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντίνος ἀφελὼν κρυπτῶς ἀπὸ Ῥώμης τὸ λεγόμενον Παλλάδιον; HESYCHIUS, 41, p. 17–18 (addition from the eleventh century); PSEUDO-CODINUS, 45, p. 174; G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 30; C. DIEHL, *De quelques croyances byzantines sur la fin de Constantinople*, BZ 30, 1929/1930, p. 192–196; A. ALFÖLDI, *On the foundation of Constantinople, a few notes*, JRS 37, 1947, p. 11.

⁶⁷ G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 39; S. BASSETT, *op. cit.*, p. 69–70.

⁶⁸ SOZOMENUS, II, 3.

⁶⁹ *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai*, 56 (cetera: *Parastaseis*), [in:] *Scriptores originum...*, vol. I, p. 56–57: Πολλὰ οὖν ὁ Διακρινόμενος ἀνωθεν τοῦ κίονος φάσκει πράγματα τεθῆναι, ἐνθα ἡ στήλη ἴσταται, ἐν οἷς καὶ χαραγῆ βασιλικῆ Κωνσταντίνου ἡ λεγομένη σωτηρικός, χίλια κεντηνάρια.

⁷⁰ SOCRATES, *Kirchengeschichte*, I, 17, ed. G.C. HANSEN, Berlin 1995 (cetera: SOCRATES) [= GCS, 1]; GEORGIUS MONACHUS, p. 500; *Andreae Sali vita*, 224, [in:] PG, vol. CXI, col. 868; HESYCHIUS, 41, p. 17; M. GUIDI, *Un Bios di Costantino*, Rome 1908, p. 37, 15–22; A. FROLOW, *La dédicace de Constantinople dans la tradition byzantine*, RHR 127, 1944, p. 77, an. 1–2; A. KAZHDAN, „Constantin imaginaire”: *Byzantine Legends of the ninth century about Constantine the Great*, B 57, 1987, p. 233.

at the base of the Column. The first one, pagan, *To Constantine, who shines like the Sun (Helios)*⁷¹; the second, inspired by *Vita Constantini* by Eusebius⁷² and the text by Sozomenus⁷³: *To you, Christ, God, I entrust the city*⁷⁴; third one, the most literary: *To thee, Christ, who art the creator and ruler of the world, to thee I entrust this city which is thine, like the scepter and the power of Rome. Save it and deliver it from all calamity.*⁷⁵ Thus, the statue was perceived by the authors of source texts both as a Christian and pagan monument. The representation of Christ as the god of sun and these dedications addressed to him became the basis for the suggestion that the Column was surmounted with a statue of Christ himself⁷⁶. It is possible that Christians began to see the Column as a sacred monument because of a widespread belief that it housed sacred relics.

The Porphyry Column played an important role in the ceremony of the foundation of Constantinople, which was divided into two stages⁷⁷. Celebrations began with an official procession, going from Philadelphion or Magnaura to the Forum of Constantine, to place the statue and holy relics on the Column⁷⁸. The festive procession was composed of Christians, led by priests, chanting hymns and entrusting Constantinople to God's care with the words of a prayer: *Keep it (the city) in prosperity until the end of time, our Lord*, and reciting the *Kyrie eleison*⁷⁹.

The second phase of the foundation ceremony, called *pompa circensis*, which took place on 11 May 330 AD, was, on the command of emperor Constantine himself, repeated annually on the day when the anniversary of the founding of the city was celebrated on the hippodrome⁸⁰. A wooden statue covered with gold, probably

⁷¹ LEO GRAMMATICUS, p. 87: *Κωνσταντίνω λάμποντι Ἡλίου δίκην*; CEDRENUS, p. 518.

⁷² EUSEBIUS, III, 48, p. 98.

⁷³ SOZOMENUS, II, 3, 7, p. 240.

⁷⁴ NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, VII, 49, 19–20, col. 1325: *Σοὶ, Χριστέ ὁ θεὸς παρατίθημι τὴν πόλιν αὐτήν.*

⁷⁵ CEDRENUS, p. 565: *Σὺ, Χριστέ, κόσμου κοίρανος καὶ δεσπότης, Σοὶ νῦν προσήξα τήνδε τὴν δούλην πόλιν, Καὶ σκῆπτρα τάδε καὶ τὸ τῆς Ῥώμης κράτος Φύλαττε αὐτήν, σώζε τ' ἐκ πάσης βλάβης.*

⁷⁶ More on the subject of the association of the worship of Christ with the solar cult, see H. CHADWICK, *Kościół w epoce wczesnego chrześcijaństwa*, trans. A. WYPUSTEK, Warszawa 2004, p. 125–126. Suggestions associating the statue with Christ are rejected by Cyril MANGO (*Constantine's Column...*, p. 6).

⁷⁷ GLYKAS, p. 617; ZONARAS, XIII, 3, 26–27; G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 37; R. JANIN, *op. cit.*, p. 77–80.

⁷⁸ *Parastaseis*, 56, p. 56: *Ἡ στήλη ἡ ἐν τῷ Φόρῳ πολλὰς ὑμνωδίας ἐδέξατο. Ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ πολιτεύμα καὶ Ὀλβιανὸς ἔπαρχος καὶ οἱ σπαθάριοι, οἱ κουβικουλάριοι καὶ μόνον καὶ σιλεντιάριοι μετὰ κηρῶν λευκῶν ὀψικεύσαντες, λευκὰς στολὰς ἀμφότεροι περιβεβλημένοι, ἀπὸ τὸ καλούμενον ἀρτίως Φιλαδέλφιν, τότε δὲ Προτείχισμα καλούμενον (ἐν οἷς καὶ πόρτα ἦν τὸ πρότερον ὑπὸ Κάρου κατασκευασθεῖσα) ἀνήνεγκαν ἐποχομένην εἰς καρούχαν· ὡς δὲ ὁ Διακρινόμενός φησιν, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς καλουμένης Μαγναύρας. Ἐν οἷς ἐν τῷ Φόρῳ θεθεῖσα καὶ πολλὰς, ὡς προείρηται, ὑμνωδίας δεξαμένη εἰς Τύχην τῆς πόλεως προσεκυνήθη παρὰ πάντων, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὰ ἐξέρκετα· ἔσχατον πάντων τότε ἠνοῦτο ἐν τῷ κίονι, τοῦ ἱερέως μετὰ τῆς λιτῆς παρεστηκότος καὶ τὸ Ἰκῦρι ἐλέησον' πάντων βοῶντων ἐν ρ' μέτροις; cf. G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 39.*

⁷⁹ *Parastaseis*, 56, p. 57: *εἰς ἀπείρους αἰῶνας εὐδῶσον αὐτήν, Κύριε.* The procession was attended by prefect Olbianus.

⁸⁰ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 529: *καὶ ἐποίησεν ἑορτὴν μεγάλην, κελύσας διὰ θειοῦ αὐτοῦ τύπου τῆ αὐτῆς ἡμέρα*

a replica of the statue on the Porphyry Column, was solemnly brought in a chariot into the hippodrome⁸¹. The depicted figure had a crown of rays and in its right hand was, also gilded, the Tyche of the city. Most likely, it was a globe surmounted by Victoria rather than a figural personification of Constantinople. The statue was accompanied by a squad of soldiers (dressed in chlamys and *campagi* boots), each of whom was holding in his hand a white candle. When the chariot on which the statue was placed circled the hippodrome, it stopped in front of the imperial box, and the currently reigning emperor rose and gave a deep bow before the statue and the representation of Tyche of the city. At the end of the ceremony, the people chanted hymns and worshiped at these depictions by adoration⁸². Thus, in the *pompa circensis* ceremony, the chariot carrying the statue had its triumphant run, setting off from *carceres*, circling the *spina* and coming to a stop in front of the imperial tribune.

The author of the *Chronicon Paschale* identified the chariot as ὄχημα⁸³, and the *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai* pointed to its solar character, calling it a ἡλίου ἄρμα⁸⁴. A similar term was used by Pseudo-Codinus⁸⁵, in whose opinion the statue crowning the column at the Forum of Constantine depicted Apollo⁸⁶. According to Gilbert Dagron, in the hippodrome, Constantine-Helios from the Porphyry Column became a coachman driving his solar chariot⁸⁷.

This ceremony, according to some sources, was to continue until the reign of Julian (361–363), when the emperor was to recommend the gilded statue to be buried because of the cross adorning it⁸⁸. Pseudo-Codinus, on the other hand, at one point associates the ceremony abolition with Julian⁸⁹, and another time with Theodosius the Great⁹⁰, while John Malalas († 578) asserted that this ceremony took place even in his day⁹¹. It seems likely that the real reason for the abolition of the adoration ceremony could be that it was

ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τὸ γενέθλιον τῆς πόλεως αὐτοῦ.

⁸¹ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 530: ποιήσας ἑαυτῷ ἄλλην στήλην ἀπὸ ξοάνου κεχρυσωμένην βαστάζουσαν ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ τύχην τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως, καὶ αὐτὴν κεχρυσωμένην, κελύσας κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ γενεθλιακοῦ ἰππικοῦ εἰσιέναι τὴν αὐτὴν τοῦ ξοάνου στήλην διριγευομένην ὑπὸ τῶν στρατευμάτων μετὰ χλανιδίων καὶ καμπαγιῶν, πάντων κατεχόντων κηροῦς λευκοῦς, καὶ περιέρχεσθαι τὸ ὄχημα τὸν ἄνω καμπτόν, καὶ ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸ σκάμμα κατέναντι τοῦ βασιλικοῦ καθίσματος, καὶ ἐπεγείρεσθαι τὸν κατὰ καιρὸν βασιλέα καὶ προσκυνεῖν τὴν στήλην τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς τύχης τῆς πόλεως; cf. MALALAS, XIII, 8; *Parastaseis*, 38, 56, p. 42, 56; PSEUDO-CODINUS, 42, 49, 87, p. 172–173, 177–178, 195–196.

⁸² *Parastaseis*, 56, p. 56–57; PSEUDO-CODINUS, 49, p. 177.

⁸³ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 530.

⁸⁴ *Parastaseis*, 38, p. 42.

⁸⁵ PSEUDO-CODINUS, 42, p. 172.

⁸⁶ PSEUDO-CODINUS, 45, p. 174.

⁸⁷ G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 307: *Le Constantin-Helios de la colonne de porphyre devient à l'Hippodrome le conducteur du char du Soleil.*

⁸⁸ *Parastaseis*, 38, p. 42.

⁸⁹ PSEUDO-CODINUS, 42, p. 173.

⁹⁰ PSEUDO-CODINUS, 87, p. 196.

⁹¹ MALALAS, XIII, 8.

deemed too pagan⁹². Presumably, it survived only in the form of festivities and food distribution, which is confirmed to be happening as late as in the tenth century⁹³.

Thus, the Porphyry Column with the statue, and since the reign of Manuel I Comnenus (1143–1180) – with the cross which replaced the latter, remained throughout the history of the Byzantine Empire a symbol of Constantinople and its foundation, as well as the divine protection over the city. In addition, in early Byzantium, it presumably united the ideas of paganism and Christianity, becoming sacred to pagans and Christians alike. It must seem extremely interesting, therefore, how it was presented by Constantinople church historians in the mid-fifth century – Socrates and his successor, Hermias Sozomenus.

Socrates in his *Ecclesiastical History* refers to the Porphyry Columns twice. The first time he describes the circumstances under which the relics of the Holy Cross were found by Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great⁹⁴; the second time – when he presents the circumstances of the death of heresiarch Arius⁹⁵. In the first case, he refers to the Column as the place where the relics of the Holy Cross Tree were deposited⁹⁶. The emperor, having received them from his mother, convinced that the city where such holy items are kept would never perish, was to order them to be hidden in the Porphyry Column⁹⁷. In the second case, according to the account by Socrates, Arius, having deceived the emperor Constantine as to his faith, boasting about his triumph, left the imperial palace following the route along which rulers usually celebrated their victories⁹⁸. When he arrived at the

⁹² G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

⁹³ *De ceremoniis*, I, 70.

⁹⁴ SOCRATES, I, 17. The relics of the Holy Cross were found probably in the twenties of the fourth century, but the tradition of linking their discovery to Helena is a few decades older, see J.W. DRIJVERS, *Helena Augusta. The mother of Constantine the Great and the legend of her finding of the True Cross*, Leiden–New York–København–Köln 1992, p. 89, 93 and also S. BORGHAMMAR, *How the Holy Cross was found. From the event to medieval legend*, Stockholm 1991, p. 31–53; B. BAERT, *A Heritage of Holy Wood. The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image*, Leiden 2004; H.A. KLEIN, *Byzanz, der Westen und das 'wahre' Kreuz. Die Geschichte einer Reliquie und ihrer künstlerischen Fassung in Byzanz und im Abendland*, Wiesbaden 2004. More on the subject of Eusebius' silence on the aforementioned relics, see J.W. DRIJVERS, *op. cit.*, p. 83–89; H.A. DRAKE, *Eusebius on the True Cross*, *JEH* 36, 1985, p. 1–22; S. BORGHAMMAR, *op. cit.*, p. 116–117.

⁹⁵ SOCRATES, I, 38.

⁹⁶ The relics of the Holy Cross were distributed to various places in the *Imperium Romanum* (Cf. J.W. DRIJVERS, *op. cit.*, p. 89–92), according to CYRIL OF JERUSALEM (*Catechesis*, X, 19, [in:] PG, vol. XXXIII, col. 685 B), they were located all over the world.

⁹⁷ SOCRATES, I, 17, p. 180: "Ὁπερ δεξάμενος καὶ πιστεύσας τελείως σωθήσεσθαι τὴν πόλιν, ἔνθα ἂν ἐκεῖνο φυλάττηται, τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἀνδριάντι κατέκρυψεν, ὃς ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐν τῇ ἐπιλεγομένῃ ἀγορᾷ Κωνσταντίνου ἐπὶ τοῦ πορφυροῦ καὶ μεγάλου κίονος ἴδρυται. The relics of the Holy Cross were found in the twenties of the fourth century, and thus at the time when the Porphyry Column was erected. Placing these relics in there was therefore possible from a chronological point of view. However, apart from Socrates, only George the Monk mentions it (GEORGIUS MONACHUS, p. 500).

⁹⁸ In the opposite direction, however, than the rulers did.

Forum of Constantine, where the column of porphyry stands⁹⁹, as Socrates points out, he came down with terrible stomach pains, which led to his death by his entrails falling out; Arius was to meet his end in the latrine at the back of the Forum.

The historian's account on the Column is, therefore, on the one hand, very laconic, on the other, very eloquent. Because of the relics of the Holy Cross, the Column became sacred, as the heresiarch learned himself. He deceived the ruler but was not able to deceive God and was exposed at the moment when in his pride he approached the sacred item which the Column had already become by then. Interestingly, in the work of Socrates, the monument appears only in stories of legendary character. Thus, Socrates referred to the legend already at that time associated with the sanctity of the Column. He must have been aware of this issue. Writing about the hidden relic in the Holy Cross, he added that he included that detail on the basis of a verbal account, and *nearly all the citizens of Constantinople contend that it is consistent with the truth*¹⁰⁰. It is possible that the relics in question was attributed the same role as the pagan Tyche of the city played, since in the opinion of Constantine, according to Socrates, it was meant to ensure the continuance of Constantinople and it was to be so for the eternity. The City in which the said relic was kept was not to be destroyed. The Porphyry Column has the same significance in the eyes of pagans and Christians – for other reasons, however. In the opinion of the former, it was to be guaranteed by the Palladium and the representation of Tyche, crowning a sphere held by the statue, while the latter believed that it was ensured by the relics of the Holy Cross.

How was this legend addressed by Sozomenus, who, according to many researchers improved and reinterpreted the *Ecclesiastical History* by Socrates?¹⁰¹ In fact, Sozomenus did not mention the Porphyry Column at all, not even once. Neither did he refer to it when he informed of the discovery of the relic of the Holy Cross of Christ,¹⁰² nor when he

⁹⁹ SOCRATES, I, 38, p. 180: ἐπεὶ δ' ἐγένοντο πλησίον τῆς ἐπιλεγομένης ἀγορᾶς Κωνσταντίνου, ἔνθα ὁ πορφυροῦς ἰδρυται κίων.

¹⁰⁰ SOCRATES, I, 17: Τοῦτο μὲν οὖν ἀκοῆ ἡράψας ἔχω· πάντες δὲ σχεδὸν οἱ τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν οἰκοῦντες ἀληθῆς εἶναι φασιν.

¹⁰¹ It was pointed out on numerous occasions, see G.F. CHESNUT, *The first Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomenus, Theodoret, and Evagrius*, Paris 1977, p. 205; G. SABBAB, *Introduction*, [in:] SOZOMENUS, vol. II, p. 59 [= SC, 477]; F. YOUNG, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, London 1983, p. 32; T.D. BARNES, *Athanasius and Constantius*, Cambridge 1993, p. 206; T. URBAINCZYK, *Observations on the differences between the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomenus*, *Hi* 46, 1997, p. 355–356. P. JANISZEWSKI believes (*Zywioty w służbie propagandy, czyli po czyjej stronie stoi Bóg. Studium kłesk i rzadkich fenomenów przyrodniczych u historyków Kościoła w IV i V wieku*, [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności*, vol. III, ed. E. WÍPSZYCKA, Kraków 2000, p. 153) that Sozomenus “wanted to create a work that would compete with Socrates and be closer to the canons of classic literature and the taste of the classically inclined intellectual circles of Constantinople”. More on the subject of differences between the works by Socrates and Sozomenus cf. P. VAN NUFFELEN, *Un héritage de Paix et de Piété. Étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène*, Leuven–Paris–Dudley 2004, *passim*.

¹⁰² SOZOMENUS, II, 1.

wrote about the death of Arius¹⁰³. In the first case, his account is consistent with the story by Socrates. The discovery of the tree of the Holy Cross was made possible through God's help, shortly after the Council of Nicaea, when the mother of the emperor, Helena, was staying in Jerusalem¹⁰⁴. In a miraculous way, with the participation of Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem, the Cross of Christ was distinguished from the crosses of the two thieves, thanks to the healing of a dying woman. Both of them, Socrates and Sozomenus, also stressed that a part of the relic is kept in Jerusalem in a silver box and Helena sent another part to Constantine, like the nails from the Passion of Christ. The two accounts are different in some of the details. In the account of Socrates, the mother of the emperor went to Jerusalem as a result of prophetic visions she received in her dreams, while in the text by Sozomenus she came there at the time when her son decided to erect a temple in Jerusalem near Golgotha, and the purpose of her pilgrimage was her religious passion – the desire to pray and explore holy places. Finding the tree of the Holy Cross was only her great desire. Thus, in the work of Socrates, Helena plays an active role in the search for relics, ordering the relevant work to be performed, while in Sozomenus' account she is only a witness of their discovery during the works undertaken at the command of the ruler. According to Socrates, the woman healed by touching the Cross was a resident of Constantinople, while in the opinion of Sozomenus she belonged to the elite of Jerusalem. Helena assisted at her healing, which Socrates does not mention explicitly. The issue of the healed women appears to be a seemingly minor detail. In Jerusalem, however, there were probably a number of seriously ill people. The fact that in the account by Socrates it is a woman that is healed – a resident of Constantinople, bears some significance. As can be expected, in this way Socrates wanted to express the belief in the importance of the relics of the Cross for the future of the capital, since the discovery of the true Cross of Christ saved the resident of the city. In addition, it also seems that her gender is not without importance either. Personifications of cities were in fact female. Perhaps, therefore, Socrates saw in that healed woman a symbol of the city itself? Sozomenus did not share the views of his predecessor on this issue. Most likely, it was his approach to the Porphyry Column that distinguished him from Socrates, because he also held the relics of the Cross in great esteem. The historians agree as to the actual nature of the facts they are quoting, they only differ as regards the details, including the most important ones concerning the role of the emperor's mother, and placing the relics in the Porphyry Column.

It is interesting that Sozomenus, like Socrates, felt it necessary to validate his account on the subject, quoting sources of the information provided. He indicated then that he acquired it from people who were knowledgeable, who told the story from generation

¹⁰³ SOZOMENUS, II, 30.

¹⁰⁴ To Sozomenus, it was more probable that God gave direct guidance on this issue, although the historian does not rule out that the relevant information was delivered by a Hebrew man. The legend of *Inventio Crucis*, whose origin dates back to 415–450 identified him as Judah-Cyriacus; see S. BORGEHAMMAR, *op. cit.*, p. 146–161.

to generation as well as from written accounts, which he had at his disposal. Significantly, too, that Socrates gave a similar confession about the origin of the facts which he was describing; he did that elsewhere, however, unlike Sozomenus, his successor. Socrates introduced the relevant passage immediately following the information about placing the relics of the Holy Cross in Porphyry Column while Sozomenus, ignoring or rejecting this fact, concluded the account on the finding of the Cross of Christ in this way, as though he wanted to use his words to counterbalance the testimony of Socrates and on the subject of the Column. Thus, it can be asserted that the omission of information about the deposit of relics in the Column of Constantine was not accidental.

As for the description of the death of Arius, also this time the two accounts are consistent in their nature. The heresiarch met his end in a similar manner¹⁰⁵. But while Socrates clearly points to the Forum of Constantine as the place where his agony began only to finally end at the back of the square, Sozomenus does not specify the location of the latrine where Arius was to die. In an attempt to lend credibility to his account, he quoted a lengthy passage from Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, in which the place of the heresiarch's death was given in detail¹⁰⁶. One can assume that it was the issue of that location that led the historian to quote a rather lengthy citation from the work by Athanasius, who was held in great esteem at that time, although generally Sozomenus rarely referred the citations in his *History*¹⁰⁷.

Sozomenus' complete silence on the subject of the Column must seem perplexing, all the more so if we agree with the thesis that this historian wrote his *History* with the work by Socrates in his hand. It is also mystifying since it was Sozomenus, unlike Socrates, who drew attention to the religious aspect of the foundation of Constantinople. It was him who wrote of Constantinople as the city of Christ, with no pagan cults¹⁰⁸. It is in his account that Constantine acted on the instructions of God himself, who chose Byzantium as his new capital. The emperor, obeying his orders, expanded the area of the city, surrounded it with walls, developed it, populated with the people he had brought from the *Old Rome* and gave it the name *New Rome* – Constantinople. The ruler's efforts

¹⁰⁵ SOZOMENUS (II, 29) points to different interpretations of Arius' death.

¹⁰⁶ SOZOMENUS, II, 30, p. 364–368; the account by Socrates and Sozomenus on the death of Arius depends on the Athanasian sources: *Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae* 18–19, and his *Epistula ad Serapionem de morte Arii*.

¹⁰⁷ S. BRALEWSKI, *Obraz papieżstwa w historiografii kościelnej wczesnego Bizancjum*, Łódź 2006, p. 272 [= BL, 10].

¹⁰⁸ SOZOMENUS, II, 3. This is inconsistent with the first ceremony of the foundation of the city of a decidedly pagan character held in the year 324 (more on the subject, see: G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 29–47, 373) as well as other sources: ZOSIMUS, *Historia nova*, II, 31, 2–3, ed. L. MENDELSSOHN, Lipsiae 1887; HESYCHIUS, 41, p. 15–16. M. SALAMON (*Rozwój idei Rzymu–Konstantynopola od IV do pierwszej połowy VI wieku*, Katowice 1975, p. 78 [= PNUŚ, 80]) pointed out that the belief in the lack of pagan tradition in the Eastern capitol was the consequence of its having been founded by a Christian ruler, and the idea itself contributed over the subsequent centuries to an increase of tension between the two capitol dioceses.

make his new capital an equal of the Italian Rome¹⁰⁹ were successful also by the grace of God, because through it, the city grew to such an extent that the number of inhabitants and its wealth exceeded those of the former one. God gave support to the enthusiasm of the emperor and, through his revelations, confirmed the sanctity of churches the ruler built. Thus, in Sozomenus' version, the new capital was equated with the old; it became a participant of its precedence, equal to the first in terms of honour¹¹⁰.

As can be suspected, therefore, Sozomenus' silence on the subject of the Porphyry Column was not accidental, all the more so that we know from elsewhere that in other matters he was given to omitting facts inconvenient for his ideas¹¹¹. Most probably, then, he did not mention the Porphyry Column because of its dual character, which made it possible for Christians and pagans to see it as their sacred monument. It seems that Eusebius of Caesarea never wrote about it in his biography of emperor Constantine for the same reason¹¹². Perhaps Sozomenus rejected the account on the relics of the Holy Cross placed in the Column standing at the Forum of Constantine. This would also indicate that not everyone in the mid-fifth century saw it as an object of Christian worship and therefore some part of the inhabitants of Constantinople did not share the belief in the relics of the Cross of Christ hidden there.

Abstract. The complicated fates of the Porphyry Column of emperor Constantine resemble the reach and difficult history of Constantinople, the New Rome and capital of the eastern Empire from its very beginnings. Perceived by the Constantinopolitans as both Christian and pagan monument, adorned with legends repeated and enriched by generations, it was always a landmark of the city. The article summarizes, compares and analyzes the accounts of Byzantine historians, showing continuity of tradition and the lasting role of the unique object in the very heart of political centre of the imperial capital.

Translated by Katarzyna Gucio

Sławomir Bralewski

Katedra Historii Bizancjum

Uniwersytet Łódzki

ul. A. Kamińskiego 27a

90-219 Łódź, Polska

s.bralewski@o2.pl

¹⁰⁹ SOZOMENUS, II, 3, 6, p. 240: ἐν πᾶσι δεῖξαι σπουδάσας ἐφάμιλλον τῇ παρὰ Ἱταλοῖς Ῥώμῃ τὴν ὁμώνυμον αὐτῷ πόλιν οὐ διήμαρτεν.

¹¹⁰ SOZOMENUS, II, 3, 1-2, p. 236: ἦν ἴσα Ῥώμῃ κρατεῖν καὶ κοινωνεῖν αὐτῇ τῆς ἀρχῆς κατεστήσατο. According to F. DVORNIK (*Bizancjum a prymat Rzymu*, trans. M. RADOŹYCKA, Warszawa 1985, p. 30-31) moving the imperial seat to the East was a stimulus for the development of Peter's idea in Rome.

¹¹¹ As was the case with the papacy, cf. S. BRALEWSKI, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

¹¹² C. MANGO, *Constantine's Column...*, p. 6.

Małgorzata Skowronek (Łódź)

THE FIRST WITNESSES. MARTHA, LONGINUS AND VERONICA IN THE SLAVIC MANUSCRIPT TRADITION (INITIAL OBSERVATIONS)

The objective of the following study is to trace the fate – as it is related in the literature of the Orthodox Slavs – of three characters known to us from Early Christian sources. The first of them appears under her own name in the canonical Gospels, where the second is also referred to (albeit rather imprecisely, and anonymously), while the third – originally a legendary figure – became ‘canonical’ through identification with another anonymous character from the *New Testament*.

The material which we shall utilize to portray those three characters comprises literary texts written hundreds of years apart, from the Ancient Christian times (2nd–3rd centuries) until the close of the Middle Ages (the *Tale of Martha* – 15th century) and originating from diverse cultural milieus. From among those that are employed in liturgy, we may mention the ‘microgenre’ of the *sticheron* (a verse sung during service conveying the fundamental significance of the liturgical holiday), the so-called ‘short’ or ‘prologue’ lives of saints (found in the *menologia* in chronological order), the ‘extended’ lives (*vita, gesta*, enriching the factual material with rhetorical elements) and the passions (*passio*). Another, lower register of the medieval system of genres is comprised by the customarily more popular texts such as the ‘tales’ (known as *slovo*, literally ‘word’, in the Slavic literary tradition and occasionally approximating the *gesta*: ‘story’ or *narratio*) and the legends, both genres incorporated and adapted into official texts. Texts belonging to the latter register – tales and legends – are not infrequently labelled as pseudo-canonical or apocryphal, although it should be noted that the term as employed here is, in a way, conventional.

The material under discussion largely includes texts that form a part of the Slavic Orthodox tradition, depicting them on the one hand against the background of fairly well-known works belonging to the Western Christian tradition; on the other hand, it should be highlighted that not all of them are original and unknown in the other linguistic traditions of Eastern Christianity. Quite the reverse, most of them are in fact translations or adaptations of texts originally stemming from the Byzantine heritage and have closely related counterparts in Latin, Syriac, Armenian, etc. It is

often the case that the original Slavic compositional element may be identified by comparing the text with its sources in different languages.

The epithet 'first witnesses', conferred on the three saints in the title, is but a conventional designation; it seems fitting as common for the figures of Martha, Veronica and Longinus, all three of whom gave strong proof of their devotion to Christ. Otherwise, although they make no simultaneous appearance in any of the canonical texts, there are – interestingly – far more interconnections between the three characters in pseudo-canonical and legendary literature than could be surmised from the lack thereof in the Bible. Finally, it is my intention to point out how the Christian tradition exemplifies various manifestations of holiness, what means it has for annotating, elucidating and embellishing the Biblical hypertext, and how it adapts pseudo-canonical legends for the purposes of liturgical use.

I. Martha¹

From among the three characters under discussion, Martha, the sister of Mary and Lazarus, is the best 'documented'. The siblings from Bethany have been attributed noble birth; in the pseudo-canonical *Armenian Gospel of the Infancy*, it is maintained that they were the offspring of a certain Eleazar, a prince of Hebrew descent². Martha comes to light in the canonical Gospels, where she witnesses the great miracle of her brother being brought back to life in the scene known as the resurrection of Lazarus³:

John 11, 1–5; 11, 17–27; 11, 38–44: Now a man named Lazarus was sick. He was from Bethany, the village of Mary and her sister Martha. (This Mary, whose brother Lazarus now lay sick, was the same one who poured perfume on the Lord and wiped his feet with her hair.) So the sisters sent word to Jesus, "Lord, the one you love is sick." When he heard this, Jesus said, "This sickness will not end in death. No, it is for God's glory so that God's Son may be glori-

¹ Recently, numerous studies devoted to the figure of Martha have been published, cf. e.g. N. CORSON CARTER, *Martha, Mary and Jesus: Weaving Action and Contemplation in Daily Life*, Collegeville 1992; P.F. ESLER, R. PIPER, *Lazarus, Mary and Martha: Social-Scientific Approaches to the Gospel of John*, Minneapolis 2006, and especially: M.M. DAAS, *From Holy Hostess to Dragon Tamer: the Anomaly of Saint Martha*, LT 22.1, 2008, p. 1–15; furthermore: A.M. ERNST, *Martha from the Margins: The Authority of Martha in Early Christian Tradition*, Leiden–Boston 2009.

² *The Apocryphal New Testament: Being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses, with Other Narratives and Fragments*, ed. M.R. JAMES, Oxford 1924, p. 83. Cf. also the entire text in: *The Armenian Gospel of the Infancy, with Three Early Versions of the Protevangelium of James*, ed. A. TERIAN, Oxford 2008. Furthermore, cf. the remarks on the background of Mary Magdalene (as presented in the sermons of Catholic priests in Poland) in: M. KURAN, *Postać św. Marii Magdaleny w staropolskim kaznodziejstwie wobec tradycji apokryficznych*, [in:] *Biblia Slavorum Apocryphorum. Novum Testamentum. Materiały z Międzynarodowej Konferencji Naukowej, Łódź, 15–17 maja 2009*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, I. PETROV, Łódź 2009, p. 77–91.

³ The same episode is also related in further pseudo-canonical works, e.g. the *Georgian Gospel (Evangelium Ibericum)*, cf. the Polish translation by G. PERADZE: *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, vol. I, *Ewangelie apokryficzne*, pars 1, ed. M. STAROWIEYSKI, Kraków 2003, p. 204–229.

fied through it." Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus. [...] On his arrival, Jesus found that Lazarus had already been in the tomb for four days. Now Bethany was less than two miles from Jerusalem, and many Jews had come to Martha and Mary to comfort them in the loss of their brother. When Martha heard that Jesus was coming, she went out to meet him, but Mary stayed at home. "Lord," Martha said to Jesus, "if you had been here, my brother would not have died. But I know that even now God will give you whatever you ask." Jesus said to her, "Your brother will rise again." Martha answered, "I know he will rise again in the resurrection at the last day." Jesus said to her, "I am the resurrection and the life. The one who believes in me will live, even though they die; and whoever lives by believing in me will never die. Do you believe this?" "Yes, Lord," she replied, "I believe that you are the Messiah, the Son of God, who is to come into the world." [...] Jesus, once more deeply moved, came to the tomb. It was a cave with a stone laid across the entrance. "Take away the stone," he said. "But, Lord," said Martha, the sister of the dead man, "by this time there is a bad odour, for he has been there four days." Then Jesus said, "Did I not tell you that if you believe, you will see the glory of God?" So they took away the stone. Then Jesus looked up and said, "Father, I thank you that you have heard me. I knew that you always hear me, but I said this for the benefit of the people standing here, that they may believe that you sent me." When he had said this, Jesus called in a loud voice, "Lazarus, come out!" The dead man came out, his hands and feet wrapped with strips of linen, and a cloth around his face. Jesus said to them, "Take off the grave clothes and let him go."⁴

There is no mention of the miracle of the resurrection of Lazarus in the synoptic Gospels; an account is only provided by John.

Martha, whose name (of Aramaic origin) means 'lady,' is furthermore referred to in two other passages: in the context of her family ties, as well as with emphasis on her diligence and care for the household, which latter characteristic has become the Saint's distinctive feature and given the basis for the worship of Martha as the patron saint of cooks and household wives (at least in the Western tradition):

Luke 10, 38–42: As Jesus and his disciples were on their way, he came to a village where a woman named Martha opened her home to him. She had a sister called Mary, who sat at the Lord's feet listening to what he said. But Martha was distracted by all the preparations that had to be made. She came to him and asked, "Lord, don't you care that my sister has left me to do the work by myself? Tell her to help me!" "Martha, Martha," the Lord answered, "you are worried and upset about many things, but few things are needed – or indeed only one. Mary has chosen what is better, and it will not be taken away from her."

John 12, 1–2: Six days before the Passover, Jesus came to Bethany, where Lazarus lived, whom Jesus had raised from the dead. Here a dinner was given in Jesus' honour. Martha served, while Lazarus was among those reclining at the table with him.

⁴ This and all the following quotations from the Bible follow the New International Version, quoted after <http://www.biblica.com/bible/browse-books/> [20 X 2011].

These passages from the Scripture have earned Martha the honourable title of *Hospita Christi* – ‘the hostess of Christ’, attested e.g. in the *Martyrologium Romanum*⁵. On the basis of those excerpts from the Gospels, Biblical scholars and exegetes interpret the figure of Martha as supplementary for the contemplative attitude of her sister⁶, although the first of the quotations provided above brilliantly illustrates the former’s ardent faith.

The liturgical commemoration of Saint Martha of Bethany takes place on 29 July in the calendar of the Western Church, and on 4(17) June in the East (where she is worshipped alongside Mary). The sticheron dedicated to the sisters reads: *Ѡ ВИДИНА СЕСТРЫ ЛАЗАРОВЫ СЪПТИ ВЪЗМОГЫИ. ТАЩЕ И МРТВЪКМЪ ВЫВШІИМЪ*⁷.

Nevertheless, Martha is commemorated twice more in the East: in the liturgy of Lazarus Saturday (before Palm Sunday)⁸ as well as on the so-called Sunday of the Myrrhbearers (the second Sunday after Easter). The latter commemoration has its roots in the traditional conviction – not expressed in the canonical Gospels, however – that Martha is one of the women carrying the ointments for Christ, the latter already taken down from the Cross and buried. John speaks of Mary Magdalene solely in this context (John 19, 25); Matthew mentions Mary Magdalene and another Mary (Matthew 28, 1), while Luke enumerates Mary Magdalene, Joanna and Mary the mother of James (Luke 24, 10). Finally, Mark writes that „some women were watching [Christ’s death] from a distance. Among them were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses, and Salome” (Mark 15, 40). It is in all likelihood this reference to ‘them’ that has elicited the speculations about there being further women among those accompanying and serving Jesus in Galilee, including Martha. In the pseudo-canonical *Epistula Apostolorum* (*Epistle of the Apostles*, dated to the 2nd century and known in four versions: Greek, Latin, Ethiopic and Coptic), containing an outstandingly high number of quotations from the canonical Gospels, we read: [Jesus] *was buried in a place which is called the place of the skull, to which three women came, Sarah, Martha and Mary Magdalene. They carried ointment to pour out upon his body, weeping and mourning over what had happened...*⁹ As can be

⁵ *Martyrologium romanum: Tarasci, in Gallia Narbonensi, sanctae Marthae Virginis, hospitae Salvatoris nostri ac sororis beatorum Mariae Magdalенаe et Lazari*, <http://divinumofficium.com/www/horas/Latin/Martyrologium/07-29.txt> [20 X 2011].

⁶ *Religia. Encyklopedia PWN*, vol. VI, ed. T. GADACZ, B. MILERSKI, Warszawa 2006.

⁷ *You deigned to save the sisters of Lazarus of Bethany, though after his death*, quoted after: Г. ПЕТКОВ, *Стишиният пролог в старата българска, сръбска и руска литература. Археография, текстология и издание на проложни стихове*, Пловдив 2000, p. 413.

⁸ The BHG catalogue (ed. F. HALKIN, Bruxelles 1953) only mentions one sermon (among over thirty for that day) in which Lazarus is commemorated together with his sisters in the title (cf. vol. III, *Lazarus a Betania, Amicus Christi, quatruiduanus*, p. 39–43). The *Bibliotheca Hagiografica Balcano-Slavica* catalogue (К. ИВАНОВА, София 2008) does not list 4 June as a day of commemorating Saint Martha at all.

⁹ *Epistula Apostolorum* (*‘Epistle of the Apostles’*), [in:] *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection*

seen, the account of this event as preserved in the *Epistula Apostolorum* diverges from the canonical variants: the Four Gospels mention neither the presence of Martha nor the woman named Sarah. Although certain (Western) versions of the life of Martha claim that she *watched [...] the death of Jesus, her God, and saw His resurrection alongside the other disciples*¹⁰, she is not usually included among the women lamenting the Passion of Christ on Mount Golgotha.

Martha is also depicted as a person of profound piety and zealotry in the work known as *Pistis Sophia* ('Faith-Wisdom'). It is a gnostic text composed around the 2nd–3rd centuries in the Greek language and preserved in its entirety in one of the Coptic dialects; its title refers to one of the highest female Aeons. The work has the form of a collection of dialogues between Jesus and the disciples (predominantly John and Mary Magdalene) twelve years after the Resurrection, organized into 113 chapters¹¹. Chapter 38 mentions the presence of Martha among the disciples and relates how she, blessed by the Lord, inspired by the Spirit, describes the grace of penance received from Pistis Sophia and praises Christ by singing a psalm¹². It would be difficult to establish any direct link with text of the canonical Gospels; only in the gnostic *Gospel of the Egyptians* and in the *Gospel According to Mary Magdalene* does Christ speak to his female disciples, singling them out from among the Apostles.

of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation Based on M.R. James, ed. J.K. ELLIOTT, Oxford 1993, p. 561 (entire text on p. 555–590).

¹⁰ *Żywot Świętej Marty, dziewicy*, [in:] P. SKARGA, *Żywoty Świętych Pańskich na wszystkie dni roku*, Katowice–Mikołów 1937, http://ruda_parafianin.republika.pl/swi/m/marta.htm [20 X 2011].

¹¹ Translations of the entire work are available online: <http://gnosis.org/library/pistis-sophia/ps042.htm> [20 X 2011] (English) and <http://www.krotov.info/acts/03/3/pistis.htm> [20 X 2011] (Russian). Excerpts in Polish (trans. R. SZMURŁA) are to be found in *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu...*, vol. I, p. 159–162.

¹² *And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished speaking these words unto his disciples, saying: "This is the third repentance of Pistis Sophia", that he said unto them: "Let him in whom a sensitive spirit hath arisen, come forward and speak the thought of the repentance which Pistis Sophia hath uttered". It came to pass then, before Jesus had finished speaking, that Martha came forward, fell down at his feet, kissed them, cried aloud and wept with lamentation and in humbleness, saying: "My Lord, have mercy upon me and have compassion with me, and let me speak the solution of the repentance which Pistis Sophia hath uttered". And Jesus gave his hand unto Martha and said unto her: "Blessed is every one who humbleth himself, for on him they shall have mercy. Now, therefore, Martha, art thou blessed. But proclaim then the solution of the thought of the repentance of Pistis Sophia". And Martha answered and said unto Jesus in the midst of the disciples: "Concerning the repentance which Pistis Sophia hath uttered, O my Lord Jesus, of it thy light-power in David prophesied aforetime in the sixty-ninth Psalm, saying: 1. O Lord God, give heed to my help. 2. Let them be put to shame and con-founded who seek after my soul. 3. May they turn straightway and be put to shame, who say unto me: Ha, ha. 4. May all who seek thee, be joyful and exult because of thee, and they who love thy salvation, say ever: May God be exalted. 5. But I am wretched, I am poor; O Lord, help me. Thou art my helper and defence; O Lord, delay not". "This then is the solution of the third repentance which Pistis Sophia hath uttered, singing praises to the height" – Pistis Sophia, trans. G.S.R. MEAD, <http://gnosis.org/library/pistis-sophia/ps042.htm> [20 X 2011].*

The Orthodox Church worships the Sisters from Bethany as martyrs, a fact probably connected with the account according to which – after the death of the Stephen, the First Martyr – Mary and Martha left Jerusalem accompanying Lazarus, whom they supported in preaching the word of Christ. All three are related to have perished on Cyprus, where Lazarus had become the first bishop¹³. An alternative explanation assumes a transfer (contamination?) of the type of holiness from two other female martyrs by the same names, stemming from Caesarea¹⁴. Nevertheless, no sources that would enable us to solve this question beyond all doubt have survived.

Conversely, no such doubts are faced by the Western Christian tradition, whose main vehicle comprises two texts: *The Life of St. Mary Magdalene and of Her Sister St. Martha* by Rabanus Maurus (788–856)¹⁵ as well as its considerably simplified adaptation (making use of some of the information found in the original) of the story of Saint Martha included in Jacobus de Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* (*Golden Legend*, 13th century)¹⁶.

The vita compiled by Rabanus Maurus enjoyed indubitable prestige. This extensive work, divided into 50 chapters and markedly rhetorical in character, comments with unparalleled meticulousness on those passages of the *New Testament* where Martha appears. The Saint is portrayed in the context of her family background (she is said to be the daughter of the Syrian Theophilus and Euchartha) and delineated as an exceptionally strong personality. After the Ascension and the banishment by pagans (or Jews), Martha is claimed to have reached the southern shores of France (the place called Saintes Maries-sur-la-Mer, in the vicinity of Marseilles) in a ship without sails, oars or rudder, together with her siblings and Saint Maximilian, who had baptized them. Martha as described by the abbot of Fulda is not merely an inspired missionary (from Marseilles to the north, up to the Rhone), endowed with an outstanding gift of elocution, and a visionary (she sees Christ and the already deceased Mary Magdalene, and also predicts the moment of her own death), but also the founder of the church of the Blessed Virgin Mary, where she is said to have spent the rest of her life. Apart from that, she achieves an exceptional deed: she slays a dragon. In what is probably the most widely known legend associated with the name of Saint Martha, she is said to have subdued a ferocious dragon (called Tarasconus) that had harassed the local population. With the help of the cross and holy water, Martha is said to have

¹³ *Жития святых в изложении святителя Димитрия, митрополита Ростовского. Книга первая*, 1689, http://www.ispovednik.ru/zhitij/oct/okt_17_Lazar.htm [20 X 2011].

¹⁴ *Девуцы Марфа и Мария и Лицарион*, [in:] Архиепископ СЕРГИЙ (СПАССКИЙ), *Полный месяцесводов Востока*, vol. III, *Святой Восток*, Москва 1997, p. 60 [6 February].

¹⁵ RABANUS MAURUS, *De Vita Beatae Mariae Magdalenae et Sororis Ejus Sanctae Marthae*, [in:] PL, vol. CXII, col. 1441–1507; commented English translation: RABANUS MAURUS, *The Life of St. Mary Magdalene and of Her Sister St. Martha*, trans. D. MYCOFF, Kalamazoo 1989.

¹⁶ *Saint Martha*, [in:] JACOBUS DE VORAGINE, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, trans. W. GRANGER RYAN, vol. II, Princeton 1993, p. 23–26.

captured it and rendered it harmless, tying it up with her own belt (a *topos* recurring in stories related to other saints, e.g. Margaret of Antioch)¹⁷. Until today, the inhabitants of the commune of Tarascone (between Arles and Avignon) commemorate this accomplishment by organizing celebrations in the last weekend of June. *The Life...* also describes Martha's miraculous healings (performed both during her life and after death) as well as the resurrection of a drowned man.

Jacobus de Voragine¹⁸ makes use of the part of *The Life...* that deals with Martha; although he preserves the general form, he simplifies and sometimes distorts it. He extols Martha as the most "prudent" of the three siblings, one who *kept close watch over her brother's and sister's estates and took care of the needs of her armed men, her servants, and the poor*¹⁹.

The main idea of those tales or legends about the Saint which we shall here conventionally call 'Western' is, as it appears, the attempt to substantiate the notion of a remarkably early Christianization of Western Europe – already in the half of the 1st century (further analogous stories about the Christianization of particular European lands at the hands of Christ's disciples exist; we may mention the one about Saint James the Greater in Spain). The anecdotal or even fantastical status of these accounts is utterly unquestionable, especially in view of the lack of any testimony whatsoever to the later life of Martha.

Considering the far-reaching discrepancies, it could seem that the stories about Saint Martha stemming from Eastern and Western Christianity actually describe two different characters. This is, however, not the case; at least two 'intersections' of the fates of the 'Eastern' and the 'Western' Martha can be identified on the legendary/literary plane.

The first one is Eusebius of Caesarea's account (mentioned but abridged and simplified by de Voragine), according to which Martha is to be identified with the woman healed by Jesus from the issue of blood (Luke 8, 42–48). In gratitude, she decides to erect a monument for the Teacher:

But since I have come to mention this city²⁰, I do not think it right to omit a story that is worthy to be recorded also for those that come after us. For they say that she who had an issue of blood, and who, as we learn from the sacred Gospels²¹, found at the hands of our Saviour relief from her affliction, came from this place, and that her house was pointed out in the city, and that marvellous memorials of the good deed, which the Saviour wrought upon her, still

¹⁷ Others connect the story about Martha slaying the dragon with Celtic beliefs about monsters whose subjugation is to be an element of the canicular myth, cf. P. WALTER, *Christianity: The Origins of a Pagan Religion*, trans. J.E. GRAHAM, Rochester Vt. 2006.

¹⁸ *Saint Martha...*, p. 24.

¹⁹ *Saint Mary Magdalene*, [in:] JACOBUS DE VORAGINE, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 375.

²⁰ Caesarea Philippi, also called Paneas.

²¹ Matthew 9, Mark 5, Luke 5.

remained. For [they said] that there stood on a lofty stone at the gates of her house a brazen figure in relief of a woman, bending on her knee and stretching forth her hands like a suppliant, while opposite to this there was another of the same material, an upright figure of a man, clothed in comely fashion in a double cloak and stretching out his hand to the woman.²²

The above account constitutes an ancient and more complete version of a legend according to which there were – unlike in the *Legenda Aurea* – as many as two statues, of the healed and of the Healer²³. The identification of the woman who reared the statue of Christ with Martha, as in the relation of Jacobus de Voragine, starts to appear beginning in the 12th century in the writings of Western writers and theologians (Petrus Comestor, Gervase of Tilbury)²⁴. Already earlier (in the 5th–6th century: Macarius Magnes, John Malalas), however, legends are recorded in the East according to which the woman was a princess named Berenice, a native of Edessa. This theme – both the city of Edessa and the name Berenice (Veronica), the latter associated with a number of originally anonymous female characters known from literary texts (such as the *New Testament*) and legends – is worth remembering, not without reason. Berenice/Veronica will appear in the context of other stories about the deeds and death of Christ. This can be seen the most clearly in the sixth Station of the Cross in the Western tradition, but is also noticeable in liturgical texts of the Eastern Church.

Another such point where the Eastern and Western variants of the story about Saint Martha overlap has its roots in the work called *On How Martha Judged Pilate*, also known as the *Tale* ('*Slovo*') of *Martha*²⁵. In spite of having been published twice²⁶, the text remains relatively unknown. It is an original Slavic compilation of motifs known from a number of pseudo-canonical works belonging to the so-called *Pilate Cycle* – a collection of texts narrating the circumstances and consequences of the Passion, developed in the course of a few centuries (from the 2nd/3rd until the 11th/12th century) in various languages (Greek, Latin, Italian). Students of the Slavic manuscript

²² EUSEBIUS, *The Ecclesiastical History*, VII, 18, 1–2, trans. K. LAKE, vol. II, London–New York 1926 (cetera: EUSEBIUS), p. 175–177.

²³ J. NAUMOWICZ, *Posąg Jezusa z Paneas w źródłach patrystycznych i bizantyńskich*, [in:] *Słowo i ikona. Źródła literackie w badaniach sztuki bizantyńskiej i postbizantyńskiej*, ed. W. DELUGA, Warszawa 2004 [SByz, 2], p. 43–54.

²⁴ J. POLÍVKA, *Drobné příspěvky literárně-historické*, Praha 1891, p. 9.

²⁵ In the scholarly literature the text is known under its Latin title *Narratio de Martha*, cf.: F.J. THOMSON, *Apocrypha Slavica: II*, SEER 63, 1985, p. 81; *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus. Texts, Intertexts, and Contexts in Western Europe*, ed. Z. IZYDORCZYK, Tempe 1997, p. 9 (= *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 158).

²⁶ The editions of *The Tale of Martha*: St. NOVAKOVIĆ, *Bugarski zbornik, pisan prošloga veka narodnim jezikom*, Star 6, 1874, p. 45–47 (a 17th century manuscript from the National Library of Serbia, cat. no. 106, destroyed during the bombings of World War II); GJ. POLÍVKA, *Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko jugoslavenskih rukopisa u Pragu*, Star 24, 1891, p. 115–118 (text); *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів*, sel. I. ФРАНКО, vol. II, *Апокрифи новозавітні, А, Апокрифічні євангелія*, Львів 1889 [repr. 2006], p. 418–420; cf. F.J. THOMSON, *op. cit.*, p. 81–82.

tradition (F.J. Thomson) distinguish two versions of the *Tale of Martha*, of which the older, more extensive one – probably written in the 15th century in Bulgaria – is attributed to John Chrysostom²⁷. The variants of the *Tale of Martha* that survive until today (at least 16 in number²⁸) were composed between the 15th and the 18th century and represent both the Serbian and Bulgarian as well as the Russian recension of the Church Slavic language, which provides proof for the presence of the text in both the South and the East Slavic domain.

The plot of the *Tale of Martha* is the following: after the Ascension, Martha makes her way to Rome, to emperor Augustus, to whom she intends to confess the “truth” about Christ. To this end, she expounds the role of Pilate, the prefect, as well as of a Roman centurion named Longinus, in Christ’s being sentenced to death. She also gives an account of the miracles done by Jesus, including the resurrection of Lazarus²⁹. Demanding a “confirmation”, Augustus sends one of his servants (in the implied company of Martha) to Jerusalem. Afterwards, Martha returns to Rome together with her brother Lazarus and the centurion Longinus, who had “believed by himself”. Christ’s robe that Longinus has with himself causes “tremor” in the palace: when Longinus enters without the precious keepsake/relic, the “tremor” fades. Another trial of the emperor’s faith is the healing of the ulcer in his nose; after he has made the sign of the cross and called the name of God, the ulcer disappears. Consequently, he confesses faith in Christ and is baptized (!). Next, accompanied by his army, he goes to Jerusalem, where he brings about the capture of Pilate. The latter, having himself asked for being condemned to torture, is decapitated, his head taken to heaven by angels. Caiaphas escapes “into the wilderness”, only to be accidentally shot in the heart during a hunt³⁰. Augustus makes yet another confession of his faith. The short version of the *Tale of Martha* diverges from its longer counterpart by omitting certain details, insignificant for the plot (moreover, the account of the tragic fate of Pilate and Caiaphas is left out; there are also no remarks on Longinus’ possessing the robe of Christ)³¹. Besides disparities in plot details, the various versions also diverge

²⁷ F.J. THOMSON, *op. cit.*, p. 81–82.

²⁸ Most of them are enumerated and classified in *ibidem*, p. 81–82.

²⁹ There are texts (also Slavic) in which the woman pleading for Christ in Rome is *Mary Magdalene, whom he had cleansed from seven demons* (*The Reply of Emperor Tiberius Given to Pontius Pilate as Well as Governor Rahab and His Two Thousand Soldiers*, quoted after: *Ответ Тиверия кесаря Пилату Понтийскому и в ответ воеводе Рахааву и с ним воинам числом две тысячи*, [in:] *Апокрифы Древней Руси*, ed. М.В. Рождественская, Санкт-Петербург 2006, p. 136–137).

³⁰ *The Letter of Tiberius to Pilate* ends in a parallel episode, the difference lying in the fact that it relates the death of Pilate, cf. *The Letter of Tiberius to Pilate*, [in:] *The Apocryphal New Testament...*, p. 224–228.

³¹ This story is also known to function as a compositional element of more substantial works, e.g. the *Tale of the Passion* attributed to John Chrysostom; cf. the Slavic text: *Иже в свѣтъныхъ штьца нашего Йоданна Златоустатаго архїєпископа Константина града славѣ о страсти Спасовѣ*, in: GJ. POLÍVKA, *op. cit.*, p. 124–129.

lexically (e.g. 'СВ'ЪД'В'Т'ЕЛ'СТВОВА' vs. 'МАРТОРИСА'³², 'ЕЗА' vs. 'ЖИВИНИЦА', 'СЪТНИКЪ' vs. 'НА СТО ХОРА ГЛАВА', 'КР'ЕПЬКЪ' vs. 'ІАКЪ'), which indicates, among other things, that the particular variants were composed in different places and at another time.

Nevertheless, the structure of the text is noteworthy: although she is the title character, and – as the protagonist – the ultimate cause of the described events, Martha's presence and part in the story actually come to an end halfway through the text, when the emperor is baptized by Lazarus and Longinus. Despite that, we are dealing with a beautiful example of an enhancement of a *New Testament* story, drawing its 'reliability' from the fact that the characters are set in a historical and geopolitical context (the emperor in Rome, the journey to the capital with a complaint about the prefect of a province).

The *Tale of Martha*, drawing on motifs present in a number of texts narrating the Passion and death of Christ and the fate of His disciples after the Resurrection (*Anaphora Pilati*, *Paradosis Pilati*, *Tiberii Rescriptum*), is considered an original Slavic compilation. In view of the topics to which it pertains, the *Tale of Martha*, representing an independent, autonomous text, should be granted a place in the *Pilate Cycle*, which is a comparatively new concept³³ – unfortunately still not consistently adhered to³⁴. Nonetheless, there are additional aspects of the *Tale of Martha* corroborating its affinity to the *Pilate Cycle*, for instance in the domain of typology. The *Gospel of Nicodemus* features an episode in which, upon the entry of Jesus into the interrogation chamber, the images – that is, the top parts of the standards held by the soldiers – bow down in respect³⁵. In the *Tale of Martha*, Christ's robe causes the ground in

³² In each of the pairs the first member is the form attested in the 17th century (?) Serbian version of *On How Martha Judged Pilate Before Emperor Augustus* as edited by: GJ. POLIՒKA, *op. cit.*, p. 115–118, while the second member is the form taken from the 18th century copy from codex no. 437 (the so-called codex from Kotlen) stored in the St. St. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia (cetera: NBKM), f. 22'–25'.

³³ *The Medieval Gospel of Nicodemus...*, p. 9.

³⁴ Thus, e.g. in the Polish three-volume anthology of the New Testament apocrypha edited by Marek Starowieyski (*Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, ed. M. STAROWIEYSKI, vol. I–III, Kraków 2001–2007) the *Tale of Martha* is not included, either in the part devoted to apocryphal gospels (where the *Pilate Cycle* belongs) or among the apocryphal stories about the Apostles.

³⁵ Episode I, 5–6: *Now when Jesus entered, and the ensigns were holding the standards, the images on the standards bowed down and worshipped Jesus. And when the Jews saw the behaviour of the standards, how they bowed down and worshipped Jesus, they cried out loudly against the ensigns. But Pilate said to them, 'Do you not marvel how the images bowed and worshipped Jesus?' The Jews said to Pilate, 'We saw how the ensigns lowered them and worshipped him'. And the governor summoned the ensigns and asked them, 'Why did you do this?' They answered, 'We are Greeks and servers of temples: how could we worship him? We held the images; but they bowed down of their own accord and worshipped him.' Then Pilate said to the rulers of the synagogue and the elders of the people, 'Choose strong men to carry the standards, and let us see whether the images bow by themselves.' So the elders of the Jews took twelve strong men and made them carry the standards by sixes, and they stood before the judgement-seat of the governor. And Pilate said to the messenger, 'Take him out of the praetorium*

the imperial palace to tremble, and it is only after Longinus returns without it and its power is confirmed that the emperor accepts Martha's words about Christ as true:

ЕІА ВЪНИДОШЕ ВЪ ПОЛАТОУ КЪ ЦРОУ ТОГА ПОЛАТА ПОТРЕСЕ ВЕЛИКО И РЕЧЕ ЦРЬ СЪН БЕЛЕГЪ ІЮ ЕЖЕ ТВОРИТ СЕ ВЕЛІЕ ЧЮДО. И АВГОУТЬ ВЖАСЕ СЕ ВЕЛИИ. И РЕКОШЕ БОЛАРЕ КЪ ЦРУ. ГИ ЕІА СИХЪ РАДИ ЛЮДІЕ. ТАКО ТВОРЕТ СЕ. ЕЖЕ ПРИДОШЕ Ꙗ ІЕРЛИМА ГЛАТИ Ꙗ ХА РАСПЕТОМЪ. АВГОУ ЦРЬ РЕ ИЗЫДЕТЕ ВЪСІИ ИС ПОЛАТА И ИЗЫДОШЕ. И РЕ ВЪНИДЕТЕ ВЪСІИ ПО ЕДИНОМЪ. ДА ВИДИМІ КОГО РАДИ ТАКО ТРЕТ СЕ ПОЛАТА. ЕІА ХОТЕШЕ ЛОГЫНЪ ВЪНИТИ ТОГА ВЪСТРЕПЕТА ПОЛАТА. И ВЪСІИ ЛЮДІЕ СТРАХОМЪ ꙖДРЪКНИ БЕХОУ. И Ꙗ СТРАДЪ НЕ МОЖАХОУ ЗРЕТЫ НА ЛОГЫНА. ЦРЬ РЕ КЪ ЛОГИНОУ ЧЛЧЕ ЧТО ТАКО ЧТО ЕСИ ТЫ. ЕЖЕ ТЕБЕ РАДИ ХОЩЕМЕ ПОГИБНОУТИ И ꙖВЕШАВЪ ЛОГЫНЪ РЕ ЕМУ. ГНЕ НЪБ МЕНЕ РАДИ НЪ ХА БА МОЕГО РАСПЕТАГО ЕГОЖЕ АЗЪ ПРОБОДЪ НА КРТЪ ВЪ РЕБРА ЕГО. И ИЗЫДЕ КРЪВЪ И ВОДА ТОГА СЛНЦЕ ПОМРЪКНА И КАМЕНІЕ РАСПАДЕ СЕ И ЗДЕ ІЮ ЧЛКЪ ЛАЗАРЪ ЕЖЕ ВЪСКРСЪ Ꙗ ГРОБА. ЧЕТВОРОДНЕВНАГО. ЦРЬ РЕ ДА ВЪ ИСТИНОУ ЛИ ТАКО ЕСТЬ И АЗЪ ДА ВЕРОУЮ НЪ ПОЩО РАДИ ДОМЪ МОИ ТРЕСЕТ СЕ ТАКО. ТЕБЕ РАДИ. ЛИ СТРАХОМЪ ꙖДРЪЖИМИ ЕСМЫ ВЪСІИ. ЛОГЫ РЕ ЕДА РИЗА ЕГО НА МНЕ ІЮ ТОГО РАДИ ТАКО ІЮ. ЦРЬ РЕ ИЗЫДИ ВЪНЬ И СВЪЛЕЦИ Ю СЪ СЕБЪ И ИЗЫДЕ ЛОГЫНЪ И СВЪБЕЧЕ Ю. ЕІА ВЪНИДЕ НЕ БЫ СТРАДЪ НИ ТРЕПЕТЬ.³⁶

Certain similarities to this motif can also be found in the Byzantine and Syriac variants of the legend of king Abgar, in which a “great”³⁷, “wonderful vision”³⁸, seen

and bring him in again in whatever way you wish.’ And Jesus left the praetorium with the messenger. And Pilate summoned those who had previously been carrying the images, and said to them, ‘I have sworn by the salvation of Caesar that, if the standards do not bow down when Jesus enters, I will cut off your heads’ And the governor commanded Jesus to enter in the second time. And the messenger did as before and begged Jesus to walk upon his scarf. He walked upon it and entered. And when he had entered, the standards bowed down again and worshipped Jesus – The Gospel of Nicodemus or Acts of Pilate, [in:] The Apocryphal New Testament..., p. 171–172.

³⁶ When they walked into the emperor's palace, the palace shook powerfully, and the emperor said: “This sign does a remarkable wonder”, and Augustus was filled with great fear. The boyars told the emperor: “Lord, this is happening because of the people who came from Jerusalem to speak about the crucified Christ”. Emperor Augustus said: “Go out of the palace, all of you” – and they went out. And he said: “Come in one by one, all of you, so that we can see because of whom the palace shakes in such a way”. The palace shook at the moment when Longinus was about to enter, and all the people were struck with fear, and out of fright they could not look at Longinus. The emperor said to Longinus: “O human, who are you, so that we would have died because of you?” Answering, Longinus said to him: “Lord, not because of me but of Christ, my crucified God, whom I pierced in the ribs on the cross. And blood and water came out; then, the sun darkened and rocks cracked apart. And here is Lazarus, the man whom he had raised from his grave after four days”. The emperor said: “If it is indeed so, I shall also believe, but for what reason does my house shake in such a way because of you? We are all seized with terror.” Longinus said: “I am wearing His robe, this is why it is so”. The emperor said: “Go out and take it off”, and Longinus went out and took it off. When he went inside, there was no fear or shaking (translated from the *Tale of Martha* as preserved in manuscript NBKM 437; translation into English from the original as well as the author's Polish translation – M.M.).

³⁷ EUSEBIUS, I, 13, p. 93.

³⁸ *The Doctrine of Addai, the Apostle*, trans. G. PHILLIPS, London 1876, p. 6.

only by the ill monarch, appears in the face of apostle Thaddaeus when the latter enters the palace in Edessa.

The juncture, therefore, between the Eastern and Western legends is to be sought at this very stage: Martha's journey to Rome. In the legends known in the West (including the legitimized literary texts of the *Pilate Cycle*), the women travelling to Rome (together or separately) are Mary Magdalene and Veronica, the latter carrying her precious relic attribute: the cloth that bears the image of Christ's face. In the East, conversely, this venturesome and zealous person (though not possessing any relics) is Martha; it is an image which fits perfectly into the practical aspect of her personality known to us from the Gospels³⁹.

In the recent research (mainly of English and American scholars), predominantly such combining the fields of Biblical studies and sociology, the figure of Saint Martha is placed among the group 'loyal to John'. Emphasis is laid on the distinctive kind of her spirituality, committed to the effective organization of the religious community. This, however, comes dangerously close to the symbolic misuse of this character by feminist movements, attempting to turn Martha, one of the three most important women of the *New Testament*, into an almost prototypical efficient administrator and manager⁴⁰.

II. Veronica

From among the three characters under discussion, Saint Veronica is beyond doubt the most familiar and widely known. She is commonly envisaged as the saintly, pious woman who, during the Passion, wiped Jesus' forehead with a cloth, and is regarded as the patron saint of photographers in view of this miracle. This episode, known in the West since the 4th century, developed and spread especially owing to the Franciscan spirituality, finding its way into the Stations of the Cross. The canonical Gospels, though, mention neither her name nor even any such situation taking place: *A large number of people followed him, including women who mourned and wailed for him. Jesus turned and said to them, "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me; weep for yourselves and for your children"* (Luke 23, 27–28).

According to some sources, the woman who wiped Christ's face was called Seraphia. The name Veronica is thus claimed to be a later appellation, originating from the words *vera icon* 'real image', the latter having arisen in this peculiar way⁴¹. Older versions of the account attest the form 'Berenica' or 'Beronica', explaining it as

³⁹ In the Slavic (translation of?) *On the Journey to Rome of Lazarus's Sisters, Martha and Mary*, attributed to John Chrysostom, the sisters, accompanied by Longinus the centurion, speak to emperor Tiberius; cf. *Сказание о приходе в Рим сестер Лазаря, Марфы и Марии*, [in:] И.Я. ПОРФИРЬЕВ, *Апокрифические сказания о новозаветных лицах и событиях по рукописям Соловецкой библиотеки*, Санкт-Петербург 1890, p. 197–204.

⁴⁰ E. MOLTSMANN-WENDEL, *The Women Around Jesus*, London 1982.

⁴¹ U. JANICKA-KRZYWDA, *Patron – atrybut – symbol*, Poznań 1993, p. 84.

Greek for ‘bringing victory’ (φέρω ‘I bring’, νίκη ‘victory’). Some scholars find proof for the influence of the symbolism of blood in this process⁴²: the proper name ‘Prunicos’ or ‘Prunica’ designated – in the teachings of the Valentinian Gnostics – a personification or symbol of Wisdom, flowing from a virgin of the same name. ‘Prunica’ would have been substituted by ‘Beronica’ (along with yet another variant ‘Bernice’), a well-known and fairly popular name at the time⁴³. Thus, the name of the originally anonymous Saint was probably ‘picked’ as a result of the contamination of different stories, whereas deriving it from the words ‘true image’ is a fairly late concept, secondary in comparison with the Early Christian stories (though substantiated by certain themes associated with the figure of the Saint).

Veronica of the Way of the Cross is unknown in the tradition of the Eastern Church, although two saints bearing this name are mentioned in liturgical calendars. The first of them is commemorated on 4(17) October. She is a martyr for the faith; this Veronica, together with her mother Domnina (Domna) and her sister Prosdoco, was halted by the soldiers of emperor Diocletian (305–306) on her way to Edessa and forced to turn back to their native Antioch; fearing disgrace on the side of the pagans, the three women prayed and threw themselves into the river, losing their lives⁴⁴.

Possibly under the influence of their cult the woman who is supposedly the witness of the Passion, but is associated with the protagonist of a different Biblical episode, is at times referred to as a “martyr” in Slavic sources⁴⁵. 12(25) July is the date of the commemoration of Veronica known as ‘just’ and ‘saint’. The sticheron⁴⁶ dedicated to her alludes to Christ’s healing a woman suffering from bleeding, as described by Matthew (9, 18–26), Mark (5, 21–42) and Luke (8, 40–48):

Mark 5, 25–34: And a woman was there who had been subject to bleeding for twelve years. She had suffered a great deal under the care of many doctors and had spent all she had, yet instead of getting better she grew worse. When she heard about Jesus, she came up behind him in the crowd and touched his cloak, because she thought, “If I just touch his clothes, I will be healed.” Immediately her bleeding stopped and she felt in her body that she was freed from her suffering. At once Jesus realized that power had gone out from him. He turned around in the crowd and asked, “Who touched my clothes?” “You see the people crowding against you,” his disciples answered, “and yet you can ask, ‘Who touched me?’” But Jesus kept looking around

⁴² E. KURYLUK, *Weronika i jej chusta. Historia, symbolizm i struktura „prawdziwego” obrazu*, Kraków 1998, p. 14–15.

⁴³ J. NAUMOWICZ, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

⁴⁴ Архиепископ СЕРГИЙ (СПАСКИЙ), *op. cit.*, p. 413; cf. also *Święte niewiasty. Mały leksykon hagiograficzny*, coll. et ed. J. SZARKIEWICZ, Hajnówka 2001, p. 29.

⁴⁵ E.g. in the 16th century prologues from the collection of the Church Historical and Archival Institute of the Bulgarian Patriarchate in Sofia, cat. no. 294 and 285.

⁴⁶ ВЕЩИ ННѢ ИЗВЕДЪШИ МЫСЛЕНЪИ СЛОВЕ. ОКРИЛѦ ТВОЕГО ДРЕВЕЛѦ ТОЧІЮ ВЪСПРІЕМШИ // ВЕЩИ МЫСЛЕНЪИ НШЕЕН И ННѢ СЛОВЕ. Ѡ ОКРИЛѦ ТВОЕГО ДРЕВЕЛѦ ТЪЧІ ВЪСПРІЕМШИ (*once, barely having touched your robe, she, [speaking] in other words, chased away the sensual matters*) – Г. ПЕТКОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 436.

to see who had done it. Then the woman, knowing what had happened to her, came and fell at his feet and, trembling with fear, told him the whole truth. He said to her, "Daughter, your faith has healed you. Go in peace and be freed from your suffering."

This anonymous figure of the woman suffering from bleeding appears in Early Christian Syriac and Greek works (a fact proved *inter alia* by Eusebius' citation in the *Ecclesiastical History*). She is also to be found in pseudo-canonical texts, e.g. in the *Report of Pilate the Governor Concerning Our Lord Jesus Christ, Which Was Sent to Augustus Caesar in Rome*, dating back to the 5th century, the dramatic case of her sickness and healing is incorporated into the prefect of Judaea's account of the great deeds of Christ:

And [there was] a woman also, who had an issue of blood for a long time, and whose veins and arteries were exhausted, and who did not bear a human body, being like one dead and daily speechless, so that all the physicians of the district were unable to cure her. There remained to her not a hope of life, but as Jesus passed by she mysteriously received strength by his shadow falling on her from behind. She touched the hem of his garment and immediately, in that very hour, strength filled her exhausted limbs, and as if she had never suffered anything, she began to run along towards Capernaum, her own city, so that she reached it in a six days' journey.⁴⁷

In a work belonging to the *Pilate Cycle* entitled *The Avenging of the Saviour*, earlier than the 9th century, the suffering woman is also provided with a name. She testifies in front of the imperial emissary, Velosianus: *And there came also the woman named Veronica, and said to him: And I touched in the crowd the fringe of His garment, because for twelve years I had suffered from an issue of blood; and He immediately healed me*⁴⁸. Needless to say, in both these passages a far-reaching influence of the Biblical story can be observed.

The Eastern Christian tradition quickly identified the woman healed by Christ with His follower, defender and possessor of His miraculous image. The seriously ill Tiberius (suffering from leprosy or having a wasp nest inside his head), having heard of Jesus, sent to Jerusalem an envoy (Velosianus) to bring him to Rome⁴⁹. Upon hearing of the crucifixion, however, he ordered Pilate to be arrested and the witnesses of

⁴⁷ *The Report Of Pilate The Governor*, [in:] *The Apocryphal Books of the New Testament: Being All the Gospels and Epistles Attributed to Jesus Christ, His Apostles and Their Companions*, ed. W. HONE, Philadelphia 1901, p. 274.

⁴⁸ Quoted after: *The Avenging of the Saviour*, [in:] *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. VIII, *The Twelve Patriarchs, Excerpts and Epistles, The Clementina, Apocrypha, Decretals, Memoirs of Edessa and Syriac Documents, Remains of the First Ages*, ed. A. ROBERTS, J. DONALDSON, A.C. COXE, New York 1886, p. 474. Those words are also present in Veronica's letter to Herod.

⁴⁹ Once again it is possible to speculate the seeming exchangeability of characters within certain themes and motifs: king Abgar of Edessa also merely heard about Christ and desired to be healed by him.

Christ's miracles (among them, the healing of the woman suffering from bleeding) to be summoned. Having recognized the Teacher as a godly figure, he was healed by looking at the image of His face alone, found on the canvas brought to Rome by Veronica. This story, narrated in various ways in the *Pilate Cycle*, exists in several versions. In some of them the owner of the precious relic decides to travel to Rome on her own; more often, however, she is summoned there to testify against Pilate or for Jesus. The accounts of her further fate vary as well. She may come back to Galilee; sometimes, on the other hand, she stays in Rome (having donated the valuable canvas to pope Clemens), or even acts as a Christian missionary in Western Europe (more specifically, Southern Gaul). According to some of the legends she was accompanied by her husband, the convert Zacchaeus known from the Gospel of Luke (Luke 9, 2–10) – formerly the superintendent of customs, subsequently living the life of a hermit at the mouth of the Gironde (under the name Amadour). Not long thereafter, beginning in the 6th century, similar accounts begin to surface in the West.

Let us, however, return to the episode described by Eusebius: the healed woman erecting a monument for the Saviour. Although she is known to us as Veronica, the Western commentators also gave her the name Martha, presumably as a simplification of the name Mariosa or Marosa, appearing frequently in this context and purportedly originating from an earlier *αἱμορροῦσα* (*haimorrhousa*) 'suffering from bleeding'⁵⁰. In this way, the moniker of a previously anonymous woman became a proper name. Thus, Martha finds her way into Western legends: for instance, Jacobus de Voragine, following the authority of Ambrosius, claims that out of the love for Mary Magdalene Jesus healed her sister from the issue of blood, from which she had been suffering for 7 years⁵¹.

In order to characterise the legendary figure of Veronica the most succinctly, then, one might perhaps venture the hypothesis that she reflects the convergence of two characters, in both of whom traces of Martha's presence can be detected: the ill woman from the Gospel and the woman holding the canvas during the Passion.

The legend of Veronica is, in a way, not original. That is to say, it derives from another text – or perhaps from variants and revisions of a text – containing similar elements. In the case at hand, the source is not particularly difficult to identify⁵². The text in question is the so-called legend of king Abgar – a pagan ruler of Edessa, who, having heard about Christ's miracles, decided to invite him to his city wishing to be healed from a condition from which he had been suffering for a number of years (gout or leprosy). Christ never arrived in Edessa, but he replied to Abgar by letter, blessing him and promising that he would be healed through his power by

⁵⁰ J. NAUMOWICZ, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

⁵¹ *Saint Mary Magdalene...*, p. 376.

⁵² Which task, as it happens, was accomplished over one hundred years ago, cf.: E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende*, Leipzig 1899.

one of the disciples. The legend of Abgar – both in its legitimized versions (liturgical texts) and in the form of prayers or rites for the sick, or, finally, as represented on amulets – is thoroughly familiar to the nations of *Slavia Orthodoxa* (East and South). As per one of the variants of the legend, Luke (the apostle and evangelist) travelled to Edessa after the Ascension, carrying with him an image of Christ, “not of human making”, to the sick Abgar. The latter, upon seeing it, recovered from his illness⁵³. Typologically close versions of the tale of Veronica – supposedly the daughter of Abgar, receiving the miraculous image for her ill father, but at times also a noble lady or even queen, functioned first in the Syriac, then also the Byzantine tradition beginning in the 6th century.

As far as Slavic texts are concerned, the presence of Veronica is not confined to pseudo-canonical works. Her story surfaces in the prologue life for the liturgical commemoration on 12 July, in itself a translation from the Greek and preserving the stage that the legend achieved, in the course of its development, around the 6th century in the East. The text is only attested in late, 16th and 17th-century copies (two of them published⁵⁴) from the Slavic domain. Scholars have pointed to an excerpt of John Malalas’ *Chronicle* as the intermediate source⁵⁵. The prologue mentions a letter sent to Herod by a wealthy citizen of Paneas called Vernice (Veronica). In it, she describes the story of her distress, the bleeding that she had not been able to cure despite spending a fortune on doctors, and finally the Healer – Christ, whose power she had the honour to perceive (all of the above is known from the canonical Gospels, the *Pilate Cycle* as well as the account of Eusebius of Caesarea). The grateful Veronica intends to raise a monument for Christ; consequently, she has to ask for Herod’s consent (this might echo the ancient tradition according to which erecting statues was banned as an improper form of worship, an interpretation mentioned by Eusebius himself). The intrigued king embraces the idea, after which a statue of Christ made of copper “with an admixture of gold and silver” is constructed, sometime later relocated from the centre of Paneas to the temple. This variant of the story deserves closer attention not only in view of its archaic character and consistency with the accounts of Early Christian writers, who comment e.g. on the composition of the alloy used in building the monument⁵⁶. Equally interest-

⁵³ A version of the legend incorporated into the *Tale of the Wood of the Cross* by the Bulgarian priest Jeremiah (10th/11th cent.); Polish translation: *Opowieść o Drzewie Krzyżowym. Słowo i pochwała Mojżesza o splocie drzewa sosny, cedru i cyprysu*, trans. M. SKOWRONEK, [in:] *Apokryfy i legendy starostamentowe Słowian południowych*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, Kraków 2006, p. 187.

⁵⁴ *Легенда о кровоточивой жене, Веронике, поставившей образ Спасителя в Панаеде*, [in:] И.Я. ПОРФИРЬЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 279–281. Cf. *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів...*, p. 362–364.

⁵⁵ *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, 11–12, rec. J. THURN, Berolini et Novi Eboraci 2000 [= CFHB, Series Berolinensis, 35]; *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів...*, p. 364.

⁵⁶ *Bronze with an admixture of gold and silver, since its glitter had the colour of amber; bizarre brightness: this is how the statue was described by Theodosius and Gregory of Tours*, cf. J. NAUMOWICZ,

ing is the very form of the letter and Veronica's first-person account, which corresponds closely with the tradition of numerous pseudo-canonical letters associated with both the miraculous image of Christ (Abgar's letter and Jesus' response) and the correspondence widely represented in the Pilate Cycle (*Anaphora Pilati, Letter of Pilate and Tiberius, Letters of Herod and Pilate*), both as 'independent' texts and incorporated into larger collections.

Tracing the lives of Martha and Veronica (as literary characters), one cannot resist the impression that their stories are strikingly similar to one another. On the one hand we are dealing with a contamination of the two figures, seen in the stories about the cured bleeding, the journey to Rome and testifying the deeds of Christ; on the other hand, it appears that both Saints have different images in the traditions of the Eastern and the Western Church (in the West, the sympathetic Veronica accompanies Christ during the Passion, whereas Martha is a missionary in France). Their stories are intertwined because of related motifs – also background ones, as for instance the healing plant that sprouted at the feet of the statue of Christ in Paneas⁵⁷, and its counterpart from the part of France where Saint Martha is said to have dwelled – the herb which is called the 'dragon's wort' (*artemisia dracunculus sativa* or tarragon; *dracunculus* is Latin for 'little dragon') in commemoration of the Saint's subduing the ferocious creature. The plant is used as a remedy for insomnia, indigestion, menstrual problems and other issues.

III. Longinus

In the Early Christian tradition, the name of Longinus became associated with a character present during the scene of the Crucifixion, anonymous in the canonical Gospels. This is what we learn about him from the Scripture:

Matthew 27, 54: When the centurion and those with him who were guarding Jesus saw the earthquake and all that had happened, they were terrified, and exclaimed, "Surely he was the Son of God!"

Mark 15, 39: And when the centurion, who stood there in front of Jesus, saw how he died, he said, "Surely this man was the Son of God!"

Luke 23, 46–47: Jesus called out with a loud voice, "Father, into your hands I commit my spirit." When he had said this, he breathed his last. The centurion, seeing what had happened, praised God and said, "Surely this was a righteous man."

John 19, 34: ... one of the soldiers pierced Jesus' side with a spear, bringing a sudden flow of blood and water.

op. cit., p. 49.

⁵⁷ [A]t his feet on the monument itself a strange species of herb was growing, which climbed up to the border of the double cloak of brass, and acted as an antidote to all kinds of diseases, quoted after: EUSEBIUS, VII, 18, 3 (vol. II, p. 177).

There is no certainty as to when the soldier/centurion, lacking a name in the canonical Gospels, was provided with one. It can be fairly certainly attributed to a folk etymology based on the Greek word for spear (λόγχη)⁵⁸; it also echoes the attributes of the weapon that the character wielded, and using which he pierced Christ's side (Lat. *longus* 'long'). Irrespective of that, Longinus promptly became a rewarding character for the legend rooted in the testimony of Mark, Matthew and Luke, where he is shown to have confessed faith in the true God immediately after the Crucifixion. The succinctness of John the Evangelist's account proved hardly a constraint for the Christian tradition, which has ascribed to Longinus a beautiful spiritual path: from a (perhaps involuntary) executioner of God to a confessor and martyr. Already Gregory of Nyssa speaks of him as the first evangelist and bishop of Cappadocia, where Longinus is said to have settled after leaving Jerusalem, which proves the existence of the Saint's cult at least as early as in the 4th century⁵⁹.

From among the three characters under discussion, Longinus is the best 'documented' in officially legitimized texts (that is, those used in liturgy)⁶⁰. Namely, we are in the possession of all types of texts needed for celebrating the Saint's liturgical commemoration (at least in the Greek language)⁶¹: two kinds of the prologue life (both 'standalone' and with sticheron), the extended life and the service (Slav. *služba*) – penned by Theophanes the Confessor (8th/9th cent.)⁶². What is more, the author of the life of Longinus is Saint Hesychius – an outstanding commentator of the Scripture, a student of Gregory of Nazianzus (the Theologian) and a presbyter in Jerusalem (died 434 / after 450)⁶³. In his opinion, Longinus was born in a place called Sandralis (or Adrales) near Tyana.

The earliest official text devoted to Longinus, the life (sometimes also referred to as a passion) written by Hesychius, is preserved in as few as six Slavic copies, of which the oldest ones date back to the 14th century⁶⁴. It is a translation of Hesychius

⁵⁸ John 19, 34: ἀλλ' εἰς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγχῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἐνύξεν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εὐθὺς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ, quoted after: *Новый Завет на греческом и русском языках*, ed. А.А. Алексеев, Москва 2002.

⁵⁹ *Letter XVII*, 15, [in:] Gregory of Nyssa, *The Letters*, trans. A.M. SILVAS, Leiden–Boston 2007, p. 166 [= Supplements to VC, 83].

⁶⁰ Cf. the comprehensive study: G. ORSOLA, *San Longino nella tradizione greca e latina di età tardoantica. Analisi, commento delle fonti e contesto agiografico*, Perugia 2008.

⁶¹ The sticheron for the Saint reads as follows: живѣ воу рѣ и пакы хрѣ. лонгѣнъ дрѣвле посѣкаемъ мечемъ. въ ,си. лонгѣнъ мечѣ оудрѣ ("To live in God, that is, in Christ", said Longinus once, and was beheaded with a sword. On the sixteenth [of October] Longinus was killed with a sword"), quoted after: Г. Петков, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

⁶² Архиепископ СЕРГИЙ (СПАСКИЙ), *op. cit.*, p. 429.

⁶³ On Hesychius cf. И.К. ЦОНЕВСКИ, *Патрология. Жизнь, сочинения и учение на церковните Отци, учителя и писатели*, София 1986, p. 358.

⁶⁴ К. ИВАНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 250–251 (16 October). The Byzantine tradition is richer in this respect: the BHG notes three texts (+ variants), no. 988–990; cf. PG, vol. XCIII, col. 1545–1560 and PG, vol. CXV, col. 32–44.

text with chapter 16 omitted. The work is an early and therefore potentially credible testimony of the legends connected with the Saint. Thus, Longinus is held to have been one of the more senior in rank of the Roman soldiers, the commander of the unit that was ordered to guard Christ's tomb. When the Jews offered him money in return for testifying that Christ had not risen from the dead, but his body had been stolen by the disciples, he refused and, accompanied by two fellow soldiers⁶⁵, left Jerusalem for his native Cappadocia. There, he lived in holiness, preaching to pagans⁶⁶. Still, upon learning about Longinus calling Christ the king of nations, Pilate – in cooperation with the emperor (Tiberius) and in order to appease the latter's anger – sent two people with a mission to kill the centurion. Coming across emissaries seeking a certain Longinus, the Saint did not reveal his identity, instead inviting the guests to his house and hosting them for three days – knowing that he is the one searched for, facing punishment by death. Afterwards, he summoned his companions, so that they might die alongside him for the glory of the true God. The envoys initially refused to execute the sentence on their cordial host, but eventually, seized by fear of Pilate, they carried out the order. In return for a sum of money, the governor traded the Martyr's head to the Jews, who threw it away onto a heap of dung. After some time had passed, a blind woman came to Jerusalem with the intention of visiting a number of holy places, aided by her only son, who, however, died unexpectedly on the way. Saint Longinus appeared in the woman's dream, commanding her to find the disgraced head and promising to reward her for the suffering and misery she had gone through. All this indeed happened – after locating the precious relic, the woman regained sight, once again seeing Longinus in her dream, this time with her son in his arms. The latter explained to her that she should bury the holy head together with his body, so that he might enjoy eternal happiness. Having carried out the instructions, the widow experienced yet another vision in her dreams, in which she was assured about her son's felicity “among the prophets”.

The story is remarkable because of an array of ostensibly trivial details. Firstly, Longinus as presented here has scarcely anything in common with Christ's death on the cross: he is but a guard at His tomb, which might point to an attempt on the side of Hesychius to ‘soften’ the image of the executioner of Christ, an endeavour to ‘whitewash’ the Saint's true story (i.e. the one appearing in the canonical Gospels). Secondly, no doubt under the influence of Gregory of Nazianzus, Hesychius makes every effort to depict Longinus as the one who brought Christianity to Cappadocia,

⁶⁵ The soldiers who, having abandoned the service in the Roman army and arrived in Cappadocia along with Longinus, lost their lives and were worshipped as martyrs, are traditionally known as Isaurus and Aphrodisius. They are commemorated on 19 April in the liturgical calendar.

⁶⁶ Similarly in other Western versions of the legends, cf. *Żywot Świętego Longina, żołnierza i męczennika*, [in:] P. SKARGA, *op. cit.* (http://ruda_parafianin.republika.pl/swi/1/longin.htm [20 X 2011]).

comparing him with Thomas the Apostle in India, Peter among the Romans or Paul in the lands ranging from Jerusalem to Illyria. Thirdly, the blind woman arrives in Jerusalem from Cappadocia, thus repeating the path of Longinus, who in this way became a kind of local patron. This was probably meant to corroborate the image of Cappadocia as 'the chosen land', which task Hesychius carried out quite convincingly. Finally, Longinus was ascribed *post mortem* miracles (appearing in the dreams of the woman in need of help, guiding and healing her as well as restoring her sight).

Hesychius opted for this particular kind of disability with a clear aim in mind. There also exists a motif (Greek in origin) of the blindness of Longinus himself; the condition is said to have been cured by the blood and water flowing out of the Saviour's pierced side. This event initiated the spiritual change in Longinus, formerly Cassius. More probably, however, as a soldier of the Roman army, he was not entirely blind, but had poor eyesight or was blind in only one eye. One of his commanders, the one who had already executed Longinus for his refusal to worship idols, descended into insanity and lost his sight until the moment when Longinus interceded for him. Stories on losing and regaining sight would become the *leitmotif* of the character of Longinus, present in virtually every single text devoted to him, including the iconographic ones⁶⁷.

However, the Western tradition (Bollandists) distinguishes between two separate characters, in all likelihood due to the divergent accounts of the Four Gospels as to who pierced Christ's side. The first of them is the soldier (originally) called Cassius, from Isauria, who thrust his spear into the Lord's body and, having adopted the name Longinus, died a martyr's death in Caesarea (in Cappadocia) (the date of the liturgical commemoration varies from church to church: 15 March, 22 November, 2 December). The other is a centurion from Adrales near Tyana (in Cappadocia), who under the Cross admitted that Christ was the Son of God (commemorated on 16 November)⁶⁸. Certain accounts even specify the name of this centurion: Gaius Cassius Longinus, which is in accordance with both traditions⁶⁹. In the version of the story found in the *Legenda Aurea*, Longinus returned to Cappadocia, where he lived for 38 years as a monk (!)⁷⁰. In Italy, there is a widespread legend according to which Longinus, after conversion, brought a lead casket full of earth soaked with the Lord's Blood to Mantua and buried in the place where the Basilica of St. Andrew stands today. Not long after that, he attained martyrdom and was buried in the vicinity of the relics⁷¹. (The murals in the local chapel portray the scene of the Crucifixion with

⁶⁷ J. JAGŁA, *Oko i serce. Apokryficzna postać Longinusa w sztuce średniowiecznej*, [in:] *Biblia Slavorum...*, p. 221–230.

⁶⁸ Архиепископ СЕРГИЙ (СПАСКИЙ), *op. cit.*, p. 428–429.

⁶⁹ http://bibleprobe.com/holy_lance.htm [20 X 2011].

⁷⁰ According to the English translation of the *Legenda Aurea* [in:] www.catholicforum.com/saints/golden174.htm [20 X 2011].

⁷¹ Cf. S. TRAYNOR-MORAWSKA, *Longino soldato Romano di Lanciano*, Lanciano 1999.

Longinus kneeling, collecting Christ's Blood into a chalice). Longinus is commonly regarded as the patron saint of horse riders and trainers⁷².

The oldest Slavic copies of the prologue lives, read during the service (*officium*) on the day of Saint Longinus, come from the 14th century.

The so-called *Lesnovo Prologue*, 1330⁷³

при тивѣрини кесарѣ. бѣше тои ѿ страны
кападокеискыи.

сѣтничь сын съ пилатомъ игемономъ
иудѣискыимъ.

повелѣному бѣ тѣмъ славжити и на
чѣныи стрѣти хѣвы и на распетии.

и емь съ прочими .р. воини стрѣщи гробъ
с квестодиною. иже ѿ чин воинскыи
видѣвъ же на крѣтѣ хѣвѣ.

бывающа чѣса. трѣсь и сланчное
помячение.

и ѿвразниче се гробы въстаниче мртвце.
и каменни распяюще се.

и възпиевъ истинъ снь бѣ ежи сын.

вставъ же свщени его воинство. и свое
страны дошѣдъ. апльскыи проповѣдаше хѣ.
въбѣше же се иудѣи даше злато пилатови.

и написа къ тиверию. он же посла
всѣкнѣти и съ двѣма воинома.
и посла главоу его въ иерѣль таже и
скрыена бѣ въ гнонщи нѣкоемъ.

въ лѣта же послѣднѣта. жена нѣкаа
ѿ кападокеи слѣпа. шѣши въ иерѣль.
ѿ бжтвнаго василана.

The so-called *Przemysl Prologue*, 16th century⁷⁴

логинь сѣтнич стын мчникъ
бѣ при тивѣрини цри ѿ странны кападокѣискыа,

сотническыи дръжа сан и с пилатомъ
въ иерѣль пришѣдъ.

въ вѣрѣма же стрѣти гнѣ повелено емь бысть
пилатом игемоном пославжити въ чѣныа стрѣти
хѣвы при распетии

и съ прочими сто воини стрѣщи гробъ съ
квестодиною, еже естъ чинъ воинныескыи.

видѣвъ же хѣ предавъ ба дхѣ, внегда ввинни
превиша развоинникама голени,

и видѣвъше іса вже змръша, не прѣвиша
голенію его, нж единъ ѿ воин копѣем ребра
его прободе, абѣе изыиде кръвь и вода.

тогда видѣвъ логинь и рече: „въ истинноу
бѣ сѣнь ви сѣни!“ и вѣрова въ хѣ
и встави ввинство и дошѣд своеа страны
іако апль проповѣдаше хѣ.

и увидѣвъше же иудеи и дашъ злато
пилатови, да егда его поговѣит.

и написа таи к тиверию и тои повелѣ
и всѣкнѣти съ двѣма ввинома
и посла главоу его въ иерѣль.

по бжтвеному ѿкрѣвеніѣж вкопашъ
ж иудеи въ гнон нѣкоем.

и по малѣ лѣт нѣкаа жена ѿ
кападокыа слѣпа и идѣ въ иерѣль

⁷² G. LANZI, F. LANZI, *Saints and Their Symbols: Recognizing Saints in Art and in Popular Images*, Collegeville 2004, p. 49.

⁷³ The so-called *Lesnovo Prologue* from 1330, f. 40^v–41, text edition: Станиславов (Лесновски) *пролог от 1330 година*, ed. P. Павлова, В. Желязкова, Велико Търново 1999, p. 58–59.

⁷⁴ The so-called *Przemysl Prologue* from the 16th century, f. 287–288; edition of the text in: *Апокрифи і легенди з українських рукописів...*, p. 366.

И ОБРЪКТЕ ГЛАВЪ ЕГО И АБНІЕ ПРОЗЪК.
ТОГО МАТВЕИИ ХЪ БЕ НШЬ.⁷⁵

И ОБРЪКТЕ ГЛАВЪ СТАГО ЛОГИНА И ПРОЗЪК
И ПРОСЛАВИ ХА БА.⁷⁶

Although in both cases we are dealing with the same literary genre, and – at any rate theoretically – with the same text, far-reaching differences in the treatment of the material are observable. The earlier version appears to be less coherent and more poorly organized – but on the other hand consistent with the synoptic gospels' attitude towards Longinus, 'whitewashing' him to a certain degree by slightly down-playing his role in the Crucifixion.

The prologue preceded by the sticheron largely draws from the type of the simple prologue. In fact, its first part corresponds to the simple prologue without any major modifications; the difference consists in the treatment of the second part, describing the *post mortem* miracles, i.e. the story of the healing of the blind woman. In particular, certain additional details of this episode are brought to light, whereas in the simple prologue the whole story is covered by a single sentence. The account is in full compliance with the life by Hesychius:

After many years a certain woman from Cappadocia, having gone blind in the eyes, came

⁷⁵ [The Saint Martyr Longinus] of the Cappadocian land lived during [the reign of] emperor Tiberius, with Pilate the hegemon of Judaea. By the latter, he was ordered to serve during the holy Passion of Christ as well as the Crucifixion, and to guard the Tomb with another one hundred soldiers (a military unit) on sentry duty. Having seen the wonders happening at Christ's Cross, the earthquake and the eclipse of the sun, graves opening and the dead rising, and rocks cracking apart, he cried: "Truly this was the Son of God". Leaving behind his unit and returning to his native land, he preached Christ like an apostle. Having discovered this, the Jews gave gold to Pilate, and he wrote to Tiberius. The latter ordered him [Longinus] to be beheaded together with two soldiers [who had deserted the army with him]. And he sent his head to Jerusalem, where it was hidden in some pile of dung. During the later years, a certain blind woman from Cappadocia, having come to Jerusalem from Saint Basil, found his head and immediately regained sight owing to his [Longinus'] prayers. (translated into English from the original as well as the author's Polish translation – M.M.).

⁷⁶ Longinus the Centurion, the Holy Martyr from the Cappadocian land, lived during [the reign of] emperor Tiberius. He held the rank of a centurion and came to Jerusalem with Pilate. At the time of the Lord's Passion, he was ordered by hegemon Pilate to serve during the Crucifixion, and to guard the Tomb with another one hundred soldiers (a military unit) on sentry duty. He saw that Christ had already given up the ghost, when the soldiers pierced the criminals' shins, and – seeing Christ already dead – did not pierce His shins, but one of the soldiers pierced His ribs with a spear, and immediately blood and water flowed out. Seeing this, Longinus said: "Indeed this man was the Son of God". And he believed in Christ. And he left behind his unit, and having reached his native land he preached Christ like an apostle. Having discovered this, the Jews gave gold to Pilate, so that he would kill him. And he wrote to Tiberius, and the latter ordered him [Longinus] to be beheaded together with two soldiers [who had deserted the army with him]. And he sent his head to Jerusalem. According to God's will, the Jews buried it in some dung. After some years a certain blind woman from Cappadocia went to Jerusalem and found the head of Saint Longinus, and regained sight, and praised God (translated into English from the original as well as the author's Polish translation – M.M.).

to Jerusalem with her only son, in order to visit the holy places and find rescue for her eyes as well as for the [suddenly] deceased son. In despair, she wailed mournful songs. In a dream, the blessed Longinus appeared to her and told her where his head had been hidden, and ordered her to dig it up and take it, and in this way she should be healed and see her son in glory. Upon this demand, having found the heap of dung and dug up the head with her hands, she took it and returned from blindness to sight. In a dream, she saw her son together with the Saint, receiving honour from him. Having buried her son's body together with the Saint's head, as she had been commanded to do, she went to Cappadocia. As in the parable of Saul, in which he searched for his father's donkeys and received the kingdom [1 Samuel 9, 1–16], thus also she gained healing for her eyes and an ardent helper and advocate [in the Saint]. Having erected a beautiful church there, she placed the Saint's body there, the source of healing for everyone⁷⁷.

Although liturgical practice legitimizes legends, placing them in an official context, Longinus – in view of his participation in the Crucifixion – remains one of the constant characters of pseudo-canonical works dealing with the Passion. In the *Tale of Martha*, mentioned above, he is in fact a prominent figure, as the possessor of Christ's robe showing the Saviour's power and as the one who baptized the emperor, himself being an excellent example of a convert infidel. Significantly, this proves that he has been ascribed not only *post mortem* miracles and appearing to the faithful in revelations, but also curing the sick still during his lifetime – not limited to illnesses related to eyes. Longinus is mentioned abundantly in the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, where he appears not just as a nameless centurion (11, 2), but also as “Longinus the soldier” who “pierced his side with a spear” (16, 7)⁷⁸.

In the *Letter of Pilate to Herod*, dating back to the 5th century, Longinus (alongside Pilate's wife, Procla) is the primary witness of Christ meeting His disciples after the Resurrection:

And now when Procla my wife heard that Jesus was risen, and had been seen in Galilee, she took with her Longinus the centurion and the twelve soldiers who watched the tomb, and went forth, as it were to a great sight, to welcome the person of the Messiah. And she saw him along with his disciples. And whilst they were standing in astonishment looking upon him, he looked upon them and said to them: “What is it? Do ye believe on me? Know, Procla, that in the testament which God gave to the fathers, it is said, that every body which had perished, should live by means of my death, which ye have seen.”⁷⁹

It is not only the Saint himself who became the subject of Christian leg-

⁷⁷ Prologue from the collection of the Library of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, cat. no. 74, f. 79^v–80^r (translated into English from the original as well as the author's Polish translation – M.M.).

⁷⁸ *The Gospel of Nicodemus or Acts of Pilate*, [in:] *The Apocryphal New Testament...*, p. 184.

⁷⁹ *The Letter of Pilate to Herod*, [in:] *Apocrypha Anecdota. Second Series*, ed. M.R. JAMES, Cambridge 1897, p. 71–72.

ends. The tool which he used during the Passion, known as the Spear (or Lance) of Longinus or the Spear of Destiny, was an object desired by numerous rulers, even beyond the Christian world⁸⁰. Longinus has also been considered by some to be the one who collected the Blood flowing from Christ's pierced side into a vessel during the Crucifixion, thus linking the Saint with the legends about the Holy Grail⁸¹.

* * *

Needless to say, the group which was above conventionally described as the 'first witnesses' could easily be expanded. In the light of canonical and pseudo-canonical, apocryphal or even historical texts, further figures that demonstrated strong attachment to Jesus and His teachings might be added to it: Joseph of Arimathea, Nicodemus and Gamaliel (e.g. in the *Gospel of Nicodemus*), or the ruler of Edessa, Abgar, whom we have mentioned a number of times already – a historical figure, 'manipulated' in a way within the pseudo-canonical tradition. Taking into consideration certain other texts, even Pontius Pilate as well as his wife, called Claudia Procula (or Procula/Procla), worshipped as a saint in the Ethiopian church, could be considered as candidates. Obviously, all those characters appear in a context much wider than the preserved Slavic texts: namely, in Byzantine, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Coptic and also Latin sources.

As far as the number of texts is concerned, the Slavic tradition cannot match the incomparably more abundant Byzantine or Latin ones. Still, even within this area certain variation in the texts can be observed, which demonstrates that the Slavic tradition also sought its own mode of expression, though at a later time.

Even so, the characters (also in a literary sense) of Martha, Veronica and Longinus, examined against the background of the monuments of Christian literature, enable us to formulate a number of arguments concerning the cult of the saints in general.

Firstly, they illustrate the problematic point of the 'recognizability' in the worship of the saints, indicating the relations between saints bearing the same name. The 'Biblical' Veronica, known from the legend about the healed woman, is at times referred to as a 'martyr' – no doubt owing to the influence of the cult of another saint by the same name, indeed a martyr. (The fact that both of them are connected with

⁸⁰ The history of this relic has been described in detail in: M. HESEMANN, *Die stummen Zeugen von Golgatha: die faszinierende Geschichte der Passionsreliquien Christi*, München 2000. Cf. also e.g.: A. BAKER, *Invisible Eagle. The History of Nazi Occultism*, London 2000, p. 84–94 (chapter 5: *Talisman of Conquest. The Spear of Longinus*).

⁸¹ As regards the abundant literature devoted to the identifications of the Holy Grail, cf. a number of studies that connect its story with the character of St. Longinus: C. KRÖNER, *Die Longinuslegende, ihre Entstehung und Ausbreitung in der französischen Literatur*, Münster 1899; R. PEEBLES, *The Legend of Longinus in Ecclesiastical Tradition and in English Literature and its Connection with the Grail*, Baltimore 1911 [= Bryn Mawr College Monographs, 9]; J.R. DONER, *The Knight, the Centurion, and the Lance*, Neo 77, 1993, p. 19–29.

the same place – Edessa – cannot have facilitated distinguishing between the two). The situation is quite similar as far as Martha and Mary from Bethany are concerned: conceivably, the two are called martyrs due to the interpolation of the sisters called Martha and Mary who were beheaded with a sword. Through the attempts to differentiate between certain characteristics of the ‘soldier’ or ‘centurion’ known from the Gospels, the ‘dual’ figure of Longinus was constructed (the soldier of 15 March and the centurion of 16 October). The occurrence of part of the contaminations of this sort may be ascribed to the lack of clarity in the Biblical text (as in the case of Longinus), while others can be explained as the result of the impact exerted by certain motifs and the replacement of certain lesser-known characters (such as the martyr from Edessa/Antioch) by those more ‘consolidated’ in general awareness (the ‘Biblical’, healed Veronica).

Secondly, the genres of pseudo-canonical texts in which those characters appear seem to be inferior in no respects to the same genres known from the Biblical hypertext. Legends or ‘tales’ tend sometimes to quite successfully imitate the accounts of the fates of the Apostles (the voyages of Martha and Veronica, the teaching of Longinus), recalling the *acta* or *gesta*. The letters also pattern themselves after the canonical model of the genre, encompassing a range of topics much wider than mere caution or worry, and displaying the (often intricate) relations between the sender and the addressee while depicting the same situation from several perspectives.

Thirdly, it becomes apparent how texts which – perhaps merely seemingly, at first glance – are supposed to recount the lives of saints in fact serve purposes that are not that saintly at all. This is especially visible in the Western adaptations of motifs of Eastern origin: the depiction of Veronica, Mary Magdalene and Martha or Longinus stay in Gaul or northern Italy is to aid the cause of ‘ennobling’ or even ‘archaizing’ the history of the local Christianity.

Finally, maybe even more significant and interesting than the fate of the three *New Testament* (and simultaneously ‘pseudo-canonical’) characters are the literary/cultural planes on which they come to meet: the *Tale of Martha*, the *Gospel of Nicodemus* or the story about the woman from Edessa/Paneas healed from the issue of blood. It turns out that the legends are inspired by the canonical text (fragmentary in many respects) on the one hand, while on the other hand they themselves infiltrate official texts – they become officially sanctioned as soon as their popularity (in a good sense) is taken over and adopted by liturgical practice. It should be borne in mind that those legends – part of which is known both in Eastern and in Western Christianity – confirm one further crucial characteristic of texts constituting the canonical and pseudo-canonical tradition: the commonness of themes and motifs which can without exaggeration be called ‘wandering’. They determine the fact that there is hardly any originality in the formation of the characters of patron saints; moreover, on the level of creating the notion of sainthood and its reception, there seem to be far more

common points than differences between both of the Early Christian traditions – the East and the West.

Abstract. The epithet ‘first witnesses’, conferred on the three saints in the title, is but a conventional designation; it seems fitting as common for the figures of saints, who gave proof of their devotion to Christ. Otherwise, although they make no simultaneous appearance in any of the canonical texts, there are – interestingly – far more interconnections between the three characters in pseudo-canonical and legendary literature than could be surmised from the lack thereof in the Bible.

The aim of the paper is to present a literary picture of three *New Testament* heroes, as commemorated in different literary texts representing diverse cultural registers, even from the Ancient Christian Times until the close of the Middle Ages. Among them there are short and extended lives and passions of saints, liturgical poetry, as well as specific, more popular texts, such as ‘tales’ and legends. The material under discussion largely includes texts that form a part of the Slavic Orthodox tradition, depicting them on the background of fairly well-known works belonging to the Western Christian tradition.

It turns out that the legends are inspired by the canonical text on the one hand, while on the other hand they themselves infiltrate official texts – they become officially sanctioned as soon as their popularity is taken over and adopted by liturgical practice. It should be borne in mind that those legends – part of which is known both in the Eastern and in the Western Christianity – confirm one further crucial characteristic of texts constituting the canonical and pseudo-canonical tradition: the commonness of themes and motifs which can without exaggeration be called ‘wandering’. They determine the fact that there is hardly any originality in the formation of the characters of patron saints; moreover, on the level of creating the notion of sainthood and its reception, there seem to be far more common points than differences between both of the Early Christian traditions – the East and the West.

The paper is an attempt to point out how the Christian tradition exemplifies various manifestations of holiness, what means it has for annotating, elucidating and embellishing the Biblical hypertext, and how it adapts pseudo-canonical legends for the purposes of liturgical use.

Translated by Marek Majer

Małgorzata Skowronek
Zakład Paleoslawistyki i Kultury Ludowej
Katedra Sławistyki Południowej Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego
ul. Lipowa 81
90–568 Łódź, Polska
skowronek.malgo@gmail.com

Teresa Wolińska (Łódź)

CONSTANTINOPOLITAN CHARIOTEERS AND THEIR SUPPORTERS

So engrossed were they in the wild passion that the entire city was filled with their voices and wild screaming. (...) Some perched higher behaving indecorously, others located in the market shouted at the horsemen, applauded them and screamed more than others.¹

The above characteristics of the Byzantine supporters, recorded in the fourth century by the bishop of Constantinople, John Chrysostom, could as well, after minor adjustments, be applied to describe today's football fans. Support in sport is certainly one of the oldest human passions. It is only the disciplines captivating audiences that change.

In the ancient Roman Empire, bloody spectacles had the same role as today's world league games – gladiatorial combat and fights with wild animals². However, they were incompatible with Christian morality, and as such, they were gradually eliminated as the Christianization progressed³. Their place was taken by hippodrome racing, particularly chariot racing.

Residents of the imperial capital cheered the chariot drivers, whose colourful outfits signaled their membership in a particular circus faction. In the empire, there were four factions (*demes*), named after the colours of their outfits worn by runners and drivers representing them, the Blues, Greens, Whites and Reds⁴. Each faction had

¹ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMOS, *Homilia adversus eos qui ecclesia relicta ad circenses ludos et theatra transfugerunt*, 1, [in:] PG, vol. LVI, col. 263.

² H.G. SARADI, *The Byzantine City in the Sixth Century. Literary Images and Historical Reality*, Athens 2006, p. 306. Constantine ordered that convicts be sentenced to work in the mines, rather than forced to be gladiators (*Codex Theodosianus*, XV, 12, 1, [in:] *Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges novellae ad theodosianum pertinentes*, rec. T. MOMMSEN, P. MEYER, Berlin 1971 [cetera: *CTh*]).

³ During the reign of Maurice rebels were still sentenced to death by being torn apart by animals, but the emperor pardoned the convicts (THEOPHYLACT SIMOCATTA, *Historia*, III, 8, 6–8, ed. C. DE BOOR, reed. P. WIRTH, Stuttgart 1972 [cetera: THEOPHYLACT]).

⁴ PROCOPIUS, *The Anecdota or Secret History*, VII, 1, ed. et trans. H.B. DEWING, London 1935

their own racing team. It was their rivalry that aroused such a great passion among the supporters in Constantinople that a modern scholar, N. Baynes, did not hesitate to write that Byzantine society had two heroes, i.e. *the winner in the chariot race and the ascetic saint*⁵.

For Constantinople, the division into ‘colours’ was evidenced for the first time in 380, in the homily of Gregory Nazianzen⁶. In the capital of the empire, the first two factions played the leading role: the Blues and the Greens. Throughout history, lasting alliances were formed between the demes. The Blues collaborated with Whites, and Greens with Reds.

The races took place at the hippodrome – a building resembling in shape and dimensions a modern stadium, located in the city center, near the imperial palace. The Constantinople hippodrome was designed on the model of the Roman *Circus Maximus*. It was shaped like a very elongated horseshoe or a letter U surrounded by a high wall. The northern end was rounded – it was the *sphendone* (ring). It is the only part of the hippodrome visible today⁷. At the south side, there were 12 boxes closed off with barriers (*carceres*, *kankélla*, *thýrai*), from which chariots started their run⁸. Through the center of the hippodrome ran a *spina*, a slightly sloped stone barrier that separated the track where chariot races were held⁹. Racers circled it, just as today runners circle the football field. At either end of the *spina*, there were cylindrical columns called *metae*¹⁰, around which chariots turned back. Thus, they were not the finish lines in the modern sense of the word.

Thanks to the preservation of *sphendone*, it is possible to calculate the width of the building. At the beginning of the arch it was about 120 meters¹¹, with the length of the track amounting to about 82 meters¹². It is not possible to determine the length of the hippodrome, though, as it was not possible to find the starting boxes. It is estimated at 370–450 meters¹³. Also, the width of the auditorium can be determined only approximately, because the stands did not survive. It could be 21.5 m on the

[cetera: PROCOPIUS, *Anecdota*].

⁵ N.H. BAYNES, *The Byzantine Empire*, Princeton–London 1925, p. 33.

⁶ GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS, *Oratio* 37, 18, [in:] PG, vol. XXXVI, col. 301–304; G. DAGRON, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris 1974, p. 350.

⁷ Today, archaeological works are conducted there (in a limited scope).

⁸ J. KOSTENEC, A.T. ÖNER, *Walking thru Byzantium. Great Palace Region*, ²Istanbul 2008, p. 20.

⁹ New research has shown that it could consist of a series of rectangular containers filled with water.

¹⁰ On top of each of them another three conical pillars were placed (G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 323).

¹¹ Depending on the measurement, it is quoted as 117.5 or 123.5 m (*ibidem*, p. 328).

¹² G. DAGRON estimates the length of the arena as 79.50–83.25 m.

¹³ G. DAGRON (*op. cit.*, p. 328) cautiously estimates it as 400–480 m. R. GUILLAND (*Études sur l'Hippodrome: les dimensions de l'Hippodrome*, Bsl 31, 1970, p. 1–11) divides these measurements into following sections: 145 m from *carceres* to the Blues' *meta* + 105 m from the Blues' *meta* to the Greens' *meta* + 100 m the Greens' *meta* to the *sphendone* wall + 20 m of the auditorium.

east and 22.5 on the west side of the hippodrome¹⁴. Places for spectators were on the three sides of the object, probably at an angle of about 26 degrees. It is assumed that there were 30–40 rows of seats. It is certain that at least some seats were lined with marble¹⁵. The number of spectators which the hippodrome could accommodate is estimated to be from 30 to even 100 thousand. In addition to the seats, there were probably also standing places in the aisles.

For the imperial couple, a special box (*káthisma*) was reserved in the eastern part of the building, on the first floor. At the emperors' side, their family members and senators watched the spectacle, along with high officials and dignitaries of state¹⁶. Rulers of foreign countries and their deputies staying in Constantinople were invited to the imperial box¹⁷. Places below were reserved for highest dignitaries and lay officials. The wives of dignitaries, ladies-in-waiting and eunuchs from the palace could watch the games from a darkened box on the second floor, invisible to the rest of the audience. Imperial guard soldiers sat probably not far from the imperial *káthisma*¹⁸. Places a bit to the side were occupied by representatives of lower aristocracy, while the opposite side of the hippodrome – supporters grouped in factions. The latter were positioned so that the Blues sat slightly to the right of the emperor (at the beginning of the spina), next to them set the Whites, then Reds and Greens at the end¹⁹.

Since visibility from the *sphendône* was not the best, places there were occupied by representatives of lower social classes²⁰. Their compensation was the opportunity to watch accidents which often happened to drivers there, and on other occasions – executions which were carried out in this place²¹. The spectacle was watched from the outside of the stands by people connected professionally with the hippodrome – drivers, messengers, track guards and, as we would say today, law enforcement officers and other personnel²².

Admission to the hippodrome was open and free of charge, although it is pos-

¹⁴ G. DAGRON, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

¹⁵ J. KOSTENEC, A.T. ÖNER, *op. cit.*, p. 47. Some of them were found in the area of the Blue Mosque.

¹⁶ R. GUILLAND, *Études sur l'Hippodrome de Byzance*, III, *Rôle de l'empereur et des divers fonctionnaires avant et pendant les courses*, Bsl 26, 1965, p. 2, 5–6.

¹⁷ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, III, p. 6.

¹⁸ Initially, during the reign of Theodosius the Great, the Imperial Guard soldiers occupied seats in front of the imperial box and slightly to the left. Theodosius II gave them to the Greens. Then, soldiers sat in the vicinity of the Blues. Then again they changed place, perhaps for security reasons (*ibidem*, p. 7).

¹⁹ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, I, *Le palais du Kathisma*, Bsl 18, 1957, p. 47–49; IDEM, *Études...*, III, p. 6. That was the case from Theodosius II.

²⁰ J. KOSTENEC, A.T. ÖNER, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

²¹ *L. cit.*

²² R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, III, p. 6.

sible that if the place could not accommodate all those interested, special tokens or tickets were distributed²³.

For the race to take place, each time the consent of the ruler was necessary²⁴. The emperor could decide on his own initiative or in response to a request from the factions²⁵. Residents of the capital were informed about the decision by a flag hanging on the top of the hippodrome, on the quadriga tower, which rose above the starting boxes²⁶. Until the last moment, the Emperor could revoke the permission. This happened relatively rarely and some special circumstances had to occur to deprive the residents of the capital of their favorite entertainment. In 583, Maurice had to cancel the races due to an earthquake²⁷.

The importance of races is evidenced by the fact that the preparation was personally supervised by the city prefect, and in the relations with the factions the emperor was represented by the chamberlain of the sacred bedchamber (*praepositus sacri cubiculi*)²⁸. The latter managed the Hippodrome staff, among whom were law enforcement officers, messengers, inspectors, guards of the urn for drawing lots, combinographers (their job was writing down the program of the races and the settings in different runs), grooms, those responsible for setting and lowering starting barriers and the maintenance of track and many others²⁹. *Praepositus* made decisions on behalf of the ruler if any contentious issues arose and communicated his will during the competition. It was through him that the emperor instructed to display the flag, signaling that the race is to be held.

A special role of the emperor in the hippodrome is confirmed by the images placed on the base of the obelisk of Tuthmosis III, which show Theodosius I the Great seated in the imperial box at the hippodrome, with a wreath in his hand³⁰. During the

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 6–7.

²⁴ It could be given in writing or orally (*ibidem*, p. 1).

²⁵ The latter ones were usually arranged (IDEM, *Études...*, IV, *Les courses de l'Hippodrome*, Bsl 26, 1965, p. 18). Rodolphe GUILLAND (*Études...*, V, *Les courses de l'Hippodrome*, Bsl 27, 1966, p. 36) assumes that each of them annually received permission to organize a certain number of races.

²⁶ IDEM, *Études...*, III, p. 2. More on the subject of preparation for the race, cf. G. DAGRON, *L'organisation et le déroulement des courses d'après le Livre de Cérémonies*, TM 13, 2000, p. 147–155.

²⁷ THEOPHYLACT, p. 58; *Theophanis Chronographia*, AM 6075, p. 252, 29–31, rec. C. DE BOOR, Lipsiae 1883 [cetera: THEOPHANES]; GEORGIUS CEDRENIUS, IOANNES SCYLITZES, *Opere*, vol. I, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1838–1839, p. 691 [cetera: CEDRENIUS].

²⁸ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, III, p. 1–3; IDEM, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines*, vol. I, Berlin–Amsterdam 1967, p. 345.

²⁹ IDEM, *Études...*, III, p. 3–5. They are all mentioned in the *Book of Ceremonies*. Cf. *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*, I, 55; I, 69; I, 72, rec. I.I. REISKE, vol. I, Bonnae 1829 [cetera: *De cerimoniis*]. Issues concerning the personnel working at the hippodrome have been recently discussed by G. DAGRON (*L'organisation...*, p. 134–139), however, he is interested in the later period (9th and 10th centuries).

³⁰ J. GEYSEN, *Presentation of Victory on the Theodosian Obelisc Base*, B 68, 1998, p. 49–50.

race, the ruler served as the honorary head and sometimes an arbitrator settling disputes³¹. Throwing a crimson scarf (*mappa*) gave the signal to start the competition³². Through his *mandator*, he crowned the winners. Sometimes he did so in person³³, as had emperor Gallus, personally decorating driver Thorax³⁴. The ruler also granted his consent to promote a driver to a higher category, as well as award the winner with a golden bull (*chrysobulla*) and the right of the lap of honor³⁵.

Organizing the competition along with all the accompanying events has been an essential task of factions (*demes*), sometimes called circus factions. These factions were real sports associations, which can be compared to modern clubs³⁶. They had significant financial resources at their disposal. They paid for and supported a number of drivers, runners, trainers of horses and wild animals, mimes, dancers, acrobats, poets, musicians and singers. They cared for their recruitment and training. They also employed caretakers, messengers, artisans of various specialties, grooms, etc.³⁷ Organizing shows to fill time between individual races, factions cooperated with a special official³⁸.

In the fight for the victor's palm four chariots participated, representing the above-mentioned factions. Chariots started from the boxes, with the start line shaped like an arch – the chariot closest to the spina was further away than the one at the edge³⁹. The chariots circled the stadium seven times anti-clockwise⁴⁰. Finish line was probably on the western line, opposite the imperial box.

Drivers used chariots whose construction has changed little since ancient times, when they were used in a war. A chariot was small in size, with the wheel axle set low. It consisted of a booth with three sides and an open rear platform. In the past, the number of horses harnessed to the chariot would sometimes vary, but in the Byzantine

³¹ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, III, p. 2.

³² G. DAGRON, *From the mappa to the akakia: Symbolic Drift*, [in:] *From Rome to Constantinople. Studies in Honour of A. Cameron*, ed. H. AMIRAV, B. TER HAAR ROMENY, Leuven–Paris 2007, p. 203–204; F. KOLB, *Ideal późnoantycznego władcy. Ideologia i autoprezentacja*, trans. A. GIERLIŃSKA, Poznań 2008, p. 250. The former emphasized, however, that due to the vastness of the hippodrome, the emperor signaled with a nod of his head to the official (*mapparior*) who lifted the *mappa*, while his colleague gave the signal to persons opening the carceres (p. 204).

³³ *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, XV, 6, rec. J. THURN, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 2000 [cetera: MALALAS].

³⁴ AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, *Römische Geschichte*, XIV, 11, 12, ed. W. SEYFARTH, vol. I, Berlin 1988 [cetera: AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS]; R. GUILLAND, *Études sur l'Hippodrome de Byzance*, II/1, *À propos du chapitre 69 du Livre de Cérémonies. Les courses à Byzance*, Bsl 23, 1962, p. 203.

³⁵ *De cerimoniis*, I, 69, vol. I, p. 327–329; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, III, p. 2–3.

³⁶ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 206.

³⁷ IDEM, *Études sur l'Hippodrome de Byzance*, IX, *Les Factions au X siècle: leur organisation*, Bsl 30, 1969, p. 6.

³⁸ IDEM, *Études...*, IX, p. 2.

³⁹ J. Kostenec, A.T. Öner, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁴⁰ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, I, p. 45.

Empire exclusively quadrigae participated in races. The driver had to control four horses running along a track similar in shape to a very elongated ellipse. The horses were harnessed in lines: two to the drawbar of the car and two next to them, by the sides.

The driver's affiliation with a faction was marked by a band worn over his shoulder. Also other persons connected with the hippodrome wore the attire of the factions⁴¹. Leaders of demes (demarchs) wore short tunics in appropriate colours and chlamys⁴². Their colours were used in animal harnesses, an expression of which were plumes on the heads of horses.

Competition usually lasted one day, but sometimes it could be extended to several days⁴³. While mostly about 8 races took place in one day, their number could reach 24–25 races⁴⁴, usually in two series: in the morning and in the afternoon⁴⁵. At the beginning, a trial race was always held⁴⁶.

Fighting for victory meant that competitors did not always play fair. We read about attempts to use magical means, but also doping, to ensure the success of one's charioteer⁴⁷. To prevent abuse, the authorities tried to maintain equal conditions for all competitors. They were both people appointed by both factions, as well as imperial officials who were responsible for this. Chariots and horses were carefully selected (each had a fixed place in the team, where it would run continuously). The skills of the horse running on the left side were regarded as particularly important because efficient performance on the curves largely depended on it⁴⁸. Proper functioning of

⁴¹ The symbol of their power was a staff. They also carried writing tools (IDEM, *Études sur l'Hippodrome de Byzance*, II/2, À propos du chapitre 69 du «Livre de Cérémonies». *Les courses*, Bsl 25, 1964, p. 243). Leaders of demes (demarchs) wore short tunics in appropriate colours and chlamys (*De cerimoniis*, I, 17, p. 106; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 210).

⁴² *De cerimoniis*, I, 17, p. 106; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 210.

⁴³ We owe the description of competitions held on fixed dates to Constantine VII (*De cerimoniis*, I, 69, p. 310–340). Cf. also G. DAGRON, *L'organisation...*, p. 158–170.

⁴⁴ H.G. SARADI (*op. cit.*, p. 298) mentions up to 50 races possible, although in this case the competition was probably held over the period of several days. During the Nika rebellion, after the 32nd race, the factions appealed to the emperor for grace for their members (PROCOPIUS, *History of the Wars*, II, 11, 31–35; II, 14, 1–2, ed. et trans. H.B. DEWING, vol. I, London 1914 [cetera: PROCOPIUS, *Wars*]; IOANNES EPHEINUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica pars tertia*, VI, 6, rec. E.W. BROOKS, Lovanii 1936 [cetera: IOANNES EPHEINUS]).

⁴⁵ This is proven by the inscription (Leontius' epigram) found between the hippodrome and the baths of Zeuxippos (*Anthologia Graeca*, IX, 650), and Malalas' testimony that after the 22nd race, the factions presented their demands to the emperor Justinian in 532 (MALALAS, XVIII, 71). Cf. H.G. SARADI, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

⁴⁶ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/2, s. 239.

⁴⁷ *CTh*, IX, 16, 11; A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius the Charioteer*, Oxford 1973, p. 173, an. 3, p. 245; IDEM, *Circus Factions. Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*, Oxford 1976, p. 345; H.G. SARADI, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

⁴⁸ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/2, p. 237. Particularly valued were horses of Spanish blood, which were not allowed to be sold even if because of age and a large number of runs they were no longer suitable for work in the hippodrome (*CTh*, XV, 10, 1).

starting boxes (*carceres*) was examined as well as that of the barriers that divided them from the arena. In the interest of justice particular care was taken to allow the quadrigae simultaneous take-off, which was all the more important since the barriers were opened manually. This task was given to the officials subordinated to the *praepositus*, and thus those representing the emperor, autonomous from the factions⁴⁹. The health of horses was also monitored and starting positions were drawn⁵⁰. Frequently, this was done the day before the race. The draw ceremony took place either in the arena, or in the court building, and its participants were both the representatives of all factions, as well as government officials⁵¹. Not everything, however, depended on fate. If four races were held, in each race a different faction had the best starting place – the draw just decided in which one⁵².

In order to make the event more varied, different types of races were held. Most popular were, of course, those in which each faction had its charioteer, chariot and horses. Sometimes, however, they would exchange chariots (then the driver of the Greens was driving a horse owned by the Blues, the Whites' driver drove the Reds' one and vice versa), or placed teams in which each faction would give one horse for each of the four quadrigae⁵³. In the latter case, teams were drawn and it was here that the driver could prove his skill. The rules of the substitution of a driver who would suddenly fall ill were determined in detail, as well as the rules of rewarding his replacement⁵⁴. For the latter it was a chance to show his skills.

The passion for supporting the drivers was common for all groups and social classes. The hippodrome was visited by the representatives of the aristocracy, artisans and the poor of the city alike. It was said that Antiochus and Xenophon, two wealthy residents of the capital, agreed to sell their homes to the emperor Justinian for an unfavorable price. The first one did so out of fear that if were to be imprisoned, he would not be able to watch the races, the second – on the condition that before the race four drivers would give him a bow in the arena such the one given to the emperor⁵⁵. People of lower social standing discussing for hours the merits of horses and drivers were de-

⁴⁹ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/2, p. 239.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 234 and 249. The most valuable were two tracks closest to the spina. When a horse appeared to be unable to race, it could be replaced with another according to applicable rules. More on this subject see *ibidem*, p. 249.

⁵¹ *De cerimoniis*, I, 69, 312–313; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/2, p. 242; IDEM, *Études...*, III, p. 4.

⁵² IDEM, *Études...*, II/2, p. 246.

⁵³ More on the rules of such races, cf. IDEM, *Études...*, II/1, p. 222–223; IDEM, *Études...*, II/2, p. 236.

⁵⁴ IDEM, *Études...*, II/2, p. 250.

⁵⁵ *Peri tés hagías Sofías*, 4–5, [in:] *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. T. PREGER, vol. I, Lipsiae 1901, p. 78–81). Leo the Deacon called the Byzantines lovers of spectacles (*Leonis Diaconi Caloënsis Historiae libri decem*, IV, 5, ed. C.B. HASE, Bonnae 1828, p. 61 [cetera: LEO DIACONUS]). More on the subject of “hippomania” of the Byzantines, cf. R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 203–205.

scribed by Ammianus Marcellinus⁵⁶. Officials taking positions in a new place, in order to win favor, would take horses and drivers from the area which they had previously managed to the new office, before such practices were legally prohibited⁵⁷.

The popularity of racing is also reflected in the comparisons used by writers referring to the world of the hippodrome. For example, George of Pisidia, in his *Heraclias*, compared Heraclius's victory over Khosrau to a victory in a race⁵⁸. Similar phrases are particularly frequent in the works of Christian moralists. John Chrysostom speaks about the prophets as drivers of truth, the Apostles – as the horses of God, the Church – as a spiritual hippodrome, etc.⁵⁹ The above figures of speech are all the more remarkable that the clergy were forbidden to appear in the hippodrome⁶⁰. Often repeated prohibitions may, however, prove that also for its representatives it was a great temptation⁶¹.

Also, self-respecting women should avoid this place. Justinian acknowledged the presence of married women in the hippodrome as a reason for a divorce⁶², which, however, indirectly indicates that there were ladies ready to risk their reputation. The exception was the empress, who used to accompany her spouse in his box. Aristocratic ladies could watch games from a covered box on the second floor of the Kathisma Palace. Among the spectators, there were ladies of questionable repute⁶³. They were also featured in the performances, usually highly frivolous, presented to the spectators in the intervals between individual races.

Expectations of subjects meant that emperors put great emphasis on the organization of shows and they were actively engaged in them themselves. They were always present in the hippodrome during the competition. Some, for example Michael III and Theophilus, demonstrated great interest in races⁶⁴. This first even appeared

⁵⁶ AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, XIV, 6, 25. The cited passage refers to Rome but the case was similar in Constantinople.

⁵⁷ *CTh*, XV, 5, 3.

⁵⁸ GEORGIUS PISIDES, *Heraclias*, I, 201–220, ed. A. PERTUSI, [in:] *Giorgio di Pisidia Poemi, Panegirici epici*, Ettal 1960.

⁵⁹ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMOS, *Oratio de circo*, [in] *PG*, vol. LIX, col. 567–570; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 205; H.W. HAUSSIG, *Historia kultury bizantyńskiej*, trans. T. ZABŁUDOWSKI, Warszawa 1980, p. 155–156.

⁶⁰ They were forbidden to do so by the patriarch Epiphanius (520–535), while Justinian included the prohibition in his code (*Codex Justinianus*, I, 4, 34, ed. P. KRÜGER, Berolini 1900 [cetera: CJ]).

⁶¹ The above-mentioned prohibition states that men of Church are forbidden to appear in the hippodrome even in disguise. R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, III, p. 8. Patriarch Theophylact (X w.) was a fan of races (CEDRENIUS, II, 332; *Ioannis Zonarae Epitome historiarum libri XIII–XVIII*, XVI, 26, vol. III, rec. T. BÜTTNER-WOBST, Bonnae 1897 [cetera: ZONARAS]), but there is no evidence that he frequented the hippodrome.

⁶² CJ, *Novellae*, CXVII, 8, 6 (it also applied to going to theatre).

⁶³ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, III, p. 6.

⁶⁴ P. KARLIN-HAYTER, *Imperial Charioteers seen by the Senat or by the Plebs*, B 57, 1987, p. 326–335.

in the arena himself, which was not necessarily accepted by his subjects. Of course, not everyone went to the hippodrome with equal eagerness. For some, it was a chore. However, it was a duty they had to do perform because subjects expected that rulers would share their passion and show no contempt for their preferred entertainment. Common emotions supporting a favorite charioteer gave a sense of community, intimacy, of an immediate – even if from the height of the imperial lodge – contact between the ruler and his people.

Byzantine supporters, like their modern counterparts, had their idols. The object of their worship, and at the same time the elite among those working on the hippodrome, were charioteers (*heniochoí, aurigae*). Driving a chariot was not a safe occupation and being a driver required unique skills. Chariots were light carts, maintaining the stability thanks to the weight of the driver. Often, there accidents and falls would occur, sometimes with tragic consequences, as exemplified by the coachman Julianicus, who died during a race⁶⁵.

Training drivers took a long time and not all of those who pursued this career would succeed. The profession was often inherited⁶⁶. The majority of drivers belonged to a group called *hoi begáριοι*⁶⁷, and it included both full and novice drivers. The first ones drove in the colours of a particular faction, and theoretically they were not allowed to change them. In practice, as evidenced by Porphyrius, they did so, and they did it often⁶⁸. A beginner, who today would be called a trainee, could in the future choose a “team” for which he would ride. Having proved his skills in racing he turned to the Emperor asking for a special belt⁶⁹, which, along with a helmet and tunic, was the symbol of a driver.

The most talented among the *begáριοι* were able to advance and become factionaries (*hoi faktionáριοι*) or mikropanites (*hoi mikropanítai*). Each of the two major factions, that is the Blues and the Greens, had one factionary, the other two – a single mikropanite each⁷⁰. They were appointed by the emperor at the request of a particular faction⁷¹. Other drivers were subject to mikropanites and factionaries, who represented them in all matters concerning racing. They chose competitors from among *begáριοι*, who represented the faction in a particular race.

Although formally drivers were classified as *inhonestae personae*⁷², outstand-

⁶⁵ MALALAS, XVIII, 144.

⁶⁶ A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius...*, p. 156–157.

⁶⁷ The name is confusing as it suggests drivers of two-horse chariots. More on the subject of driver categories, cf. R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 212–222; G. DAGRON, *L'organisation...*, p. 145–147.

⁶⁸ A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius...*, p. 150–151, 163–165.

⁶⁹ *De cerimoniis*, I, 69, p. 329–330; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 224.

⁷⁰ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 213, 215–218.

⁷¹ *De cerimoniis*, I, 69, p. 327–328.

⁷² *CTh*, XV, 7, 12 (394 A.D.). It prohibited the portraits of drivers and actors from being featured in respectable places, especially where portraits of the Emperor were also featured.

ing competitors enjoyed immense popularity, just like modern stars of football or volleyball. Surviving iambic verses indicate that the ceiling in the gallery above the imperial kathisma featured images of famous drivers⁷³. They had monuments and *stellae* dedicated to them, as well as poems which praised their achievements. Their accomplishments are documented in epigrams located on the bases of statues preserved and recorded in anthologies⁷⁴. Through these, we know the names of the most famous among them: Porphyrius, Faustinus and his son, Constantine⁷⁵, Julian and Uranius⁷⁶.

The first of these had several statues, put by both the Blues and the Greens⁷⁷. At the Constantinople hippodrome *spina* alone there were five⁷⁸. What is worth emphasizing, emperor Anastasius had agreed to honor the driver in such a way before the latter ended his career⁷⁹. Uranius lived to see a special honor – he was given a statue of gold, while others' were of bronze⁸⁰. Drivers were given monuments particularly often in fifth and sixth century. From the later period there are none, but it does not necessarily prove the decline in the popularity of racing, as statues of private individuals were no longer erected, reserving the privilege for the rulers and their family members⁸¹.

The most famous among these players was undoubtedly Porphyrius⁸², born probably in the early sixth century in Africa⁸³, also known under the name Kalliopas⁸⁴. His career lasted for a very long time (he was winning for about 40 years) and dur-

⁷³ A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius...*, p. 188–214.

⁷⁴ In Palatine and Planudean *Anthology*. Since those on the statues and those from the anthology are almost identical, it must be assumed that they were copied in the Hippodrome and the copyist wrote them down one at a time, statue after statue (A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius...*, p. 117). The cited author analyzes the inscriptions in terms of linguistics and their content (*ibidem*, p. 65–95).

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 122, 136–140. Two epigrams mention Faustinus, 14 – his son.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 141–143. Uranius is the hero of 5 epigrams, Julian – only one.

⁷⁷ We know of at least five. The earliest originates from ca. 500, while the fifth – from 515 (*ibidem*, p. 241).

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 11. More on the subject of their placement – p. 180–187. The description of the two surviving bases of the statues – p. 12–58.

⁷⁹ In the opinion of A. CAMERON (*Porphyrius...*, p. 251), the emperor agreed to numerous statues of Porphyrius because the latter was not his real rival, unlike the outstanding commanders, and moreover, the emperor could treat the charioteer's victories as the symbol of his own power and victory.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 168, 240. The author is right to emphasize that the price of the statue did not necessarily mean that Uranius, was more successful than his predecessors. Instead, it demonstrates the increase in races popularity.

⁸¹ A. CAMERON (*ibidem*, p. 255) emphasizes that he only knows one exception from this rule – the erection of a statue of Narzes during the time of Justin II.

⁸² *Ibidem*, p. 117–131, 150–180; more on this figure, cf. annex.

⁸³ *Ibidem*, p. 155 and 170. The author suspects that by Libia Alexandria could have been meant.

⁸⁴ MALALAS, XVI, 6; A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius...*, 123–124 (cites 5 inscriptions), 173.

ing it he changed the colour several times, which is confirmed by inscriptions⁸⁵. He appeared in the hippodrome in Constantinople, but also in Antioch. In the latter city, he was the leader of the Green faction⁸⁶. There, he not only participated in sports competition, but he led his supporters in an attack on the synagogue at Daphne⁸⁷. In turn, after his return to Constantinople, he took part in the suppression of a usurpation (probably the Vitalian rebellion of 515⁸⁸). Perhaps these very achievements led the emperor to consent to the erection of several of his statues.

Drivers were entitled to payment both for their participation in the race and for winning it. In addition to the monetary payment, they could also receive payment in nature and a certain amount of bets they had made⁸⁹. The most talented among them were honored and rewarded both by rulers and other wealthy admirers. In addition to gifts, *sportulae*, they were entitled to their official dress, stored in a special changing room⁹⁰. The race winner was decorated in a *stama*, facing the imperial box⁹¹, by handing him a wreath and palm tree branch⁹². He could also (though he did not have to) receive permission from the emperor to make a lap of honour on his chariot. It was then that he received the Golden Bull (*faction, faktiona*)⁹³.

Most active supporters were grouped in factions. It is uncertain how big a number of people were grouped in demes. Once it was thought that the entire population of the capital was divided between them⁹⁴, but the fact that only certain some grandstands in the hippodrome were assigned to for them shows that it could not have been possible. There is no doubt that factionists were a minority⁹⁵. Their social makeup was very diverse. All of the factions associated some young aristocrats, artisans, clerks and others. Some references in the sources suggest that there were fac-

⁸⁵ A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius...*, p. 65, 121 (inscriptions), 150–151, 163–165 (reasons for changing colours); 178–180, 240–241 (length of career).

⁸⁶ MALALAS, XVI, 6.

⁸⁷ MALALAS, *l. cit.*; A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius...*, p. 150; P. HATLIE, *Monks and Circus Factions in Early Byzantine Political Life*, [in:] *Monastères, images pouvoirs et société à Byzance*, ed. M. KAPLAN, Paris 2006, p. 20. JOHN OF NIKIU (*The Chronicle of John, bishop of Nikiou*, LXXXIX, 23–30, trans. R.H. CHARLES, Oxford 1916), who writes of these events, never mentions Porphyrius by name, emphasizing the role of factions instead. His account suggests that factionists acted opposing the authority and their protests turned into a rebellion.

⁸⁸ A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius...*, p. 126–128, 150.

⁸⁹ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 221.

⁹⁰ *De cerimoniis*, II, 55, p. 799.

⁹¹ *Stama* was located opposite of the imperial box (*Chronicon Paschale*, rec. L. DINDORF, Bonnae 1832, p. 530; MALALAS, XIII, 8; R. GUILLAND, *L'Études sur l'Hippodrome de Constantinople: l'arène*, JÖBG 6, 1957, p. 25–44).

⁹² The wreath was probably silver and used only for decoration, that is, the winning charioteer did not keep it to himself. Cf. R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 224.

⁹³ *De cerimoniis*, I, 69, p. 328; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 218–219.

⁹⁴ As claimed PROCOPIUS, *Anecdota*, VII, 1.

⁹⁵ A. CAMERON, *Circus factions...*, p. 75.

tion activists and ordinary supporters-sympathizers⁹⁶. The former were mostly young people, who wanted to stand out, also with their clothing and hair. They tried to be noticeable. Procopius described them as follows:

(...) the mode of dressing the hair was changed to a rather novel style by the Factions: for they did not cut it at all as the other Romans did. For they did not cut the moustache or the beard at all, but they wished always to have the hair of these grow out very long, as the Persians do. But the hair of their heads they cut off in front back to the temples, leaving the part behind to hang down to a very great length in a senseless fashion, just as the Massagetae do. (...) And the part of the tunic which covered the arms was gathered by them very closely about the wrist, while from there to each shoulder it bellowed out to an incredible breadth. And as often as their arms were waved about, either as they shouted in the theatres and hippodromes, or urged man on to victory in the customary manner, this part of their garments would actually soar aloft (...) Also their cloaks and their drawers and especially their shoes as regards both name and fashion, were classed as "Hunnic"⁹⁷

Some grew out of their youthful passion. This was the case with Menander Protector, who in his youth was an avid supporter⁹⁸.

Factionists, especially young people, often demonstrated a high level of aggression⁹⁹. As a result, factions provoked many brawls, sometimes turning into riots spreading to the entire city¹⁰⁰. They reached their peak in sixth century, starting during the reign of Anastasius. Historians, among them Procopius, Cassiodorus, and Menander, were aware of the dangers of the fighting supporters¹⁰¹. Procopius wrote about them that they were destroying each other¹⁰². Conflicts between the factions did not have any serious (be it economic, social or political) reasons. They were simply hooligan antics, mostly due to the results of the competition, of which even the contemporaries were already aware¹⁰³. Justinian issued a special regulation prohibiting

⁹⁶ As the text of PROCOPIUS (*Anecdota*, VII, 2–3) seems to suggest, where the author writes about the excesses of some of the activists of the Blues that frightened even their colleagues from the faction.

⁹⁷ PROCOPIUS, *Anecdota*, VII, 8–14. Cf. also B.B. PHILLIPS, *Circus Factions and Barbarian Dress in Sixth Century Constantinople*, [in:] *Avarenforschungen*, ed. F. DAIM, vol. I, Wien 1992, p. 25–32.

⁹⁸ *The History of Menander the Guardsmen*, fr. 1, ed. R.C. BLOCKLEY, Liverpool 1985, p. 40, 12–14 [cetera: MENANDER]; *PLRE*, vol. III, p. 873.

⁹⁹ PROCOPIUS, *Anecdota*, VII, 11–21, 33–38; XVIII, 32–34; *The Chronicle of Marcellinus*, a. 445. 2, ed. B. CROKE, Sydney 1995 [cetera: MARCELLINUS COMES].

¹⁰⁰ MALALAS mentions the riots on several occasions (vide e.g. p. 394–395, 416, 473–476, 483, 484, 490, 496).

¹⁰¹ *Agathiae Myrinaei Historiarum libri quinque*, V, 14, 4; V, 21, 4, ed. R. KEYDELL, Berlin 1967 [cetera: AGATHIAS]; MENANDER, fr. 1, p. 40, 12–44; THEOPHANES, AM 6053, p. 235–236; A. CAMERON, *Circus factions...*, p. 77.

¹⁰² PROCOPIUS, *Anecdota*, XVIII, 32–34.

¹⁰³ A. CAMERON, *Circus factions...*, p. 272.

supporters from throwing rocks and committing murders, promising severe punishments for those who caused unrest¹⁰⁴. However, if social and economic riots broke out, factions could join them, led by a simple desire to, as we would say today, cause trouble. There were cases when as a result of dissatisfied citizens joining in, they could turn into political protests, this, however, happened rarely. Most of the unrest in the capital of the empire began in the hippodrome. People gathered there had a sense of power. However, for the riots to spread over the city and become really dangerous, there had to be more serious reasons than the emotions of supporters¹⁰⁵.

The popularity of chariot racing is evidenced by their frequency. The so-called *Philokalos Calendar* of 354 listed 177 days in which performances (*ludi*) were scheduled, 66 of which were reserved for *circenses*, that is racing¹⁰⁶. Some races had their permanent day in the Byzantine calendar.

Competitions were held throughout the year, but in certain periods, for example during the carnival, there occurred particularly often¹⁰⁷. In January, new consuls took the office, and they tended to begin their time with organizing a competition¹⁰⁸. When the consulate disappeared in 541, the task was taken over by the emperors themselves. On the first of January, the race of the vow was held (*tó Bóton*)¹⁰⁹, very solemn in character. The name comes from the custom of taking a vow on this day for the prosperity of the state and the emperor¹¹⁰. On January 13th, the race of the Ides of January was held¹¹¹. It was during this event that a rebellion broke out, known as *Nika* (532).

Particularly solemn was the competition held on May 11th, the day which can be regarded as a public holiday of the Byzantines. The anniversary of the capital was celebrated – a “birthday” of Constantinople. It was held for the first time in 330 A.D.,

¹⁰⁴ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 617. Procopius, in turn, complained that Justinian turned a blind eye to the “exploits” of factionists, who not only murdered one another, but also attacked and robbed persons not associated with the factions. They also had the habit of carrying weapons during the night while wandering around the city (PROCOPIUS, *Anecdota*, VII, 5–6, 15–18, 22–29, 33–37). The historian blamed the emperor of Constantinople and the authorities that did not investigate these matters (*ibidem*, VII, 30–31).

¹⁰⁵ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, III, p. 11.

¹⁰⁶ The remaining 101 days were reserved for theatrical performances, and another 10 for *munera gladiatoria*. G. VESPIGNANI, *Il cerimoniale imperiale nel circo (secoli IV–VI). La iconografia nei dittici eburnei*, Bi 2, 2002, p. 13. More on the subject, cf. M. SALZMAN, *On Roman Time. The Codex–Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in late Antiquity*, Berkeley 1990.

¹⁰⁷ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, V, p. 33.

¹⁰⁸ Justinian limited number of races organized by the consuls to two – at the beginning and the end of tenure (*Novellae*, 105). C. HEUCKE, *Circus und Hippodrom als politischer Raum. Untersuchungen zum Großen Hippodrom von Konstantinopel und zu Entsprechenden Anlagen im Spätantiken Kaiserresidenzen*, Hildesheim 1994, p. 77–80.

¹⁰⁹ *De cerimoniis*, I, 72, p. 359–364.

¹¹⁰ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, V, p. 26.

¹¹¹ MALALAS, XVIII, 71; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, V, p. 28.

during the reign of Constantine the Great¹¹². It was very solemn and the emperor was always present¹¹³. It was preceded by a great cavalcade in the hippodrome and a procession with the statue of the Genius of the City¹¹⁴.

Spring competitions, depending on the date of Easter, could be held on different days. The competition of the Golden Hippodrome were very solemn in nature, organized most likely on a Tuesday after the first Sunday of Easter. It took its name from the gilded costumes that victorious charioteers wore that day¹¹⁵. November was also often chosen for the organization of competition¹¹⁶. It is possible that more frequent races in the winter were due to the fact that in the summer emperors often stayed outside the capital, for example, on military expeditions. Another reason was the lack of church holidays in this period which would make it impossible to organize shows at the hippodrome. However, if the emperor was present in the capital, events could take place also in summer and autumn¹¹⁷.

Apart from these fixed dates, numerous occasions could be a reason to organize a competition for the entertainment of Constantinople citizens. A very common reason for organizing races was a victory over external or internal enemies. Theodosius II in 415 celebrated in this way the defeat of a barbarian chieftain John¹¹⁸ and the death of the Visigoth king Ataulf¹¹⁹, and a year later, the triumph over the usurper Attalus¹²⁰, Mauritius – the victory over the Persians¹²¹, while Michael II in 823 celebrated the defeat of Thomas the Slav¹²². The competition was usually accompanied by a triumphant entry to the capital. Justinian honored this way his best commander, Belisarius, after the latter restored North Africa to the empire¹²³. Theophilus¹²⁴ and Nicephorus Phokas¹²⁵ did the same the

¹¹² *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 529; *Patria I*, 55; *Patria II*, 87, [in:] *Scriptores originum...*; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, IV, p. 25.

¹¹³ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, IV, p. 25.

¹¹⁴ *Patria II*, 87.

¹¹⁵ *De cerimoniis*, I, 68, p. 303–310; R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, IV, p. 30.

¹¹⁶ THEOPHANES, AM 6053, p. 235–236.

¹¹⁷ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, V, p. 35.

¹¹⁸ SOCRATES, *Kirchengeschichte*, VII, 23–24, ed. G.C. HANSEN, Berlin 1995 [cetera: SOCRATES]; PHILOSTORGIUS, *Kirchengeschichte. Mit dem Leben des Lucian on Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines arianischen Historiographen*, XII, 14, ed. J. BIDEZ, F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1981.

¹¹⁹ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 572; C. HEUCKE, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

¹²⁰ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 573; C. HEUCKE, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

¹²¹ THEOPHYLACT, p. 124.

¹²² *Josephi Genesisii Regum libri quattuor*, II, 9, rec. A. LESMUELLER-WERNER, I. THURN, Berolini 1978.

¹²³ PROCOPIUS, *Wars*, IV, 9, 1–12; ZONARAS, XIV, 7.

¹²⁴ *Georgii Monachi Vitae imperatorum recentiorum*, [in:] *Theophanes Continuatus. Ioannes Cameniata. Symeon Magister. Georgius Monachus*, rec. I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1838, p. 798; ZONARAS, XV, 28.

¹²⁵ LEO DIACONUS, IV, 5, p. 61.

defeat of the Arabs and Michael IV after the victory over the Bulgarians¹²⁶.

Racing were also how emperors celebrated the seizure of power. So did, among others, Leo I in 457¹²⁷, Phokas in 602¹²⁸, and Heraclius in 610¹²⁹. Another pretext to organize competitions was an important event in the imperial family¹³⁰. For example, races were held to celebrate weddings in imperial families¹³¹, anniversaries of birth, births, coming to power or an imperial coronation¹³². Often, races were held in honor of guests of the Empire, crowned heads and ambassadors¹³³ – for example, envoys of the Arab caliphs¹³⁴. Sometimes, no pretext was needed to provide entertainment for the residents of the capital.

On some days it was not permitted to organize performances at the hippodrome. Excluded dates were primarily religious holidays – sundays, Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, the week before and after Easter¹³⁵. Thus, Gilbert Dagron speaks of adapting the pagan *ludi* to the Christian calendar¹³⁶.

In fact, the Christianization of the empire was followed by a kind of “Christianization” of the hippodrome, as well as the competitions held there¹³⁷. Successful charioteers believed that they owed their success to God. Before racing, they prayed and attended a Mass¹³⁸. This “Christianity” did not mean, however, as evidenced by the events described above in Constantinople, emotional restraint and

¹²⁶ *Michaelis Attaliatae Historia*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1853, p. 9–10.

¹²⁷ *De cerimoniis*, I, 91, p. 417.

¹²⁸ THEOPHYLACT, VIII, 10, 8–13.

¹²⁹ *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 701.

¹³⁰ C. HEUCKE, *op. cit.*, p. 67–76, 106–129.

¹³¹ Such as the marriage of Theodosius II to Aelia Eudocia (*Chronicon Paschale*, p. 578); the marriage of Domentia, the daughter of Phokas (THEOPHANES, AM 6099, p. 294, 11–14sq).

¹³² *Strategicon*, III, 101–107, [in:] *Three Byzantine Military Treatises*, ed. G.T. DENNIS, Washington 1985, p. 18. Leon VI, imprisoned by his father, Basil I, would later celebrate the anniversary of his liberation (R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, IV, p. 21).

¹³³ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, IV, p. 15; C. HEUCKE, *op. cit.*, p. 130–138.

¹³⁴ Such as in 946 – *De cerimoniis*, II, 15, p. 588–592.

¹³⁵ *CTh*, II, 8, 20 (the prohibition did not include those days on which birthdays of rulers were celebrated). This law, issued by Theodosius I, was taken further by Leo I who banned all music and secular ceremonies at this period (*CJ*, III, 12, 9 [11]). On Sundays, it was obligatory to refrain from any activities (MALALAS, XIV, 39; *Michaelis Glycae annales*, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1836, p. 483).

¹³⁶ G. DAGRON, *L'organisation...*, p. 128–132.

¹³⁷ H.G. SARADI, *op. cit.*, p. 300–301. A manifestation of this phenomenon were Christian invocations, carved in the hippodrome in Alexandria. It is also possible that in the Constantinopolitan hippodrome ancient inscriptions were preserved which were copied in the sixth century (A. CAMERON, *Porphyrius...*, p. 109–116). However, it is uncertain whether they were copied from objects or from literary sources.

¹³⁸ R. GUILLAND, *Études...*, II/1, p. 220–223. At the same time they had no qualms about seeking advice of fortune tellers before the race (E. WIPSZYCKA, *Historia pewnego zwycięskiego woźnicy*, MW 1995, p. 8).

civilizing the forms of cheering one's favorite competitors. Nor did it contribute to discouraging the short-tempered factionists from violence against the supporters of rival teams, or even from criminal behaviour.

Abstract. Support in sport is certainly one of the oldest human passions. Residents of the eastern Roman imperial capital cheered the chariot drivers. The passion for supporting the drivers was common for all groups and social classes. The hippodrome was visited by the representatives of the aristocracy, artisans and the poor of the city alike. The popularity of chariot racing is evidenced by their frequency. 66 days were reserved for *circenses*, that is racing.

Organizing the competition along with all the accompanying events has been an essential task of circus factions (*demes*). In the empire, there were four factions named Blues, Greens, Whites and Reds. These factions were real sports associations, which can be compared to modern clubs. They had significant financial resources at their disposal. Each faction had their own racing team. They paid for and supported a number of drivers, runners, trainers of horses and wild animals, mimes, dancers, acrobats, poets, musicians and singers. They cared for their recruitment and training. They also employed caretakers, messengers, artisans of various specialties, grooms, etc.

Expectations of subjects meant that emperors put great emphasis on the organization of shows and they were actively engaged in them themselves. The preparation was personally supervised by the city prefect, and in the relations with the factions the emperor was represented by the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*. The latter managed the Hippodrome staff. Byzantine supporters, like their modern counterparts, had their idols. The object of their worship, and at the same time the elite among those working on the hippodrome, were chariot-eers. Outstanding competitors enjoyed immense popularity, just like modern stars of football or volleyball. They had monuments and stelae dedicated to them, as well as poems which praised their achievements. The ceiling in the gallery above the imperial kathisma featured images of famous drivers.

Translated by Katarzyna Gucio

Teresa Wolińska
Katedra Historii Bizancjum
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. A. Kamińskiego 27a
90-219 Łódź, Polska
t.wolinska@wp.pl

Dimo Cheshmedjiev (Plovdiv–Sofia)

NOTES ON THE CULT OF THE FIFTEEN TIBERIOUPOLITAN MARTYRS IN MEDIEVAL BULGARIA

The cult of the fifteen Tiberiopolitan martyrs is one of the most intriguing cults in medieval Bulgaria. There are, however, a lot of questions about this cult, some of which I will address in this paper.

The earliest evidence of the cult at our disposal is their mention in the *Evangelarium Assemani* (late 10th – early 11th C.), at 29th August. Only three of the martyrs are listed in this entry and the place of their martyrdom has already been located in Stroumitsa¹. In the next manuscript which mentions them, the *Liber Savvae* (11th C.), they are again related to Stroumitsa, albeit venerated on another date – 28th November². This is also the case in a later document – the so-called *Ohridski apostol* (12th C.)³.

A very important source for this cult is the well-known *Life of Clement of Ohrid* by Theophylact of Ohrid – called: *The martyrdom of the fifteen Tiberiopolitan martyrs* (late 11th or early 12th C.)⁴. The following points are of interest: first, the evidence by Theophylact as to where their martyrdom took place, where their cult was initially founded and when this event occurred. The answer to the last question is

¹ В. ИВАНОВА-МАВРОДИНОВА, А. ДЖУРОВА, *Асеманиево евангелие. Старобългарски глаголически паметник от X в. (художествено-историческо проучване)*, София 1981, p. 24–27; cf. I. Dujčev's preface, (*ibidem*, p. 8); cf. also А. МИНЧЕВА, *Асеманиево евангелие – важный источник о старобългарской культуре*, Pbg 2, 1983, p. 91–95; Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Месеослов Асемановог јеванһельа и старје ѕидно сликарство у Македонији*, ЗЛУ 21, 1985, p. 14.

² И.И. СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ, *Древние славянские памятники юсоваго письма*, Санкт-Петербург 1868, p. 6, 84; К. КУЕВ, *Съдбата на старобългарската ръкописна книга през вековете*, София 1986, p. 194.

³ С.М. КУЛЬБАКИН, *Охридская рукопись апостола конца XII в.*, София 1907, p. 107 [= BC, 3]; cf. К. КУЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 205; Т. ЛАЛЕВА, *Охридски апостол*, [in:] *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник*, ed. Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, София 1992, p. 309–310.

⁴ P. GAUTIER, *L'episcopat de Theophylacte Nephistos, archeveque de Bulgarie (Notes chronologiques et biographiques)*, REB 21, 1963, p. 165; И.Г. ИЛИЕВ, *Произведения на Теофилакт Охридски, архиепископ български, относящи се до българската история*, [in:] FGHB, vol. IX, pars 2, ed. ИДЕМ, Serdicae 1994, p. 42; cf. also I. SNEGAROV, *Les sources sur la Vie et l'activite de Clement d'Ohrida*, BBg 1, 1962, p. 105–106.

clear, as the author dates the event during the reign of Emperor Julian the Apostate. The topography of the cult, on the other hand, is more problematic. Already in N 12, immediately after the long preface, Theophylact asserts without any clear reference to the previous text: *In Macedonia, Theodoulos and Tatianos, pious and inspired men, broke into a pagan temple at night and destroyed the images*⁵. There is nothing unusual in this evidence, except for the note by P. Gauthier who, following an idea by K. Jireček, sustains that Theophylact moved the tale of the martyrdom of the Saints from Asia Minor to the Balkan Peninsula, taking the ethnonym Makedonios as toponym. According to the French scholar, Theophylact used a tale by the church historian Socrates about three martyrs named Makedonios, Theodoulos and Tatianos who suffered in the town of Myra (Phrygia, Asia Minor)⁶.

Then Theophylact continues with his tale of the fate of the other martyrs. Once again, the events take place in Asia Minor – in Nicaea, where some of them resided (Timothy, Comasios, Eusebios and Theodor) but left for Thessalonike due to their persecution. Soon after they moved to Tiberioupolis, (...) *which lies north of Thessalonike, at the borders of Illyrian lands*⁷.

This vague account is followed by details about the martyrs' deeds. Of interest for us is the evidence that Timothy became bishop of Tiberioupolis, while Theodor, also a bishop, though of an unknown place, participated in the first Catholic Council of Nicaea (325 AD) as one of the 318 Theophoric Fathers. This evidence is usually taken as a hagiographic myth⁸.

Further on, when listing the names of the other martyrs (Peter, John, Sergios, Theodor, Nikephoros, Basil, Thomas, Hierotheos, Daniel, Chariton), Theophylact discusses their martyrdom in Tiberioupolis⁹, where they died on 28th November and were buried, each in their own casket bearing his name¹⁰. This account is followed by the tale of the invasion by a people called *Omvri*, said to have come from the south (sic!), who demolished Tiberioupolis. The caskets with the saints' relics remained beneath the ruins of the church-temple and were then forgotten¹¹.

Let us now set aside the evidence of the arrival of the Bulgarians, their baptizing etc., which is of no interest for us here. I go on to discuss the very discovery of the relics, dated back to the reign of khan Boris I the Baptist (852–889), when the relics proved miraculous. The ruler ordered a special temple to be built for them

⁵ И.Г. Илиев, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

⁶ К. Иречек, *Християнският елемент в топографическата номенклатура на балканските земи*, ПСБЖД 55–56, 1898, p. 248; cf. И.Г. Илиев, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

⁷ И.Г. Илиев, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 55.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 57.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 62.

¹¹ *Ibidem*.

in the Bishopry of Bregalnitsa. This was carried out by Taridin, the local Comes. Although this is important as hagiographic evidence, I would rather emphasize the question posed by prof. Y. Ivanov, namely, why the relics needed to be moved to another place instead of repairing the old church or just building a new one in its place?¹² It seems that the reason was not that Tiberiopolis no longer existed. On the contrary, the source mentions that the town not only survived but that its inhabitants were opposed to the removal of the relics. For this reason, only three of the caskets were actually moved (those of Timothy, Comasios and Eusebios) and placed in a specially built church-temple on the 28th of August¹³. During the reign of tsar Symeon the relics of two more martyrs (Socrates and Theodor) were placed in the same temple¹⁴. Further on and without going into detail, Theophylact talks about a monastery named after them¹⁵.

I shall not deal with the canons and liturgies for the martyrs¹⁶ but note in passing that the title of one of their masses, believed by its discoverer, T. Vukanović, to be a *second version*, says they suffered in **Тивериополн престолаголемомъ Стрѣмица**¹⁷. I discuss this below.

As shown above, Theophylact's *Vita* speaks of two church-temples named after the martyrs. The first was the one underneath which the caskets remained after the demolition of Tiberiopolis. However, he does not mention this when talking about their funeral: *The saints' caskets remained buried together with the demolished temple in which they were placed (...)*¹⁸. Nothing further is mentioned about this church-temple. In N 37, Theophylact already talks about the other church – in the bishopry of Bregalnitsa:

Thus the rumour reached the Bulgarian King Michael. And he [...] ordered a special church-temple to be built for them in the bishopry of Bregalnitsa, which was accomplished [...].¹⁹

¹² Й. ИВАНОВ, *Северна Македония*, София 1906, p. 75.

¹³ И.Г. ИЛИЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 77–78.

¹⁶ И. СНЕГАРОВ, *История на Охридската архиепископия*, vol. I, София 1924, p. 280; Т. ВУКАНОВИЋ, *The Legend of the martyrs of Tiberiopolis (Strumica)*, ВГ 7, 1971; Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Портрети на светителите од Македонија од IX–XVII в.*, Скопје 1983, p. 123; М. СТОЈАНОВ, *Опис на гръцките и други чуждоезични ръкописи в НБ "Кирил и Методий"*, София 1973, p. 56; Х. МЕЛОВСКИ, *Москополски зборник. Пролошки житија на светиците*, vol. I, pars I, Скопје 1996, p. 29–31. On Moschopoulos' edition of the martyrs' mass see M.D. REYFUSS, *Die Druckerei von Moschopolis 1731–1769. Buchdruck und Heiligenverehrung im Erzbistum Achrida*, Wien 1996, p. 120–122 [= WAGSO, 13]; Г. ПОП-АТАНАСОВ, *Нов прилог кон проучувањето на Светиклиментовото химнографско творештво*, БФСКОГЗ 7, 2001, p. 99–112.

¹⁷ Т. ВУКАНОВИЋ, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

¹⁸ И.Г. ИЛИЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 69.

Then he mentions it at several places, calling it *the church-temple in Bregalnitsa*²⁰, and at one point (N 53) he starts talking about a monastery²¹.

The attempts at identifying the two churches began long ago. Already in the 1920's the Serbian scholar J. Tatić recognized the Stroumitsa church-temple in an area known as *the fifteen saints*, in the local oral tradition²².

In the seventies, archeological excavations were carried out on that site, which led to interesting results. The archaeologists discovered the narthex, the northern nave and the annex of the south-eastern side of a decussate church-temple, three paleobyzantine brick-graves in the nave and the narthex with remains of a fresque added later, on which the fifteen Tiberiupolitan martyrs are depicted; a part of the oldest floor of the early Christian basilica with the northern stylobates and a part of the central apse. According to the archaeologists, D. Kotso and P. Milkovic-Peppek, the discovery of the northern stylobates and part of the oldest apse with a floor of mortar and part of the central apse, shows that the upper decussate, probably five-vaulted, church is built on top of a significantly older three-vaulted basilica containing three graves. The relation between the early Christian basilica and the three graves within is not quite clear. The archaeologists assume that they were built after the demolition of the early Christian basilica and assign their construction to the early Byzantine period (6th – 8th C.). This conclusion is supported by the form of the crosses drawn in red color on the bricks of the first construction of the central vault. According to the two authors, it can be asserted with certainty that the early Christian basilica and the newly discovered central brick vault are not primarily related to the cult of the martyrs. They claim that this cult was moved to Stroumitsa from Asia Minor by emigrants (7th and 8th C.). In addition, and this is very important, the fresque with the fifteen martyrs in the central vault is added later to the construction of the vault, together with the decussate church-temple. Besides, they categorically relate the building of the decussate church with the cult of the martyrs by claiming that this place is related to the cult after the construction of the central vault within the building²³.

Hence the question of dating these fresques becomes very important. Similar images can be traced back to the later 9th and early 10th centuries, including ceramic icons from the monastery in the area of Touzlaluka in Preslav. For this reason, the fresques belonging to the church are dated at that period. The decus-

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 75.

²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 77–78.

²² Ж. ТАТИЋ, *Два остатка византијске архитектуре у Струмичком крају*, ГСНД 3, 1928, p. 83.

²³ Д. КОЦО, П. МИЛКОВИК-ПЕПЕК, *Резултатите од археолошките ископувања во 1973 г. во црквата „св. 15 тивериуполски мъченици“*, Стр 8–9, 1975–1978, p. 93–94.

sate church is also dated at that period. This conclusion of the two authors is supported by the discovered fragments of fresques differing in style from the former ones, (late 11th or early 12th C.) and related to the renovation of the church-temple at the time of archbishop Theophylact of Ohrid²⁴.

According to B. Aleksova who also participated in the excavations, the discovered church-temple was built on top of the graves of the martyrs who were initially buried in 16 vaults²⁵, built in the late antique style and forming an area martyris. The most important of them is the big central vault which is situated beneath the nave of the decussate church, in the nave of the basilica²⁶. Based on this, she concludes that this vault was built on top of the martyrs' graves and only later a new basilica was built by adding lateral rooms. Then a new decussate five-vault church-temple was built on top and it is still unclear whether it was built because the basilica was destroyed or simply in order to enlarge it. B. Aleksova assigns the construction of the decussate church-temple to the reign of emperor Justinian I (527–565). In addition, she takes the evidence by Theophylact to mean that this church-temple was destroyed and later rebuilt in the early 9th – early 10th C., during the intensive baptizing of the Slavs in Macedonia. B. Aleksova supports the dating of the fresques by means of the images of the martyrs found in the central vault and dated at the same period²⁷. Based on the findings at the excavations and the discovered images, B. Aleksova concludes that the martyrs suffered in Stroumitsa, that they were buried there and that their cult developed there²⁸.

The images are situated in the brick vault in the church crypt, on the western wall, divided into three areas: four images in the upper area, six in the middle

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 95–96.

²⁵ Recently B. Aleksova claimed that there were 19 vaults, which might be due to the discovery of some new vaults – Б. АЛЕКСОВА, *Св. тивериополски мъченици, комплекс на старохристиянски църкви*, [in:] *Археолошка карта на Република Македонија*, vol. II, Скопје 1996, p. 412.

²⁶ Б. АЛЕКСОВА, *Епископијата на Брегалница – прв словенски црковен и културно-просветен центар во Македонија*, Прилеп 1989, p. 123; Б. АЛЕКСОВА, *Св. тивериополски мъченици...*, p. 413.

²⁷ Б. АЛЕКСОВА, *Епископијата на Брегалница...*, p. 123; ЕАДЕМ, *Св. тивериополски мъченици...*, p. 414; cf. Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Портрети...*, p. 136, 137; Л. МАВРОДИНОВА, *Изображения на Тивериуполските маченици, открити неотдавна в Струмица*, [in:] КМС, vol. XIII, София 2000, p. 139–144.

²⁸ Б. АЛЕКСОВА, *Епископијата на Брегалница...*, p. 125–126:

Овие мошне значајни археолошки остатоци ги потврдуваат податоците што ни ги дава Теофилакт. Мачениците што настрадале во Струмица биле закопани во истиот град. На почвата на Македонија е создаден нивниот култ и нивното славење. Поради тоа отпаѓа секоја претпоставка дека култот можел да биде пренесен од Мала Азија, зашто, ако се работи за пренесување на веќе создаден култ на друга територија или друг град, можат да бидат пренесени само мошти или реликви на маченици. Во тој случај за нив не се градат гробови, бидејќи од тоа нема потреба. Нивните реликви не се сместуваат на гробиштата. За нив се градат конструкции от типот на Confessio или memoria (...).

and five in the lower areas. In this lower area only two images are preserved (one of them in part), in the middle area only the lower part of the first three images is destroyed while the heads are preserved. The images in the upper area have remained intact²⁹. These images are recognized with the help of the text by Theophylact of Ohrid. The first image in the upper area is probably Timothy, because the represented figure is a bishop; the second and the third are, respectively, Comasios and Eusebios, while the fourth figure is the other bishop – Theodor. As is well-known, these four are the first who moved from Nicaea to Tiberiupolis. The next group comprises partly or completely destroyed images that are hard to recognize, although Ts. Grozdanov claims that the last saint in the third area is Thomas because he is depicted as a deacon³⁰. Ultimately, the author supports the dating suggested by the archaeologists D. Kotso and P. Milkovic-Peppek (late 9th – early 10th C.), based on a stylistic analysis of the fresques, agreeing with them that *these portraits are inspired by the classical base of the renewed Byzantine art from the late 9th or the early 10th C.*³¹

Aleksova's hypothesis would seem convincing if the other archaeologists had not concluded that the central vault within the church-temple initially belonged to the early Christian basilica which is unrelated to the cult of the martyrs and it was only in the 9th and 10th C. that this vault was related to it, together with the newly built decussate church³². Ts. Grozdanov does not comment on this at all, only noting in passing that he needed more proof³³.

As to the second church-temple (the one in Bregalnitsa), it is identified by Aleksova with the cathedral discovered in 1984 near Kroupishte on Bregalnitsa, in the area of Kale. Within it, in the annex at the right side of the altar there is a decussate martyrium which, according to the archaeologists, was designed for placing the martyrs' relics. It is dated back to the mid-9th to early 10th C. and for this reason Aleksova assumes that this is precisely the church built on Boris's orders where the relics of the Tiberiopolitan martyrs were placed on two occasions³⁴.

Thus we reach the important issue of identifying Tiberiupolis with today's Stroumitsa, an issue which crucial for the cult. A significant amount of scholarly work has been done on it and I will only mention the main opinions. I begin with K. Jireček who came up with the first consistent theory. His starting point is the name *Tiberiupolis*, which he connects to several towns, two in Asia Minor (the

²⁹ Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Портрети...*, р. 136.

³⁰ Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Портрети...*, р. 136; cf. П. МИЉКОВИК-ПЕПЕК, *Најстарите светителски култови во Македонија, темели за самостојната Самоилова црква и автокефалност на Охридската архиепископија*, ЗММАЕИ.СУ 1, 1993, р. 19.

³¹ Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Портрети...*, р. 136.

³² Д. КОЦО, П. МИЉКОВИК-ПЕПЕК, *op. cit.*, р. 94.

³³ Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Портрети...*, р. 135.

³⁴ Б. АЛЕКСОВА, *Епископијата на Брегалница...*, р. 126.

first in Phrygia, south of the Bithynian Olympos, the second in Pisidia), a third in Armenia and three in the Balkan peninsula (the examined one in Macedonia, another one identified as the mysterious Velika and a third in Varna)³⁵.

The second point made by Jireček is that the saints of Stroumitsa are mentioned only in books that originated in the diocese of the Ohridian archbishopry and could not be found elsewhere, say in Basil II's *Menologia* or other Greek manuscripts³⁶. By pointing out that Theophylact's *Vita* is the main source for identifying Tiberiupolis with Stroumitsa, Jireček lists the other texts in which this identification occurs, as in the so-called *Τάξις τῶν Θρόνων τῆς πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς, where a bishop Τιβεριουπόλεως ἦτοι Στρουμίτης is mentioned*³⁷. According to Jireček, this manuscript dates back to the late 12th C., around the time of the Bulgarian uprising in 1186³⁸. However, a slightly earlier list reports the episcopacy simply as ἡ Στρούμιτζα which allows him to conclude that this list is at the origin of the tradition of the later Byzantine *notitiae* to identify Tiberiupolis with Stroumitsa. It is very important that Jireček relates the appearance of the name Tiberiupolis to Stroumitsa with the theory that the archbishopry of Ohrid should be identified with Justiniana Prima which was founded around the second half of the 12th C., as is well-known³⁹. The other sources Jireček examines are the following:

- the inscription in the church Sv. Bogoroditsa Eleousa near Stroumitsa, made by the local bishop Manuel who calls himself *ἐπίσκοπος Τιβεριουπόλεως* dated back ca. 1080⁴⁰, although Jireček had some doubts about the dating⁴¹.

- a manuscript fragment from the 14th C. by the name of some Kallinikos, who was *μητροπολίτης Τιβεριουπόλεως*⁴².

Further discussing the identification of Tiberiupolis and Velika and Varna, the famous scholar concludes as follows:

This uncertainty shows by itself that all identifications are grounded on hypotheses only and even the medievals considered them unlikely. The legend re-written by Theophylact deals with excavations in Stroumitsa, at the time of Boris I, when caskets with inscriptions were found. Added to this is another *Life of Martyrs* by an unknown author from the time of Emperor Julian I. Bishop Theodor, purported to be one of those who moved from

³⁵ К. ИРЕЧЕК, *op. cit.*, p. 246: *ἐπίσκοπος Τιβεριουπόλεως*.

³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 243.

³⁷ *Vat. Gr.* 828, fol. 354 r.; cf. H. GELZER, *Ungedruckte und Wenig bekannte Bistumverzeichnisse der orientalischen Kirche*, BZ 1, 1892, p. 257.

³⁸ К. ИРЕЧЕК, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 246, an. 1.

⁴⁰ L. РЕТИТ, *Le monastere de Notre Dame de Pitie en Macedoine*, ИРАИК 6, 1900, p. 6.

⁴¹ К. ИРЕЧЕК, *op. cit.*, 246. This dating is confirmed by В. ДЖУРИЧ, *Византийские фрески. Средневековая Сербия, Далмация, славянская Македония*, Москва 2000, p. 31. On older opinions *vide* В. ДЖУРИЧ, *op. cit.*, p. 331–333.

⁴² К. ИРЕЧЕК, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

Nicaea, did not participate in the Nicaean Council and cannot be found either in Bithynia or Phrygia, Galatia or any other province of Asia Minor. Bishops of that name who attended the Council came from Pisidia, Isauria and Kilikia. It is to be noted that Theophylact imports Phrygian martyrs from the age of Emperor Julian I to Macedonia and one of them was actually called Makedonios. This leads us to the assumption that the learned archbishop of Ohrid also imported a legend that originally took place in Tiberioupolis south of Nicaea in Asia Minor.⁴³

Soon after Jireček's paper there appears an opposing view by the Benedictine scholar L. Petit who found Jireček's conclusions *a little hasty*, based on the evidence that *a bishop of Tiberioupolis* called Theoktistos attended the so-called Council of Photios in 879⁴⁴. However, Petit does not say that Tiberioupolis and Stroumitsa fully coincide; according to him, the ancient Tiberioupolis was located near Stroumitsa in the place of today's village Banitsa, following the local tradition (as attested in Archimandrite Gerasimos)⁴⁵.

It is also worth noting Y. Ivanov's opinion, according to which, if we accept Jireček's hypothesis that the legend and the town's name were imported from Asia Minor, we have to assume that in Stroumitsa there must have been even older legends of other Christian martyrs and that Theophylact used them in his *Vita*. Y. Ivanov, who obviously thinks that the import was made by Theophylact, takes them to be Slavic tales of an earlier time, as for instance, their being mentioned in the *Evangelarium Assemani*. He also recalls that the church-temple in Stroumitsa named after the martyrs and mentioned in 1348, is very likely to have been there much earlier⁴⁶.

V. Zlatarski also deals with this problem in a separate article, as well as in his *History of the Bulgarian State in the Middle Ages*. In his paper he starts from Jireček's conclusion that the events took place in Asia Minor and were later imported to Bulgaria although, in his view, the importing of the legend and the cult occurred much earlier than Theophylact. He finds proof of this in much earlier evidence of their cult in Bulgaria as, for example, in the *Evangelarium Assemani*. However, Zlatarski does not believe that the importing of the legend and the cult occurred by means of texts only, but that there were other reasons. He finds one of those reasons in the mass emigration of Asia Minor population to the Balkan Peninsula at the time of the discovery of the martyrs' relics. He refers to a similar event during the reign of Emperor Nikephoros I Genikos (802–811), around Sept. 809 – Easter 810, according to Theophanes the Confessor⁴⁷.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 248.

⁴⁴ L. РЕТИТ, *op. cit.*, p. 95–96.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 100.

⁴⁶ Й. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

⁴⁷ В.Н. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *Легенда за откриване на мощите на Тивериуполските мъченици*, [in:]

In addition, V. Zlatarski thinks that Tiberioupolis and Stroumitsa were identified in the manuscripts as early as the 10th C., that is, before the towns of the archbishopry of Ohrid received their classical or transliterated names, along with their Old Bulgarian names⁴⁸. This identification began with the move of the relics to Stroumitsa, all details of the martyrs' cult being transferred from the demolished Tiberioupolis to the town of Stroumitsa, which had been flourishing as an important center since the early 10th C., when tsar Symeon transformed it into a bishopry⁴⁹.

According to V. Zlatarski, the legend of the martyrs was written down in Old Bulgarian *probably at the beginning of the 10th C.* However, he emphasizes the fundamental role of Theophylact in importing the legend, as the latter seems to have artificially created the link between the Tiberiopolitan and the local Macedonian legends. For this purpose, the bishop is said to have presumed the existence of Tiberioupolis in Ancient Macedonia, as well as its identity with Stroumitsa. Thus he depicted the martyrs as moving from Nicaea to Macedonia, where they suffered martyrdom in the 4th C. and were forgotten due to the Avars' invasion in the 6th C.⁵⁰

As is noted in today's historiography, Zlatarski's hypothesis raises too many problems, although, paradoxically, it is still the basis of all subsequent reconstructions hostile to it. Recently, hypotheses dominate which, by contrast to the above-mentioned ones, claim that Tiberioupolis is a Macedonian town (in the contemporary political sense) and that Theophylact and his sources did not invent anything but correctly transmit the events.

The most important argument against Jireček – Zlatarski's hypothesis is the result of the archaeological excavations in Stroumitsa in the church-temple *the fifteen Saints* done by B. Aleksova, the main supporter of the *continuity* hypothesis. I should like to add a further point she made, namely that in Stroumitsa and the region, the cult of the forty martyrs was quite popular at that time⁵¹.

The *continuity* hypothesis is also supported by Ts. Grozdanov, based on the recently discovered images of the saints in the church-temple. But he is troubled by certain question which he does not answer. First, he does not refute Jireček in any way, whom he elsewhere accuses of *concocted criticism*. Nor does he refute Zlatarski, whose hypothesis he ironically calls *very subtle*. It is important to note that Ts. Grozdanov, like all other supporters of this hypothesis, does not comment or pay attention to Ph. Παπαζoglou's and others' strong claim that no Macedonian

ИДЕМ, *Избрани произведения*, vol. I, София 1972, p. 195–196.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 199.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 202.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 203.

⁵¹ Б. АЛЕКСОВА, *Епископијата на Брегалница...*, p. 127–128.

town named Tiberioupolis was known in Antiquity and the Middle Ages before the 11th C.⁵² Ts. Grozdanov does not consider the results of the excavations published by T. Kotso and P. Milkovic-Peppek, nor does he mention the fact that the archeologists excavated 16 or 19 vaults (but not 15) in the *area martyris* in Stroumitsa, to cite B. Aleksova, which is used for the *continuity* hypothesis⁵³.

There have been recent attempts at solving this problem. According to the Greek scholar A. Angelopoulos, the cult of the fifteen martyrs was wide-spread in the region of Stroumitsa and the name of the town where the relics were placed, did not change due to them but due to a historical factor – someone called Tiberius. In his view, a concrete proof of that is the preserved local name of the medieval site near Stroumitsa called *Tiber's mountain*⁵⁴.

Considering all arguments, I think that Jireček's hypothesis is the most likely. Today we know that there was no town in late-antique Macedonia named Tiberioupolis. It is also beyond any doubt that the earliest evidence of a Macedonian Tiberioupolis dates back to the 11th C. and refers to Stroumitsa. This convincingly shows that the identification Stroumitsa-Tiberioupolis was quite late. It first appeared in 1080⁵⁵. We should note, as contemporary historiography does⁵⁶, that in the first Chrysobull by Basil II, some 60 years before (1019) the bishopry of Stroumitsa is listed only by its Bulgarian name⁵⁷. This means that

⁵² T. TAFEL, *De Thessalonica eiusque agro. Dissertatio geographica*, Berolini 1839, p. 294; Ф. ПА-ПАЗОГЛУ, *Македонски градови у римског доба*, Скопје 1957, p. 254–255.

⁵³ The problem of the number of martyrs in different copies of Theophylact's *Vita* still awaits clarification – cf. А. АНГЕЛОПУЛОС, *Петнадесетте Тивериополски мъченици в гръцко-българското духовно предание*, [in:] ИБПЦИАИ, vol. II, София 1984, p. 104.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 102–110. Б. НИКОЛОВА, *Устройство и управление на българската православна църква (IX–XVI в.)*, София 1997, p. 76–77, recalls Tafel's and Jireček's view and asks: *Ако наистина такъв град (Тивериупол) не е съществувал на мястото на Струмица, тогава кое е името на селището, от което са взети мощите на тивериуполските мъченици, за да бъдат пренесени в Брегалница?* She then cites Angelopoulos' stance and compares Bulgarian and Byzantine sources on the town's name, concluding that the Bulgarian ones (including the charters by Basil II) do not mention Tiberioupolis while the Byzantine ones emphasize the Greek name – an observation, which is inexact at the least. Then the author rejects the identification of Theoktistos of Tiberioupolis, who attended the Council in 878–879, as a Macedonian bishop since he figures on the list together with prelates from Asia Minor, and also because Theophylact does not mention any bishopry of Tiberioupolis in his *Vita*. Finally, like other authors, Nikolova concludes that the only certain fact is that the cult of the Tiberiopolitan martyrs was wide-spread in the bishopry of Stroumitsa in the late 9th C. and that the martyrs' relics were placed in the church-temple there.

⁵⁵ L. РЕТІТ, *op. cit.*, p. 95–96; cf. Ф. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Акт отвода земли монастырю Богородицы Милостивой*, ИРАИК 1, 1896, p. 1.

⁵⁶ L. РЕТІТ, *op. cit.*, p. 94; В. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

⁵⁷ И. СНЕГАРОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 56; Й. ИВАНОВ, *Български старини из Македония*, София 1931, p. 522.

the identification occurred sometime between 1019 and 1080, presumably on ecclesiastical grounds, as it is found only in some church manuscripts⁵⁸. After the above-mentioned Manuel, the founder of the church-temple Sv. Bogoroditsa Eleousa, also called ἐπίσκοπος Τιβερίουπόλεως this identification is confirmed by Theophylact in the late 11th – early 12th C., as well as in Τάξις τῶν Θρόνων τῆς Πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς (late 12th C.)⁵⁹, in a 1286 Mount Athos charter⁶⁰, and in a bishop's notitia from the early 12th C.⁶¹ At the same time, the counter-examples of Stroumitsa listed under its Bulgarian name only, are a lot more, including Greek and ecclesiastic sources⁶². Besides, today we cannot doubt that Theoktistos of Tiberiupolis, the priest who participated in the Council of Photios⁶³, was indeed a bishop in Asia Minor⁶⁴.

Assuming that Tiberiupolis and Stroumitsa were identified at some point in the mid-11th C., we can now move to the other important questions: on what grounds was this identification made and why? As we have seen above, there are two historiographic hypotheses on this matter. One is advanced by Zlatarski and obviously does not work. Apart from other minor problems, in his view, the emigrants from Asia Minor who spent only three years (809–812) in their new settlements, in that short period succeeded in building a new town called Tiberiupolis, in importing the relics, re-burying them, building the new church and disseminating the cult among the local Christian population, to the extent that 50 years later this cult was embraced by the newly baptized Bulgarians and Slavs. This is obviously impossible and for this reason, the only probable explanation is Jireček's – the identification was due to the cult of the martyrs in Stroumitsa⁶⁵.

An obvious role in this respect was also played by the tendency to render toponyms archaic, as evidenced during the Byzantine rule of Bulgarian lands. Historiographically, this process is usually related to the origin and develop-

⁵⁸ L. PETIT, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

⁵⁹ H. GELZER, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

⁶⁰ F. DÖLGER, *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges*, München 1948, p. 298–301.

⁶¹ J. DAROUZES, *Notitiae episcopatum ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, Paris 1981, p. 372, Notitia N 13.

⁶² L. PETIT, *op. cit.*, p. 26, 27, 30, 31, 34. See other examples in F. DÖLGER, *op. cit.*, p. 298–301; J. DAROUZES, *op. cit.*, 372; FGHB, vol. VII, ed. G. САНКОВА-ПЕТКОВА et al., *Serdicae* 1968, p. 102.

⁶³ *Pseudosynodus Photiana*, [in:] FGHB, vol. IV, ed. I. ДУЏЕВ et al., *Serdicae* 1961, p. 117.

⁶⁴ L. PETIT, *op. cit.*, p. 96; Й. ИВАНОВ, *Северна Македония...*, p. 75, an. 2; А. КУЗЕВ, *За някоя епархия в България през IX в.*, [in:] *1100 години от блажената кончина на св. Методий*, vol. I, София 1989, p. 146.

⁶⁵ Near Kouklis, close to Stroumitsa, we can find another cult site related to the Fifteen Holy martyrs of Tiberiupolis. The site, however, is not examined by the archaeologists and a new church-temple was built there in the 70's, which almost certainly destroyed any archaeological traces; cf. Д. КОЦО, П. МИЛЬКОВИК-ПЕПЕК, *op. cit.*, p. 96, an. 1.

ment of the view that the archbishopry of Ohrid is to be identified as Justiniana Prima⁶⁶.

Even if we accept Jireček's idea, however, there remains a further basic question: how did the cult arise in Stroumitsa? According to Ivanov this could have occurred through some local tradition related to other Christian martyrs⁶⁷. This is quite possible in the light of the wide-spread cult of the forty holy martyrs which was attested by Aleksova. However, it could be that this was not due to written tradition but to material facts, such as the discovered vaults, etc. In any case, the cult had already been established in Stroumitsa by the late 9th C. This is shown not only by Theophylact's evidence, but also by the images in the vaults which undoubtedly belong to this period.

This conclusion seems to contradict Theophylact's report of the relics' import under Boris I and Symeon. If the cult had originated in Stroumitsa, why did the kings have to move the relics to another place close by? This is a reasonable question and the answer is quite simple. When carefully reading Theophylact's *Vita*, we can see that they did not move the relics of all martyrs, but only of five of them (three under Boris and two under Symeon). Theophylact claims that the removal of the relics was impeded by the Tiberiopolitans' resistance but this account is obviously a hagiographic turn, because there is no mention of resistance during Symeon's reign and he still moved the relics of two other martyrs. All this shows that the Bulgarian rulers had no intention of moving all the relics but only to establish another center of their cult, where to place and venerate something quite valuable in the Middle Ages. This move could have resulted from the establishment of a new bishopry, especially if we assume that the big cult center on the Bregalnitsa, discovered by Aleksova, was really a bishopry⁶⁸. Moving some relics to a new location does not mean that the old center had diminished; there is both direct and indirect evidence that it continued to function. One such direct testimony is a charter by Stefan Dušan dated around 1348–1352 which announces a donation to the monastery of Saint Archangels near Prizren and mentions a church-temple in Stroumitsa named after the martyrs: **И ѱШТЕ ЦРЪКОВЪ ОУ СТРОУМИЦИ НА ИМЕ СВЕТНИХЪ ПЕТЪНАДЕСЕТЕ СЪ ЛЮДМИ, И СЪ ЗЕМЛОМЪ, И СЪ ВИНОГРАДИ,**

⁶⁶ К. ИРЕЧЕК, *op. cit.*, p. 246, an. 1; М. ДРИНОВ, *Исторически преглед на българската църква от самото и начало и до днес*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Избрани съчинения*, vol. II, София 1971, p. 120; Й. ИВАНОВ, *Архиепископията и градът Първа Юстиниана*, БПЦВ 10–12, 1903, p. 111; И. СНЕГАРОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 80–81; cf. V. Tărkova-Zaimova's notes in FGHB, vol. VII, p. 107; for further reading see С. ПИРИВАТРИЧ, *Самуиловата държава, обхват и характер*, София 2000, p. 192.

⁶⁷ Й. ИВАНОВ, *Северна Македония...*, p. 209.

⁶⁸ Б. АЛЕКСОВА, *Епископията на Брегалница...*, p. 128; ЕАДЕМ, *Брегалница – словенски црковен и просветно-културен центар на Балканот*, [in:] *Климент Охридски и улогата на Охридската книжевна школа во развитокот на словенската просвета*, Скопје 1989.

и съ мѣни, и съ всѣмъ што си ю имала црѣквѣ таа отъ испрѣва⁶⁹. The text obviously refers to the church-temple as having existed even earlier – отъ испрѣва. Besides, this charter contains the written canons by Constantine Cabasilas and also the fact that it commemorates the first *Stroumitsa* date of venerating the martyrs, clearly shows that the initial center of the cult did not diminish. We can even assume that this initial center grew stronger, probably because it was a bishopry for a longer time.

On the other hand, as noted by Jireček, no Greek manuscripts mention the martyrs, except those coming from the diocese of the Ohrid archbishopry⁷⁰. Together with the fact that Theophylact's *Vita* has an Old Bulgarian base⁷¹, this shows that the cult was imported soon after the baptizing of the Bulgarians. We also conclude this from the images in the vault which undoubtedly belong to that time. A last proof is the acrostic in the first version of the martyrs' mass, attested by G. Popatanassov, which says: **КЛИМЕНТ**⁷². Kliment of Ohrid is the likely author of the Old Bulgarian *Vita* used by Theophylact, and although it was based on a Greek manuscript, the latter probably came from Asia Minor and not from Thessalonike or Constantinople.

Abstract. The cult of the fifteen Tiberiopolitan martyrs is one of the most intriguing cults in medieval Bulgaria. There are, however, a lot of questions about this cult, some of which I address in this paper.

The earliest evidence of the cult is their mention in the *Evangelarium Assemani* (late 10th – early 11th C.), at 29th August, but only three of the martyrs are listed. Another important source for this cult is the well-known *Life of Clement of Ohrid* by Theophylact of Ohrid, called *The martyrdom of the fifteen Tiberiopolitan martyrs* (late 11th or early 12th C.). One of the most interesting evidences, however, is the very discovery of the relics, dated back to the reign of khan Boris I (852–889), when the relics proved miraculous.

According to the recent studies, the cult of the fifteen martyrs was wide-spread in the region of Stroumitsa and the name of the town where the relics were placed, did not change due to them but due to a historical factor – someone called Tiberius. On the other

⁶⁹ С. НОВАКОВИЋ, *Законски споменици српских држава средњега века*, vol. V, Београд 1912, p. 682–705.

⁷⁰ К. ИРЕЧЕК, *op. cit.*, p. 243; Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Портрети...*, p. 137; Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Месецослов*, p. 15.

⁷¹ К. ИРЕЧЕК, *op. cit.*, p. 248; Ц. ГРОЗДАНОВ, *Портрети...*, p. 127; Н. ДРАГОВА, *Старобългарските извори за житието на Петнадесетте Тивериуполски мъченици от Теофилакт Охридски*, СВ, 2, 1970, p. 111–112; П. МИЛЬКОВИК-ПЕПЕК, *op. cit.*, p. 19. On the same page P. Milković-Peprek says: *Воспоставуването на култот на св. 15 Тивериуполски маченици во времето на Климент Охридски, што се поврзува и со стилските отлици на нивните представи од ова време во Цариград (...)*. It is not clear which *images* of the saints in Constantinople the author has in mind.

⁷² Т. VUKANOVIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 52–53; Г. ПОП-АТАНАСОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

hand, however, no Greek manuscripts mention the martyrs, except those coming from the diocese of the Ohrid archbishopry. The facts shown above proves that the cult was imported soon after the baptizing of the Bulgarians.

Translated by Anita Kasabova

Димо Чешмеджиев
Пловдивски университет „Паисий Хилендарски“
Философско-исторически факултет
4000 Пловдив, ул. Костаки Пеев 21
Кирило-Методиевски научен център при БАН
1000 София, ул. Московска 13
dimoclio7@yahoo.com

Kirił Marinow (Łódź)

**IN THE SHACKLES OF THE EVIL ONE
THE PORTRAYAL OF TSAR SYMEON I THE GREAT
(893–927) IN THE ORATION
*ON THE TREATY WITH THE BULGARIANS***

In this beast there dwelt an innate barbarity and
savagery, traits completely alien to Roman blood.
And no wonder: his mother came from beyond the
Danube.¹

Lactantius about Galerius, Diocletian's Caesar

Symeon I, the third son of Boris-Michael (852–889), ruler of Bulgaria who was officially baptised in the mid-ninth century, in his youth was educated in Constantinople. He knew the language and Greek/Byzantine culture, and probably was destined to become the head of the Bulgarian Church. However, fate decided that he became the ruler of Bulgaria after his older brother Vladimir (889–893), who betrayed his father's political and religious policies and was overthrown by Boris. Symeon ruled between 893–927, as the first Bulgarian ruler assuming in 913 the title of tsar, or emperor (Gr. βασιλεύς). He was the builder of the new, Christian capital of Bulgaria – Veliki Preslav. As a patron of culture, and being himself an author, he was said to have loved books above all else and wrote many of them personally, as well as played music and sung like the biblical king David (as a contemporary Bulgarian comparison would have it)². The Bulgarian ruler was to be an extraordinarily pious man, leading a humble, even ascetic life. During his reign, the more complicated Glagolitic script was replaced by the Cyrillic alphabet, created in Preslavian literary circles, and from that time onward became the official literary language of the Bulgars. Assessing Symeon I's rule, modern historians write about the *golden age* of mediaeval Bulgarian literature and the creation of the so-called Preslavian Literary School. The tsar turned out to be also an excellent military leader, extending Bulgarian borders to reach three

¹ *Lucii Caecilii liber ad Donatum Confessorum de mortibus persecutorum*, 9, 2, ed. S. BRANDT, G. LAUBMANN, [in:] *L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti opera omnia*, pars II, fasc. 2, Pragae–Vindobonae–Lipsiae 1897, p. 182, 18 – 183, 2 [= CSEL, 27, fasc. 2].

² Л. МИЛЕТИЧ, *Цар Симеон, споменат в един среднобългарски ръкопис*, БП 4, 1898, p. 159.

seas – the Black Sea, the Adriatic and the Aegean. During his reign, Bulgaria was a power on a European scale, he therefore had valid reasons to assume the previously mentioned title of the basileus of the Bulgarians (βασιλεὺς τῶν Βουλγάρων), to which, because of his political-ideological aspirations and territorial gains at the expense of the Eastern Roman Empire, he eventually added the expression καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων, or *and (of) the Romans*. He also styled himself as simply the emperor of Romans. He is universally regarded as the greatest ruler of mediaeval Bulgaria, which is reflected in honouring him, the only Bulgarian ruler to be honoured so, with the epithet the Great.

Symeon I's rule posed a significant challenge for Byzantium, especially since during the second half of his reign the empire was going through difficult times, due to Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' (913–959) minority and the government of subsequent regencies, which were implementing conflicting policies towards the northern neighbour. The first clash with the Bulgarian ruler took place already during the reign of emperor Leo VI the Wise (886–912), specifically in the years 894–896, and was linked to the violating by the Byzantines of the rights of Bulgarian merchants to display their goods in Constantinople³. Undoubtedly, this was negatively affecting not only the economic interests of the Bulgarians, but also the prestige of their ruler, who had to respond to this. Lasting for two years, the war ended with Symeon's victory and the commitment of the Byzantine side to restore the Bulgarian marketplace in the capital city of Byzantium (this happened in 899 at the latest). This first conflict, followed by two decades of relatively good Byzantine-Bulgarian relations (the scholarly discussions bring into question only the actions undertaken by Symeon during 902 and 904), did not seem to presage a real shock that awaited the Byzantines. In retrospect, however, it could be described as a prelude to the great drama of 913–927.

It all began in late 912 or early 913, when the emperor Alexander (912–913) insulted the Bulgarian envoys who came to Constantinople to confirm the peaceful relations of the Bulgarians with the new Byzantine ruler. In retaliation, during the summer of 913, Symeon arrived with his army at the walls of the Byzantine metropolis. The emperor Alexander was already dead by then, and the reign over the empire came into the hands of the minor Constantine VII, son of Leo VI, who was in regency's custody. Some scholars believe that the reason for the Bulgarian ruler's action was not Alexander's scandalous behaviour towards his ambassadors (which would have been merely a convenient pretext for organizing the expedition), but desire to take over the power in Byzantium. From an ideological point of view, both Constantine VII's minority and the recent turmoil surrounding his rights to the throne (arising from the fact that he came from Leo VI's fourth marriage, not recognized by the Church) favoured Symeon. Regardless of whether this assumption is correct, an assault on Constantinople did not take place, and during a formal meeting between Symeon and the leader of the regency board, patriarch Nicholas I Mysticus (901–907, 912–

³ The Bulgarian market was moved to Thessalonika.

925) the Bulgarian ruler most likely gained the right to using the title of basileus. One of his seals from this period bears the legend Σιμεών βασιλεύς⁴, most likely, however, in an ethnic meaning, that is, basileus of Bulgarians (βασιλεύς τῶν Βουλγάρων, although the scholarly opinions on this matter are divided). He also gained an assurance of peaceful relations with the empire, which was to be guaranteed by the marriage of Constantine VII with one of the daughters of the Bulgarian monarch. Some scholars believe that the last provision could open the way to the real influence on ruling the empire, as thanks to this marriage he gained the right to an honourable and very important title of basileopator (βασιλεοπάτωρ), i.e. *father of the emperor*. This position had a particular importance due to the minority of the Byzantine heir to throne. This view, however, is not convincing to all of the specialists in the field, who, firstly, doubt that the Bulgarian ruler was seeking to gain this title at all and secondly, that as a man from outside of Byzantium and its imperial court circles, had real chances of attaining this honour.

The following year, however, the Constantinopolitan patriarch was removed from the regency, and Zoe Karbonopsina, the recalled from exile mother of Constantine VII, has taken its lead, which led to a change in the political course towards Symeon. The treaty between Nicholas Mysticus and Symeon from 913 was declared void. Faced with this, the Bulgarian tsar began military operations against the empire, which, with varying intensity, lasted for ten years. The most famous Byzantine-Bulgarian battle of this period took place in 917, when the Empress Zoe organized a great expedition against the Bulgarians. Unfortunately for the Byzantines, on August 20 it ended with a debacle of the imperial army by the river Acheloos (near the seaside Anchialos). After this victory, Symeon began systematic raids on the Byzantine territories, taking control over huge swathes of the empire – in Thrace, Macedonia and Greece proper.

Failures of the regency's policies under the leadership of Empress Zoe facilitated elevating to the imperial throne on 17 December 920 (as co-emperor – συμβασιλεύς – of Constantine VII) of the ambitious Romanos I Lekapenos (920–944), commander of the imperial fleet. Lekapenos gained power in the way that, in all likelihood, Symeon himself was hoping for in 913. In 919, supported by the political opposition and troops loyal to himself he attained the position of heteriarch, or the commander of the imperial guard. The following year in May he betrothed his daughter Helen to the under-age ruler, gaining the title of basileopator and forcing Karbonopsina into retiring from political life, and subsequently on 24 September 920 he received the dignity of caesar. At this point only one step was separating him from declaring himself the emperor, and afterwards, on 20 May 921, declaring his eldest son, Christophoros, co-ruler. The Bulgarian ruler contested taking over the power by Lekapenos and continued raids on the empire. It was only on 9 September 924 that, next to the Byzantine capital, Symeon and the new emperor have met. Some scholars believe that the result of this was an agreement, under which the Bulgarian tsar promised to refrain from

⁴ Й. ЮРУКОВА, В. ПЕНЧЕВ, *Български средновековни печати и монети*, София 1990, р. 29–30.

further military actions against Byzantium. And indeed, until his death he did so, focusing instead on fighting the allies of Byzantium – Serbs and Croats. Others believe that these talks were to be a prelude to reaching a final peace agreement between the warring states. According to others, the meeting did not lead to any conclusions. Regardless of whether an agreement was made, it remains a fact that Symeon died on 27 May 927, during preparations for another expedition on Constantinople, leaving no doubts as to his intentions towards peace with his southern neighbour⁵.

⁵ The literature on Symeon I and various aspects of his reign is extremely abundant. Below I am therefore presenting a selection of works – С. ПАЛАУЗОВ, *Векът на българския цар Симеон*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Избрани трудове в два тома*, vol. I, *Изследвания по история на България и европейския югоизток през средновековието*, ed. В. Гюзелев, Х. Коларов, София 1974, p. 87–202 (the first Russian edition is from 1852); М. ДРИНОВ, *Южные славяне и Византия в X веке*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Избрани съчинения в два тома*, vol. I, *Трудове по българска и славянска история*, ed. И. Дуйчев, София 1971, p. 435–495 (first published in 1875); К. ИРРЕЧЕК, *История на българите. С поправки и добавки от самия автор*, ed. П.Х. Петров, София 1978, p. 179–196 (first edition from 1876); В.Н. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *История на Българската държава през средните векове*, vol. I, *Първо българско царство*, pars II, *От славянизацията на държавата до падането на Първото царство (852–1018)*, София 1927, p. 278–515; S. RUNCIMAN, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*, London 1930, p. 133–177; Г. ОСТРОГОРСКИ, *Die Krönung Symeons von Bulgarien durch den Patriarchen Nikolaos Mystikos*, ИБАИ 9, 1935, p. 275–287; K. ZAKRZEWSKI, *Historia Bizancjum*, Kraków 2007, p. 180–182, 186–190 (reprint from 1938); П. МУТАФЧИЕВ, *История на българския народ (681–1323)*, ed. В. Гюзелев, София 1986, p. 177–199 (first edition from 1943); G. SERGHERAERT, *Symeon le Grand (893–927)*, Paris 1960; М. ВОЙНОВ, *Промяната в българо-византийските отношения при цар Симеон*, ИИИ 18, 1967, p. 147–202; G. SANKOVA-РЕТКОВА, *Der erste Krieg zwischen Bulgarien und Byzanz unter Simeon und die Wiederaufnahme der Handelsbeziehungen zwischen Bulgarien und Konstantinopel*, BF 3, 1968, p. 80–113; G. OSTROGORSKI, *Dzieje Bizancjum*, trans. H. EVERT-KAPPESOWA et al., ²Warszawa 1968, p. 221–222, 224–229; S. RUNCIMAN, *Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign. A Study of Tenth-Century Byzantium*, Cambridge 1969, p. 50–57, 81–101; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Към хронологията на българо-маджарската война при цар Симеон (894–896)*, ВСб 40.6, 1971, p. 20–33; И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Из писмата на патриарх Николай Мистик*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Българско средновековие. Проучвания върху политическата и културната история на средновековна България*, София 1972, p. 146–152; 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Η συνάντηση Συμεών και Νικολάου Μυστικού (Αύγουστος 913) στα πλαίσια του Βυζαντινο-βουλγαρικού ανταγωνισμού, *Θησαυρόνικη* 1972; R. BROWNING, *Byzantium and Bulgaria. A Comparative Study across the Early Medieval Frontier*, London 1975, p. 56–69; E. CHRYSOS, *Die „Krönung“ Symeons in Hebdomon*, *Сут* 3, 1975, p. 169–173; Й. АНДРЕЕВ, *Нарышковая надпись князя Симеона и административное устройство болгарского государства в конце IX и начале X в.*, *ЕВ* 14.3, 1978, p. 121–131; I. VOŽILOV, *A propos des rapports bulgare-byzantins sous le tsar Syméon (893–912)*, *ВВг* 6, 1980, p. 73–81; ИДЕМ, *Цар Симеон и Златният век на средновековна България*, ИП 36.1, 1980, p. 5–22; ИДЕМ, *България при цар Симеон. Външнополитически отношения*, [in:] *История на България в четринадесет тома*, vol. II, *Първо българско царство*, ed. Д. Ангелов, София 1981, p. 278–296; ИДЕМ, *Златният век на цар Симеон*, [in:] *История, изкуство и култура на средновековна България*, ed. В. Гюзелев, София 1981, p. 59–72; Д. АНГЕЛОВ, С. КАШЕВ, Б. ЧОЛПАНОВ, *Българска военна история от Античността до втората четвърт на X в.*, София 1983, p. 254–278; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Цар Симеон Велики (893–927): Златният век на Средновековна България*. София 1983; I.V.A. FINE JR. *The Early Medieval*

Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century, Ann Arbor 1983, p. 132–158; Μ. ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΥ-ΙΩΑΝΝΙΔΟΥ, *Η βυζαντινοβουλγαρική σύγκρουση στους Καταστροφές (917)*, ΠΘΕΕΦΣ 21, 1983, p. 121–148; I. BOŽILOV, *L'idéologie politique du tsar Syméon: Pax Symeonica*, BBg 8, 1986, p. 73–89; D. ANGELOV, *Preslav und Konstantinopel – Abhängigkeit und Unabhängigkeit im Kulturbereich*, [in:] *The 17th International Byzantine Congress. Major Papers*, New Rochelle–New York 1986, p. 429–446; I. BOŽILOV, *Preslav et Constantinople: dépendance et indépendance culturelles*, [in:] *The 17th International Byzantine Congress...*, p. 429–446; W. GIUZELEW, *Bułgarskie średniowiecze (VII–XIV w.)*, [in:] *Bułgaria. Zarys dziejów*, ed. I. DIMITROW, trans. M. WIĘSKOWSKA, A. KOSESKI, Warszawa 1986, p. 46–49, 71, 80–82; Г.Г. ЛИТАВРИН, *Первое Болгарское царство в зените могущества. Расцвет культуры*, [in:] *Краткая история Болгарии. С древнейших времен до наших дней*, ed. IDEM, Москва 1987, p. 73–80; T. WASILEWSKI, *Historia Bułgarii*, ²Wrocław 1988, p. 55–59, 63–67; J. SHEPARD, *Symeon of Bulgaria – Peacemaker*, ГСУНЦСВПИД 3, 1989, p. 9–48; Е. АЛЕКСАНДРОВ, *Интронизирането на княз Симеон – 893 г.*, Pbg 15.3, 1991, p. 10–17; Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Византия. Възход и залез на една империя*, София 1991, p. 222–226; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *ΟΡΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΒΟΥΛΓΑΡΩΝ*, СЛ 25–26, 1991, p. 102–109; Ι. ΚΑΡΑΓΙΑΝΝΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Οι βυζαντινο-βουλγαρικές συνκρούσεις επί Συμεών*, Вка 11, 1991, p. 23–46; А. ΚΑΖΗΔΑΝ, *Symeon of Bulgaria*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. III, p. 1984; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Преславската цивилизация*, [in:] *Пр.Сб*, vol. IV, ed. IDEM, София 1993, p. 33–48; П. ДИМИТРОВ, *Вербални конструкции за личността на цар Симеон (методологически мотиви)*, [in:] *Пр.Сб*, vol. V, ed. Т. Тотев, София 1993, p. 26–32; Е.Κ. ΚΥΡΙΑΚΗΣ, *Βυζάντιο και Βουλγαροι (7ος–10ος αι.)*. *Συμβολή στην εξωτερική πολιτική του Βυζαντίου*, Αθήνα 1993, p. 133–158, 259–268; J. KARAYANNOPOULOS, *Les causes des luttes entre Syméon et Byzance: Un réexamen*, [in:] *Сборник в чест на акад. Димитър Ангелов*, ed. В. Велков, София 1994, p. 52–64; Г. АТАНАСОВ, *Към въпроса за короните на цар Симеон (893–927)*, [in:] *1100 години Велики Преслав*, vol. I, ed. Т. Тотев, Шумен 1995, p. 74–86; Г. БАКАЛОВ, *Средновековният български владетел (Титулатура и инсигнии)*, ²София 1995, p. 148–169; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *От „варварската“ държава до царството. България от средата на IX в. до първите десетилетия на X в.*, [in:] IDEM, *Седем етюда по средновековна история*, София 1995, p. 94–129; Ν. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *“Ορος ‘Ρωμαίων και Βουλγάρων*, [in:] *Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία 324–1430 μ.Χ.*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1995, p. 239–242; Й. АНДРЕЕВ, *Цар Симеон (893–927)*, [in:] Й. АНДРЕЕВ, М. ЛАЛКОВ, *Исторически справочник. Българските ханове и царе. От хан Кубрат до цар Борис III*, Велико Търново 1996, p. 91–106; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Културата на Средновековна България*, София 1996, p. 95–142; Г. ОСТРОГОРСКИ, *Автократор и самодържац. Прилог за историју владалачке титулатуре у Византији и у јужних Словена*, [in:] IDEM, *Сабрана дела*, vol. IV, Београд 1996, p. 303–318; V. VAVŘÍNEK, *Byzanc na vrcholech moci*, [in:] *Dějiny Byzance*, ed. В. ZÁSTĚROVÁ, Praha 1996, p. 155–163; M. WHITTON, *The Making of Orthodox Byzantium, 600–1025*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1996, p. 285–292; S. TOUGHER, *The Reign of Leo VI (886–912). Politics and People*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997, p. 172–183; W. TREADGOLD, *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*, Stanford 1997, p. 463–464, 471–479; X. ДИМИТРОВ, *Българо-унгарски отношения през Средновековието*, София 1998, p. 29–70; Д. ОБОЛЕНСКИЙ, *Византийское содружество наций. Шесть византийских портретов*, trans. А.В. Горизонтова et al., Москва 1998, p. 113–126; Й. АНДРЕЕВ, *Симеон*, [in:] Й. АНДРЕЕВ, И. ЛАЗАРОВ, П. ПАВЛОВ, *Кой кой е в средновековна България*, София ¹1999, p. 338–345; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Цар Симеон Велики (893–927): от „варварската“ държава до християнското царство*, [in:] И. БОЖИЛОВ, В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, *История на средновековна България VII–XIV век*, София 1999, p. 229–270; П. ГЕОРГИЕВ, *За граничните колони в района на Солун по времето на княз Симеон*, [in:] *Общото и специфичното в балканските култури до края на XIX век. Сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф. Василка Тъпкова-Заимова*, ed. Г. Бакалов, София 1999, p. 98–106; П. ПАВЛОВ, *Християнското и имперското минало на българските земи в ойкуменичната доктрина на цар Симеон Велики (893–927 г.)*, [in:] *Източното православие в европейската клт-*

After the fiasco of attempts to continue the expansionistic policies of Symeon, his son Peter I (927–969) concluded a peace with Byzantium in 927. For the sake of creating a lasting agreement, the empire was willing to go for considerable concessions. It was to pay the Bulgarians an annual tribute. In order to enhance the restored interstate relations, a marriage between the Bulgarian ruler and Maria, granddaughter of Romanos Lekapenos, was arranged. The importance of peace can be seen in

тура. Международна конференция, Варна, 2–3 юли 1993 г., ed. Д. Овчаров, София 1999, p. 111–115; J. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *Byzantium, Bulgaria and the Peoples of Ukraine in the 890s*, [in:] *Материали по археологии, истории и этнографии Таврии. Сборник*, vol. VII, ed. А.Й. Айбабин, Симферопол 2000, p. 342–356; P. STERNENSON, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*, Cambridge 2000, p. 18–23, 26–27, 31, 37, 39; П. ГЕОРГИЕВ, *Коронацията на Симеон през 913 г.*, ИП 57.1–2, 2001, p. 3–20; Г. БАКАЛОВ, *Христианизация на българското общество*, [in:] *История на българите*, vol. I, *От древността до края на XVI век*, ed. ИДЕМ, София 2003, p. 249–265; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Симеон*, [in:] *КМЕ*, vol. III, II–С, ed. Е. ДОГРАМАНДЖИЕВА et al., София 2003, p. 591–600; J. SHEPARD, *The ruler as instructor, pastor and wise: Leo VI of Byzantium and Symeon of Bulgaria*, [in:] *Alfred the Great. Papers from the Eleventh-Centenary Conferences*, ed. T. REUTER, Aldershot 2003, p. 339–358; Т. ТОТЕВ, *Преслав*, [in:] *КМЕ*, vol. III, p. 301–311; И. БОЖИЛОВ, В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, *История на Добруджа*, vol. II, *Средновековие*, Велико Търново 2004, p. 60–62; Г. БАКАЛОВ, *За една насилена интерпретация на изворите: Влахерините 913 г.*, [in:] *Културните текстове на миналото. Носители, символи и идеи*, fasc. 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, ed. В. Гюзелев, София 2005, p. 168–173; В. ВАЧКОВА, *Симеон Велики – пътят към короната на Запада*, София 2005; F. CURTA, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages 500–1250*, Cambridge 2006, p. 177–179, 213–227; J. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *A short piece of narrative history: war and diplomacy in the Balkans, winter 921/2–spring 924*, [in:] *Byzantine Style, Religion and Civilisation. In Honour of Sir Steven Runciman*, ed. E. JEFFREYS, Cambridge 2006, p. 340–360; А. НИКОЛОВ, *Политическа мисъл в ранносредновековна България (средата на IX–края на X век)*, София 2006, p. 115–230; Р. РАШЕВ, *Цар Симеон. Шрихи към личността и делото му*, София 2007; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Византийският свят*, София 2008, p. 378–385, 405–412; Н. КЪНЕВ, *Стремля ли се е българският владетел Симеон I Велики (893–927 г.) към ранга на византийски василеопатор?*, [in:] *България, българите и Европа – мит, история, съвремие*, vol. II, *Научна конференция 31 октомври 2007*, ed. Д. Димитров, Велико Търново 2008, 61–67; П. ПАВЛОВ, *Сърбия в политиката на княз Борис-Михаил (852–889) и цар Симеон Велики (893–927)*, [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. 136–145; Д. КЕНАНОВ, *Цар Симеон Велики и християнската философия на историята*, [in:] „България, земя на блажени...” *In memoriam Professoris Iordani Andreevi*, *Международна конференция в памет на Проф. д.и.н. Йордан Андреев, Велико Търново, 29–31 октомври 2009*, ed. И. Лазаров, Велико Търново 2009, p. 265–278; Н. ГАГОВА, *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. 40–79; М. КАЙМАКАМОВА, *Световната история в пропагандната политика на цар Симеон (893–927) и развитието на българската хронография*, ВМд 1, 2010, p. 59–93; Х. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *Младостта на цар Симеон*, София 2010.

the new name that Maria took – Irene, or *peace* in Greek. The fact that a foreign ruler married a woman from the imperial family was also a sensation, and for which many years later Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus himself was berating Lekapenos⁶. This indicates just how much the empire cared about concluding this peace. Under its terms, also the imperial title of Peter was recognized, even though it was consistently denied to Symeon after 914⁷.

During the period of aforementioned conflicts, representatives of the Byzantine court corresponded with Symeon. First, in the years 894–896, it was Leo Choirosphactes⁸, a diplomat and envoy of the emperor Leo VI. His subsequent interlocutors were Nicholas Mysticus, who was writing to him since 912/913 until his death in 925⁹, and the emperor Roman Lekapenos, or rather writing in his name Theodor Daphnopates (890/900–after 961), the then chief of the imperial Chancery (πρωτοασηκρητης)¹⁰. Correspondence of these dignitaries, in addition to hagiographic works and the works of Byzantine historians, allows reconstructing the assess-

⁶ КОНСТАНТИН БАГРЯНОРОДНЫЙ, *Об управлении империей. Текст, перевод, комментарий*, 13, ed. Г.Г. Литаврин, А.П. Новосельцев, Москва 1991, p. 60, 146 – 64, 194 [= ДИИИСССР].

⁷ Д. СТОИМЕНОВ, *Към договора между България и Византия от 927 г.*, Век 1988, 6, p. 19–22; В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, *Значението на брака на цар Петър (927–969) с ромейката Мария-Ирина Лакапина (911–962)*, [in:] *Културните...*, p. 27–33.

⁸ И. КУЗНЕЦОВЪ, *Писмата на Льва Магистра и Романа Лакапина и словото „Ἐπί τῇ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει” като изворъ за историята на Симеоновска България*, СЛУНК 16–17, 1900, p. 184, 190–196, 197, 207–220. About Leo *vide e.g.* G. KOLIAS, *Biographie*, [in:] *Léon Choirosphactès, magistre, proconsul et patrice. Biographie – Correspondance*, ed. et trans. G. KOLIAS, Athens 1939, p. 15–73; М.А. ШАНГИН, *Византийские политические деятели первой половины X века*, [in:] *Византийский сборник*, ed. М.В. Левченко, Москва–Ленинград 1945, p. 228–248; А. КАЗHDАН, *Choirosphactes, Leo*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. I, p. 425–426.

⁹ И. КУЗНЕЦОВЪ, *op. cit.*, p. 183–190, 197–198, 200–202, 204, 209, 223–230, 235–238, 243, 244; Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Методы византийской дипломатии в отношениях с Болгарией по данным писем Константинопольского патриарха Николая Мистика*, ВИС 1, 1963, p. 60–69; NICHOLAS I PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, *Letters*, ed. et trans. R.J.H. JENKINS, L.G. WESTERNIK, Washington 1973 (cetera: NICHOLAS); А.П. КАЖДАН, *Болгаро-византийские отношения в 912–925 гг. по переписке Николая Мистика (опыт пересмотра хронологии писем)*, ВБ 13.3, 1976, p. 92–107; L. СИМЕОНОВА, *Power in Nicholas Mysticus' Letters to Symeon of Bulgaria (Notes on the Political Vocabulary of the Tenth Century Byzantine Statesman)*, Bsl 54, 1993, p. 92–93. On the subject of the patriarch *vide e.g.* А. КАЗHDАН, *Nicholas I Mystikos*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. II, p. 1466–1467; ИДЕМ, *A History of Byzantine Literature (850–1000)*, ed. Ch. ANGELIDI, Athens 2006, p. 66–75.

¹⁰ В.Н. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *Писмата на византийския императоръ Романа Лакапина до българския царъ Симеона*, СЛУНК 13, 1896, p. 282–322; И. КУЗНЕЦОВЪ, *op. cit.*, p. 196–197, 205; Е. АЛЕКСАНДРОВ, *Дипломатическая переписка царя Симеона с императором Романом Лакапином*, Рbg 14.2, 1990, p. 16–22. On his subject *vide e.g.* М. СЮЗЮМОВ, *Об историческом труде Θεοδора Даφνοпата*, ВОб 2, 1916, p. 295–302; Н.-Г. ВЕСК, *Kirche un Theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, München 1959, p. 552–553; THÉODORE DAPHNOPATÈS, *Correspondance*, ed. et trans. J. DARROUZÈS et L.G. WESTERNIK, Paris 1978 (cetera: DAPHNOPATES), p. 1–11; А. КАЗHDАН, *Daphnopates, Theodore*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. I, p. 588; М. SALAMON, *Dafnopata Teodor*, [in:] *Encyklopedia kultury bizantyńskiej*, ed. O. JUREWICZ, Warszawa 2002, p. 133.

ment of the reign of this Bulgarian ruler by the representatives of the ruling circles in Byzantium. A prominent place among the Greek sources depicting the figure of the tsar has also the oration *On the treaty with the Bulgarians* (Ἐπὶ τῆ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει)¹¹, which was delivered at the Byzantine court in connection with conclusion of the peace treaty of 927, or soon after this event¹². In scholarship, there were several suggested attributions of this oration to well-known figures of the Byzantine court and ecclesiastical circles of the first half of the 10th century. Among them were named such figures as Nicholas Mysticus himself, Niketas Magister or Arethas of Caesarea, one of the animators of the intellectual life of this period. The most likely, however, hypothesis is that the author of the speech was the aforementioned Theodore Daphnopates, an eminent figure in the intellectual environment of the Byzantine capital of the first half of the 10th century, and the emperor Romanos Lekapenos' personal secretary¹³.

The scholars have undertaken the task of reconstructing the image of Symeon I in the Byzantine written sources before¹⁴. Despite that, the oration *On the treaty with*

¹¹ I am using the following critical edition of the text – Ἐπὶ τῆ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει (cetera: Συμβάσει), [in:] I. DUJČEV, *On the Treaty of 927 with the Bulgarians*, DOP 32, 1978, p. 254–288.

¹² R.J.H. JENKINS, *The Peace with Bulgaria (927) celebrated by Theodore Daphnopates*, [in:] *Polychronion. Festschrift F. Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. WIRTH, Heidelberg 1966, p. 289; 'A. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο Ἀνώνυμος λόγος „Ἐπὶ τῆ τῶν Βουλγάρων συμβάσει”, Βυζ 8, 1976, p. 347–349.

¹³ R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 301–302; P. KARLIN-HAYTER, *The Homily on the Peace with Bulgaria of 927 and the 'Coronation' of 913*, JÖB 17, 1968, p. 39; I. DUJČEV, *op. cit.*, p. 241–242, 243, 249, 252–253. Cf. Ф.И. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Неизданное церковное слово о болгарско-византийскихъ отношеніяхъ въ первой половинѣ X вѣка*, ЛИФО.ВО 4, 1894, p. 99–100; 'A. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο Ἀνώνυμος..., p. 351–360.

¹⁴ И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Цар Симеон Велики (893–927): Златният век...*, p. 151–166; П. АНГЕЛОВ, *България и българите в представите на византийците*, София 1999, p. 182–199; J. BONAREK, *Romaŋowie i obcy w kronice Jana Skylitzesa. Identyfikacja etniczna Bizantyńczyków i ich stosunek do obcych w świetle kroniki Jana Skylitzesa*, Toruń 2003, p. 138–146; M.J. LESZKA, *Wizerunek władców Pierwszego Państwa Bułgarskiego w bizantyńskich źródłach pisanych (VIII–pierwsza połowa XII wieku)*, Łódź 2003, p. 89–123. Vide also Л. СИМЕОНОВА, *Образът на българския владетел във византийската книжнина (средата на IX–началото на XI в.)*, [in:] *Представата за „другия” на Балканите*, ed. Н. ДАНОВА, В. ДИМОВА, М. КАЛИЦИН, София 1995, p. 20–31. More on portrayal of Bulgarians vide e.g. V. GJUZELEV, *Bulgarien und die Bulgaren in der mittelalterlichen Dichtung (7.–15. Jh.)*, BHR 9.3, 1981, p. 42–72; P. SCHREINER, *Das Bulgarienbild im Europäischen Mittelalter*, EB 18.2, 1982, p. 58–68; T. MORIYASU, *Images des Bulgares au Moyen Age*, [in:] *Studia Slavico-Byzantina et Mediaevalia Europensia*, vol. I, *Studies on the Slavo-Byzantine and West-European Middle Ages. In memoriam Ivan Dujčev*, ed. P. ДИНЕКОВ et al., Sofia 1988, p. 41–43; П. ЖАВОРОНКОВ, *България и болгары в изображении никейских авторов: традиция и трансформация взглядов*, [in:] *Studia Slavico-Byzantina...*, p. 75–78; P. ANGELOV, *The Bulgarians through the Eyes of the Byzantines*, BHR 22.4, 1994, p. 14–33; Г.Г. ЛИТАВРИН, *Константин Багрянородный о Болгарии и болгарях*, [in:] *Сборник в чест на акад. Димитър Ангелов*, ed. В. ВЕЛКОВ, София 1994, p. 30–37; J. SHERARD, *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. 131, 134, 136–137, 138–139; P. STEPHENSON, *Byzantine Conceptions of Otherness after the Annexation of Bulgaria (1018)*, [in:] *Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider. Papres from*

*the Bulgarians*¹⁵ has not been yet subject to a detailed analysis, although the general conclusions put forward by scholars on its basis are essentially correct and coincide. The lack of in-depth examination was most likely influenced by the specificity of the text itself, difficult to interpret as the author did not express his thoughts in a straightforward manner, but rather by referring to the characters and themes of the Holy Scripture and classical literature¹⁶. It has been pointed out, however, that this does not mean that we are unable to understand the message of the Byzantine rhetorician. Even more than that, because it is possible to attempt an unravelling of even the most subtle allusions¹⁷. Following the last claim, the aim of this paper is to uncover the views of the oration's creator on the Bulgarian tsar Symeon I.

* * *

I would like to point out that the name of Symeon never once appears in the text, although in several of the passages he is without any doubt identifiable. In some of the other places, the orator talks about the Bulgarian ruler in a more veiled manner, and a number of passages could, hypothetically, be indirect references to him. The image that I intend to present below is composite in nature and is based on a thorough analysis of the account. It is, however, an interpretation. Many of the statements that are presented below have not been expressed directly by the Byzantine rhetorician, but without a doubt, they are a logical consequence of his statements, suggestions and clues provided in the speech. I think that many of them were intelligible, probably with much more clarity, to his immediate audience or Byzantine readers, than they are to us today¹⁸. I have therefore sought, even though it is extremely difficult and burdened with the danger of overinterpretation¹⁹, to follow the thoughts of the orator, to attempt reconstruction of his vision of Symeon. I emphasise that these observations do not aspire to exhaust the topic, as a full analysis of all references and allusions to Symeon I expressed by the orator would have considerably exceeded the framework of this, already quite voluminous, paper.

the Thirty-second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998, ed. D.C. SMYTH, Variorum 2000, p. 245–257; J. BONAREK, *op. cit.*, p. 128–156, 169–171, 175–176.

¹⁵ Т. ТОДОРОВ, „Слово за мира с българите“ и българо-византийските политически отношения през последните години от управлението на цар Симеон, [in:] България, българите и техните съседи през вековете. Изследвания и материали от научната конференция в памет на доц. д-р Христо Коларов, 30-31 октомври 1998 г., Велико Търново, ed. И. Андреев, Велико Търново 2001, p. 141–150.

¹⁶ Vide on this subject the comments of Ф.И. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 50–51, 52–53, 94, 100–101; I. DUJČEV, *op. cit.*, p. 251; M.J. LESZKA, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

¹⁷ R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 288–289.

¹⁸ Cf. *ibidem*, p. 299, 302–303.

¹⁹ Cf. comments by M.J. LESZKA, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

Here Symeon, like Adam in Eden, succumbed to the Evil One's promptings. He was deluded and deceived, enticed by the vision of the passing glory (δόξης προσκαιρου) and some unnecessary and improper wreath or crown (στεφάνου... περιπτου τινος και ακαιρου)²⁰. One could say that the Evil One showed Symeon the grandeur, glory and might of the Byzantine Empire and convinced him that this power and splendour could come into his possession, if he would only will it. At once the reader associates this with the temptation of Jesus, whom Satan offered power over the kingdoms of the Earth, in return for a bow. He however resisted the temptation²¹. Unfortunately, Symeon did not do so, and seized on the godless thought of conquering Byzantium and winning the imperial title. I would add that this is perhaps because he did not recognize the one who was suggesting to him these thoughts and aspirations. He did not realize whose goals he was really pursuing. Either way, like disobedience of the first man allowed death and sin to enter the world²², so did (because of Bulgarian ruler's improper desires) the oecumene, or the inhabited world, become an easy prey for the Devil²³. For, having listened to him, Symeon began to fulfill his desire, and thus became a tool in Satan's *hands*.

Elswhere in his oration, reflecting on the deeper causes of the Byzantine-Bulgarian conflict, Daphnopates once again returned to the question of what caused the actions of Symeon himself. He concluded that either the goodness has reached its peak and the time of evil has come so that the balance in the universe could be preserved, or that it was the result of human transgressions, which made themselves known before the Creator²⁴. It remained a fact for him, however, that

at once the river of ambition [or: the love of glory – K.M.], the whirlwind [or: hurricane – K.M.] of primacy, downpour, hail – these and others, even more powerful phenomena that shake Haemus and Ister – burst into the archon's soul (αυτίκα γάρ ο φιλοδοξίας ποταμός, ο της προεδρίας τυφών, ο υετός, ή νιφάς – οία και μάλιστα τον Αιμόν τε και τον Ιστρον κλονεί – τη του αρχοντος προσεβέρύη ψυχή).²⁵

On the margin of this passage (specifically the mention of a *whirlwind*) a later copyist added an obvious identification – Συμμεών²⁶. Moving on to the interpretation

²⁰ Συμβάσει, 3, p. 258, 64–68. Cf. commentary in Φ.Ι. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 110–112; R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 298; 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανώνυμος..., p. 384, an. to p. 365, v. 12–16.

²¹ Mt 4, 8–10.

²² Rom 5, 12.

²³ Συμβάσει, 3, p. 258, 64–68. Cf. e.g. NICHOLAS, 5, p. 28, 55–57; 24, p. 170, 60–61; 26, p. 182, 23–26.

²⁴ Συμβάσει, 12, p. 272, 302–274, 307.

²⁵ Συμβάσει, 12, p. 274, 307–310. I am offering here a translation only minutely different from the one by R.J.H. JENKINS – *ibidem*, p. 275.

²⁶ Φ.Ι. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 78, an. 3. Cf. Συμβάσει, p. 272; 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανώνυμος..., p. 394, an. to p. 372, v. 25–27, who refer this annotation to this whole passage, which

of this passage, it is essential to first state that Haemus mountains (i.e. modern day mountain ranges of Stara Planina, or Balkan mountains, and Sredna Gora) and Ister (the lower Danube) have been mentioned here as the most characteristic and dominant geographical features of the Bulgarian state, separated by the Danubian Plain, the territorial core of early mediaeval Bulgaria. The author clearly states that weather conditions specific to this area, as well as to Haemus mountains and the great river's valley, had an influence on Symeon. It could be said that it was the intensity and ferocity of the atmospheric phenomena of the land in which he was born and grew up, in which the Bulgarian ruler eventually reigned and lived, that shaped his violent personality. It should be also noted, that Christianity condemns yielding to the elements of this world, which were worshiped by pagans as deities²⁷, and following one's passions, as it was regarded as a return, of sorts, to the pagan lifestyle. Recalling of this image was to indicate that by yielding to the said phenomena, the Bulgarian ruler was in fact serving them and by this, in a sense, was making them his gods. Therefore if the gods (here taking form of the elements of nature), to whom Symeon was yielding, were violent, arrogant and ambitious, then he must have resembled them in his attitude and behaviour. The author of the oration leaves no doubt as to the fact that the one created in the image and likeness of the Most High, by turning away from the way of peace and towards the conflagration of war, by raising sword against his brethren, becomes once again a follower of the ancient Hellenic gods – warlike, quarrelsome, insidious, etc.²⁸ Without a doubt, the previously mentioned by the Byzantine orator atmospheric and natural phenomena symbolize the world of such emotions, passions and violent urges. Symeon however, although he should be guided by reason, by what was called the *mind of Christ*²⁹, which allows to distinguish between good and evil, God's will, was subject to mundane elements. Succumbing to the passions also negatively characterised many of the ancient Greek thinkers, at least some of whom would have been known to Daphnopates. The ruler of Bulgaria lacked what Hellenes called *σωφροσύνη*, or temperance, self-mastery, prudence, inner peace and balance, characteristics of a harmonious and internally whole man (Gr. *σωφρονικός* – a man naturally self-controlled, moderate, moral). Mental balance, virtue, decency, prudence were therefore alien to him, and the lack of these characteristics, so dear to the Greeks, also suggested an excessive form of government – tyranny³⁰. *Σωφροσύνη*

generally does not change the meaning of this postscript.

²⁷ Rom 1, 18–32; Col 2, 20; Iudae 12–19.

²⁸ *Συμβάσει*, 9, p. 270, 262–267.

²⁹ 1 Cor 2, 6–16. Cf. e.g. NICHOLAS, 5, p. 28, 49–54.

³⁰ On the subject of *σωφροσύνη* and similar terms *vide* e.g. one of Plato's dialogues – PLATO, *ΧΑΡΜΙΔΗΣ* [*ἢ περὶ σωφροσύνης πειραστικός*], [in:] IDEM, *Charmides, Laches, Lysis*, ed. C.F. HERMANN, Lipsiae 1897, p. 1–30; PLATON, *Charmides*, [in:] IDEM, *Ion. Charmides. Lizys*, trans. W. WITWICKI, Κεῖty 2002, p. 33–34 (from the introduction by W. Witwicki), 37–80 (text with dialogue and comments) and *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G.W.H. LAMPE, Oxford 1961 (cetera:

was therefore an opposite of yielding to desires and passions, to unbridled temperament, which in the Greek world were considered to be features of the barbarians and the less well born.

In the above passage particularly interesting are the statements about *the love of glory* and about *the whirlwind of primacy*, which were supposed to have shaken and taken over the soul of the Bulgarian. They indicate, according to the rhetorician, that Symeon was filled with pride that made him demand for himself precedence over other rulers, at the same time negating the unique position that the Byzantine emperor had among them. Daphnopates further states that as a result of Symeon's yielding to the aforementioned elements there was a great earthquake (ὁ σεισμός) that was felt even by those who lived past the Pillars of Hercules (that is, Gibraltar – ἐπέκεινα Γαδεύρων). Symeon was to victoriously raise high the captured wreath (or crown) and throne (τὸ στέφος καὶ ὁ δίφρος; in other words: to proclaim himself basileus), which according to the orator deprived Europe of the crown and brought destruction to many. Daphnopates calls his actions apostasy (ἡ ἀποστασία), as his proclamation and other things (the author does not specify what things, but he could mean further titles, or deeds that took place after elevation to the imperial dignity) brought about profanation of the sigil, or sign (ἡ σφραγίς). According to Daphnopates, thus evil was born, and Symeon appropriated the harvest (or fruit) of his progenitor (τὰ γεννήματα τοῦ τεκόντος ἐξιδιάζεται), he rejected on the one hand his father, and on the other the spirit (καὶ ἀθετεῖ μὲν τὸν πατέρα, ἀθετεῖ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα) who is the deposit/pledge of his sonship (δι' οὗ ὁ ἀρράβων τῆς υἰότητος)³¹.

The interpretation of this passage may be manifold, and none of the possibilities rule out the others, as they contain related and interconnecting thoughts. Let us, however, go back to the beginning. Symeon's pride has led him to wishing to be equal to the Byzantine emperor, more than that, he wanted to replace him, supplant him and his highest place among the other rulers of oecumene. In my opinion, the Haemus mountains do not appear here by chance at all, as in the Byzantine eyes they were the symbol of Bulgarian haughtiness³². Their peaks, in conjunction with the Bulgarian

PGL), p. 1247; *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. H.G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, rec. H.S. JONES et al., Oxford 1996 (cetera: LSJ), p. 1751–1752 (here further references to the ancient sources); *Słownik grecko-polski*, vol. IV, P-Ω, ed. Z. ABRAMOWICZÓWNA, Warszawa 1965 (cetera: SGP), p. 270–271; *Słownik grecko-polski*, vol. II, Α-Ω, ed. O. JUREWICZ, Warszawa 2001 (cetera: *Słownik*), p. 377–378.

³¹ Συμβάσει, 12, p. 274, 310–316.

³² On this subject vide K. MARINOW, *Hemus jako baza wypadowa i miejsce schronienia w okresie walk o restytucję państwowości bułgarskiej pod koniec XII i na początku XIII wieku*, [in:] *Cesarstwo Bizantyńskie. Dzieje. Religia. Kultura. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Waldemarowi Ceranowi przez uczniów na 70-lecie Jego urodzin*, ed. P. KRUPCZYŃSKI, M.J. LESZKA, Łask–Łódź 2006, p. 183, 186, 192, 194, 197; IDEM, *Dzicy, wyniosli i groźni górale. Wizerunek Bułgarów jako mieszkańców gór w wybranych źródłach greckich VIII–XII w.*, [in:] *Stereotypy bałkańskie. Księga jubileuszowa Profesor Ilony Czamańskiej*, ed. J. PASZKIEWICZ, Z. PENTEK, Poznań 2011, p. 35–45.

ruler's aspirations, must have brought to the minds of Daphnopates' listeners famous passage from Isaiah 14, referred by Byzantine exegetes to rebellion of Lucifer against God. Besides, the Day Star, Son of Dawn, is mentioned there directly:

How is fallen from heaven, the Day Star, which used to rise early in the morning! He was been crushed down into the earth who used to send light to all the nations! You said in your mind, „I will ascend to heaven; I will set my throne above the stars of God; I will sit on a lofty mountain, upon the lofty mountain toward the north; I will ascend above the clouds; I will be like the Most High.” But now you will descend into Hades and into the foundations of the earth.³³

Does it not harmonize with the further information about Symeon arbitrarily declaring himself basileus, elevating his crown and throne high up? Was the lofty mountain, in which the new emperor of Europe resided, not to be Haemus?! I need to add that exactly the same reasoning, connecting the haughty Bulgarian rulers, who opposed the Byzantine autocrats, with the Haemus mountains that they inhabited, appeared in Byzantine historical sources describing the rebellion of Asen brothers, in the late twelfth century³⁴. Just as pride was born in Lucifer's heart, so did it burst into Symeon's soul. Thus he imitated with his behaviour the Prince of Darkness himself. The correctness of this reasoning is confirmed by the fact that in another passage of his speech, the rhetorician directly references the revolt and Lucifer's fall, concluding that he was cast out of heavens to serve as a warning to all others like him³⁵. The allusion to Symeon is therefore more than clear. However, this was not enough for Daphnopates, therefore he reached for yet another procedure. The previously mentioned whirlwind, in Greek *ὁ τυφών* (identified by the copyist, as I have mentioned, directly with the Bulgarian ruler), is the word referring to a character from Greek mythology. Typhon, a monstrous creature, half human, half animal, the youngest son of Gaia and Tartarus³⁶, and thus a god of darkness, or abyss (which was not without significance to the Christian audience of the oration), with his height and strength surpassed all the other descendants of Earth. From his shoulders grew a hundred dragon heads, and from the waist down he was wrapped around by two giant snakes. Erect, he reached the stars, his arms encircled the whole earth. Winged, he breathed fire, shook the earth, and with his fiery spit he destroyed fields, houses and temples.

³³ Isa 14, 12–15 (English translation – *Esaias*, trans. M. SILVA, [in:] *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, ed. A. PIETERSMA, B.G. WRIGHT, Oxford 2007 [cetera: NETS], p. 835).

³⁴ More on this subject *vide* K. MARINOW, *Hemus...*, p. 181–199, especially p. 189–190, an. 33.

³⁵ Συμβάσει, 8, p. 268, 215–217.

³⁶ According to a different legend, he was a son of Hera, begotten without the participation of a male element; or an offspring of Kronos, born from an egg he fertilised – P. GRIMAL, *Słownik mitologii greckiej i rzymskiej*, trans. M. BRONARSKA et al., intr. J. ŁANOWSKI, ³Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1997, p. 355; K. KERÉNYI, *Mitologia Greków*, trans. R. RESZKE, Warszawa 2002, p. 30.

Along with Echidna, half woman, half snake, he was also to beget other mythical monsters, including Chimera, Lernean Hydra and Cerberus, and according to some of the ancient authors also Scylla; these also appear in the oration³⁷. Identified with the destructive forces of nature, the cause of hurricanes³⁸, a fire breathing monster, according to one of versions of the Greek myth he also rebelled against the established order and acted against the Olympic gods, trying to overthrow them and take their place³⁹.

Thus, according to our orator, this pagan god and rebel literally came in the form of storms that pulled at the ruler's emotions, and in reality, as a demon, entered Symeon (using the language of the Church: possessed him)⁴⁰. It is no wonder then that the effects of tsar's activity were identical to those done by the legendary beast. The first of these was, mentioned by Daphnopates, a powerful earthquake, felt even beyond the boundaries of the inhabited world. Further, as mentioned by the orator himself, and what more than once Nicholas Mysticus underlined in his correspondence with the Bulgarian tsar, Symeon's troops destroyed farmlands in Byzantine territories, as well as houses, Christian temples and monasteries⁴¹. In other words, the condition in which Symeon found himself after Typhon entered his soul was the exact opposite of the state of the Roman emperor. According to the political ideology that was being developed in the empire, the Byzantine ruler began to be styled not only emperor *from God* (ἐκ Θεοῦ, i.e. of divine appointment, choosing) but the emperor *in God* (ἐν Θεῷ), which well explains the related term ἐνθεος, or *inspired by God, filled with God, possessed by Him*. It therefore defined the Byzantine monarch as the person who took God into himself. The formula indicated mystical activity of God in the emperor's person and thereafter, through the ruler's person, it was making itself known through his actions⁴². According to

³⁷ Συμβάσει, 21, p. 284, 469.482.488.

³⁸ Including typhoons, or tropical cyclones, name of which comes from the English transcription of his name – V. ZAMAROVSKÝ, *Bogowie i herosi mitologii greckiej i rzymskiej*, trans. J. ILLG, L. SPYRKA, J. WANIA, Warszawa 2003, p. 456.

³⁹ J. PARANDOWSKI, *Mitologia. Wierzenia i podania Greków i Rzymian*, ²⁴Warszawa 1990, p. 43–44; R. GRAVES, *Mity greckie*, trans. H. KRZECZOWSKI, intr. A. KRAWCZUK, ⁵Warszawa 1992, p. 126–128 (36.a–36.4); P. GRIMAL, *op. cit.*, p. 355–356; K. KERÉNYI, *op. cit.*, p. 29–31; W. MARKOWSKA, *Mity Greków i Rzymian*, Warszawa 2002, p. 21–22; Z. KUBIAK, *Mitologia Greków i Rzymian*, Warszawa 2003, p. 77–79; V. ZAMAROVSKÝ, *op. cit.*, p. 456.

⁴⁰ *Vide* e.g. Mt 12, 45; Mc 5, 2.15; Lc 8, 30; 13, 16; Io 13, 27.

⁴¹ Συμβάσει, 2, p. 256, 40–44; 3, p. 256, 47–53; 7, p. 264, 174–177; NICHOLAS, 14, p. 94, 59 – 96, 77; 24, p. 170, 57–60; 26, p. 182, 22–27.

⁴² X. ХУНГЕР, *Империя на ново средище. Християнският дух на византийската култура*, trans. Г. Инджијева, ed. В. Пюзелев, София 2000, p. 91–97; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Византийският...*, p. 122–123. Cf. NICHOLAS, 5, p. 30, 77–80: *The evil man from the evil treasury of his heart bringeth forth evil. The good man from the good treasury of his heart bringeth forth good* (cf. Mt 12, 35; Eng. trans. – NICHOLAS, p. 31).

the analysed message, Symeon was, in turn, *in Typhon*, or rather, Typhon was in him, therefore the Bulgarian ruler was possessed (once again ἐνθεός⁴³) by that pagan deity. Undoubtedly this discredited him in the context of the title of the Christian emperor of the Romans that he assumed.

Three more times in the text we will find an allusion to Symeon's-Typhon's activity. Mentioning the Byzantine expedition against Symeon and the defeat of the Byzantine army in the 917 battle of Acheloos, the rhetorician notes that in this way Zoe's regency ignites a fire (ὕπανάπτει τὸ πῦρ), flames of which shone to the times contemporary to when the oration was composed⁴⁴. This statement is, of course, supposed to point to the catastrophic move of the Byzantine government that not only infuriated the Bulgarian ruler but, after he achieved a spectacular victory and weakened the Empire's military forces, allowed him the freedom of action in the Balkan Peninsula. As a result of this, the previously mentioned fire was started, which was eventually extinguished by the diplomatic efforts of Romanos Lekapenos, and the peace treaty of 927. The latter statement is to indicate how severe and long lasting were the effects of the destructive activity of the Bulgarian tsar.

Daphnopates identifies Symeon with fire in general, of course in the context of its destructive force. He specifies that fire is difficult to consume/destroy with fire (δὲ πυρὶ τὸ πῦρ δυσανάλωτον), and for that reason God raised Moses from water (ἐξ ὕδατος ἀναλαμβάνει Θεὸς τὸν Μωσῆν)⁴⁵. Without a doubt, hiding behind the biblical archetype, that is Moses, who having risen from water was to extinguish the flames kindled by Symeon-Typhon, is emperor Romanos Lekapenos. The copyist left no doubt in this matter, who next to the name of Moses noted – 'Ρωμανόν⁴⁶. Comparison between the Old Testament prophet, leader and the lawgiver of Israel and the emperor is particularly telling in this passage. The biblical tale of raising Moses from water⁴⁷ undoubtedly brought to the listener's, and later readers', minds a link to the military career of Romanos himself, who for a number of years served as a droungarios of the imperial fleet. The new emperor was therefore literally summoned from the water to the empire's rescue⁴⁸. It should be added that also in the myth about Zeus', conqueror of Typhon, birth there appears a motif associated with water, in which Rhea wanted to bathe her son⁴⁹.

Concluding his statement about the talks between Symeon and Romanos Lekapenos in 924, the author stated that like the most savage of beasts (τὰ τῶν θηρίων

⁴³ On the meaning of this word *vide* LSJ, p. 566; SGP, vol. II, E-K, ed. Z. ABRAMOWICZÓWNA, Warszawa 1960, p. 141; *Słownik*, vol. I, A-K, ed. O. JUREWICZ, Warszawa 2000, p. 307.

⁴⁴ Συμβάσει, 14, p. 276, 343–347.

⁴⁵ Συμβάσει, 15, p. 276, 348–349.

⁴⁶ Συμβάσει, p. 276; 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανάγνωμος..., p. 399, an. to p. 374, v. 6.

⁴⁷ Ex 2, 1–6.

⁴⁸ Cf. R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 298, 301.

⁴⁹ J. PARANDOWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

ώμότερα)⁵⁰, when they cannot reach those who are shooting at them, they begin to fight against the darts (τὰ βέλη, also: javelins), so did he (that is, Symeon), chased off along with his hostility, hurled his bile (or anger) in the forest thickets (τοῖς δρυμοῖς τὸν χόλον ἀπέσκηψε)⁵¹. Indirectly, this comparison is to underline the powerlessness of the Bulgarian ruler in relation to the Roman emperor, who has driven him away – the savage Bulgarian, unable to effectively carry out his hostile plans towards the Byzantines, is venting his anger on the defenseless nature. This mention should most likely be linked to the source information relating to the cutting of trees by Symeon's army during devastating and burning of Thrace and Macedonia in 924, shortly before the meeting with Romanos Lekapenos⁵². However, due to its placement by the rhetorician after the information about concluding negotiations between the two rules, a different interpretation is possible. In the context of an earlier reference, in which the Bulgarian ruler was named a wild hog, living in the woods⁵³, these words can mean that he only showed his anger in Bulgarian territories (in the forests in which he dwelled), which again emphasizes his powerlessness. This time the bile thrown from inside is synonymous with the fire, thrown from the jaws of Typhon. Besides, according to the myth, Zeus also cast at the monster darts of rays (lightning bolts, so also τὰ βέλη), forcing him to flee, and eventually casting him down into the abyss⁵⁴.

It is noteworthy that Typhon appeared in Daphnopates' text in conjunction with the aforementioned Haemus mountains. Moreover, the whirlwind, or hurricane, that he causes is one of the phenomena that, according to the orator, rage among these mountains. There is no doubt that Daphnopates intended this procedure. The learned Byzantine rhetorician was referring in this passage to one of the versions of the myth of Typhon, according to which, during the epic fight with Zeus, the monster reached Thrace and began to hurl the local mountains at the pursuing enemy. Wounded by the Olympian god, he sprinkled with his blood the mountain range, which from that time onward was called Haemus (in classical Greek Haimos – Αἴμος,

⁵⁰ Symeon, in yet another passage, is called a *savage/wild animal* (τὸ θηρίον) or, what is more telling, a *predator, monster, beast hostile to man* – Συμβάσει, 15, p. 276, 359. It is worth pointing out that this expression was also used as a curse, meaning *vile beast* – LSJ, p. 800; SGP, vol. II, p. 463; *Słownik*, vol. I, p. 449. To provide a full overview, I am also providing synonyms: θήρ, θηρός – *wild animal*, in plur. *mythical animals, monsters, mythological figures* (cf. the question of Typhon) – LSJ, p. 799; SGP, vol. II, p. 461; *Słownik*, vol. I, p. 449. It is not impossible, that in this oration the author is using the expression τὸ θηρίον (also in plur.) in its ecclesiastical meaning, and therefore referring to e.g. pagan deities, demons appearing under appearances of animals, Antichrist, the Satan himself and his angels – PGL, p. 651–652.

⁵¹ Συμβάσει, 16, p. 278, 369–371.

⁵² THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, VI, 15, ed. I. BEKKER, Bonnæ 1838 (cetera: THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS), p. 405, 17–20. Cf. P. KARLIN-HAYTER, *op. cit.*, p. 39; 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΑΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανάγνωμος λόγος...', p. 401, an. to p. 377, v. 25–28.

⁵³ Συμβάσει, 14, p. 276, 343–346.

⁵⁴ W. MARKOWSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

from Gr. αἷμα, that is *blood*)⁵⁵. It is possible that a more veiled reference to Haemus mountains as the place of Symeon's whereabouts is in a passage, which discusses the calamitous Byzantine expedition against Bulgaria in 917. Daphnopates states there that the Byzantines went to hunt wild boars in a forest (κατὰ τοῦ ἐκ δρυμοῦ μονιοῦ)⁵⁶, and it is otherwise known that the Stara Planina mountain range was particularly densely forested during antiquity and middle ages⁵⁷. In addition, the Delphic Python (Snake), occasionally identified with Typhon, the embodiment of the destructive Northern Wind (shown with the tail of a serpent) that fell on Greece from Haemus mountains⁵⁸. This fact can also be indirectly connected with Symeon, who from Stara Planina attacked and ravaged Byzantine territories.

Regardless of whether the latter supposition is correct, considering the above metaphor about Symeon-Typhon, one should remember about the main point – defeated by Zeus, the monster was cast into Tartarus, or buried under Mount Etna (according to a different version of the myth)⁵⁹. Similarly to the aforementioned Lucifer, who was cast down from the heaven into the abyss of Sheol. Typhon's rebellion was the last opposition against the rule of the divine inhabitants of Olympus. The victory of the latter was a *triumph of perfection, nobility and intelligence over the brute and savage bestial strength*⁶⁰. In a sense, Symeon-Typhon therefore represents in the Byzantine rhetorician's oration the old, pagan order, rebelling against the new, Christian one. In other words, anyone who goes against the hierarchy established by the Most High, automatically becomes a tool of demons, again yields to the old, unruly and greedy gods, who want to destroy the divine order and restore the old rule of darkness.

One should note, that this was not the only such characterisation of a Bulgarian ruler in Byzantine literature. John Geometres, a former soldier and a Byzantine poet

⁵⁵ J. PARANDOWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 44; R. GRAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 127; P. GRIMAL, *op. cit.*, p. 355; K. KERÉNYI, *op. cit.*, p. 30; Z. КУВИАК, *op. cit.*, p. 78–79. On the subject of such etymology of the name of the Haemus mountains *vide e.g.* Д. ДЕЧЕВ, *Хемус и Родопи. Принос към старата география на България*, ГСУИФФ 21.10, 1925, p. 1–36.

⁵⁶ Συμβάσει, 14, p. 276, 343–346.

⁵⁷ On this subject *vide e.g.* Л. ДИНЕВ, Л. МЕЛНИШКИ, *Стара Планина*, София 1962, p. 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 37–39; Г.Д. ДАНОВ, *Средна Гора. Пътеводител*, София 1971, p. 12, 13–14, 23; H. MARUSZCZAK, *Bulgaria*, Warszawa 1971, p. 160; В. НИКОЛОВ, М. ЙОРДАНОВА, *Планините в България*, София 2002, p. 10, 19–24, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44.

⁵⁸ R. GRAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 83, n. 2, p. 127, przym. 1; Z. КУВИАК, *op. cit.*, p. 77. In some of the Byzantine sources Bulgarians were presented as vipers inhabiting Haemus, and Asen, one of the leaders of the anti-Byzantine rebellion of 1185 was compared to a hail and storm cloud, which from that very range fell down on the empire – К. МАРИНОВ, *Hemus...*, p. 190, 193–194, 195.

⁵⁹ J. PARANDOWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 44; R. GRAVES, *op. cit.*, p. 127; P. GRIMAL, *op. cit.*, p. 355; K. KERÉNYI, *op. cit.*, p. 30; W. MARKOWSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 22; Z. КУВИАК, *op. cit.*, p. 78–79; V. ЗАМАРОВСКÝ, *op. cit.*, p. 456.

⁶⁰ Quoted after J. PARANDOWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

from the late 10th century, likened tsar Samuel (997–1014), a Bulgarian ruler and one of the so-called Komitopouloi, precisely to Typhon:

Upon high, a comet lit the sky, below cometes [comes – i.e. Samuel – K.M.] burned (πυρπολεῖ) the West [i.e. the Balkan provinces of the Byzantine Empire – K.M.] [...] This terrible Typhon among the villains, burns everything (τὰ πάντα πιμπρᾷ).⁶¹

Comparison between Samuel and Typhon also brings with it justified mountain connotations, as the Bulgarian ruler inflicted upon the emperor Basil II (976–1025) a severe defeat in the most important gorge of Haemus, through which passed the famous military road (via militaris) connecting Belgrad with Constantinople; this memorable battle took place at so-called Gate of Trajan⁶², on 17 of July 986⁶³. The conclusion is all the more justified, because the aforementioned John Geometres dedicated another of his poems to the defeat of the Byzantine at this pass. He cursed in it the treachery of the mountain peaks, among which the emperor feared to face the Bulgarians (including, of course, Samuel)⁶⁴. To conclude, I would like to remind that already in antiquity the Greeks referred to gigantomachy, including the myth about the battle between Zeus and Typhon, as the symbolic representations of their armed struggle against the aggressive and barbaric Asia⁶⁵. Undoubtedly, both of the Byzantine authors, Daphnopates and Geometres, alluded to this image while presenting the struggles of the Eastern Roman Empire against the Bulgarian tsars, who in their opinion were also violent barbarians.

The result of the actions of Symeon described above could only have been the plagues described by the rhetorician – earthquakes (one should keep in mind that this is only a metaphor), depriving Europe of the only true imperial title, inherent to the basileus of Romans (from Byzantine point of view, a real result in the ideological dimension) and, in a most real sense, bringing about the deaths of many people, in other words consequences of war⁶⁶, which Symeon undertook to bring about his *dreams of power*, to quote one of the scholars⁶⁷. Demands and actions of Symeon Daphnopates calls with a very important and powerful word – ἡ ἀποστασία (apostasy), concerning

⁶¹ *Ioannis Geometrae carmina varia argumenti sacri vel historici* (cetera: GEOMETRES), [in:] PG, vol. CVI, col. 920 A. Vide also G.N. ΝΙΚΟΛΟΒ, *Bułgarzy i ogień grecki (VII–XI w.)*, [in:] *Byzantina Europaea. Księga Jubileuszowa ofiarowana Profesorowi Waldemarowi Ceranowi*, ed. M. KOKOSZKO, M.J. LESZKA, Łódź 2007, p. 453.

⁶² Modern day Ihtiman pass in the Sredna Gora range.

⁶³ On this subject vide e.g. П. МУТАФЧИЕВ, *Старият друм през „Траянови врата”, СБАН.КИ-ФФО 55.27, 1937, p. 101–125.*

⁶⁴ GEOMETRES, col. 934 A.

⁶⁵ J. PARANDOWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁶⁶ Cf. R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 298; 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανώνυμος..., p. 394, an. to p. 372, v. 28.

⁶⁷ M.J. LESZKA, *Symeona, władcy Bułgarii, sny o potędze*, TK 64–66.4–6, 2001, p. 6–10.

not only matters of faith, but also being a *terminus technicus* indicating usurpation of imperial power. Symeon was thus in his eyes a usurper, and one that ultimately failed, and therefore acted against God's will⁶⁸. In the text it is clearly stated that during a feast organized by him, Symeon demanded the respect for himself as a Byzantine emperor, and being titled *basileus* of Romans⁶⁹. The personal attitude of the orator and the evaluation of what happened is equally clear – it is evil (τὸ κακόν)⁷⁰. He states that the Bulgarian appropriated a good that is the title of *basileus*, and especially of *basileus* of Romans. A good which he should not have, as a little further in the text the rhetorician clearly states that it is not permissible for a non-Roman to rule over Romans (εἰ μὴ Ῥωμαῖον Ῥωμαίοις ἀπώμοτον)⁷¹. Daphnopates is willing to grant Symeon only the customary title given by the Byzantines to Bulgarian rulers, namely that of archon of Bulgarians (ἄρχοντος Βουλγάρων), which can be seen in the passage quoted above. This assertion is also confirmed by the correspondence he was conducting between the Bulgarian ruler and emperor Romanos Lekapenos, in which Symeon is being consistently styled archon of Bulgaria, similarly as by the vast majority of Byzantine authors⁷². Especially since Symeon styled himself in such way on his seals until the beginning of the second decade of 10th century (e.g. Χριστὲ βοήθη Συμεὼν ἄρχοντα Βουλγαρίας)⁷³. This means that the Byzantine author did not accept the changes that occurred in the titlature of the Bulgarian ruler after this period. In case of the said sign (ἡ σφραγίς), it can indicate specifically seals of Symeon himself, on which he first styled himself emperor of the Bulgarians, and afterwards emperor of the Bulgarians and Romans, and even Romans alone (e.g. Συμεὼν ἐν Χριστῷ βασιλεὺς Ῥομέων/Ῥωμαίων)⁷⁴. In this way he would have been defacing them, assuming titles that did not befit him. He would have depreciated them by placing on them an obvious untruth. The Byzantine symbols of imperial power that were placed on these seals were also defiled⁷⁵. It is very likely,

⁶⁸ On the subject of interpreting usurpations by Byzantines *vide* e.g. M.J. LESZKA, *Uzurpacje w Cesarstwie Bizantyńskim w okresie od IV do połowy IX wieku*, Łódź 1999, p. 39–56, 73–80.

⁶⁹ These are most likely reminiscences of the events in Constantinople in 913 – R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 299; P. KARLIN-HAYTER, *op. cit.*, p. 30. Cf. Ф.И. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 115–117.

⁷⁰ Συμβάσει, 12, p. 274, 314. Cf. *ibidem*, 4, p. 260, 93; 9, p. 270, 268; 12, p. 272, 303; 21, p. 284, 478. 480; 21, p. 286, 496. 500.

⁷¹ Συμβάσει, 13, p. 274, 320–321.

⁷² Г. БАКАЛОВ, *Средновековният...*, p. 163, 166; M.J. LESZKA, *Wizerunek...*, p. 112, 120–121. Exceptions to this rule were Theophanes Continuatus, Pseudo-Symeon and Theophylact of Ohrid, who graced him with the title of *basileus*. P. KARLIN-HAYTER, *op. cit.*, p. 29, 38, sees the question of titling Symeon in the oration somewhat differently. Cf. R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

⁷³ И. ЙОРДАНОВ, *Корпус на печатите на средновековна България*, София 2001, p. 40–45; Г. БАКАЛОВ, *Средновековният...*, p. 149. Even in the Old Bulgarian note from 907 Symeon is styled a *knyaz*, or prince (князь) – Б. ХРИСТОВА, Д. КАРАДЖОВА, Е. УЗУНОВА, *Бележки на българските книжовници X–XVIII век*, vol. I, X–XV век, София 2003, p. 25, nr 1.

⁷⁴ И. ЙОРДАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 48–55; Г. БАКАЛОВ, *Средновековният...*, p. 162.

⁷⁵ Cf. R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

however, that the sign mentioned in the text simply indicates the Sign of the Cross⁷⁶, the most important symbol of Christianity. In this way, the Bulgarian ruler's rebellion against the Byzantine emperor would have become indirectly, and even directly, a rebellion against God himself. Once redeemed by confession of faith and baptism, now Symeon would have turned away from Christ, denying established by order. The order, in which according to the Byzantine political doctrine the highest position among the rulers of the world was once and for all reserved for the Eastern Roman emperor. Therefore, in a sense, the previously mentioned accusation of apostasy could also apply to this stance of the Bulgarian ruler, this time in its basic, ecclesiastical meaning, which is rejection of the order created by God, opposition to the revealed truth⁷⁷. At least, such truth as was recognized by the Byzantines. The result of all this is that the Bulgarian ruler appears as someone who reached for goods that did not belong to him; as someone who demanded for himself what brought about by Byzantine rulers, the fruit of their labours. He demanded the power over the empire that was entrusted to them, and whose greatness, wealth and glory were their exclusive heritage; the position in the Christian world that belonged to them. Significantly, in this way Symeon became a thief, and one who robs his own parent.

Particularly telling in this context is the last fragment of the cited above passage, which is a clear reference to the so-called spiritual sonship of Bulgarians, especially of the Bulgarian ruler towards the Roman emperor⁷⁸. In one of the earlier passages, characterising the Byzantine-Bulgarian conflict, the orator stated that these were not foreigners who turned against those belonging to a different tribe, nor those speaking a different tongue against those of a different tongue (μη ἀλλογενεῖς ἀλλοφύλοις μηδὲ ἀλλογλωσσοῖς ἀλλογλωσσοῖ), but sons against fathers and brothers against brothers and fathers against sons (υἱοὶ δὲ πατράσι καὶ ἀδελφοῖς ἀδελφοὶ, καὶ πατέρες υἱοῖς ἀντέστημεν)⁷⁹.

⁷⁶ Cf. 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανώνυμος λόγος..., p. 394, an. to p. 373, v. 1.

⁷⁷ Cf. e.g. NICHOLAS, 5, p. 30, 69–73.

⁷⁸ F. DÖLGER, *Der Bulgarenherrscher als geistlicher Sohn des byzantinischen Kaisers*, ИИД 16–18, 1940, p. 219–232; ИДЕМ, *Средновековното „семејство на владетелите и народите“ и българският владетел*, СБАН.КИФ 62, 1943, p. 181–222. More on this subject vide G. OSTROGORSKY, *The Byzantine emperor and the Hierarchical World Order*, SEER 35, 1956, p. 1–14; Г.Г. ЛИТАВРИН, *Политическая теория в Византии с середины VII до начала XIII в.*, [in:] *Культура Византии вторая половина VII–XII в.*, ed. З.В. Удальцова, Г.Г. Литаврин, Москва 1989, p. 59–88; Г. БАКАЛОВ, *Ранновизантийската доктрина за властта*, [in:] *Studia protobulgarica et mediaevalia europensia. В чест на професор Веселин Бешевлиев*, ed. К. Попконстантинов, Велико Търново 1993, p. 13–22; X. ХУНГЕР, *op. cit.*, p. 89–149; Ж. ДАГРОН, *Императорът и свещеникът. Етюд върху византийския „цезаропанизъм“*, trans. Ц. Кръстева, София 2006, p. 216–244; D. FEISSEL, *Cesarz i administracja cesarska*, [in:] *Świat Bizancjum*, vol. I, *Cesarstwo Wschodniorzymskie 330–641*, ed. C. MORRISON, trans. A. GRABOŃ, Kraków 2007, p. 97–109; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Византийският...*, p. 116–178; M.J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, *Cesarz, dwór i poddani*, [in:] *Konstantynopol-Nowy Rzym. Miasto i ludzie w okresie wczesnobizantyńskim*, ed. ИДЕМ, Warszawa 2011, p. 240–247.

⁷⁹ Συμβάσει, 3, p. 258, 55–57. Cf. e.g. NICHOLAS, 11, p. 78, 106–113; 14, p. 96, 80–83; 24, p. 170, 51–54.

Of course, the paragraph does not talk about the subjects of the Constantinopolitan emperor and those of the Bulgarian ruler having a common ethnic origin. Such reasoning was, moreover, alien to the contemporary way of thinking. Daphnopates wanted merely to stress that both the Byzantines and the Bulgarians were of a common faith, belonged to one, Christian, nation⁸⁰. The orator also did not mean that they spoke the same language on a daily basis, although Greek was known at the Bulgarian court, but that they used the same language of faith, that they were of one thought in the matters of religion, praised God with one voice, in harmony. The proof of this is in the last part of the mentioned passage, in which it is claimed that the Bulgarians were Byzantine sons in faith. This kinship, after all, can be understood only in a spiritual, not physical, sense. Using the method of expression typical of the Apostle Paul it can be said that the Byzantines *bore in faith*⁸¹ their northern neighbours, as they were the ones who brought them the light of the Gospel⁸². They were, and still are, their teachers and guides in Christ⁸³. Of course, the words about the brotherhood primarily concern the question of faith, the shared Orthodox faith of the Byzantines and Bulgarians. The Bulgarians are therefore both sons and brothers in faith to the Byzantines. They form one house of faith – new Israel, leadership in which, however, is exercised by the Byzantines, because of their seniority. To be capable of taking care for the Bulgarians, they must have an appropriate, and accepted by the latter, authority. Therein lies the problem, because in the light of the order listed by the Byzantine rhetorician, it were the sons who have first risen against the fathers. Of course, the first to do that was Symeon, by rejecting the dominion of his spiritual father, that is, the Byzantine emperor. Then, he drew his subjects into his apostasy. In this way the Bulgarians have become rebels, infringing the established by God order of family relations. Symeon, by rejecting the spiritual fatherhood of the emperor rejected, in fact, God the Father and the Holy Spirit, who is the pledge of Divine sonship⁸⁴. In doing so, he ceased to be a spiritual son, both of the emperor and of God, and therefore, as a consequence, he ceased to be a member of the household of faith, a member of God's family, headed by the Byzantine ruler⁸⁵. He also offended against the fourth commandment, which speaks of honouring the parents⁸⁶, in our case even spiritual ones. I must add that in one of the letters of emperor Romanos Lekapenos to Symeon (written *de facto* by Daphnopates), the Bulgarian ruler is being reprimanded for breaking the peace and going against Byzantium, as in doing so he betrayed the

⁸⁰ Eph 2, 11–22; Col 3, 11; 1 Petr 2, 7–9; Αρσ 1, 5–6. Cf. Φ.Ι. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 98–99, 112.

⁸¹ 1 Cor 4, 15.

⁸² Cf. 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανώνημος λόγος..., p. 383–384, an. to p. 365, v. 5.

⁸³ Cf. e.g. NICHOLAS, 11, p. 78, 109–113.

⁸⁴ Rom 8, 14–15.23; 2 Cor 2, 21–22; 5, 5; Eph 1, 13–14. Cf. e.g. NICHOLAS, 24, p. 170, 53–54. *Vide* also 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανώνημος..., p. 394–395, an. to p. 372, v. 2–4.

⁸⁵ *Vide* ΔΑΦΝΟΠΑΤΕΣ, 6, p. 73, 55–62.

⁸⁶ Ex 20, 12; Deut 5, 16; Mt 15, 4; 19, 19; Mc 7, 10; 10, 19; Lc 18, 20; Eph 6, 1–3.

will of his real father (in both physical and educational sense)⁸⁷, that is Boris-Michael. He would have also disobeyed his suggestions, he would have (of course from the Byzantine perspective) abandoned the legacy of continuing peaceful relations with the southern neighbour.

Talking about the sonship of the Bulgarians is a reference to the Byzantine concept of hierarchy of rulers and nations, established on earth (Gr. *τάξις*). Although this element has no direct connection with the biblical texts, it should have some attention devoted to it, as it is closely associated with the question of the above mentioned sonship in faith. At the head of this hierarchy was the Roman emperor, and below him, at different rungs of the hierarchical ladder, were other rulers and nations over whom the *basileus* exercised spiritual custody, and who owed due respect to him. In this regard, too, the Bulgarian ruler was the emperor's son. Adherence to this *τάξις* guaranteed stability and blessing of the oecumene, since this order was modelled on the heavenly hierarchy, and was therefore sacred. As such, it was untouchable, unchangeable. Infringing upon it was, in Byzantine thinking, a sacrilege, an act of violence against God's regulations.

As a result of all this, namely the stance adopted by Symeon, striving towards realisation of his ungodly desires, was a conflagration of war, which swept through the Byzantine territories. Daphnopates in many words and very vividly described the misery caused by the war that lasted for many years. He describes the time of war as night, dusk, winter, sickness, exile, wandering, storm and waves of the sea, bitter experiences, crying, sadness, evil, death. Whereas as its opposites he names dawn, day, summer, peace and goodness, and even resurrection⁸⁸. In the light of the arguments presented above on the subject of portrayal of Symeon it can be said that the victims of the war that he waged became *οἱ τυφώνιοι* – people burnt alive as a sacrifice to Typhon-Symeon. Recalling Byzantine prisoners who were captured in Bulgaria during the war the author states that they lived in remote and waterless, distant lands, deprived of freedom and rule, doomed to the yoke of slavery (*τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ ἐξουσίας, τὸν τῆς δουλείας κατακριθέντες ζυγόν*)⁸⁹. From the correspondence between emperor Romanos Lekapenos with Symeon we know that some of the prisoners were sold by the Bulgarians into slavery⁹⁰, which undoubtedly was the basis for accusing Symeon of detestable treatment of the Christian captives. It is however also possible that the author of the oration had in this passage meant only the territory of Bulgaria, in which case the statement about the lack of rule exercised over the Romans could be

⁸⁷ DAPHNOPATES, 6, p. 73, 55–58.

⁸⁸ Συμβάσει, 2–3, p. 254, 22–258, 81; 5, p. 260, 104–110; 6, p. 264, 152–158; 7, p. 264, 171–174 (on a basis of contrast with the situation after establishing of peace); 8, p. 266, 199–202; 12, p. 272, 302–274, 316; 14, p. 276, 343–347; 18, p. 280, 402–413 (on a basis of highlighting the changes after establishing of peace); 20–21, p. 280, 431–286, 498 (here e.g. examples from history, showing to what a war leads).

⁸⁹ Συμβάσει, 5, p. 260, 105–108.

⁹⁰ DAPHNOPATES, 5, p. 59, 47 – 61, 49.

applied directly to the Bulgarian tsar's rule. The authority imposed on the Byzantine prisoners in such circumstances could not have been a real, legal rule, one that would actually cared about them, an authority granting the right to adopting the title of the *emperor of the Romans*, but would have only be a yoke of slavery. For the Romans who were under his reign he was a tyrant, rather than an emperor. In fact, Symeon was indirectly accused of tyranny by Nicholas Mysticus⁹¹. Besides, the designation of tyranny was directly linked with accusation of apostasy, that is usurpation⁹².

In the source, the Bulgarian ruler is also referred to as pharaoh, holding the chosen people captive; an evil ruler, whose heart was hardened by God himself to such an extent that he was no longer able to reform. This last statement is to emphasise the finality of God's provision, according to which the Creator has allowed Symeon to do evil until the end of his life, so that the cup of his sins would overflow and that God's just judgements would be fulfilled upon him. And although the Bulgarian ruler oppressed the people of God with the consent of the Most High, it did not mean that he will not be severely punished for his actions, similarly to the pharaoh from the Old Testament story about the exodus of Israelites from Egypt. This was happening so that the punishment imposed on Symeon was more severe. It is not without significance that Egypt, according to the message of the Old and New Testament, symbolised a land of injustice, captivity and darkness, and its ruler was considered the personification of Satan. The fact that it was God himself who hardened Symeon's heart emphasised the ruler's persistence in adhering to evil, the stance and state of mind that no rational arguments can change. And yet so many of them were used by the Byzantine diplomacy, as it tried so eminently to influence the Bulgarian, to speak to his reason, to move his Christian conscience⁹³. It is possible that Daphnopates' assertion is somewhat representative of the frustration and resignation of the Constantinopolitan court, which lost the faith in the meaning of any discussion with Symeon⁹⁴. It is certain, however, that it expresses the sudden flash of insight of the Byzantines who understood that the matter of Symeon is no longer, or rather never was, in their capacity, but that it was a matter of divine judgements. And if so, then there was no reason to worry, since knowing the end of the biblical pharaoh, who was opposing God, it is not difficult to guess what end awaited the Bulgarian monarch. Just as pharaoh opposed God's decision that allowed Israelites to depart from Egypt, so did Symeon went against laws, rules and hierarchies that the Most High established on earth. If so, then God himself will oppose him, and there-

⁹¹ NICHOLAS, 5, p. 28, 58 – 30, 94; 11, p. 78, 100–102, 113–120. Commentary in L. SIMEONOVA, *op. cit.*, p. 92–93; M.J. LESZKA, *Wizerunek...*, p. 106–107.

⁹² Vide e.g. И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Асеневици: Renovatio imperii Bulgarorum et Graecorum*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Седем...*, p. 142–148.

⁹³ The diversity of Byzantine diplomatic efforts is mentioned by the rhetorician himself – Συμβάσει, 15, p. 276, 356–361. Cf. comments by R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 301.

⁹⁴ So thinks M.J. LESZKA, *Wizerunek...*, p. 112–113.

fore the Bulgarian will be in fact fighting not against the Byzantines, but against God himself. This interpretation is supported by a passage from a letter of Lekapenos to the Bulgarian tsar, in which the emperor states as follows:

(...) I know that and I am entirely sure, having heard it from pious and holy men, that even if you wanted to make peace, you could not manage it – to such an extent God has hardened your heart, in order to prove on you his power.⁹⁵

Of course, writing this letter during the Bulgarian ruler's life, Daphnopates could not have been certain that Symeon would not change his attitude. More than that, he might have used this, clear to his interlocutor passage, to inspire in him the desire to prove that he is not a puppet in the hands of Fate and that he can change his attitude, to prove that he is still his own master, a free man, in whom the Most High still has liking. During the writing and delivering the oration *On the treaty with the Bulgarians*, however, he already knew that Symeon remained faithful to his chosen path. He could therefore freely compare him to the infamous character of the Egyptian pharaoh from the pages of the Scripture.

Symeon is also characterised as Goliath, who, full of pride and surrounded by the army, arrives to talk with David, here the emperor Romanos Lekapenos⁹⁶. In short, orator wants to highlight that Symeon was haughty and sure of himself, as he placed trust in his own power and the strength of his army. So did the biblical Goliath, who not only insulted the Israeli warriors while boasting his might, but in reality also defied God himself (as David was to say: *who reproached the ranks of the living God*⁹⁷). Against him and his solely human (and at the same time pagan) might stood David alone, who put his trust only in God Almighty; and that is why he won⁹⁸. According to the Byzantine rhetorician, the victory lay in that, despite the initial self-confidence, haughtiness and verbosity, Symeon humbly listened to what the Byzantine emperor had to say. He agreed to continue the peace talks and on the following day, having not achieved what he really wanted, he left⁹⁹. While mentioning the negotiations, Daphnopates allowed himself to evaluate the behaviour and linguistic skills of the Bulgarian tsar, indicating that he was talking a lot like a barbarian, and even more in broken Greek (*καὶ πολλὰ μὲν βαρβαρίζων, πλείω δὲ σολοικίζων*)¹⁰⁰. There is no doubt that

⁹⁵ DAPHNOPATES, 5, p. 67, 149–152.

⁹⁶ Συμβάσει, 16, p. 278, 366–367.

⁹⁷ 1 Reg 17, 36b (Eng. trans. – *1 Reigns*, trans. B.A. TAYLOR, [in:] NETS, p. 261). Cf. 1 Reg 17, 45b.

⁹⁸ 1 Reg 17, 1–54.

⁹⁹ Συμβάσει, 16, p. 276, 362 – 278, 369. Cf. THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, VI, 15, p. 408, 2 – 409, 8, and the interpretation of the text by R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 301.

¹⁰⁰ Συμβάσει, 16, p. 278, 367–368. Commentary in P. KARLIN-HAYTER, *op. cit.*, p. 39; 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανώνυμος λόγος..., p. 401, an. to p. 377, v. 24; I. DUJČEV, *op. cit.*, p. 248, 294, an. to v. 368.

this passage was an expression of the Byzantine orator's dismissive attitude towards the Bulgarian tsar's learning (all in all a pupil of the Constantinopolitan school located at the Magnaura palace¹⁰¹); besides, it once again emphasised his barbarity.

According to Daphnopates, Symeon is one of the western wolves (τοὺς ἔσπεριους λύκους)¹⁰², the name with which the orator calls the Bulgarians¹⁰³. According to him, these predators are more fervent and bold from the eastern wolves (probably meaning Arabs). The Bulgarian ruler is also the sower and keeper of weeds (τὸν τῶν ζιζανίων σπορέα καὶ φύλακα)¹⁰⁴. In the latter case, the expression used is directly related to the parable from the Gospel according to Matthew. According to it, the Kingdom of Heaven is like a field, in which the owner has sown good seed, hoping for a good and abundant harvest. Under the cover of darkness, however, the owner's enemy arrives and sows weeds (τὰ ζιζάνια) among the wheat. As a result, the servants of the owner cannot remove the weeds without damaging the wheat. For this reason, wheat and weeds grow together until harvest, because then they will be easier to separate. On the day of harvest, first the weeds are gathered and burnt, then the wheat is gathered and stored in the granary¹⁰⁵. The explanation of this parable reveals at a glance the message that the Byzantine orator wished to include in his work, hence I am quoting it in full:

The one who sows the good seed is the Son of Man [i.e. Jesus Christ – K.M.]; the field is the world, and the good seed are the children of the kingdom; the weeds are the children of the evil one, and the enemy who sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the age, and the reapers are angels. Just as the weeds are collected and burned up with fire, so will it be at the end of the age. The Son of Man will send his angels, and they will collect out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evildoers, and they will throw them into the furnace of fire, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then the righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father.¹⁰⁶

Thus Daphnopates compares the Bulgarian tsar to the Devil, who tries to thwart and frustrate God's perfect plans. He puts him in a stark opposition to the *sons of justice*. Symeon is therefore a son of night, since that is when he sneaks on someone else's field and under the cover of darkness performs his criminal deeds. The phrase about the keeper of the weeds means that he cares for the *proper* growth and development of his grain, that is, all depravity and iniquity. He is polluting and

¹⁰¹ More on Symeon's education – X. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 19–49.

¹⁰² Συμβάσει, 7, p. 264, 168–169.

¹⁰³ R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 297. Cf. 'Α. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΔΟΥ-ΖΑΦΡΑΚΑ, 'Ο 'Ανώνημος λόγος...', p. 389, an. to p. 368, v. 15–18.

¹⁰⁴ Συμβάσει, 7, p. 264, 171–172.

¹⁰⁵ Mt 13, 24–30.

¹⁰⁶ Mt 13, 37–43 (Eng. trans. – *The Gospel according to Matthew*, [in:] *The New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, Anglicized Edition*, ed. B.M. METZGER, ²Oxford 1995, p. 14).

poisoning the good sowing of the Byzantine-Bulgarian relations, which was made at the time of accepting of the official baptism by Boris-Michael and establishing of a solid peace between the two states. Thus, he is destroying God's work. This is however not only an annihilation of the existing political agreement; Symeon was primarily presented as a destroyer of the house of Jacob, the house of God, and thus the unity of the spiritual Israel, of the Body of Christ, that is, the Church community¹⁰⁷; as a false prophet, sower of lies and discord. He was the cause behind the split between the brothers in the faith, the Byzantines and Bulgarians. Moreover, anyone who causes division and scandal in the House of Lord, the remaining faithful should avoid, and leave him, because he does not serve Christ, but his own desires. It is a man who yields to his senses, devoid of the Spirit of God¹⁰⁸. The passages in which the orator condemns those who are lovers of war are indirectly referring to him. It can therefore be concluded that Symeon is a sower of discord¹⁰⁹, murderer, fratricide¹¹⁰, and committed sacrilege (the rhetorician mentions burnt icons, scattered relics of saints, which fell prey to dogs and crows, and priests abducted into slavery straight from the altar, etc.)¹¹¹. Daphnopates explicitly writes about his lies, hiding his true intentions¹¹², not fulfilling agreements and instability in his proceedings (the orator calls Symeon – ὁ πολύτροπος – evasive, sly and inconsistent)¹¹³.

The bulgarian tsar was also called new Ader (ὁ νέος Ἄδερ)¹¹⁴, or the biblical Hader/Hadad, and thus the first adversary (lit. satan¹¹⁵), who went against king Solomon, representing in the text the Byzantine emperor. At least, this interpretation is accepted by all of the oration's commentators¹¹⁶. Now, according to the biblical ac-

¹⁰⁷ Συμβάσει, 7, p. 264, 171–174; 22, p. 288, 526–528. Also in the literal sense – as a destroyer of churches and monasteries, which was already mentioned.

¹⁰⁸ Rom 16, 17–18; Iudae 17–19.

¹⁰⁹ Συμβάσει, 8, p. 266, 199.

¹¹⁰ Cf. e.g. NICHOLAS, 11, p. 78, 115–120.

¹¹¹ Συμβάσει, 3, p. 256, 47–53. Vide also DAPHNOPATES, 7, p. 83, 40–43.

¹¹² Συμβάσει, 13, p. 274, 317–325.

¹¹³ Συμβάσει, 15, p. 276, 360–361.

¹¹⁴ Συμβάσει, 7, p. 264, 172.

¹¹⁵ 3 Reg 11, 14. Both in the original Hebrew of the OT and in the used in Byzantium *Septuagint* (for critical editions of the text – *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*, vol. I–XXIV, Göttingen 1931–2006; *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, vol. I–II, ed. A. RAHLFS, Stuttgart 1935), in this place can be found the term directly indicating God's main adversary. The same word was used in the passages where there is no doubt that Satan is meant (in the *Septuagint*, the related διάβολος was used) – vide e.g. Iob 1, 6.9.12; 2, 1.2.4; 1 Par 21, 1 – *NLT Study Bible*, ²Carol Stream 2008 (cetera: NLT), p. 596, 713, 856–858. Hebrews also used this word as a specialist term for an adversary and a prosecutor at a royal court, alluding thusly to his demonic character (NLT, p. 857). For Daphnopates however this term must have unequivocally been related to the Devil.

¹¹⁶ Ф.И. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 68, an. 1; I. ДУЈЧЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 264, an. 60; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Цар Симеон Велики (893–927): Златният век...*, p. 158; П. АНГЕЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 190; M.J. LESZKA,

count, Hadad was a ruler of the hostile kingdom of Edom, and he dedicated his reign to the fight with Israel. This stemmed from the fact that Edom was previously conquered by Israel, and all its men were slain. Hailing from the royal family, Hadad, then a little boy, along with a handful of courtiers escaped and took refuge in Egypt. Sometime later, instigating rebellion (most likely with the support of the Egyptians), he regained power in Edom and dedicated himself to fighting with Solomon, rejecting his previous sovereignty¹¹⁷. The biblical author summed this up in the following words: *And Hader returned to his land. This was the evil which Hader did, and he was indignant with Israel, and he reigned in the land of Edom*¹¹⁸. In this way Israel lost, at least for a time, the control over territories previously won by king David. Interestingly, however, the biblical text states that God himself has roused Hadad, to make him a tool of punishment for Solomon's derogations¹¹⁹. This does not, however, absolve Hadad himself, who was after all a rebel, pagan and a worshipper of demons (and, as is clear from the text, who was likened to Satan), whom Yahweh merely used, utilising his personal hatred towards the Israelis, for the punishment of the unfaithful servant (Solomon). Besides, the statement that God has roused Hadad should not be understood literally. In fact, his desire for revenge and hatred for Israel had a demonic base, and it was the Satan who directed his actions. Stating that God was behind this, the biblical author merely expressed his deep conviction that even the Devil can only act with the consent of the Most High. In other words, the phrase that God roused or stirred him meant, in this case, that he allowed Hadad to give in to the evil purpose¹²⁰. It is also worth pointing out that, like the biblical author judged Hadad's actions (*ἡ κακία* – lit. vice, moral evil), so did Daphnopates described Symeon's actions as evil. Therefore even if Symeon-Hadad was supposed to take the role of *scourge of God* against the Byzantines, because of their sins (or rather because of the sins of the Byzantine governments from before 920), then he should not transgress beyond the boundaries of this, appointed to him by the Most High, task – making the inhabitants of the empire repent. For Daphnopates, this repentance clearly came in the shape of Romanos Lekapenos' ascension to the throne.

Wizerunek..., p. 121, an. 161.

¹¹⁷ I. Bozhilov's assertion that Ader/Hadad first unsuccessfully rebelled against Solomon and then fled to Egypt is therefore not correct (*Цар Симеон Велики (893–927): Златният век...*, p. 158). First, during the period just before the escape he was a little boy, he was therefore not likely to be the leader of the rebellion; besides during the time of his escape to the west, the ruler who reigned in Israel and raided Edom was David, father of Solomon. Therefore Hadad's rebellion should be associated with his return from Egypt to Edom, at the time when Solomon was already the king of Israel – A. TSCHIRSCHNITZ, *Dzieje ludów biblijnych*, Warszawa 1994, p. 147–148, 240.

¹¹⁸ 3 Reg 11, 22b–25 (Eng. trans. – *3 Reigns*, trans. P.D. McLEAN (Kaige), B.A. TAYLOR (OG), [in:] NETS, p. 308). *Vide* also 2 Reg 8, 13–14; 1 Par 18, 12–13.

¹¹⁹ 3 Reg 11, 1–25.

¹²⁰ Cf. e.g. 2 Reg 24, 1 and 1 Par 21, 1, which, discussing the same events, point to a different originator.

But we cannot rule out yet another identification of Ader, namely, the one linking him with the biblical Ben-Hadad II, king of Aram (865–842 BCE)¹²¹ and a long-time enemy of Israel during the reign of kings – Ahab (871–852 BCE), Ahaziah (852–851 BCE), Joram (851–845 BCE) and Jehu (845–818 BCE). Comparison of Symeon to this character is very clear. Here is the ruler of a foreign, pagan country, who went against the kingdom of Israel (i.e. the northern Jewish state, after the division) twice and besieged Samaria, the capital of this state¹²². Importantly, during the first expedition against Ahab, king of Israel, he demanded for himself Ahab's silver, gold and his most beautiful wives and children. In addition, he ordered the king to give back to Arameans all of the valuables that belonged to his subjects. Upon Ahab's refusal, he sent out an armed expedition against Israel. The invasion of the enemy king, however, was repulsed; what is more, the king himself was taken into captivity, from which he was soon released¹²³. Returning to the thought earlier expressed by Daphnopates, Ben-Hadad, like Symeon, stretched out his hand for the good that did not belong to him, for the harvest/fruit of the kings of Israel. Just as in the case of Symeon (of course, in the rhetorician's opinion), the pride of the king of Aram was thus emphasised. Sometime later, he organised an expedition to Samaria and subjected it to a long lasting siege. However, Yahweh himself interceded for his people, and miraculously chased off the Aramean army, without the Israelis needing to fight¹²⁴. It cannot be ruled out that it was this particular episode that the Byzantine orator was thinking of when he said that it is impossible to know the means of the one¹²⁵, who without the use of force (lit. *iron, weapons*) during the whole life overruled and kept back Ader, that is, Hadad-Symeon (δίχα σιδήρου διὰ βίου τὸν Ἄδερ ὑπεκράτει τε καὶ ἀνέστειλεν)¹²⁶, preventing him from achieving his wicked goals.

¹²¹ *Septuagint*, in accordance to the Hebrew wording of his name, describes him as the *son of Ader*. Naming him in such way it underlined the fact that as the *son of Ader/Hadad* (Hadad – here a pagan deity), Ben-Hadad was in his behaviour the same as his *parent*. On the subject of Ben-Hadad II himself *vide* A. TSCHIRSCHNITZ, *op. cit.*, p. 68–69, 161, 249.

¹²² Some of the modern biblical scholars think that in fact the second siege of Samaria and victory over Joram at Ramon Gilead was the deed of Hazael, Ben-Hadad's successor – *vide* A. TSCHIRSCHNITZ, *op. cit.*, p. 161. Regardless of whether this opinion is correct, Byzantine readers of the Bible could not have possessed such knowledge and linked these events with Ben-Hadad.

¹²³ 3 Reg 21 (20), 1–43.

¹²⁴ 4 Reg 6, 24–7, 20.

¹²⁵ It is difficult to understand from the text of whom the rhetorician is thinking – Θ.Ι. Успенский, *op. cit.*, p. 115–117. R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 299–300 thought that he meant the patriarch Nicholas Mysticus, while P. KARLIN-HAYTER, *op. cit.*, p. 30–31, that it was emperor Leo VI, which I find more convincing. Ultimately, however, the one who stopped Ader was God, an indication of which might be the statement that it is not possible to know the means with which Ader was being kept back. Cf. *Leonis VI Tactica*, XVIII, 40, ed. et trans. G. DENNIS, Washingtoniae D.C. 2010, p. 452, 210–221 [= CFHB, 49].

¹²⁶ Συμβάσει, 13, p. 274, 324–326.

Symeon is also a contemporary Holophernes (ὁ καινὸς Ὀλοφέρνης)¹²⁷, the commander of armies of the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar II (604–562 BCE)¹²⁸, who in the Old Testament account was presented as the ruler of Assyria. On the ruler's order, Holophernes gathered a massive army, with which he moved against all of the lands in the west, mercilessly conquering, plundering, ravaging these lands and murdering their inhabitants. Moreover, all of this happened because they did not acknowledge Nebuchadnezzar as the only true deity. For that reason, destroying local temples was of particular significance to Holophernes. All of the lands were in his power. At the news of this, the Israelites *became most exceedingly frightened by his visage and distressed for Ierusalem and the shrine of the Lord their God*¹²⁹. They have therefore turned to God for help in prayer, they also started to prepare for defence. Despite the warning that should not go against the Israelites, since they lived in inaccessible mountains and their God, who hated iniquity (an allusion to the Assyrian's actions), kept watch over them, Holophernes undertook an expedition against Israel. He did not, however, went further in his march than the mountain town of Betulia; under its walls God's punishment reached him. Judith, a pious Israelite, who pretended to have fled from the besieged settlement, cut off his head¹³⁰. The biblical author presents the Assyrian general as a worshiper of the pagan gods (or rather, of a man – king Nebuchadnezzar), a cruel, boastful and confident man, devoid of honour and reverence to the true God. An evil man, who suffered a deserved punishment for his actions¹³¹. Undoubtedly, throughout this whole story many similarities with Symeon can be found. For Daphnopates, Bulgarian ruler appears as a contemporary cruel conqueror, who wanted to impose his will on Byzantium with brute force. He is a contemporary barbarian, who raised his hand against the chosen people, the *new Israel*, that is, the subjects of the Byzantine emperor. It is again indicated, that he is primarily a destroyer of temples, including the most important one – the temple of the Lord, no doubt understood as the whole community of the Church. But, like in the Assyrian's case, even such a great conqueror as Symeon was to be eventually punished¹³². It is noteworthy that the Bulgarian ruler was also warned that by waging an unjust war against the most Christian empire, he will bring upon himself an inglorious end¹³³. The story associated with the death of Holophernes undoubtedly is a reference to the legend, widespread in the Byzantine capital, about the death of the Bulgarian ruler. According to it,

¹²⁷ Συμβάσει, 7, p. 264, 172–173. On the margin of the manuscript, by the mention of the new Ader and the contemporary Holophernes, there is a note: Συμεών ὁ Σκούθης – ibidem, p. 264.

¹²⁸ I. ДУЈЧЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 264, an. 61; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Цар Симеон Велики (893–927): Златният век...*, p. 158.

¹²⁹ Iud 4, 2 (Eng. trans. – *Ioudith*, trans. C. BOYD-TAYLOR, [in:] NETS, p. 446).

¹³⁰ Iud 2–3, 5–7, 10–13.

¹³¹ M.J. LESZKA, *Wizerunek...*, p. 122, an. 162.

¹³² П. АНГЕЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 190–191.

¹³³ ДАРННОПАТЕС, 5, p. 61, 51–57; 7, p. 85, 68–74.

when John the astronomer saw the emperor Romanos [Lekapenos – K.M.], he said to him thusly: *Sire, the statue set in the arc on the (hill) Xerolophos, looking towards the west, is (a likeness of) Symeon; if you were to cut off its head, then at the same time Symeon would die.* The emperor Romanos ordered at night the statue's head to be cut off, and at the time Symeon died in Bulgaria.¹³⁴

Thus, as was in the case of Ader, God himself saw it to remove Symeon, who was an obstacle for concluding a strong peace treaty between the Byzantines and Bulgarians, and of rebuilding the unity of the spiritual Israel¹³⁵.

It appears that a different passage of the speech may be an indirect reference to Symeon. In it, the rhetorician is considering the question of enmity (τῆς ἐχθρας) and its implications. In earlier parts of his work the author did not leave his listeners, and later readers, any doubt that the Bulgarian tsar was hostile towards Byzantium, and that the war was the meaning of his existence. And here, Daphnopates states:

And who (unless he were more foolish than Korybos) would not think her [i.e. the hostility – K.M.] hateful, deathly, more monstrous than Hydra's or Scylla's own self, more monstrous than all monsters? Unsocial, lawless [also: wicked, godless – K.M.], a proper madman, replete with drunken torpor and folly, is he who loves division and wars (καὶ τίς εἰ μὴ Κορύβου ἡλιθιώτερος οὐκ ἀποτρόπαιον αὐτήν, οὐκ δλέθριον, οὐ τῆς Ὑδρας αὐτῆς, Σκύλλης αὐτῆς, οὐ πάντων ἀτόπων ἀτοπωτέραν ἠγγησοῖτο; ἀφρήτωρ, ἀθέμιστος καὶ παράκοπος ὄντως καὶ κάρου καὶ παροινίας ἀνάπλευς, ὁ διχוסτασίας καὶ πολέμων ἐρών).¹³⁶

The fact that hostility and love of war have been characterised as more hideous than the offspring of Typhon and Echidna is noteworthy. They are thus the manifestation of the most monstrous activity of Symeon-Typhon. It should be therefore understood that the war started by the Bulgarian monarch, and the goals which he wanted to attain with its help, deserve condemnation which cannot be expressed in words. The orator implies that neither he himself, nor any other civilised man, is able to give a rational explanation for such passion for the horrors of war. He therefore concludes that its eulogist can only be someone outside the margin of society, a man disrespecting divine laws, even deranged, intoxicated, either with alcohol, or in spirit, in this case without a doubt under demonic influence. In other words, a man not acting according to reason. Daphnopates further in the text states that this passion is contrary to the teaching of Scripture and the pagan wisdom¹³⁷. The love of discord and war were not acci-

¹³⁴ THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS, VI, 21, p. 411, 17 – 412, 1. The thread of this legend was recently analysed by В. ВАЧКОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 79–80.

¹³⁵ Συμβάσει, 7, p. 264, 171–174.

¹³⁶ Συμβάσει, 21, p. 284, 466–472 (translation after R.J.H. JENKINS – *ibidem*, p. 285).

¹³⁷ Συμβάσει, 21, p. 284, 472–473. Cf. e.g. NICHOLAS, 11, p. 78, 103–106.

dentally called in this text with a word *ἐρως*, used in the Greek literature to mean physical love, lust or desire¹³⁸. Something that was earthy, violent, unclean, so to speak, filthy – because the love of war could not be a merit of a real Christian. In this way the rhetorician once again stresses, that such people as the Bulgarian ruler are driven by low, primitive inclinations, that they derive animal satisfaction from creating a split between Christians and from the spilling of Byzantine blood. Again, this points to the rudeness of Symeon's nature, who does not, or does not want to, understand that a war, especially with his brother in faith, is evil. When Symeon was finally persuaded, and agreed to the peace talks (924), by the new Moses and saviour of the Byzantine empire, who freed the empire from the Egypt's yoke (i.e. from the Bulgarians, or rather from Symeon), that is, by the droungarios of the fleet, the new emperor Romanos Lekapenos, with God's will he did not live to see the advent of permanent peace (927). The author explains this fact by referring to the story of the Old Testament king David and his desire to build a temple for Yahweh. Unfortunately, God could not have allowed him to do so, because in youth David's hands were stained with blood, which precluded his participation in this honourable endeavour¹³⁹. Only the pure, undefiled hands can be used for building a sanctuary of peace, in which the Most High would accept praise and thanksgiving. Because of this, like Solomon, son of David, completed this task, so did in 927 Peter, son of Symeon, conclude the peace with Byzantium; Symeon, as a man who spilled a lot of brotherly, Christian blood, could not erect a shrine to the Lord¹⁴⁰. It remains to guess whether the figures of David and Solomon were mentioned only because of the simple similarity of situation (the son completes the work that the father could not), or whether the orator was directed by a deeper motivation. Is it only a simple reference to David, as the typical for the era archetype of the ruler, and therefore an acknowledgement from the Byzantine orator for the obvious fact, that Symeon was simply a monarch? Or is there hidden behind this an explicit reference to the way in which Symeon was being presented at his own, Preslavian, court? And if so, could Daphnopates really have had the knowledge that the Bulgarian tsar was being praised as the new David and compared, of course in a positive meaning, by those surrounding him to the great Old Testament king? If so, then in this passage of the oration he undoubtedly allowed himself to indulge in a rather mordacious emphasising of the darker sides of the well-known Israeli ruler's reign, which fitted well with the general picture of Symeon which he tried to create in his work. If it was therefore God himself who made it impossible for the tsar to conclude peace, then this fact

¹³⁸ LSJ, p. 695; SGP, vol. II, p. 313–314; *Słownik*, vol. I, p. 385.

¹³⁹ *Vide e.g.* 2 Reg 16, 5–11; 3 Reg 5, 17–19; 8, 15–19; 1 Par 22, 7–10. Cf. also R.J.H. JENKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 301.

¹⁴⁰ Συμβάσει, 16, p. 278, 371–378. Cf. Ф.И. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

emphasised once again just how defiled a man was the Bulgarian ruler. It could be said that in his belligerence he went so far that he was unable to return to the way of peace. Additionally, according to the orator, God personally made sure that he could not repent, which was clearly to be a warning for the future enemies of Byzantium, who should remember on whose side the Most High is, and what are the consequences of going against the empire. Undoubtedly. However, by weaving into his statement the analogy with David, whom God forbade to build the temple, Daphnopates tried to explain to himself and to his listeners Symeons obduracy in the matter of concluding the peace¹⁴¹.

What was the ultimate end of Symeon according to the Byzantine orator is not difficult to guess. In pursuing the vanities of this world (the crown, Byzantine throne and their transient, earthly glory¹⁴²), he loses from sight the really important, eternal matters. He ends like rebellious Lucifer, cast out from the place of haughtiness and pride, like Typhon, defeated by Zeus and cast into Tartarus. In our source, these are only suggestions that can be plucked out from the context of the whole oration. Whereas in the letters from Lekapenos to Symeon, Daphnopates is clearly warning the tsar about the consequences of persisting in the rebellion and continuing war. Through the lips of the Byzantine ruler he reminds him of the Last Judgement and the punishment of wicked deeds¹⁴³. In turn, from the content of the oration, it appears that Symeon can be counted among those who love discord and war. He can be included among the killers, who likened themselves, as Daphnopates wrote, to Cain and Lamech, and so the archetypes of the wicked men, in the Scripture called directly the children of the Evil One¹⁴⁴. And with them, among those who found themselves on the left hand side of the Christ's throne of judgement, in the place of the goats, among those who have been crossed out from the Book of the Redeemed (*ἀπαλειφή δὲ τῆς βίβλου τῶν σωζομένων*)¹⁴⁵, to go into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels¹⁴⁶. In the context of Symeon's fall one could mention other characters named by the rhetorician – the haughty Xerxes, Eteocles and Polinices, sons of Oedipus who fighting for the control over Thebes killed each other, Cyrus the Younger, who was not satisfied with his own inheritance, Antaeus murdering his own guests and the greedy Alexander the Great, the great conqueror and murderer of his loved ones. All of them, for their love of hostility and war, received a *worthy* pay – an ignominious end¹⁴⁷.

¹⁴¹ One of the letters of Romanos Lekapenos testifies about this obduracy – ΔΑΦΝΟΠΑΤΕΣ, 5, p. 67, 135–136.

¹⁴² *Vide* e.g. Isa 40, 6–8; 1 Petr 1, 24.

¹⁴³ ΔΑΦΝΟΠΑΤΕΣ, 7, p. 83, 44 – 85, 74. Cf. e.g. NICHOLAS, 11, p. 78, 94–100.

¹⁴⁴ Gen 4, 1–24; Sap 10, 3; Mt 23, 35; 1 Io 3, 12–13; Iudae 11.

¹⁴⁵ Συμβάσει, 9, p. 268, 240–270, 269.

¹⁴⁶ Mt 25, 31–46.

¹⁴⁷ Συμβάσει, 20–21, p. 282, 448–284, 468. *Vide* also И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Цар Симеон Велики (893–927)*:

* * *

The year 927 brought about the conclusion of a lasting peace between Byzantium and Bulgaria. Peace, which ended many years of armed struggle between the two states. The war that tsar Symeon waged against his southern neighbour shook the Byzantines. Military successes of the Bulgarian ruler, his aspirations to impose his rule on the empire, cut to the quick the deep conviction of the Constantinopolitan rulers and their subjects that only the Eastern Rome had right to preside over the Christian world. In the eyes of the Byzantines, Symeon's aspirations seemed to be a violation of the sacred order (τάξις) established on earth by God, and imitating celestial order. The order, according to which the Bulgarian ruler owed subjection and respect to Constantinopolitan basileus. Anyone who rejected this order was, in fact, spreading anarchy (ἀταξία), and so became like barbarians, and even more – demons¹⁴⁸. This is despite the fact that in the personal dimension he seemed to be a devout Christian. Unlike him, the Byzantines did not allow a possibility of making a breach in the political doctrine that they adopted. In keeping with their worldview, the aspirations of the Bulgarian tsar to the presidency over Christian oecumene meant that he was treated stereotypically – as unworthy of the highest honours barbarian and a rebel. Unrestrained in his desires, not guided by reason, but by the typical elements that tugged at every barbarian's soul. At least such is the portrayal of Symeon that we can find in the oration *On the treaty with the Bulgarians* that was presented in front of the court of the emperor Romanos Lekapenos by Theodore Daphnopates, his personal secretary. The Bulgarian ruler was then already dead, and celebrating the just concluded peace agreement rhetorician could blame on him all of the responsibility for the calamities of the long-lasting war and present him as a usurper and an enemy of truth, a servant of Satan.

Abstract. The year 927 brought a peace treaty between Byzantium and Bulgaria, which ended many years of military struggle between both the states. On this occasion Theodore Daphnopates delivered a speech praising the newly concluded agreement. The blame for the accursed war was to put on (already dead) Symeon I (893–927), the then Bulgarian ruler, and his ungodly aspirations to the crown of the Byzantine Empire. It was his personal ambitions that were a real infringement on the God's earthly order, and it was only and exclusively Symeon, who lead to the appearance of a crack on the *House of the Lord*. The Bulgarian ruler

Златният век..., p. 159–160; П. АНГЕЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 191; M.J. LESZKA, *Wizerunek...*, p. 122, an. 165.

¹⁴⁸ H. AHRWEILER, *L'idéologie politique de l'Empire byzantin*, Paris 1975, p. 129–147; P. STEPHENSON, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier...*, p. 35; C. MANGO, *Introduction*, [in:] *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, ed. IDEM, Oxford 2002, p. 16; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Византийският...*, p. 177–178.

is referred to as pharaoh, holding the chosen people captive. Symeon is also characterised like various ungodly personages from the Old and New Testament, i.e. Goliath, Ader, Holophernes or even the Devil himself. It can therefore be concluded that Symeon was a usurper, tyrant, sower of discord, murderer, fratricide, and one who committed sacrilege. Daphnopates explicitly writes about his lies, hiding his true intentions, not fulfilling agreements and instability in his proceedings. So, by means of a variety of hints to ancient history, literature and the Bible the speaker present Symeon as a usurper and an enemy of truth, a servant of Satan.

Translated by Michał Zytka

Kiril Marinow

Katedra Historii Bizancjum
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. A. Kamińskiego 27a
90-219 Łódź, Polska
cyrillus.m@wp.pl

Anna-Maria Totomanova (Sofia)

A LOST BYZANTINE CHRONICLE IN SLAVIC TRANSLATION

A couple of years ago I started working on an understudied chronographic text identified as the *Slavic Version of the Chronicle of George Synkellos*. The work was introduced to the Slavic studies community thanks to the copy in the collection of V. M. Undolsky. In the manuscript it follows on immediately after the Chronicle of Hamartolos in its second redaction¹. The similarity between this unknown to the scholarship of the time text and the Chronicle of George Synkellos was noted yet by Undolsky himself. V.M. Istrin contributed to the final identification of the text as a Slavic version of the Chronicle of George Synkellos. The scholar believed that the Slavic text contains an abridged redaction of the chronicle although nothing similar was found in the Greek copies of Synkellos' work he was familiar with². Istrin reached the conclusion that the chronicle's translation appeared in Kievan Rus in the 14th century on the grounds of some cursory observations on the copy's language. The text has been preserved in five Russian copies of the 15th or the 16th centuries, manifesting no textological differences³.

¹ X. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *Наблюдения върху славянския превод на хрониката на Георги Синкел*, РВг 14.4, 1990, p. 102.

² В.М. ИСТРИН, *Из области древне-русской литературы*, ЖМНП 1903, август, p. 401:

³ Until the mid-1980s we were familiar with only four copies of this work: two from Moscow, kept in the Russian State Library (Undolskiy [cetera: Унд.] № 1289 of Moscow (III +488 f.), 1^o, f. 405–488b and Egorov № 908 1^o, (I+ 615 f.) f. 497–615.) and two Petersburg's copies, kept in the National Library of Russia (Sofijski [cetera: Соф.] № 1474, II+397 ff. 4^o; f. 34–135a and Solovecki [cetera: Сол.] № 829/839, 4^o, 656 f.; f. 2–221a). The first two date to the 15th century and the second two – to the 16th century (X. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 102; О.В. ТВОРОГОВ, *Хроника Георгия Синкелла в Древней Руси*, [in:] *Исследования по древней и новой литературе*, Ленинград 1987, p. 217. Traditionally the copy of Undolskiy was believed to be the earliest and it lies in the basis of our edition too (cf. А.-М. ТОТОМАНОВА, *Славянската версия на хрониката на Георги Синкел. Издание и коментар*, София 2008). Recently however another copy of the chronicle from Egorov's collection was introduced into science (Egorov 863), which has a dating (a marginal note of 1452) and is relatively earlier (Т.В. АНИСИМОВА, *Хроника Георгия Амартола в древнерусских списках XIV–XV вв.*, Москва 2009, p. 89–93). Textologically Egorov 863 does not differ from the other Moscow copies of which only the Undolsky manifests petite deviations mainly expressed in omissions, word shuffles and lexical changes (Н.В. БРАЖНИКОВА, *Из наблюдений над списками славянского перевода Хроники Георгия Синкелла*, [in:] *Лингвистическое*

For decades now, the interest in this understudied Slavic chronicle has been more than sporadic and no researcher questioned Istrin's opinion that this was an abridged and probably draft version of Synkellos. To a great extent this was due to the limited text material adduced by Istrin⁴, and for want of serious research and an edition of the work. As a matter of fact, most Slavic chronographic heritage researchers (M. Weingart, A. Meshterskiy, O. Tvorogov, M.D. Priselkov) merely repeat Istrin's hypothesis on the origin and the contents of the chronicle⁵. As regards the place and the time of the translation, however, the researchers are not that unanimous. M. Priselkov, like Istrin, bound the translation of the Synkellos' chronicle with the translation of Hamartolos. Unlike Istrin, however, he believes that the translation appeared in a much earlier age⁶ and that it should be referred to the translation endeavors of Yaroslav in the 1040s in Kiev. Bulgarian scholar Y. Trifonov was the first⁷ to suggest that judging by the chronicle's linguistic characteristics and by the information it contains, it was more likely to have been translated in Bulgaria in the tenth or eleventh centuries. Some 60 years later another Bulgarian scholar, Ch. Trendafilov, drew the attention to the fact that the historical account is situated between two chronological poles: the Creation of the world and the foundation of Constantinople – and features episodes from the Old-Testament and from the Roman history as well as from the histories of other nations. Thus where both the chronicle's scope and the selection of the episodes suggest an ideological purpose, meant to prepare the society for adopting Christian history⁸. This, which again leads us to the Bulgarian reality of the tenth and eleventh centuries. In support of his thesis Trendafilov quotes a number of lexemes of indisputable Bulgarian origin.

In my brief presentation I will try to share and illustrate my main conclusions on the publication and the research of the text. The Slavic chronicle proved to be a chronographic compilation about the events from the Creation of the world to the

источниковедение и история русского языка, Москва 2000, p. 106–118). The first notice of this translation see in: *Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописных книг XV в., хранящихся в СССР (Для сводного каталога рукописных книг хранящихся в СССР)*, сост. А. Турилов, Москва 1986, p. 100.

⁴ This fact was also noted by X. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁵ Cf. M. WEINGART, *Byzantské kroniky v literatuře církevněšlovanské. Přehled a rozbor filologický*, v Bratislavě, pars 1, 1922, p. 52–55; Н.А. МЕЩЕРСКИЙ, *Источники и состав древней славяно-русской письменности IX–XV вв.*, Ленинград 1978, p. 85–87; О.В. ТВОРОГОВ, *Древнерусские хронографы*, Ленинград 1975, p. 9; ИДЕМ, *Хроника Георгия Синкелла...*; М.Д. ПРИСЕЛКОВ, *История русского летописания XI–XV вв.*, Санкт-Петербург, 1996, p. 65. Detailed review of the history of research of the Slavic text see in: X. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 101–102.

⁶ М. Д. ПРИСЕЛКОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

⁷ Ю. ТРИФОНОВ, *Византийските хроники въ църковнославянската книжнина*, ИИД 6, 1924, p. 169–170.

⁸ X. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

founding of Constantinople, rather than an abridged version of the Chronicle of George Synkellos.

The first part, encompassing about two-thirds of the work's size (405a1 – 458b15 in Und. 1289), contains an excerpt from the Chronicle of Julius Africanus about the years from the Creation of the world to the Resurrection of Christ. The identification of Africanus as the author of this part of the chronographic compilation was made on the basis of different types of evidence, which could be summarized as follows:

The narrative in this part is completely based on the chronological and the Christological concept of Africanus, who interprets the world history from the Creation to the Resurrection as a fulfillment of God's providence in six days (millennia). This chronological treatment of world history differs from the Synkellos' concept presented in the second part of the work.

a. The story until Christ's birth, which encompasses Old-Testament history and part of the history of ancient Rome, Persia and the Hellenistic world, is built on 23 chronological observations, each containing Africanus' dates and calculations, where part of the chronologies agree with some preserved fragments of Africanus⁹. The chronological observations form the backbone of the account in the first part and manifest a frequency much higher than that of the chronologies in the second part (see Table 1).

Table 1

1.	406a18–20 Chronology from Adam to Enos	year 435
2.	406b24–25 Chronology of the Flood	2262
3.	407b1–6 Chronology of the migration of Abraham	3277 Abraham was 75-years old When he was 100 his son Isaac was born Isaac is 60 – Jacob/Israel Jacob/Israel entered Egypt at the age of 130 A total of 215 years until Jacob's entry in Egypt Jacob died in Egypt and after 70 years Joseph died
4.	411a6–14 Chronology of the death of Joseph	3563

⁹ The fragments were identified after the edition of Routh (*Julii Africani Emmauntis, seu Nicopolis, apud Palaestinam episcopi, qui post initia saeculi tertii scripsit, reliquiae*, ed. M.J. ROUTH, [in:] *Reliquiae Sacrae*, vol. II. Oxford 1846, p. 225–309), because the new edition of the fragments of Africanus was published only months prior to my book.

5.	412b21–413a16 Chronology of the Exodus and the 430 years of exile	3707 Moses was 80
6.	416b5–8 Chronology of the death of Moses	3747 The Exodus lasted 40 years
7.	417b20–23 Chronology of the death of Joshua of Nun	3772 Joshua of Nun – 25 years
8.	420b12–18 Chronology of the years of the judges	4292 490 judges and 30 old men
9.	421a7–11 Chronology of Eli, Samuel and Saul	90 (20 for Eli and 70 for Saul and Samuel)
10.	423b8–16 Chronology of the years of Saul	20 together with Samuel
11.	428a5–7 Chronology of the separation of the 10 tribes and the beginning of the Samaritan Kingdom	4468
12.	435a11–15 Chronology of the end of the Samaritan Kingdom	4750 lasted 283 years
13.	437b25 – 438a7 Chronology of the end of the Kingdom of Judah and the beginning of the Babylonian captivity	4872 122 years after the end of the Samaritan Kingdom
14.	440a26–440b3 Chronology of the end of the Babylonian captivity	4942 70 years of captivity
15.	440b21 – 441a2 Chronology of the restoration of the temple	46 years
16.	441a2–6 Chronology of Cyrus and the Persian Kingdom	4942 55. 1 st Olympiad
17.	442a15–18 Chronology of the Regal period in Rome	5000 69 Olympiad
18.	443b10–19 Chronology of the end of the Persian Kingdom	5172 230 years
19.	443b19–444a7 Chronology of the Macedonian Kingdom and Antioch	+282 = 5454 to emperor Caesar + 300= 5472 to the death of Cleopatra + 264= 5436 to the capturing of Antioch 151 Olympiad – beginning of the Maccabees
20.	448b27–449a10 Chronology of the years of the Maccabees	5375 Death of Symon 163 Olympiad

21.	452b25–453a2 Chronology of the beginning of the Empire in Rome and the Antiochian chronology	5454 183.2
22.	457a2–9 Chronology of the beginning of Daniel's prophecy	4942 + 115 = 5057 83.3
23.	457b25–458b15 Generalizing chronology from the Creation of the world to the resurrection	5531 Resurrection of Christ 202.2

b. All dates in the first part of the Chronicle follow the chronology of Africanus too. An exception is the date of the Universal flood, which was corrected later, but this correction is mechanical and not in line with the rest of the calculations made in relation to it.

Table 2

ПРЪВНИМЪНА ЛѢТА	ОТЪ АДАМА ДО ЕНОСА	435	
	ПОТОПЪ	2262	
	ОБЪТЪ АВРААМИЪ	3277	
	СЪМРЪТЪ НОСИФОВА	3563	
	НСХЪДЪ	3707	
	СЪМРЪТЪ МОИСѢА	3747	
ВОЕВОДАМИ	СЪМРЪТЪ ИИСОУСА	3772	
	СТАРЪЦИ	+30	
	СЪДНА	420	4292
	ВЕСТАРЪКНИШНИСТВО	40	
	ЛИРЪ	30	
	НЕРЕН И СЪДНА	90	4382
	ЦРЪСТВНА	490	4872
	ПЛЪНЪ	70	4942
	ПРЪСКОЕ ЦРСТВО	230	5172
	МАКЕДОНИ	300	5472
	ВЪСКРЪСЕННЕ ХВО	+59	5531

c. Apart from this main chronological scheme of the first part there is another chronological axis introducing Olympiad dating. The year of the first Olympiad coincides with the first year of the reign of Achaz, which is in line with Africanus' chronological concept.

d. The chronological interpretation of Daniel's prophecy about the seventy weeks follows Africanus too as the difference between the 475 solar years since the beginning of the prophecy (at the time of Nehemiah, i.e. the 20th year of Artaxerxes) to the Resurrection and the 490 years of the prophecy is explained with the difference between the solar and the lunar calendars.

To the chronography of Africanus' point the descriptions of the separate periods of universal history to the Resurrection as well:

a. The list of the judges of Israel and the duration of their government (490 years) also belongs to Africanus.

According to our version the list looks as follows:

Chousarsathom	8
Gothoniel	40
Aod	80
Aiglom	18
Jabez	20
Deborah	40
Madineans	7
Gideon/Hierobaal	40
Abimelech	3
Moabites	18
Thola	22 (23)
(Jair)	
Jephtae	6
Esebon	7
Elon (Malaon)	10
Abdon	20
Gentiles	40
Samson	20
Semegar	1

If we sum up the years of their terms minus the years of Jair, who is missing in our text, we will obtain exactly 400 years that together with the forty years of anarchy and the following thirty peaceful years gives 470. Since Africanus is explicit that the years of the judges, the anarchy and the peace are 490, the missing Jair must have been judging for 20 years, as Synkellos says. If the years of Thola are 23 as we've assumed,

it would leave only 19 years to Jair. This list of judges differs from the Synkellos' list but agrees with the supposedly Africanus' list, adduced by Gelzer and restored on the basis of the evidence of medieval chronographs¹⁰. It can shed additional light on the original text of Africanus.

b. The list of the kings of Judah and Israel and the periods of their reign also follow Africanus.

Kings of Judah:

Rhoboam	17
Abia	3
Asa	40
Josaphat	25
Joram	8
Ochozias	1
Gotholia	8
Joas	40
Amesias	29
Ozias	72
Joatham	16
Achaz	16
Ezekias	8
Total	283

Kings of Israel:

Jeroboam	22
Nadab	
Baasha	24
Elah	2
Zambri	7 days
Ambri	20
Achaab	22
Ochozias	2
Joram	29
Jeou	28
Joavhaz	17
Joas	19
Jeroboam II	41
Zacharias	9 months

¹⁰ H. GELZER, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, Leipzig 1880–1898 [repr. New York 1997], I, p. 90.

Saloum	1 month
Manaem	10
Phakesias (Phakee)	2
Phakee	20
Osee	9

The total is 267 years, 10 months and seven days minus the years of Nadav, which are missing in our text but most Byzantine chroniclers give him 2 years¹¹. If we assume this figure to be true we will obtain some 270 years for the Israelite kings. The difference between this result and the 283 years until the fall of the Kingdom of Israel should be attributed to the fact that between the reign of Jeroboam II and Zacharias and between that of Phakee and Osee there have been periods of interregna, which are not recorded in our chronicle¹².

c. The list of Persian kings and the duration of their reign (230 years). Here typical of Africanus is the identification of Cambyses with Nebuchadnezzar II.

Cyrus	31
Cambyses	9
Two brothers magoi	7 months
Artabanus	7 months
Darius the Great	36
Xerxes	20
Artaxerxes Longimanus	41
Xerxes II	2 months
Sogdianus	7 months
Darius Notus	19
Xerxes III (Cyrus)	42
Ochus (Artaxerxes)	22
Arses	4
Darius	6
Total	232 y. 11 m.

Exactly 230 years is the sum of the reigns of the rulers, who'd reigned for over one year. The order of the Persian kings agrees with that of Africanus restored by Gelzer, with only one discrepancy in the years of Cyrus and Cambyses – respectively

¹¹ H. GELZER, *op. cit.*, I, p. 99.

¹² *Иллюстрированная полная популярная библейская энциклопедия*, ed. архимандрит Никифор, Москва 1891, p. 291. The periods of interregnum are defined 12 and 8 or 9 years respectively, which does not agree with our text.

30 and 8 years according to his sources¹³. The chronology of Persian kingdom quoted here is in line with Africanus' concept that the 115th year of the Persian reign coincided with the 20th year of the reign of Artaxerxes I, when he allowed for the restoration of Jerusalem (452a2-9) if we count only the years of the kings who've ruled for over one year (31+9+36+20+20).

d. The list of Macedonian rulers – from Alexander the Great to Cleopatra and the duration of their reign (300 years) also agree with Africanus' formulations.

The list of the rulers of the Ptolemaic dynasty and their years according to our chronicle looks as follows:

Ptolemy Lagus	114	(40)
Ptolemy Philadelphus	124	37
Ptolemy Euergetes	133	25
Ptolemy Philopator	139	17
Ptolemy Epiphanes	143	24
Ptolemy Philometor	149	11
Ptolemy Euergetes Physcon	152	23
Ptolemy Philopator II	158	
Ptolemy Euergetes Physcon	158	27
Ptolemy Euergetes Physcon	164	4
Ptolemy Lathyrus	165	16
Ptolemy Alexander I	169	
Ptolemy Alexander II	173	15 days
Ptolemy Lathyrus	173	3
Ptolemy Neos Dionysos	174	25
Cleopatra	182	22

e. The list of the Seleucids also belongs to Africanus.

According to our chronicle the order of the Seleucid rulers is as follows:

Seleucus	114	32 (33)
Antoichus Soter	124	19
Antiochus Theos	129	15
Seleucus Keraunos	(138)	4
Antiochus the Great	139	36
Seleucus Philopator	148	12
Antiochus Epiphnes	151	12

¹³ H. GELZER, *op. cit.*, I, p. 103–104.

Antiochus Eupator		
Demetrius Soter	154	11
Alexander Balas	157	9
Demetrius II Nicator	159	
Diodotus Thryphon	161	
Antiochus Sidetes	161	6
Demetrius II Nicator	163	2
Alexander Zabinas		7
Antiochus Grypus	167	14
Antiochus Cyzicenus	171	3
Seleucus	171	
Civil war	172	
Tigranes of Armenia	177	14
Antiochus Dionysos	177	
Syria captured by Rome	179	

f. The list of the seven legendary kings of Rome and the duration of their reign (240 years) also refers to the chronography of Africanus.

Romulus	38	6 th Olympiad
Numa	42	16 th Olympiad
(Tullus Hostilius	33	26 th Olympiad)
Ancus Marcius	23	34 th Olympiad
Tarquinius Priscus	36	42 nd Olympiad
Servius Tullius	44	50 th Olympiad
Tarquinius Superbus	24	61 st Olympiad
Total	240	

g. The description of the miraculous events accompanying Christ's death and Resurrection agrees with one of the most famous fragments of Africanus.

3. Our chronicle contains some important biblical narrative episodes missing altogether in Synkellos' chronicle:

- a. The history from the Creation to the Flood.
- b. The whole story based on the *Book of Ruth* with the genealogy of David, the whole account on Samuel, Saul and David after *Kings*.
- c. Part of the story about Solomon.
- d. Part of the story about Samson.
- e. Part of the story about Jacob and Joseph.

4. The existing agreements between the first part of the chronicle and the Synkellos' text are due to the shared topics and sources:

a. We find complete conformity between the two sources when the text of Synkellos presents an excerpt from Africanus and partial when the former quotes a shared source, most often the works of Joseph Flavius.

b. In several cases (especially after the introduction of the additional Olympiad dating) our text does not correspond to the Synkellos' version but to that of Eusebius of Caesarea (mostly to the chronological canon translated by St. Jerome) and here the connection between the Slavic text and Synkellos' chronicle is more intricate: Eusebius' canon reflects rather correctly the text of Africanus whereas Synkellos often amasses these notices in his rubric *Σποράδην* where they remain outside the line of his main account.

The second part of the Slavic chronicle – from the Resurrection to the founding of Constantinople – contains excerpts from the Chronicle of Synkellos about the years until the reign of Diocletian (458b15–482b19 in Унд.1289) complemented with a couple of pages from the chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor (482b20–488b20).

The fitting of the two parts of the chronicle together – to the Resurrection and after it – is rather mechanical. The traces of editorial interventions within the Greek milieu are concentrated mainly on the similar presentation of the material in the parts of Synkellos and of Theophanes the Confessor. The only obvious substantial trace of editing is the correction of the date of the Universal flood – the year 2262 according to Africanus and 2242 according to Synkellos – but this was obviously done on the basis of the calculations of the years of the biblical patriarchs in the Septuagint, rather than to unify the two parts and has therefore not affected the chronologies related to the dating of Africanus.

Gelzer thinks that an excerpt from the chronography of Julius Africanus, exempted of its pre-olympic history of all ancient nations except the Judeans, has probably arisen on Greek soil and in the early ninth century has served as a source of a chronographic compilation used by the most eminent Greek chroniclers such as George Hamartolus, Leo Gramaticus and Cedrenus¹⁴. For the time being we are more inclined to believe that the Slavic chronicle has not been composed on Bulgarian soil but is a translation of the abovementioned hypothetical Byzantine compilation. It could have appeared only after 816 when Theophanes brought to completion his continuation of the chronicle of Synkellos.

The linguistic analysis reveals that the Slavic translation of the chronicle was made in the early Old-Bulgarian period, probably in the early tenth century. The following specific features support this conclusion:

1. The traces of Glagolitic letters show that the Slavic translation was made in a period when the first Slavic alphabet was in active use.
2. The ancient use of the sign for izhitsa (ypsilon) as a sign for a back labial vowel.

¹⁴ H. GELZER, *op. cit.*, II, p. 297.

3. Some errors in the segmentation of the Greek text, which are typical of the earliest translations of the bible.

4. Ancient forms of second sigmatic aorist in first conjugation verbs with liquid consonant root, characteristic of the early Russian copies of Old-Bulgarian originals.

5. The adaptation of the borrowed Greek names or names borrowed through the mediation of Greek manifests substantial differences from the picture we see in the classical Old-Bulgarian texts.

6. The ancient and rare lexis featuring some coincidences with the lexis of the works of the classical Old-Bulgarian corpus, the early Russian copies of Old-Bulgarian originals and with the language of John Exarch.

The main reason for this particular chronographic compilation to be translated so early lies in its ideological purpose. No other text in the early Slavic literature renders in such a synthesized form and at the same time comprehensively the entire Old-Testament history. Such a work was of paramount importance for a neophyte nation that was only beginning to accumulate liturgical books after the arrival of the disciples of Cyril and Methodius to Bulgaria in 886 such a work was of paramount importance. To a great extent the translation of the chronicle was intended to compensate the lack of a complete translation of the biblical books. Moreover, the chronological concept of Africanus, on which the first part of the chronicle – from the Creation to the Resurrection – is based, was obviously introducing some sort of system in the confused chronology of the Byzantines and the Bulgarians. And so the translation was pursuing rather pragmatic goals, which distinguishes it from the translations of encyclopedic works in the Golden Age. At the same time, the chronicle also gave sufficient knowledge about the history of the Hellenistic world and Ancient Rome from the beginning of the Olympiads onward, which was obviously part of the training of the educated Byzantines. With the translation of the chronicle the Bulgarians received a complete history of Christianity from the Creation of the world to the founding of Constantinople, told in an accessible, comprehensible and concise form. The legendary-mythological beginning of the narration is synthesized in a wonderful way in the title of the chronicle itself **НА[Ч]АЛО БОГОСЛОВЕН[И]И И Ш ДѢЛѢ[Х] Б[Ж]ИИ[Х] И Ш ЧИОДѢСѢ[Х]** / Ἔφο ἰα̅же σ̅τ̅τ̅τ̅τ̅τ̅τ̅ ἡ̅σ̅π̅ε̅ρ̅ε̅. ἡ̅ λ̅ε̅τ̅ο̅μ̅ι̅τ̅ ο̅υ̅κ̅α̅ζ̅α̅ν̅ι̅ε̅ π̅ο̅ ρ̅α̅δ̅δ̅. ω̅ / ц̅р̅ѣ̅х̅ъ̅ н̅ п̅р̅р̅ц̅ѣ̅ д̅о̅ х̅а̅ ѿ̅ а̅п̅п̅л̅ѣ̅ н̅ м̅ѣ̅н̅ц̅ѣ̅. ἡ̅ с̅т̅л̅ѣ̅. Not only was this chronicle suited for a neophyte nation, which had no written history of their own, but the translation of the text of Africanus fits but naturally in that part of the literary production of the Preslav literary center, which was obviously influenced by the authority of Patriarch Photius and his *Bibliotheca* containing commentaries on 279 books. Recently the Bulgarian researcher H. Trendafilov listed a total of 12 translated books among which the *Hexameron* by Basil the Great, translated by John Exarch; the *History of the Jewish War* by Josephus Flavius; the sermons of

Chrysostom collected in Simeon's *Zlatostrui*; the *Christian Topography* by Cosmas Indicopleust, whose originals were part of or corresponded to analogical works in Photius' *Bibliotheca*¹⁵. Photius not only played an active role in the Christianization of Bulgaria, but he was also a spiritual and intellectual tutor and possibly teacher¹⁶ of the future Bulgarian Tsar Simeon. Therefore it is no accident that the contents of Simeon's *Florilegium* of 1073 featured works, which had been of interest to Photius himself¹⁷. The Byzantine patriarch praised highly Africanus' chronography stressing that though concise in his style „he omits nothing worthy of record” although he described cursorily (*ἐπιτροχάδην*) the events from Christ to the reign of Roman Emperor Macrinus¹⁸. The last maybe explains why the Slavic men of letters did not choose to translate the chronicle of Africanus but opted for the compilation, where the second part described Christianity in much more detail until the summoning of the Council of Nicaea and the founding of Constantinople in the twentieth year of Constantine's the Great reign. Of course, this leaves room for speculation on whether the compilation itself could have been made on Bulgarian soil but until we can undoubtedly rule out the possibility of the existence of an analogical Byzantine compilation this should remain mere guesswork.

It is not accidental that this early Preslav translation (or compilation?) appeared in Russia in the fifteenth century, for this was the time when the Russian imperial idea and the concept of Moscow being the “Third Rome” was formulated; besides, all the extant copies of the chronicle are accompanied by a translation of the chronicle of George Hamartolus, the two Moscow copies (Унд. 1289 and Egorov 908) are placed in the chronographic miscellanies after extensive excerpts of the chronicle of Hamartolus and after the two St. Petersburg's copies (Соф. № 1474 and Сол. № 829/839) the world history continues following Hamartolus with an account on Constantine the Great. The earliest manuscript Egorov 863 is a borderline case since there the copy of the Chronicle is located after the Chronicle of Hamartolus like in the other two Moscow copies but afterwards the history continues following Hamartolus again with the same rubrics as the Petersburg's copies. The two Petersburg's cop-

¹⁵ Х. ТРЕНДАФИЛОВ, *Младостта на цар Симеон*, София 2010, р. 23–32.

¹⁶ В. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *История на българската държава през средните векове. Т. I. Първо българско царство. 2. От славянизацията на държавата до падането на Първото българско царство*, София 1971, pp. 280–282.

¹⁷ П. ЯНЕВА, „Библиотеката” на патриарх Фотий и Симеоновият сборник, [in:] *Медиевистични ракурси. Топос и енигма в културата на православните славяни*, София 1993, р. 28–32.

¹⁸ The exact English translation is as follows: Read the *History* of Africanus, who was also the author of the *Cesti* in fourteen books. Although his style is concise, he omits nothing worthy of record. He begins with the Mosaic cosmogony and goes down to the coming of Christ. He also gives a cursory account of events from that time to the reign of Macrinus, at which date, as he tell us, the *Chronicle* was finished, that is, in the 5723rd year of the world. The work is in five volumes (*The Library of Photius*, trans. J. H. FREESE, London 1920, p. 34).

ies' content is more variegated than the Moscow's and features other annalistic, anti-heretical and canonical texts.

Within the framework of the research project Concepts of History Across the Slavic Orthodox World the pursuit of Africanus' projections in the historiographic literature of Eastern Europe continues. A translation is under preparation – in Bulgarian and in English – of the part of Africanus to make the text accessible to a wider circle of researchers.

Abstract. Until recently the so-called Slavic version of the Chronicle of George Synkellos has not been paid proper attention. The attribution of Vasilij Istrin who in the beginning of the 20th c. identified the Slavic text as a translation from an abridged redaction of the Byzantine chronicle, was thoroughly accepted by the Slavic studies researchers. As a result, no great importance was attached to the Slavic text preserved in 5 copies from 15-16 cc. (of which Istrin knew only 4) because of the closed tradition of the copies and their relatively late date. My research linked to the publication of this unedited Slavic chronicle led me to the conclusion that the text referred to as the Slavic version of Synkellos by both Istrin and his successors is not a translation of the Greek Synkellos but rather a chronographic compilation. It was demonstrated that the first part of the compilation narrating the years from the Creation up to the Resurrection of Christ represents a vast excerpt from the Julius Africanus's Christian chronography and only the second part covering the years after the Resurrection up to the foundation of Constantinople contains the respective text of Synkellos plus a couple of pages from the Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor that was not translated in OCS. Both the discovery of a non fragmented text of Africanus and the conclusion that the Slavic translation was done during the 1st Bulgarian Kingdom in 10th c. raise a series of problems my contribution touches upon.

Anna-Maria Totomanova

St. Kliment of Ohrid Sofia University

15 Tsar Osvooboditel Blvd.

1000 Sofia, Bulgaria

atotomanova@abv.bg

Ivelin Ivanov (Veliko Tŕrnovo)

TSAR SAMUEL AGAINST EMPEROR BASIL II WHY DID BULGARIA LOOSE THE BATTLE WITH THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 11TH CENTURY

This question has been troubling generations of historians since the end of the 19th c., as the power of the Byzantine empire and Basil II's (976–1025) personal qualities have been considered the main reason for the fall of the First Bulgarian Tsardom in 1018¹. He was one of the most powerful and victorious Byzantine emperors and there is no doubt that the political and military stability of Byzantium at the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th c. influenced greatly the outcome of the Bulgarian–Byzantine clash², but we can also look for the answer in the dramatic events in Bulgaria after 969.

The Bulgarian military strategy and tactics up to the beginning of the 9th c. are considerably well described in the written sources. The Bulgarians traditionally attacked

¹ В.Н. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *История на Българската държава през средните векове*, vol. I, pars 2, *От славянизацията на държавата до падането на Първото царство (852–1018)*, София 1927; Г. БАЛАСЧЕВ, *Българите през последните десетгодишнини на десетия век*, vol. II, София 1929; В. КЕЦКАРОВ, *Войни на българите в Тракия 689–972 г.*, София 1940; И. ВЕНЕДИКОВ, *Военното и административното устройство на България през IX и X век*, София 1979; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Анонимът на Хазе. България и Византия на долни Дунав в края на X век*, София 1987; В. БЕШЕВЛИЕВ, *Прабългарските надписи*, София 1987; Д. АНГЕЛОВ, Б. ЧОЛПАНОВ, *Българска военна история през Средновековието (X–XV в.)*, София 1994; P. STERNENSON, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*, Cambridge 2000. According to P. STERNENSON (*op. cit.*, p. 63):

Recent scholarship has drawn attention to the inadequacy of the traditional accounts of Basil's reign, which have conflated the meager testimony of Scylitzes and Yahia of Antioch, and been misled by the pointed biography by Psellus [...]. In this revision vein, it is possible to demonstrate that Basil's Balkan campaigns were far shorter and his intentions far more limited than has generally been supposed. Moreover, although he did wage successful campaigns against Samuel, it is clear that Basil also regularly employed familiar diplomatic devices in pursuit of stability in the northern Balkans and beyond.

² For further information about Basil II's reign and his war against Bulgaria see the newest monographs by C. HOLMES, *Basil II and the governance of Empire (976–1025)*, Oxford 2005 [= OSB]; P.M. STRÄSSLE, *Krieg und Kriegführung in Byzanz. Die Kriege Kaiser Basileos' II. gegen die Bulgaren (976–1019)*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2006.

cunningly and from ambushes, sometimes undertaking big night fights, but their basic striking force was the cavalry, part of which was heavily armed for defense and attack. Beside body armour and helmets, some protective covers for horses (made of leather, chains or metal plates) are described in the surviving inscriptions about arms from the 9th c. Unfortunately we do not possess reliable information about the number of the Bulgarian heavy cavalry, with the exception of an written source telling us that in the winter of 811–812 Bulgarian khan Krum (796/803–814) acted in Thrace with 30000 cavalry, all *clad in steel*, i.e. heavily armed³. Anyway, while analyzing the arms inscriptions found in the so called *inner territories*, we could be able to estimate the number of heavily equipped riders at 1713⁴. If we assume that the surviving inscriptions of that kind are about 10% of all existing in those times, then we'll have the number of 17130 riders in the so-called inner part of the state. Comparing that to the inscription about khan Krum's 30000 warriors (no doubt clearly exaggerated), we could suppose that at the beginning of 9th c. the number of the Bulgarian army varied somewhere between 17000 and 20000⁵. The smaller number of the Bulgar's army when compared to the Byzantine contingents was compensated by its great mobility and by its missile weapons. Nevertheless, only a few decades after the great military success of tsar Symeon, in the end of the 9th c. and the beginning of the 10th c. a collapse appeared in the Bulgarian military power. What were the main reasons for such a turn of the tide?

Tsar Symeon (893–927) waged long and victorious wars against Byzantium and took Bulgaria to a leading position in the European Southeast but soon after his death the signs of a political and social crisis began to show up. During the reign of his successor tsar Peter (927–969) the Bulgarian territory was subject to devastating Hungarian invasions. As Emperor Leo VI the Philosopher (886–912) writes in his *Tactics*, the Bulgarian and Hungarian fighting techniques were similar, but despite that the Bulgarians couldn't stop the devastating attacks⁶. Anyway, this should not be necessarily interpreted as a military crisis, for in Western Europe there was not any effective resistance against the Magyars until 955 when king Otto I (936–973, after 962 an Emperor) defeated them heavily in the Battle of Lechfeld. The next strike was the invasion of the Varangians of knyaz Sviatoslav (945–972) in 969, which aimed at the most highly organized and militarily efficient part of the country – the so-called inner territories. According to the sources Sviatoslav conquered about 80 fortresses

³ *Symeonis Magistri annales*, ed. I. БЕККЕР, Bonnae 1838, p. 616, 11–13. The following is mentioned in the source: [...] *Meanwhile, when there came favorable days in the winter, and there wasn't much water in the rivers, the Bulgarians came out with an army of 30 000 strong, all clad in steel [...]*.

⁴ И. ВЕНЕДИКОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 53–54.

⁵ On the basis of the arguments adduced so far, and the assertion that the maximum militarization capability of the proto-Bulgarians was about 20%, we can assume that at the beginning of the 9th century the total number of proto-Bulgarians was about 100000.

⁶ *The Tactics of Leo VI*, XVIII, 40–43, ed. et trans. G. DENNIS, Washington 2010, p. 452, 210 – 454, 236 [= CFHB, 49].

on the Danube river, i.e. the Bulgarians did not count on open battles anymore, but on the network of fortresses and their garrisons⁷. We can also estimate the number of the fortresses judging by the fact that in 971 ambassadors from many Bulgarian fortresses came to emperor John I Tzimiskes (969–976) in search for an alliance aiming at the banishing of Sviatoslav⁸. The alliance was initially successful and, after an exhausting siege at the crucial Durostorum fortress on the river Danube, Sviatoslav asked for peace and retreated, but emperor John I himself occupied Northern Bulgaria in the same year. Byzantine garrisons were deployed in the fortresses and the Bulgarian tsar Boris II (969–971) was taken prisoner, led to Constantinople and deprived of the crown in an official ceremony⁹. These events marked the beginning of a deep crisis which led to a considerable change in the Bulgarian military power.

The events connected with the Byzantine occupation of North-Eastern Bulgaria in 971 brought to the foreground four notable aristocrats: David, Moses, Aaron and Samuel, who ruled over the western and south-western Bulgarian territories as a joint regency. After the death of the last representative of the legitimate dynasty – tsar Roman in 997, Samuel (997–1014) was declared tsar and his reign marked a period of fierce Bulgaro-Byzantine wars. The analysis of those wars leads to important conclusions about the changes in the military system of the Bulgarian Tsardom.

First we shall discuss the actions Samuel undertook against the most important fortresses. The siege of Larissa, which controlled the whole of Greek province Thessaly, went on from 977 to 983, i.e. for five long years – a fact which illustrates the limited capability of tsar Samuel concerning sieges and the conquering of big strongholds. In fact Larissa surrendered because of prolonged starvation¹⁰. Another example is the siege of Servia in Northern Greece. The Bulgarians used military cunning through which captured the commander of the fortress and thus the city surrendered in 989¹¹. Besides, in its Adriatic campaign in 998, the Bulgarian army could capture only the town of Kotor¹². One of the strategically most important fortresses – Dyrrachium, was also taken not by siege but because of the fact that the duke of the city – John Chrysilios – was Samuel's father-in-law¹³.

⁷ *Повесть временных лет*, vol. I, *Текст и перевод*, ed. Д.С. Лихачев, trans. ИДЕМ et Б.А. Романов, Москва–Ленинград 1950, p. 47.

⁸ *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, 12, rec. I. THURN, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 1973 (cetera: SCYLITZES), p. 301, 96–6 [= CFHB, 5].

⁹ И. БОЖИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 122. According to the author, Byzantine rule of the lower Danube was overthrown in the summer of 990 at the latest, and the Bulgarian rule there had already been re-introduced by the time of Basil II's march which took place in the year 1000.

¹⁰ КЕКАВМЕН, *Советы и рассказы. Поучение византийского полководца XI века*, IV, 73, ed. et trans. Г.Г. Литаврин, Санкт–Петербург²2003 (cetera: СЕСАУМЕНУС), p. 266, 30 – 268, 12 [= ВБ.И].

¹¹ СЕСАУМЕНУС, II, 31, p. 190, 18 – 192, 9.

¹² *Annales anonymi presbyteri de Dioclea*, ed. S. LIŠEV, [in:] FLHB, vol. III, ed. I. DUJČEV et al., Serdicae 1965, p. 174.

¹³ В.Н. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *op. cit.*, p. 680.

It is obvious that tsar Samuel did not possess heavy siege engines and, accordingly, the Bulgarian army developed and applied to perfection the tactics of surprise attacks, ambush, full siege and starvation when trying to take control over important fortresses. The sources show that Samuel attacked suddenly, luring the enemy away from the walls of the fortress and towards an already prepared ambush. The chronicler John Scylitzes describes the actions against Thessalonica of 996 in the following way:

[...] Samuel was campaigning against Thessalonike. He divided the majority of his forces to man ambushes and snares but he sent a small expedition to advance right up to Thessalonike itself.¹⁴

Naturally, the ambush was characteristic of the traditional Bulgarian tactics of the period between the 7th and the beginning of the 10th c. too, but it was only after 971 that it turned into the most efficient means of fighting against the Byzantine army. One of the most successful battles against emperor Basil II was fought in the Ihtiman pass in 986. After an unsuccessful siege of Serdica the emperor started back to Constantinople, but fell into an ambush in the mountain pass and was defeated. These examples lead to the logical conclusion that Samuel's actions differed considerably from the ones of the previous period and were a partial return to the fighting tactics of the early Bulgarian state (7th–8th c.).

Throughout the period between 971 and the end of the 10th c. the chroniclers describe sudden raids of the Bulgarian army in Thessaly, towards Thessalonica and into Greece proper. In one of the campaigns – the one in Thessaly in 978 – Samuel marched with cavalry and foot-soldiers, the cavalry being supposedly lightly armed¹⁵. As I already mentioned, in pursuit of the retreating Basil II in 986, the Bulgarian troops managed to move very quickly and to lie in wait for the Byzantine army but the Armenian guard of the emperor, no doubt heavily armed and well-trained, was able to fight its way through and lead him out of the battle¹⁶. This leads to the conclusion that the Bulgarian army comprised mainly of light cavalry and lightly equipped and armed foot-soldiers. Naturally, there also were some heavy armed cavalry and foot contingents but they were a very small part of the whole army. According to a source, in a battle of 1017 the Byzantines captured 200 heavy cavalry, which means that such were indeed used by Bulgarians, but they were definitely few in number¹⁷.

¹⁴ SCYLITZES, 23, p. 341, 13–15 (Eng. transl. – JOHN SKYLITZES, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*, trans. J. WORTLEY, Cambridge 2010 [cetera: JOHN SKYLITZES], p. 323). See also SCYLITZES, 36, p. 350, 59 – 351, 81; 38, p. 354, 73–79.

¹⁵ В.Н. Златарски, *op. cit.*, p. 660.

¹⁶ *Leonis Diaconi Caloënsis historiae libri decem*, ed. C.B. HASE, Bonnae 1828, p. 171, 19–173, 11 [= CSNB]; Из „Всеобща история” на Степан Таронски Асохиц (XI в.), [in:] *Българска военна история в три тома. Подбрани извори и документи*, vol. I, ed. Д. Ангелов, София 1977, p. 159; Г. БАЛАСЧЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

¹⁷ SCYLITZES, 40, p. 356, 38–50.

In 997 – the year following his coronation – Samuel penetrated deep into Greek territory but suffered a bitter defeat in a night battle near the Spercheios river. In the same year Samuel was not strong enough to join an open fight with the troops of Nicephorus Uranus, and shut himself in his strongholds¹⁸. A possible reason for that could have been the defeat at the river Spercheios, but the historians do not think that the latter was fatal to the fighting capability of the Bulgarians. Samuel's campaign in the following 998 proved that he still possessed enough warriors, but they were almost helpless against the big Byzantine fortresses. That is why the defensive actions of 997 can be interpreted as inability to face an experienced Byzantine army in an open battle. Samuel realized that and was quick to secure his rear.

The second period of the wars between Samuel and Basil II – from 999 to 1014 – clearly shows the deep political and military crisis of the Western Bulgarian Tsardom. Emperor Basil II had realized that the Bulgarians could not be conquered by a single overall campaign, but only through systematic and constant pressure, and by taking control over crucial fortresses. The first step in that direction was the reconquering of Northern Bulgaria and the strategic strongholds of Sofia, Vidin and Skopje between 1001 and 1004. Samuel counted on stubborn defense of the fortresses and on surprising raids deep into Byzantine territory. Describing the events of 1003, the chronicler John Scylitzes writes:

[...] While the emperor [Basil II – I.I.] was engaged in this siege [of Vidin – I.I.], Samuel mounted a lightning attack on Adrianople with a light and rapid force [...]. He suddenly fell on the fair which is customarily held at public expense (on that day), took a great deal of booty and went back to his own land.¹⁹

The effect of such raids was poor, and the unfavorable turn of the military action soon brought about a change of the strategy. The key Bulgarian fortresses, albeit well fortified, could not endure lengthy sieges, and Samuel was not able to render direct assistance to the besieged. The number and the poor military equipment of his warriors could have been the reasons for that and, moreover, the Byzantine Emperor did not make the mistake of 986 again. On top of this, in 1003 Samuel had to face war on two fronts because the Magyars attacked from the north-west. In 1005 Samuel also lost the important Dyrrachium fortress in today's Albania, through which Basil II could easily transfer troops from southern Italy to the rear of the Bulgarians.

However, according to some contemporary researchers, Basil was satisfied with the recovery of Dyrrachium, the reopening of the Via Egnatia, and the consolidation of control north of Thessalonica. Therefore, he was content to leave Samuel

¹⁸ SCYLITZES, 23, p. 341, 22 – 342, 51; YAHYĀ AL-ANTĀKĪ, *Cronache dell'Egitto Fātimide e dell'Impero Bizantino 937–1033*, 11, 27–28, trans. B. PIRONE, Milano 1998, p. 213.

¹⁹ SCYLITZES, 30, p. 346, 49–53 (Eng. transl. – JOHN SKYLITZES, p. 328).

with a realm based around Prespa and Ochrid, from where he could dominate the southern Slavs in Duclja and southern Dalmatia, but was denied access to the lands north and east of Sardica. Also, according to Paul Stephenson, Samuel must have kept his imperial title too, i.e. there had been some negotiations concluding with a truce with the Empire in 1005²⁰.

Quite obviously, Samuel was not satisfied with the political and military situation after 1005. The Byzantine army having encircled his domain from the south-east, east and north-east, the Bulgarian tsar decided to move out his defenses and, as the Byzantine chroniclers claim, he began blocking key spots and mountain passes. According to them,

[...] Samuel could do nothing in open country nor could he oppose the emperor in formal battle [...] so [...] He constructed a very wide fortification, stationed an adequate guard there and waited for the emperor [...].²¹

In fact these were defensive devices consisting of deep moats, fieldworks and wooden fortifications, typical for the early Middle Ages. They were preferred by the Bulgarians because their construction required less time and money and fewer workers, but brought them only temporary success. In 1014 a large Bulgarian army suffered a complete defeat at the foot of the Belasitsa mountain while defending a similar fortification. The Bulgarians found themselves in the situation of Leonidas' Spartans in the Thermopylae pass, for they were encircled by a Byzantine contingent surprising them from a by-path. However, unlike the Spartans, the surrounded troops surrendered; the Emperor had the captured 14000 to 15000 Bulgarians blinded. Although clearly exaggerated, these numbers show that the defeat was quick and the surrender – on large scales, which means that those troops were not experienced enough or were poorly armed. Most probably the bigger part of them was just free peasants called to arms or common folk. According to the sources tsar Samuel died of heart attack at the sight of his returning blinded soldiers on Oct. 6th 1014. His death marked the beginning of Basil II's triumph.

From military point of view, the main reason for Byzantium's triumph lies in the fact that after 971, and especially after 1001, Samuel could no longer use considerable number of heavy cavalry, recruited primarily from North-Eastern Bulgaria. The examples mentioned above show that the arms and the fighting style of Samuel's

²⁰ P. STEPHENSON, *op. cit.*, p. 69:

[...] *We have no information of any campaigns between the recovery of Dyrrachium and the fateful campaign of 1014. Whittow has recently noted that Scylitzes may have exaggerated when he claimed that warfare was continuous, and he draws attention to the statement by Yahya of Anthioch that after four years of fighting Basil had won a 'complete victory'. This corresponds exactly with the notion that the campaigns which in 1001 were brought to an end by the events of 1005.*

²¹ SCYLITZES, 35, p. 348, 10–18 (Eng. transl. – JOHN SKYLITZES, p. 330–331).

troops were south-Slavonic, i.e. the lightly armed foot-soldiers predominated, and the cavalry was not heavily armed. Besides, the precious experience in the building and usage of heavy siege engines, of which we read in the sources from the 9th and the first half of the 10th cc., was partially lost. Throughout that period the Bulgarians besieged and conquered large strongholds, having even besieged Constantinople and Adrianople several times, while Samuel's options in this respect were very few.

The strategy and military tactics applied by the next tsar, Gabriel Radomir (1014–1015), were similar to Samuel's and were based primarily on guerrilla war and the defense of key strongholds. During his short reign Samuel's son was not able to reverse the course of military decline and was forced to resort to urgent moves aiming at strengthening of the defense. The next ruler, John Vladislav (1015–1018), was obviously an active and warlike person but anyway Basil II continued his successful offensive policy. John Vladislav attempted to introduce a major strategic change by trying to win over the Pechenegs, thus forcing the Byzantines to fight on two fronts again; he also tried to fill in the dangerous breach in the rear, opened by Samuel's brother-in-law Ashot who had surrendered the Drach fortress to the Byzantines. The tsar perished in the siege of that town and his death brought about the beginning of the ultimate military and political end of the First Bulgarian Tsardom.

All this logically gives rise to the question about the main reasons for the change in the military strategy and tactics after the year 971. According to some scholars the main reason for the Byzantine success lies in the fact that the Bulgarian rulers did not manage to reintroduce the attacking cavalry unit applied by the proto-Bulgarian khans and, later on, by tsar Symeon. According to them the Bulgarians had lost their heavy cavalry and infantry during Sviatoslav's marches and, what is more important, as a result of the loss of 300 boyars slaughtered in Durostorum by the Varangians of Sviatoslav who had control over the military organization of the Bulgarian state at the time. In my opinion these authors are only partially right – it was not the slaughter of the 300 boyars or the loss of human lives in the marches but the occupation of East Bulgaria by emperor John Tzimiskes, and the shift of the political centre to the west of the country that were the reasons which led to radical changes in the Bulgarian military tactics. From that moment on the contingent out of which the members of the heavy cavalry were recruited, and the depots of the heavy defense weaponry, were lost as a military potential – they had remained outside the independent Bulgarian territory. Judging by certain archeological and written sources, we can assume that the major heavily-armed forces of the Bulgarian army were recruited from among the population of the internal area, or North-Eastern Bulgaria, where the heavy defense weaponry depots were also concentrated, and their loss played a crucial role in the conflict with Byzantium.

There is no doubt that tsar Samuel's defeat in his wars against emperor Basil II was a consequence of the occupation of Eastern Bulgaria and the removal of the political centre westwards after 971. The territories in which the political and military

elite lived, and where the heavily armed and the best trained contingents used to be recruited, were in a state of occupation between 971 and 976, and their re-conquering by Basil II in 1001 predetermined the outcome of the military collision. Those processes and events possibly coincided with the decline of the traditional military organization of the Bulgarians.

In conclusion I would like to mention that the wars described can be compared with the Anglo-Scottish wars of the end of the 13th and the first half of the 14th c. Both Scotsmen and Bulgarians fought fiercely but were finally defeated by a more powerful adversary. What is more, in both cases the military action was extremely cruel because of the refusal of the victor to treat the enemy as a legitimate state. From the English king's point of view the Scottish were subjects of the crown and their actions were treated as those of rebels, who were punished by being hung, drawn and quartered. Similarly, emperor Basil II did not recognize Samuel as a legitimate ruler, and treated the Bulgarian warriors as rebels. An example for this are the great number of Bulgarian captives who were blinded in 1014 – a traditional Byzantine punishment for rebellion and attempts at usurpation. Thus in 1018 the emperor finished in triumph the long wars against the Bulgarians who lost their independence for the next century and a half.

Abstract. At the beginning of the 11th century, after decades of almost incessant wars with the Byzantine Empire, the Bulgarian state lost its political independence. In many research works on the period in question there is emphasis put on the stabilization of the Empire at the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century as a major factor or a reason for the loss of our political independence for a century and a half. Naturally, the internal political state of affairs in the Bulgarian Tsardom and the decline of its military power resulting from the loss of independence also made it easier for Emperor Basil II to put pressure on the Balkans.

This article deals with the issue of the reasons for the decline in the Bulgarian military power at the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century, the changes in the military stratagems observed in the wars of tsar Samuel and his successors to the throne. Why did Samuel avoid pitched battles? Why do the sources speak mostly about lightly-equipped Bulgarian armies? Why did the Bulgarians of the time take over fortresses after prolonged sieges and mainly through starvation and military stratagems?

The present article attempts to give an answer to these questions, based on the written sources of the period and the works of historians.

Ivelin Ivanov

Department of Ancient and Medieval History
University of Veliko Tŕrnovo
Teodosij Tŕrnovski Street 2
Veliko Tŕrnovo 5003, Bulgaria
i.ivanov@uni-vt.bg

BOOK REVIEWS

***Apokryfy syryjskie. Historia i przysłowia Achikara. Grota skarbów. Apokalipsa Pseudo-Metodego [Syriac Apocrypha. The Story of Aquihar. The Cave of Treasures. Pseudo-Methodius' Apocalypse]*, trans. A. TRONINA, ed. A. TRONINA, M. STAROWIEYSKI, WYDAWNICTWO WAM, Kraków 2011, pp. 264 [= *Pisma apokryficzne*, Series, 6].**

The Syriac Apocrypha is the next volume within the monumental series edited by Marek Starowieyski, and the first one entitled *Apocryphal writings*. In this way, in six volumes prepared by over 40 co-workers: authors of translations and commentaries, more than 200 source-texts have been published dating back to different circles of Christianity – both Eastern and Western one¹. For the first time the title and structure of the anthology renounce the genological factor (among *New Testament* apocrypha, there were: first gospels, then acts of the apostles, letters and revelations) for presentation of writings belonging to the tradition of common language – Syriac. As the

first of *Apocryphal writings*, the volume *Syriac Apocrypha* is a kind of monography – all the translations are performed by Antoni Tronina.

The anthology is a textological one: by presentation of texts' variants, originating from different linguistic cultures in different times, it presents history of particular subjects and development of literary monuments. And although the presented texts *don't belong to the great literature*², they are an interesting phenomenon of religious literature, and particularly – connected to the Old Testament themes circle. The contents of *The Syriac Apocrypha* is (except Foreword and three parts sacrificed to three literal items): List of abbreviations (p. 5), Index of biblical quotations (p. 239–249), Index of names (p. 250–259) and Geographical index (p. 260–262). In the Foreword (p. 7–9), an editorial strategy of particular volumes of the series, the choice of the source texts is explained, and there is announced continuation of works on Polish translations and commentaries to the Syriac pseudo-canonical literary heritage³. In

¹ It should be reminded, that the first edition of the *New Testament* apocryphal gospels (*Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu. Ewangelie apokryficzne*, ed. M. STAROWIEYSKI) was published by the Scientific Society to the Catholic University in Lublin in 1980. New edition: *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, vol. I, *Ewangelie apokryficzne*, pars 1, *Fragmenty. Narodzenie i dzieciństwo Maryi i Jezusa*; pars 2, *Św. Józef i św. Jan Chrzcziciel. Męka i Zmartwychwstanie Jezusa. Wniebowzięcie Maryi*, Kraków 2003; *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, vol. II, *Apostołowie*, pars 1, *Andrzej. Jan. Paweł. Piotr. Tomasz*; pars 2, *Bartłomiej. Filip. Jakub Mniejszy. Jakub Większy. Judasz. Maciej. Mateusz. Szymon i Juda Tadeusz. Ewangelieści. Uczniowie Pańscy*, Kraków 2007; *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, vol. III, *Listy i apokalipsy chrześcijańskie*, Kraków 2001.

² M. STAROWIEYSKI, A. TRONINA, *Przedmowa*, [in:] *Apokryfy syryjskie...*, p. 9.

³ A full list of Polish translations from Syriac in: W. STAWISZYŃSKI, *Bibliografia patrystyczna 1901–2004. Polskie tłumaczenia tekstów starochrześcijańskich pierwszego tysiąclecia*, Kraków 2005, p. 543–567. It's worth to mention an attempt to systematize knowledge of taking the Syriac literature and culture in Poland: J. WOŹNIAK, *Polska syrologia w zarysie*, Warszawa

the introduction to each of texts, its origin and historical background have been presented, accompanied by listing its linguistic variants, both editions and translations to contemporary languages, and detailed bibliography.

The first part of the anthology is sacrificed to *The Story and proverbs of Ahiquar* (*Historia i przysłowia Achikara*, p. 11–83), adviser and secretary of Syrian rulers Sennakherib and Esarhaddon (7th cent. B.C.). The text itself is presented in translations from three variants: Aramaic, Syriac and Old-Church-Slavonic one.

It should be emphasized, that usually marginalized literary production of the *Slavia Orthodoxa* circle is included to the anthology. The authors of the volume have decided to chose the Slavic *Tale of Akir the Wise* from a 15th cent. Russian manuscript. Now we should complete the data referring to the Slavic version or rather versions of the story. The information about editions of the source text is not completely current. Apart from the Russian copies, there are other eight copies both Southern- and Eastern-Slavic⁴.

2010 (selection of studies sacrificed to Syrian language, archaeology and Christian culture with registers of Polish Syriac bibliography, as well as three newly made literary translations: BARDESANES, *The Book of nations' rights/laws; Martyrdom of Symeon Bar Sabbae*; fragments of *Our Lord Jesus Christ's Testament*). Just after *The Syriac Apocrypha* have been published, another Syrian text has been edited: *Księga pszczoły – oryginalny tekst w języku syryjskim przełożony z manuskryptów znajdujących się w Londynie, Oksfordzie oraz Monachium*, trans. J. ZACHWIEJA, Sandomierz 2011 [= *Święte księgi, święte teksty*, 14]; English version: *The Book of the Bee. The Syriac text edited from the manuscripts in London, Oxford, and Munich...*, ed. E.A. WALLIS BUDGE, Oxford 1886.

⁴ A full list in one of the newest studies devoted to the text: И. КУЗИДОВА, *Преписът на Повестта на Акир Премъдри в ръкопис № 29*

The first edition of the Slavic *Tale of Akir the Wise* presented a version acknowledged then as an oldest one⁵. Meanwhile, in 2010 another text of the first Slavic version was published – coming from the oldest Southern-Slavic copy preserved at the Savina monastery in Montenegro (14th cent., number 29)⁶. This translation, performed in the First Bulgarian Tsardom's times (10th–11th cent.), seems to be primary to the Russian versions⁷.

The second part of the anthology refers to *The Cave of Treasures*, attributed to St. Efrem the Syrian (*Grota skrabów*, p. 84–199)⁸. This most extended (in the whole anthology) text is accompanied by a very detailed commentary, whose authors explain reasons of including this source, devoid of artistic values, and being a compilation of genealogies and Biblical commentaries, some chronographical and apologetical writings, as well as Jewish and Christians legends (p. 84–85). That's why the authors set in order plots and subjects, explain point

от манастира Савина (около 1380 г.), [in:] *Пъние мало Георгию. Сборник в чест на 65-годишнината на проф. д-р Г. Попов*, София 2010, p. 492–509, with up-to-date bibliography. To the list of contemporary translations, a Bulgarian one (unfortunately, only partial) should be added, in: Й. ИВАНОВ, *Старобългарски разкази*, София 1935, p. 95–102; П. ДИНЕКОВ, К. КУЕВ, Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, *Христоматия по старобългарска литература*, ³София 1974.

⁵ А. ГРИГОРЬЕВ, *Повесть об Акире Премудром*, Москва 1913.

⁶ И. КУЗИДОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 499–506.

⁷ See: М. ЙОНОВА, *Разпространение и развитие на повестта за Акир Премъдри в средновековните литератури на южните и източните славяни*, Pbg 1, 1987, s. 104–109.

⁸ This text might be compared with another translation edited at the same time: ŚW. EFREM SYRYJCZYK, *Księga Jaskini Skarbów*, trans. M. URAM, Sandomierz 2011 [= *Święte księgi, święte teksty*, 12].

of view of its supposed authors, and different circumstances of place and time of its origin. Information referring to prevalence and popularity of the text, as well as a theological commentary and analysis of the literary monument, takes a special place.

The third text from *The Syriac apocrypha* is Pseudo-Methodius' (of Patara) *Apocalypsis* (*Apokalipsa Pseudo-Metodego*, p. 200–238). Text dating back the 7th cent., known from Syriac, Greek, Latin and Slavic copies, used to be appreciated particularly in the monastic circles. The peak of its popularity is time of Turkish march through the Balkans (14th–15th cent.). Introduction to this specific homily comprises problems of authorship and genres of the text, its theology and textological sketch of its redactions and translations. The translation from Syriac is completed with commentaries to other known translations.

A strong point of the anthology is presenting a great diversity of text originating usually from the same source. However, we could ask of principles of choice of the later, non-Syriac variants, and, e.g., lack of a commentary on a few South- and East-Slavonic redactions of the Pseudo-Methodius *Apocalypsis*. Presenting the Slavic variants, differing from the Syriac and Greek ones (like the type known from the 13th cent. so-called *Priest Dragol's codex*⁹) or extremely interesting

fragment about Bulgarians (from the 16th cent. Serbian copy¹⁰) would emphasize their originality, and thanks to that – enrich the textological description of the literary monument.

Translations presented in *The Syriac apocrypha* deserves to be read against a background of some earlier ones. In 2011 r., two titles were edited by the Armoryka Publishing House: *Historia i mądrość Achikara Asyryjczyka* [*The Story and Wisdom of Ahiquar the Assyrian*]¹¹ and *Księga Jaskini Skarbów* [*The Cave of Treasures*]¹². These ones, however, were made on basis of modern, 19th cent. English translations, and don't include both bibliography and critical commentaries.

The Syriac apocrypha possesses a great number of values: exquisite language of the Polish translation, exhaustive theological and historical-literary commentary, and very detailed bibliography, which comprises Polish, English, French, German, Italian and Russian titles (more than 100 titles for three texts, apart from editions and translations). But first of all – they make the unknown world of the Christian Syriac literature closer to non-Syriac-speakers (Syriac studies scholars). Let's hope the authors of *The Syriac apocrypha* don't make the audience wait a long tome for the next volume of the series.

Małgorzata Skowronek (Łódź)

M. LILOVA, Sophia 2011, p. 218–256 (text on p. 227–239, English translation on p. 247–253).

⁹ See editions: П.С. СРЕБЪКОВИЪ, *Зборник попа Драгоља. Садржина и пророштва, Спом 5, 1890, p. 17–20; Откровение на Методий Патарски*, [in:] В. ТЪПКОВА-ЗАИМОВА, А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия и в средновековна България*, София 1996, p. 161–182, text on p. 167–172. See also re-edition of the *Revelation of Methodius Patarensis*: А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Sources*, [in:] V. ТАРКОВА-ЗАИМОВА, А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Historical and apocalyptic literature in Byzantium and medieval Bulgaria*, trans. М. ПАНЕВА,

¹⁰ See description of the manuscript: Љ. ШТАВЉАНИН-ЂОРЂЕВИЋ, М. ГРОЗДАНОВИЋ-ПАЈИЋ, Л. ЦЕРНИЋ, *Опис ћирилских рукописа Народне Библиотеке Србије. Књига прва*, Београд 1986, p. 355–361. The edition of the fragment dedicated to Bulgarians in: В. ТЪПКОВА-ЗАИМОВА, А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 165; V. ТАРКОВА-ЗАИМОВА, А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

¹¹ *Historia i mądrość Achikara Asyryjczyka*, trans. М. ОБИДЗИŃСКА, Sandomierz 2011 [= *Święte księgi, święte teksty*, 13].

¹² ŚW. EFREM SYRYJCZYK, *op. cit.*

ИВАН БОЖИЛОВ, АННА-МАРИЯ ТОТОМАНОВА, ИВАН БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилов Синодик. Издание и превод [Boril's Synodicon. Edition and Translation]*, София 2010, pp. 386 [= История и книжнина].

The series *History and Literature* currently contains seven publications, and more are planned. The idea of this project is to present historiography of the Orthodox Slavs, to study the birth of their own concepts of history and its connections with the Byzantine model. Among the authors there are historians, philologists and linguists. A good example of their interdisciplinary approach is the book presented here, which is the result of cooperation of specialists representing different fields of scholarly studies.

The work of Anna-Maria Totomanova, Ivan Božilov and Ivan Biljarski – *Бориловият синодик. Издание и превод [Boril's Synodicon. Edition and Translation]* – has a somewhat misleading title, but in this case it is an advantage. The book does not contain simply the critical edition of *Boril's Synodicon*, but a publication of the whole Palauzov manuscript as well (14th c., kept in the Sts. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia – НБКМ¹ 289). We can find there horoses of 4th, 6th, 7th ecumenical councils, the synod of Constantinople (920 – tomus unionis), the synod of Patriarch Menas (536), three prayers for liturgical use, and the Greek originals of the horoses. The text of *Boril's Synodicon* is reconstructed – the editors took Palauzov manuscript as a basis for their work and compared it with Drinov copy (XVI c., НБКМ 432). Missing parts of Palauzov copy are supplemented with fragments from Drinov's one. Variant readings,

¹ НБКМ – Национална Библиотека „Св. Кирил и Методий“.

as well as lacunae in the text, are indicated in the footnotes. Paleographic characteristics of the text and the marginalia from both manuscripts complete the critical apparatus.

These manuscripts are the only two preserved copies of the Bulgarian Synodicon, which is one of the most interesting sources for Bulgarian medieval history and for history of Bulgarian language. The main part of *Boril's Synodicon* is a translation of the Byzantine version. This document was proclaimed in 843, after the synod which confirmed the end of iconoclasm in Byzantine Empire. The text was re-edited and expanded a few times, and it eventually became a dogmatic encyclopedia. Initially, it contained a condemnation of the iconoclasts. Over time anathemas against heretics that appeared later were added. The *Synodicon* was sung every year in episcopal churches during the service on the first Sunday of Lent. In 1211, as a result of the synod of Tarnovo, it was translated into Bulgarian. The Bulgarian version continued to expand, and it eventually became a memorial book of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church.

The edition presented here contains Bulgarian and English translations. Before this, English speaking readers had available only partial translations: one by Thomas Butler² and another by Janet and Bernard Hamilton, based on the French translation by Henri-Charles Puech and André

² T. BUTLER, *Monumenta bulgarica – A bilingual anthology of Bulgarian texts from the 9th to the 19th centuries*, Ann Arbor 1996, p. 203–215.

Vaillant³, confronted with the original by Yuri Stoyanov⁴.

The historical introduction (p. 10–54) was written by Ivan Božilov. His works are well-known for his direct study of sources, and, as he declares himself, for denouncing *historiographical inventions* (p. 20). In the introduction to *Борилев синодик... I*, Božilov gives us a summary of his ideas about situation in Bulgaria in the early XIII c. and presents few threads of the late medieval Bulgarian history which were reflected in *Boril's Synodicon*. As it is impossible to write history without at least some *historiographical inventions*, in the introduction we can find a few preferred by the author. I discuss here the idea that Boril cooperated with Nicean *basileus* Theodore Laskaris in 1210–1211 (p. 22), an opinion that Bulgarian compiler of the Synodicon used *Panoplia dogmatika* of Euthymius Zigabenos (p. 31–32) and an identification of persons listed in anathemas 76–78 of Palauzov manuscript (P. 23a, 8–10, 11–13, 14–16) with bogomils (p. 33).

The hypothesis about Nicean-Bulgarian alliance in 1211 is based on a single letter of Latin Emperor Henry *universis amicis suis* (to all his friends)⁵. In this letter the Emperor informs his *friends* from the West about the victory over his four enemies. In fact, if we read the letter carefully we cannot find any evidence of the alliance. What we find is that Theodore Laskaris' and Bulgarian

tsar's actions are contemporary. The discussed hypothesis is just a logical conclusion of the mentioned fact. But since Boril entered conflict twice later we can explain it another way: when Boril realised that Henry was fighting with Theodore, he decided to take advantage of the situation. Boril's exact aims remain hidden – neither he gained anything, nor were any of his goals made clear in any of the sources. The idea of the supposed alliance, however, is commonly accepted in historiography⁶.

Many historians attempted to discover the place and the role of the synod of Tarnovo in Bulgarian foreign policy. Some of them, like I. Duičev, claimed that it was a part of the big political project based on the *Orthodox* alliance between Boril and Theodor Laskaris, when others treated the synod as an effect of the anti-heretical agitation of Pope Innocent III⁷. All these speculations are nothing more than *historiographical inventions*, and probably that is why they are omitted in the introduction to this edition

³ H.C. PUECH, A. VAILLANT, *Le Traité contre les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre*, Paris 1945, p. 343–346.

⁴ J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, Y. STOYANOV, *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650–c. 1450*, Manchester 1998, p. 260–262.

⁵ HENRICUS IMPERATOR, *Henricus imperator universis amicis suis de quattuor imperii hostibus a se pervictis scribit*, [in:] *FLHB*, vol. IV, ed. M. VOINOV, V. GIUZELEV, et. al., Serdicae 1981, p. 18–23.

⁶ В. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *История на българската държава през сръбнитъ вѣкове. Томъ III. Второ българско царство. България при Асьневици (1187–1280)*, София 1940, p. 290–291; И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Борилевият синодик като исторически и литературен паметник*, Библ 7–8, 1977 p. 27; А. ДАНЧЕВА-ВАСИЛЕВА, *България и Латинската империя (1204–1261)*, София 1985, p. 97–98; В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, И. БОЖИЛОВ, *История на средновековна България VII–XIV в.*, София 1999, p. 470; J.V.A. FINE, *The late medieval Balkans. A critical survey from the late twelfth century to the Ottoman conquest*, Michigan 1994, p. 97–99.

⁷ В. КИСЕЛКОВ, *Борилевият синодик като исторически извор*, ИП 19.6, 1963, p. 67; П. СТЕФАНОВ, *Нов поглед към унията между българската и римската църква през XIII в.*, ПКШ, vol. V: *Изследвания в чест на проф. д. ист. н. Тотю Тотев*, ed. В. Гюзелев, Х. Трендафилов, София 2001, p. 344.

of *Boril's Synodicon*, but since they gained so much interest among historians, the lack of a commentary on this subject is noticeable.

The idea that *Panoplia dogmatica* was used during the composition of *Bulgarian Synodicon* was once widely disputed (first proposed it M. G. Popruženko in the late 19th c., the idea was accepted by D. Obolensky). Then it was connected with searching for the sources of anathemas containing Bogomil's dogmas which now we know were mainly translated from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas. I. Božilov recalls this idea with a different purpose in mind. He is looking for answer to the question from where the *Boril's Synodicon* compiler took information about Basil the Physician, condemned under Alexius Comnenus (anathema against him is placed in P. 15b, 20 – 16a, 3). I. Božilov correctly indicates that the process of Basil the Physician was mentioned in the works of Anna Comnena, John Zonaras, Michael Glykas and Euthymius Zigabenos. I. Božilov rejects the possibility that the Bulgarian compiler's source was one of the first three mentioned texts with words: *we could hardly suppose that these three Byzantine works were available for the Bulgarian writer*. And he continues: *just one possibility is left: „Panoplia dogmatica”* (p. 31). The importance of Euthymius Zigabenos work was noticed from the beginning of modern historiography. It would be pointless to enumerate here writers using *Panoplia dogmatica* while describing history of Bogomilism or Bulgarian literature in the times of Patriarch Euthymius. Maybe this long lasting tradition led I. Božilov to exaggerate the role of *Panoplia dogmatica*? Supporting his supposition, he only notices that Vladislav the Grammarian put Slavic translation of the mentioned work in *Zagrebian Collection* from 1469 (p. 31). It is very weak evidence and I do not find any-

thing else in favour of I. Božilov's opinion.

There are more than 150 persons mentioned in the *Palauzov* manuscript of the *Synodicon* (in the memorial part alone I. Božilov counts 144 persons!). Among them, we find saints, heretics, Byzantine and Bulgarian Emperors, their wives, Patriarchs, bishops, Serbian Kings, Romanian Voivodes and boyars. The authors made a considerable effort to identify them. In the introduction I. Božilov presented a detailed comparison between the content of Bulgarian and Greek lists of Byzantine Emperors, Empresses and Patriarchs. *Boril's Synodicon*, presents not just a selection of the original list, but there are a few persons added, whom we don't meet in the Greek versions. In the Bulgarian list, Emperor Michael III, Leon VI, Manuel I are not mentioned. The Bulgarian compiler adds instead Theodosius I, Honorius, Theodosius II and Marcian (p. 35–36). Analysing lists of Bulgarian rulers and Patriarchs, the Author points out not only persons included in the document, but primarily the excluded ones. The Author brings our attention to persons like Ivailo, Smilets or Patriarch Basil. The analysis of the content, additions and missing information about events and persons leads I. Božilov to formulate hypothesis about 8 steps of composing *Boril's Synodicon* (p. 41–46).

While analysing anathemas placed in P. 23a, 8–10, 11–13, 14–16 I. Božilov identifies the heretics condemned there (Tychicus, Aemilian, Luke and Mandaleus – the latter two with some reservations) as bogomils (p. 33). Supporting the identification, he invokes the work of D. Angelov. The cited opinion is not at all justified. It is based on the fact that two heretics among them (Moses the Bogomil, Peter of Cappadocia) are undoubtedly bogomils, and others mentioned in the same anathemas were not identified. But few lines above we can find anathemas collecting together such different heretics as

Simon Magus and Arius (P. 22a, 20 – 22b, 2) or Macedonius I and Apollinaris of Laodicea (P. 22b, 8–9)! Surprisingly in the footnotes we can find that the opinion criticized here is abandoned, and Tychicus is suggested to be a Paulician, whereas Aemilian, Luke and Mandaleus are marked as unidentified (p. 329–330, 370).

To sum up, I would like to stress that in publishing *Борилев синодик...* the Authors provided an excellent tool for further work with the text. Broad introduction (p. 10–86) gives readers knowledge about the circumstances in which both Byzantine (p. 10–17) and Bulgarian (p. 17–25) Synodicons appeared, detailed analysis of the translated part of the Synodicon with comparison with the original version, and commentaries about the supposed Greek prototype (p. 26–37). The introduction continues with a presentation of the Bulgarian part of the Synodicon (p. 36–52) and the part of the introduction written by I. Božilov ends with a table comparing Bulgarian and Byzantine lists of the Byzantine Emperors and Empresses (p. 52–54). Further on we find a comprehensive study of A.-M. Totomanova and I. Biljarski devoted to both Palauzov and Drinov MSS. They discussed not just the appearance of the copies, their content and their orthographical and palaeographical characteristic; the Authors published all of the marginalia giving us knowledge about the late history of MSS as well. Moreover they presented information about liturgical use of the texts placed in Palauzov copies, and Boril's Synodicon

itself. The critical edition of the main text is placed on the pages 91–178. In the edition we can find original orthography with all diacritics preserved. The table comparing rubrics of Palauzov and Drinov copies put on p. 179–195 was necessary to help us to orientate in the text because the copies differ in the order of the passages. Subsequently there are placed the Bulgarian horoses and liturgical prayers (p. 196–276) and Greek horoses (p. 277–295). This part was prepared by A.-M. Totomanova, and by A. Dimitrova (Greek part). It is followed by the Bulgarian (p. 296–316) and English translations (p. 337–358; respectively by A.-M. Totomanova and M. Paneva) with footnotes (by I. Božilov and I. Biljarski, p. 317–336) containing prosopographical, historical, textological and philological comments.

As a part of the project *История и историзъм в православния славянски свят. Изследване на идеите за история (History and Historicism in the Slavic Orthodox World. Study of Historical Thought)* under which *Борилев синодик...* were published, the scientific conference in Veliko Tarnovo was organised between 29.04–01.05. 2011 *Търновград – духовен и книжовен център през XIII в. (Tarnovgrad – spiritual and literacy centre in XIII c.)*. A significant number of papers was devoted to *Boril's Synodicon*. The hope of the Authors that their work *will give a new impetus to the study of this text* (p. 386) was fulfilled.

Jan Mikołaj Wolski (Łódź)

URSZULA WÓJCIŚKA, *Literatura staroruska z elementami historii i kultury dawnej Rusi* [Древнерусская литература с элементами истории и культуры Древней Руси], Bydgoszcz 2010, pp. 368.

Среди польскоязычных публикаций, посвященных средневековой культуре восточных славян, очень трудно найти учебное пособие для студентов русской филологии и других специальностей, содержащее целостный образ эпохи. Преобладают краткие обзоры восточнославянской письменности с древнейших времен до современности¹. Правда, существует также польский перевод обширного труда Герхарда Подскальского под заглавием *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus'* (*Христианство и богословская литература в Киевской Руси*), однако упомянутая публикация, сосредоточенная на древнейшем периоде русской истории, охватывающем время от начала христианства на Руси до нашествия монголов (1237), адресована не студентам филологических и исторических факультетов, а профессиональным исследователям-славистам².

Именно поэтому первым учебным пособием по древнерусской литературе, который предлагается вниманию польского читателя, можно считать новей-

шую публикацию Уршули Вуйчицкой, профессора Университета им. Казимежа Великого в Быдгоще, специалиста по литературе допетровской Руси (X–XVIII вв.)³ и другим вопросам русской средневековой культуры. Как сообщает автор в предисловии к рецензируемой публикации, она является результатом ее многолетней преподавательской и исследовательской работы. Следуя распространенной в современном литературоведении тенденции, Вуйчицка предлагает рассматривать историю русской культуры допетровского периода как единое целое, без разграничения средневековой письменности и литературных достижений писателей XVI–XVII вв. Поскольку в отечественной печати практически отсутствуют публикации об истории и культуре средневековой Руси⁴, исследовательница решила показать древнерусскую литературу на широком фоне общественно-исторических событий и достижений культуры (изобразительного искусства и зодчества) Древней Руси.

¹ *Historia literatury rosyjskiej*, ed. M. JAKÓBIEC, Warszawa 1976; B. МУСНА, *Historia literatury rosyjskiej. Od początków do czasów najnowszych*, Wrocław 2002.

² G. PODSKALSKY, *Chrześcijaństwo i literatura teologiczna na Rusi Kijowskiej (988–1237)*, trans. J. ZYCHOWICZ, Kraków 2000. Первое издание книги на немецком языке: G. PODSKALSKY, *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988–1237)*, München 1982. Русский перевод: Г. ПОДСКАЛЬСКИ, *Христианство и богословская литература в Киевской Руси (988–1237 гг.)*, trans. А.В. Назаренко, ed. К.К. Акентьев, Санкт-Петербург 1996 [= *Subsidia Byzantinorossica*, 1]

³ Дополнением к предлагаемой вниманию читателя книге является другой учебник Уршули Вуйчицкой, который целиком посвящен русской литературе XVIII столетия: U. WÓJCIŚKA, *Literatura rosyjska XVIII wieku z elementami historii i kultury Rosji*, Bydgoszcz 2008.

⁴ Краткий очерк истории Древней Руси польскоязычный читатель может найти прежде всего в начальных главах учебных пособий по истории России и Украины (L. VAZYLOW, P. WIECZORKIEWICZ, *Historia Rosji*, Wrocław 2010, p. 9–71; W. SERCZYK, *Historia Ukrainy*, Wrocław 2001, p. 20–53), а также в первом томе труда: A. ANDRUSIEWICZ, *Cywilizacja rosyjska*, Warszawa 2004, p. 7–304.

Книга состоит из Введения, трех глав, Заключения и Библиографии. Во Введении автор определяет хронологические рамки учебника, кратко характеризует специфику культуры средневековой Руси, развивающейся (начиная с момента крещения князя Владимира в 988 г.) под сильнейшим влиянием восточного христианства и византийской цивилизации, перечисляет важнейшие особенности древнерусской литературы. Несколько слов посвящает также наиболее характерным чертам восточнославянской палеографии, до сих пор нуждающейся, как и русская редакция древнецерковнославянского языка, в современном учебном пособии на польском языке⁵.

Учебник характеризуется последовательной подачей материала. Изложение истории литературы разделено на три части. В первой главе анализируется начальный этап развития древнерусской письменности, хронологически совпадающий с периодом существования Киевской Руси на политической сцене Восточной Европы. Вторая часть посвящена тяжелому времени татаро-монгольского нашествия и владычества (период культурного суверенитета Владимиро-Суздальской Руси). В третьей главе внимание уделено прежде всего литературным произведениям, возникшим на территории Московского государства в XVI–XVII вв. В каждой из вышеуказанных частей материал представлен по одной и той же схеме. В начале главы автор дает краткий обзор исторических событий, затем рассказывает о важнейших аспектах материальной культуры, изобразительного искусства (прежде всего иконописи), архитектуры и музыкального творчества. Кроме того, Уршуля Вуйчицка обращает внимание на малоизвестные широкому

⁵ Недавно вышел в свет древнерусско-польский словарь: Н. WĄTRÓBSKA, *Słownik staro-cerkiewno-rusko-polski*, Kraków 2010.

кругу польских исследователей новгородские грамоты на бересте, представляющие неоспоримую ценность для историка, изучающего общественную и хозяйственную жизнь Великого Новгорода, и на надписи и граффити, обнаруженные археологами на стенах важнейших памятников древнерусской архитектуры⁶. Подразделы, посвященные литературе, находятся в конце каждой главы и занимают, конечно, несравнимо больше места. Основой систематизации памятников древней письменности является жанровая система. В отдельных подразделах автор характеризует переводную литературу, средневековую историографию (летописание) и церковную литературу, прежде всего агиографию и так называемые хождения (рассказы о путешествиях). Вместе с тем исследовательница не забывает упомянуть о народном творчестве Древней Руси и тех жанрах светской письменности, которые стали появляться в литературе Московского государства на протяжении XVII в.

Подготавливая к печати столь многоаспектную публикацию, очень трудно избежать неточностей. Итак, безусловно слабой стороной рецензируемой работы можно считать фрагменты, излагающие ход исторических событий. Книга содержит, к сожалению, несколько фактографических неточностей и ошибок. Так, например, нельзя забывать, что византийский император никогда не имел полной власти над восточной церковью и ее руководителями (с. 16), что сан патриарха, начиная с половины V в., принадлежал на христианском Востоке только четырем епископам: константинопольскому, иерусалимскому,

⁶ Краткий обзор некоторых древнерусских граффити см. в монографии: М. WÓJTOWICZ, *Najstarsze datowane inskrypcje słowiańskie X–XIII wiek*, Poznań 2005, р. 91–96, 99–111, 119, 134, 137, 142–143, 146–149.

александрийскому и антиохийскому (с. 16), а окончательный раскол христианской Церкви (1054 г.) на западную/католическую и восточную/православную состоялся при константинопольском патриархе Михаиле Кируларии и римском папе Льве IX (с. 17). Трудно также согласиться с утверждением, что первые сведения о славянах стали появляться в письменных источниках уже в V в. до н.э. (с. 33) или считать текст русско-византийского договора 944 года, дошедший до наших дней только в составе *Повести временных лет*, старейшим древнерусским документом (с. 35). Княгиню Ольгу никаким образом не мог крестить император Константин Великий (с. 35), живший в IV в. и не имевший права (оно принадлежало только священникам) совершать обряд крещения. Вероятнее всего, правительница Киевской Руси крестилась в Царьграде в половине X в. во время правления Константина VII Багрянородного. Ни один византийский император не мог считать себя вполне наследственным правителем, а прозвище «Порфирогенит» (Багряногенный) придавалось в Византии только императорским детям, рожденным во время правления их отца (с. 57). Сыновья князя Владимира – Борис и Глеб – были причислены к лику святых Русской Православной Церкви не в 1020 г. (с. 91), а в 1072 г. Войска киевского князя Святослава никаким образом не могли захватить византийскую столицу в 971 г. (с. 115). Трудно также согласиться с утверждением Уршули Вуйчицкой, что изготовление чаши из черепа побежденного врага воспринималось в средневековом обществе лишь как знак почести и уважения к погибшему (с. 115). В византийских источниках можно найти информацию, что после разгрома императорской армии и гибели Никифора I, болгарский хан Крум (IX в.) приказал изготовить из черепа по-

бежденного правителя кубок, отделанный серебром, которым пользовался на пирах со своими вождями. Поступок хана интерпретировался византийцами однозначно – как чрезвычайно позорное событие в истории восточной империи⁷. Вторая жена Ивана III, Зоя-София Палеолог, была дочерью младшего брата последнего византийского императора, Константина XI Палеолога-Драгаша. В монографии читаем, что она является дочерью сестры императора (с. 159, 252). Александр Лисовский – основатель подразделений польской легкой кавалерии, действовавшей в пределах Московского государства во время Великой Смуты, никогда не получил сана гетмана (с. 314).

К тому же удивление вызывает факт, что Уршуля Вуйчицка не соблюдает – обязательного для всех исследователей прошлого – правила, согласно которому необходимо ссылаться непосредственно на исторический источник. Так, например, на с. 12, упоминая известный памятник древнеболгарской литературы, трактат *О письменах* Чернорица Храбра (IX в.), она цитирует фрагмент этого сочинения по научно-популярной книге Стефана Братковского, посвященной истории и культуре Великого Новгорода⁸. Очень

⁷ M.J. LESZKA, *Chan Krum i basileus Nikefor I w świetle Peri Nikēfōrou tou βασιλέως και πως αφήσιν τα κωλα εν Βουλγαρία*, SA 43, 2002, p. 35–43; IDEM, *Wizerunek władców pierwszego państwa bułgarskiego w bizantyńskich źródłach pisanych (VIII-pierwsza połowa XII wieku, Łódź 2003, p. 46–47 [=BL. 7]; IDEM, *Leon V i chan Krum w świetle fragmentu Chronografii (AM 6305) Teofanesa Wyznawcy*, PNH 6, 2007, p. 109–117.*

⁸ Стефан Братковский, в свою очередь, без никакой библиографической справки ссылается на какой-то труд Бориса Грекова. S. BRATKOWSKI, *Pan Nowogród Wielki. Prawdziwe narodziny Rusi*, Warszawa 1999, p. 167.

трудно понять, почему автор публикации не пользуется здесь изданием, содержащим его польский перевод авторства Александра Наумова⁹. Ситуация повторяется на с. 43. Автор приводит здесь короткий фрагмент Киевской летописи, цитируя текст по книге Евгения Осетрова *Живая Древняя Русь* и не сообщая читателям, что упоминаемый источник имеет полное научное издание на польском языке¹⁰.

Подготавливая к изданию столь обширную публикацию, разумеется, трудно полностью избежать повторений и непоследовательностей. Укажем на некоторые из них. На с. 28 Уршуля Вуйчицка неточно определяет стилистическую манеру, получившую широкое распространение в литературных произведениях православных славян в XIV в. под влиянием эстетических принципов исихазма (так называемое *плетение словес*), как «пустословие», а на с. 183 компетентно характеризует специфику этого стиля, тесно связанного с масштабнейшими явлениями в духовной культуре позднего средневековья. Приобщая читателей к основным вопросам византийского сакрального искусства (с. 51), она толкует древнецерковнославянский термин «иконопись» лишь как ошибочный перевод греческого слова *εἰκονογραφία*; в главе, посвященной переводной литературе и старейшим русским рукописям, содержащим фрагменты Ветхого и Нового Завета, подчеркивает характерное для богословия Восточной Церкви сопоставление Священного Писания и иконы (с. 68). Исследовательница ошибочно именует киевский храм Софии Премудрости Божьей

«верной копией» константинопольского собора (с. 64), а уже на следующей странице утверждает, что русская церковь отличается от византийской количеством куполов. В анализе иконографии Богородицы ошибочно утверждает, что *Спас Эммануил* изображает Христа-Младенца (с. 223), а на с. 57 подчеркивает, что анализируемый тип концентрируется на тайне Воплощения Слова Божия.

На этапе редакционно-подготовительных работ следовало также обратиться к более внимательному использованию понятий и унифицировать терминологию, что позволило бы избежать разнобоя. Например, древнецерковнославянский язык трудно считать старейшей формой славянского языка (с. 16). Древнецерковнославянский (*staro-cerkiewno-słowiański*) – это язык православной литургии и средневековой славянской письменности, в то время как начальной фазой образования славянских языков является праславянский (*prasłowiański*). В Московском государстве на протяжении XVII в. никто уже не переводил трудов Отцов Церкви с греческого на старославянский (с. 301). Языком письменности и литургии являлась в этот период русская редакция древнецерковнославянского, т.е. церковнославянский язык (*cerkiewnosłowiański*). Автор употребляет также различные термины для обозначения русских и византийских софийских соборов (с. 64–65, 196). Кажется, лучшим вариантом было бы определение «церковь/собор Софии Премудрости Божьей», минимизирующее возможность перепутать Божественную Премудрость со святой Софией.

Члены редколлегии, решившие полонизировать все личные имена и географические термины, должны были позаботиться о последовательном и адекватном их употреблении. Итак, Византий

⁹ CZERNORZECZ HRABR, *O piśmie*, [in:] *Pasterze wiernych Słowian. Święci Cyryl i Metody*, ed. A. NAUMOW, Kraków 1985, p. 26–31.

¹⁰ *Latopis kijowski 1159–1198*, ed. E. GORANIN, Wrocław 1988, p. 180. Кстати, в Библиографии это издание упоминается.

– древнегреческий город, существующий на месте будущего Константинополя (с. 16) – это по-польски *Byzantion*, а район византийской столицы, в котором находился императорский дворец и известная Богородичная церковь – это *Blacherny* (с. 54). Польская форма имени Климент звучит *Klemens* (с. 23), а имени Никифор – *Nikefor* или *Nicefor* (с. 25).

Достоинством рецензируемого труда является приведение в скобках важнейших терминов в их первоначальной (древнецерковнославянской, церковнославянской или русской) форме, благодаря чему читатели книги, прежде всего студенты филологических факультетов, получили возможность познакомиться с оригинальной терминологией, а также помещенный в книгу богатый иконографический материал. Все иллюстрации и репродукции цветные и высококачественные. Они удачно подобраны и являются ценным дополнением к тексту учебника.

Итак, рецензируемая публикация безусловно содержит обстоятельное обоз-

рение важнейших литературных явлений и цивилизационных достижений русского средневековья, т.е. эпохи, которой обычно посвящается очень мало места в учебных пособиях по истории русской литературы (большинство наших критических замечаний касается в основном второстепенных вопросов, связанных скорее с историей, чем с литературой). Она убедительно раскрывает специфику литературы и культуры средневековой Руси, знакомит с культурными связями восточных славян с важнейшими интеллектуальными центрами на Балканах (в Византии, Болгарии и Сербии), а в XVI–XVII в. – с жителями польско-литовского государства. Следовательно, можно полагать, что предлагаемое вниманию читателя учебное пособие окажется востребованным студентами русской филологии и других специальностей, а также всеми интересующимися историей и широко понятой культурой Древней Руси.

Zofia Brzozowska (Łódź)

***Uczniowie Apostołów Słowian. Siedmiu Świętych Mężów [Disciples of the Apostles of the Slavs. The Seven Holy Men]*, ed. MAŁGORZATA SKOWRONEK, GEORGI MINCZEW, Collegium Columbinum Cracoviae, Kraków 2010, pp. 216 [= Biblioteka duchowości europejskiej, 4].**

The body of sources pertaining to the disciples of Constantine-Cyril and Methodius, unlike the texts devoted to the latter¹, has not been of particular interest to

¹ E.g.: *Żywoty Konstancyjny i Metodego (obszernie)* [*Lives of Constantine and Methodius (comprehensive)*], trans., ed. T. LEHR-SPEŁAWIŃSKI, Poznań 1959; *Pasterze wiernych Słowian. Świeci Cyryl i Metody* [*Shepherds of the faithful*

Polish scholars² and it is therefore gratify-

Slavs. Saints Cyril and Methodius], ed., trans. A. NAUMOW, Kraków 1985; *Cyryl i Metody. Apostołowie i Nauczyciele Słowian* [*Cyril and Methodius. Apostles and teachers of the Slavs*], vol. II, *Dokumenty* [*Documents*], ed. J.S. GAJEK L. GÓRKA, Lublin 1991.

² For example, an exception to this is a translation of some of the Clement of Ohrid's texts,

ing to see that a new publication has filled the gap in this area. It is worth highlighting that its creation came about through the initiative and effort of South Slavic linguists from Łódź, headed by Georgi Minczew. Furthermore, in order to achieve this ambitious undertaking, it was possible not only to involve a group of excellent translators, but also to gain the assistance of prominent experts on the subject of the activity and cult of Constantine and Methodius' pupils. These experts came in the person of Elka Bakalova, Slavia Barlieva and Dimo Češmedžiev, who wrote the introductory texts.

The book is divided into four main parts; in the first, there are three studies, constituting an introduction to the source texts. The first one, *Uczniowie Apostołów Słowian Siedmiu Świętych Mężów w greckiej i słowiańskiej tradycji literackiej* [*Disciples of the Apostles of the Slavs. The Seven Holy Men in Greek and Slavic literary tradition*] (p. 17–36), is the work of Slavia Barlieva and Dimo Češmedžiev. In the first part of the text, S. Barlieva presents the personalities and works of the pupils of Constantine-Cyril and Methodius and characterises the source that is the basis of our knowledge about them. In the second part, D. Češmedžiev examines the question of the creation and development of the cult of the Seven Holy Men, which includes both the Apostles of the Slavs themselves and their pupils. He supports the view that the cult dates back to the 16th century and that the number of saints in the group is linked to the symbolic meaning of the number seven, as we know by name only six of the pupils of Constantine-Cyril and Methodius. The author of the following text *Siedmiu Świętych Mężów w sztukach pięknych* [*The Seven Holy Men in the arts*] (p. 37–60) is Elka Bakalova.

done by A. NAUMOW – *Pasterze...*, pp. 37–50, 99–105.

The scholar characterises the tendencies in art in portraying Apostles of the Slavs, as well as their pupils, beginning from the late 9th century up until the last decade of the 20th century. She discusses the most important works portraying them, points out the reasons for the proliferation and abatement of interest in the figures of the Seven Holy Men over various periods and in different areas during the more than a millennium long history of their presence in art. The third text, *Pamięć o Siedmiu Świętych Mężach w legendach ludowych i podaniach* [*The memory of the Seven Holy Men in folk tales and legends*] (p. 61–77), by Georgi Minczew shows the presence of the Seven Holy Men in South Slav folklore. The scholar disputes the current academic views and displays his own original findings concerning, *i.a.*, the archaic core of the tale of the Seven Holy Men, the lands which became the cradle of these tales and, finally, the influence of high culture on their shape.

All three of the studies – in conjunction with the preface (*Zamiast wstępu* [*Instead of introduction*], p. 9–16) by Małgorzata Skowronek, who undertook the task of sharing with the Polish reader the works associated with the pupils of Constantine and Methodius – intended to prepare the reader for the reading and understanding of the source texts. The translations, whose authors are Anna Maciejewska (3 texts), Maciej Kokoszko (1), Małgorzata Skowronek (32), Agata Kawecka (2), Magdalena Pasik (3), Ivan Petrov (1) and Aleksander Naumow (1), have been made in a professional manner, conveying not only the letter, but also the spirit of the original texts. The sources were divided into three groups. In the first, *Hagiografia* [*Hagiography*] (p. 79–142) there are eight lives of saints, including five of St. Naum (three anonymous of Slavic

provenance, *Żywot obszerny św. Nauma Ochrydzkiego* [*The comprehensive life of St. Naum of Ohrid*], attributed to Constantine Cabasilas, and *Żywot Świętego Nauma tzw. Ludowy* [*The so-called folk life of St. Naum*] by Jonče Snegarov), two of Clement (*Żywot obszerny Świętego Klemensa Ochrydzkiego* [*Legenda bułgarska*] {*The comprehensive life of St. Clement of Ohrid* [*Bulgarian legend*]} of Theophylact archbishop of Ohrid; *Żywot krótki Świętego Klemensa Ochrydzkiego* [*Legenda ochrydzka*] {*The brief life of St. Clement of Ohrid* [*Ohridian legend*]} by Demetrios Chomatenos) and Jonče Snegarov's *Żywot Świętego Erazma, tzw. Ludowy I* [*The so-called folk life of St. Erasmus*]. In the second, *Hymnografia* [*Hymnography*] (p. 143–174) there are three texts: Anonymous of Ohrid's *Słowiańskie nabożeństwo ku czci Świętego Klemensa (na 27. Lipca)* [*Slavic devotion in honour of St. Clement (for July 27)*] (p. 145–153), Demetrios Chomatenos' *Nabożeństwo ku czci Świętego Klemensa* [*Devotion in honour of St. Clement*] (p. 154–163) and *Słowiańskie nabożeństwo ku czci Siedmiu Świętych Mężów biskupa Parteniusza* [*Slavic devotion in honour of the Seven Holy Men of bishop Parthenius*]

(p. 164–174). Part three *Legandy ludowe i memoraty z okolic Ochrydy* [*Folk legends and memorates from the environs of Ohrid*] (*Folk legends and memorates from the environs of Ohrid*) (p. 177–196) contains thirty two small texts. Małgorzata Skowronek and Georgi Minczew supply the translations with an erudite commentary. Along with the *Słownik antroponomów i toponimów* [*Dictionary of anthroponyms and toponyms*] (p. 197–207) and *Słownik terminów liturgicznych i teologicznych* [*Dictionary of liturgical and theological terms*] (p. 209–213), it facilitates the comprehension of the occasionally difficult texts.

The sources pertaining to the pupils of Constantine and Methodius included in the book, together with the already existing translations into Polish of the texts related to the activity and cult of the Solun Brothers, will allow Polish readers to shape their own views about the place and role of the Apostles of the Slavs and their pupils in the development of Slavic culture, and more broadly speaking, of European culture.

Translated by Michał Zytka

Miroslaw J. Leszka, Kiril Marinov
(Łódź)

ANDREJ ŠKOVIERA, *Svätí slovanskí sedmopčetníci* [*The Seven Slavic Saints*], Slovenský komitét slavistov, Slavistický ústav Jána Stanislava SAV, Bratislava 2010, pp. 247

Da più di dieci anni Andrej Škoviera esamina con serietà scientifica il culto dei sette discepoli di Cirillo e Metodio (i “Sette Santi”), toccando temi come: la storia del rapporto tra Oriente e Occidente cristiano nel contesto della missione in Moravia dei

Santi Fratelli Cirillo e Metodio svoltasi dalla seconda metà del IX secolo; le problematiche riguardo il patrimonio liturgico di Cirillo e Metodio; il destino di alcuni dei discepoli di Cirillo e Metodio dopo la morte di quest'ultimo, con particolare attenzione fo-

calizzata su Angelario e Gorazdo, la cui attività dopo l'anno 885 è legata, secondo alcuni studiosi, allo stabilirsi della nuova religione tra gli Slavi occidentali. Il libro *Svätí slovanskí sedmopočetníci*, dedicato al 1100 anniversario della morte di san Naum di Ocrida, è un importante contributo allo studio del culto dei Sette Santi. In esso A. Škoviera ha cercato di ordinare cronologicamente e di commentare gli studi scientifici e le fonti sulla vita e le opere dei discepoli dei ss. Cirillo e Metodio, nonché di fornirci le sue chiare ipotesi su alcuni aspetti non abbastanza chiari della loro attività nei Balcani, in Moravia e nella Polonia meridionale.

Nell'introduzione a pag. 13 l'autore individua i quattro obiettivi principali della monografia: 1) presentazione dei dati inerenti la formazione e lo sviluppo del culto di ciascuno dei Sette Santi, sia come singoli che come gruppopcome emerge dai testi liturgici, dall'iconografia e dal calendario ecclesiastico che ne riporta le date di celebrazione; 2) tracciato della storia della vita dei discepoli dei ss. Cirillo e Metodio, in particolare nel periodo 885–886, quando vennero espulsi dalla Grande Moravia; 3) presentazione delle fonti riguardanti la vita dei Sette Santi con particolare attenzione a quei testi in grado di testimoniare la formazione del loro culto; 4) spiegazione delle condizioni storiche che hanno provocato i cambiamenti del culto nel contesto liturgico, ecclesiastico e politico nei corrispettivi secoli.

Nel secondo capitolo, „Skupina svätých slovanských sedmopočetníků” (p. 15–44) A. Škoviera approfondisce la menzione dei nomi dei Sette Santi nelle fonti slave e greche più antiche; segue il significato teologico della parola *οἱ ἑπτάρηθμοι* con la quale dal XVI secolo si designa l'intero gruppo dei più stretti discepoli dei ss. Cirillo e Metodio; si ferma nei luoghi dove il culto dei Sette Santi ha lasciato nei Balcani le tracce più

evidenti: Ocrida, Berat, Moschopolis; indica le date nelle quali il gruppo è ricordato nel calendario della Chiesa; traccia lo sviluppo dell'iconografia dei Sette Santi e descrive brevemente la loro celebrazione nella Chiesa occidentale.

Il terzo capitolo, „Osudy svätých slovanských sedmopočetníků” (p. 45–129), rappresenta un tentativo di presentare le storie delle vite dei cinque discepoli più vicini ai Santi Fratelli così come le presentano le fonti slave, greche e latine. Il capitolo è suddiviso in due parti. Nella prima parte l'eredità dei ss. Clemente di Ocrida, Naum di Ocrida, Sava, Gorazdo e Angelario viene vista sullo sfondo dei rapporti tra Costantinopoli e Roma nella seconda metà del IX secolo. Vengono delineate le controversie sull'uso delle lingue nazionali nella liturgia, come anche altre differenze dogmatiche tra le due Chiese (Filioque, il primato del Papa, l'uso del pane azzimo nel sacramento ed altre) che hanno provocato il fallimento della missione in Moravia e l'espulsione dei discepoli nel 886. Vengono anche brevemente presentati gli eventi accaduti durante il ricevimento dei discepoli da parte del principe Boris I in Bulgaria. La seconda parte del terzo capitolo contiene le biografie dei cinque discepoli dei ss. Cirillo e Metodio.

Nel quarto capitolo, „Pramene o sv. sedmopočetníkoch” (p. 130–186), A. Škoviera presenta un'analisi dettagliata delle opere letterarie, religiose, fonti giuridiche e liturgiche che descrivono la vita e l'opera dei Sette Santi. Personalmente a me sembra che l'autore avrebbe potuto considerare una composizione più adatta della monografia: la rassegna delle fonti poteva trovare posto all'inizio (per esempio prima del secondo o del terzo capitolo), poiché alcune fonti sono state già analizzate proprio in questi due capitoli.

Il quinto capitolo, „Liturgia cyrylo-metodejskej misie na Veľkej Morave”, si

concentra su due importanti questioni relative alla ricostruzione della prassi liturgica durante la missione tra gli Slavi occidentali: il carattere della Liturgia delle Ore e le controversie intorno alla cosiddetta Liturgia di San Pietro. Parlando della Liturgia delle Ore, A. Škoviera sembra indurre la tesi che i Santi Fratelli e i loro discepoli abbiano tradotto e utilizzato l'*asmatiki akoluthia* del patriarcato di Costantinopoli e non il „cursus” quotidiano monastico. Per la Liturgia di San Pietro l'autore crede che essa „bola pokusom obohatit' anaforálnu tradíciu byzantského obradu o anaforu západného typu” (p. 208), ma anche in questo caso è molto attento nelle

valutazioni e osserva come le questioni atinenti la liturgia dell'epoca possano essere risolte solo dopo una edizione critica dei manoscritti glagolitici slavi, scoperti nel 1975 sul Monte Sinai.

In conclusione si può affermare che la monografia slovacca dedicata ai Sette Santi presenta una scrupolosa analisi storico-filologica con un commento teologico e liturgico delle fonti molto approfondito. Il libro di A. Škoviera è un serio contributo allo studio della tradizione dei ss. Cirillo e Metodio, soprattutto tra gli Slavi occidentali.

Georgi Minczew (Łódź)

***Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym. Miasto i ludzie w okresie wczesnobizantyńskim [Constantinople – New Rome. The City and the People in the Early Byzantine Period]*, ed. M. J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, WN PWN, Warszawa 2011, pp. 751.**

The monograph, which is the topic of this brief review, is one of the effects of the work of Polish byzantinists from the so-called Łódź School of Byzantine Studies. The book has been composed in the wake of the grant awarded to the Łódź academics by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education. Thanks to the granted funding, the researchers have had an opportunity to conduct a detailed and long-lasting archival and modern literature research in the leading academic centers of Western Europe (Oxford, London, Paris, Rome to mention but a few) and take part in fruitful field trips, which led them as far as to the heart of modern Istanbul.

The publication is divided into eleven chapters. The first (*Foundation of Constantinople and Its History from IV Century to the Beginning of 7th Century*, p. 13–101) contains subchapters on the to-

pography of the city, the history of ancient Byzantium, the foundation of New Rome by Constantine the Great and an outline of the history of Constantinople between the 4th and 7th century.

The second chapter (*The Layout of the City*, p. 102–177) is an elaboration on the spatial urban planning principles made use for the sake of inaugurating Constantinople and describes the city's main landmarks. While Mirosław J. Leszka writes about the Great Palace and other imperial residences (Bryas, Damatrys, Saint Mamas, Hebdomon, Blachernae), Teresa Wolińska presents public buildings, such as the Hippodrome, Basilica or Senate. Their information is supplemented with Sławomir Bralewski's sketch of the most renowned churches erected to embellish the capital city and Kiril Marinow's short but informative study covering the harbors and the

fortifications of the city.

In the third part of the monograph (*The inhabitants of Constantinople*, p. 178–233), which refers to the population of the city, Andrzej Kompa presents his research of the social structure of Constantinople (p. 178–226), focusing on a picture of the Constantinopolitan middle class and the significance of women in Byzantine society. Teresa Wolińska writes about Constantinopolitan circus factions and their members. She demonstrates their role during races and in unrests that occasionally burst out in the city.

In the chapter *The Emperor, the Court and the Subjects* (p. 234–269), M. J. Leszka and T. Wolińska write about the Byzantine concept of power, imperial symbolism in force throughout the period of early Byzantium and analyze the coronation ceremony. One should emphasize the importance of their conclusions concerning the significance of women at the imperial court and the relationship between the emperor and his subjects.

In the fifth chapter (*The Authorities of Constantinople*, p. 270–349) Paweł Filipczak makes a thorough analysis of the available sources concerning the office and activities of the *proconsul* of the city. He also presents a wealth of information on the distinctive Constantinopolitan system of fire protection, on the city police serving under the control of the *praetor plebis* and activities of the city's *quaesitor*, the counterpart of the modern immigration officer. The author also includes in the chapter an extensive fragment which consists of his research in the *prefect's* undertakings against any form of anti-government opposition, religious unrest or faction riots.

In the next chapter (*The Church and his Influence on the Life of the Inhabitants of Constantinople*, p. 350–400) Małgorzata B. Leszka discusses riots triggered off by the Christian population of the capital in a pro-

test against depositions of Constantinopolitan patriarchs (Joannites, Euphemius etc.) and attempts on the life of some bishops of Constantinople (John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus, Nectarius etc.). The author elaborates in detail charity work of the Church and various charitable foundations, like *xenodochia*, *orphanotrophia*, *brephotrophia*, *gerontokomia*, *ptochotrophia*, scattered all over the fourteen districts of the capital.

Various forms of religious cult are the topic of the sixth chapter (*Religious Life of the Inhabitants of Constantinople*, p. 401–432), in which S. Bralewski presents his outstanding expertise concerning religious ceremonies connected with the cult of the Saint Cross, the Mother of the God, various martyrs and their relics.

In the chapter *Supplying the City* (p. 433–470) T. Wolińska and Maciej Kokoszko write about the problem of providing Constantinople with adequate food and water supplies (especially the city's aqueducts and cisterns).

Although the chapter *The Tastes of Constantinople* (p. 471–475) could be a separate dissertation, it forms an integral part of the discussed monograph. Therein, M. Kokoszko, an authority on early Byzantine food, presents different dishes, which were prepared by the inhabitants of Constantinople. The scholar acquaints the reader with various typical cereal foods like *mádza*, meat dishes, fish delicacies (from *afye* to sharks) as well as with various soups, for instance *ptisáne*. He also presents a cornucopia of vegetables and fruits like mallow (*maláche*) or medlars (*méspilon*, *epimelís*), which are nowadays not as popular as they used to be in Byzantium. Additionally, he elaborates on a variety of herbs (pennyroyal, mint, coriander and others) and spices (like *asafetida*, which, in ancient times, was termed *silphion*), and other food additives determin-

ing the range of Constantinopolitan aromas (like famous fish sauce called *garum*). Last but not least, the author describes ancient and early Byzantine doctrines on healthy food and quotes Byzantine medical doctors on nutritional properties of various food-stuffs and dishes prepared from them.

In the tenth chapter (*The education in Constantinople*, p. 576–642) A. Kompa analyses the legal status of Constantinopolitan scholars. The author presents the history of the higher education system, which was established by Theodosius the Younger, and describes Constantinopolitan libraries, including that of Constantius II. A. Kompa's area of interest focuses not only on law and philosophy but also on medical and engineering teaching, which has not been researched into satisfactorily before.

In the last chapter of the discussed monograph (*The entertainment in Constantinople*, p. 643–669). T. Wolińska describes pantomime performances, imperial festivals (*brumalia*), chariot and runners races, animal fights, acrobatic shows and others.

The book is supplemented by a foreword (p. 9–11), detailed maps of early Byzantine Constantinople, several indices

(personal, geographical, Constantinopolitan names, p. 699–742), a selected bibliography and extensive illustrational material, collected during the trips to Istanbul.

Constantinople – New Rome. The City and the People in the Early Byzantine Period is certainly one of the most exhaustive monographs depicting the capital of Byzantine Empire at its earliest development stage. Despite the abundance of information included in the study, the authors managed to present a clear picture of all problems presented in the book, and the history of the city is only a background against which they analyze almost every aspect of the Constantinopolitans' life. Each and every individual chapter has been based on an ample body of sources and secondary literature. Particularly the chapters on the social history of the capital and Byzantine diet will contribute considerably to an increase of knowledge about the Byzantine Empire and consequently to a noteworthy progress in Byzantine studies. Let us hope that the monograph of the Łódź scholars will not pass unnoticed and that it will be an inspiration for further research.

Błażej Cecota (Łódź)

PIOTR ŁUKASZ GROTOWSKI, *Święci wojownicy w sztuce bizantyńskiej (843–1261). Studia nad ikonografią uzbrojenia i ubioru [Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art (843–1261). Studies of the Iconography of Arms and Armour]*, Wydawnictwo WAM, Kraków 2011, pp.492.

The book is a doctoral dissertation of an art historian from the Department of Ancient and Medieval Art of the Papal University of John Paul II in Cracow. The English version of the book was published

at about the same time as the Polish one.

The work is based on many sources, mostly iconographic ones from the Byzantine Empire, now scattered among different centers of scholarly study, and

complemented by written sources.

In the first introductory chapter the author demonstrates the current state of research on the development of the cult and iconography of warrior saints, in particular on the arms and armour of the Middle Byzantine army. The time-frame covers the period between 843 and 1261, although it is highly conventional and the author not infrequently goes beyond it, e.g. to the pre-iconoclastic era or to the art of 13th century.

Chapter One presents the archaeological, iconographic and written sources, on which the research is based. The written sources include military treatises (*taktika* and *strategika*). The author did not limit his work to the artifacts from the Byzantine Empire but also from the area under its cultural influence (for example, Russia or Norman Sicily).

Chapter Two discusses the origins of the image of a warrior saint. In his analysis of the problem of the Holy War in the Christian doctrine the author presents the early images of warriors, showing their two basic iconographic types (mounted and foot warrior). He pays attention to the influence of the cult of pagan gods on the development of the cult of Christian warriors. He notices the correlation with the images of Goddess Athena, and the gods of Syria and Egypt (p. 146–147). Another part of the book is devoted to the literary description of the influence of the army's heavenly supporters on the course of war; the author emphasizes that it began to appear as late as in the 10th century (p. 150–155). He sees the popularity of the cult in popular religiousness on the one hand and in the imperial patronage on the other (p. 160).

The main part of the book consists of three following chapters, dedicated to the costume and armour of warrior saints, their weapons and equestrian equipment respec-

tively. In the first of these chapters the author discusses the parts of the armour – different types of the corselet (“muscled” cuirass, scale body armour, lamellar cuirass), “soft” armour (*neurika*, *lorikion psilos*) and the other parts – *kabadion* and *skaramangion*, shoulder-guards and sleeves (*manikia*), lower tunic (*himation*, *peristethidia*), shoulder pennants (*phlamuliskia*), *epilorikion*, protection for arms, legs and footwear.

The remaining parts of the book are devoted to the symbolism and customs regarding the armour, particularly the shields.

The author pays much attention to the warriors' cloaks (both those worn by officers as well as by ordinary soldiers, known as *sagion*). He takes a close look into the insignia worn by the military, such as *fibula* (*kornoukopion*, *porpe*), officer sash (*diadema*, *zone stratiotike*), *tablion* and symbolic insignia: *diadem* and *tiara*, the *torque* (*maniakion*).

Personal weapons of Byzantine soldiers shown on the images include different types of shafted weapons (lances, spears, javelins, heavy infantry pikes). The lances were also used as a symbol of status and a symbolic weapon. The images are sometimes accompanied by a *crux hastata*, i.e. a lance with a cross-shaped end and a military pennon (*phlamoulon*, *bandon*). As the edged weapons were often used in the Byzantine army, a sword (*spatha*, *xiphos*) often accompanies the images of warrior saints, also because of its symbolic role. A *palash* (proto-sabre), known as *parameirion* is less frequently seen.

The images of warrior saints include protective parts of the horse's armour as well. These are discussed in the book, too.

The author shares some interesting thoughts on the pages of his book. Given the lack of archaeological material it is very

difficult to reconstruct the original robes and arms used by the Byzantine army. The book demonstrates that the images of warrior saints can be useful in learning what they might have looked like. The creators of the images, despite the traditional form, usually followed the arms and armour known to themselves, which can be proven by depicting such novelties as stirrups or almond-shaped shields. The process of adjusting the images of warrior saints to the military details of the era could be observed much more often outside Constantinople, particularly in Nubia and Egypt, but also in Georgia. Substantial changes can be seen during the Crusades, thanks to the contact with Latin knights. Grotowski points out the adjustment of warrior saints to the standards of the knightly culture. He also makes the reader aware that the clothes and arms were also used to convey some political ideas, both by the newcomers from the West and by the Greeks themselves (p. 450–451). He also emphasizes that the model of the warrior saint formed in the middle Byzantine era survived and went on being used also later on, in the era of the Paleologues.

The fact that the warrior saints were depicted mostly with a spear and sword can be read as a continuation of the antique composition or an image modelled on that of the imperial guards. Both these hypotheses may well be true, as the uniform of the latter clearly referred to the ancient patterns.

The illustrative material is certainly

essential to this kind of work. The book contains more than one hundred illustrations of warrior saints on frescos, icons, coins, talismans, dishes and other daily use artifacts. The illustrative material certainly makes the book easier to use. Similarly, the indices at the end facilitate the work with it. In this case, however, the reader may have some doubts about their accuracy. To give an example, Demetrios of Thessalonica appears in the book more frequently than you can expect from the index only (the occurrences of his name on page 163, 165, 166–169, 193, 238, 254, 271 are omitted). The well developed footnotes provide information to individuals exploring a particular field of study, this however makes the book difficult to recommend to those who are not specialists.

In a work with a wealth of information like this, some errors appear inevitable. Also some opinions of the author may have gone too far, like the statement that a double-headed eagle was accepted as the official coat of arms of the Empire (p. 301).

Grotowski's book is without doubt a great reference book for historians, art historians and archaeologists. It would be of interest to the researchers of warrior saints' biographies and individuals interested in the Byzantine army in the early and middle Byzantine era. An extensive bibliography represents a great tool for further individual research on the subject.

Teresa Wolińska (Łódź)

RAFAŁ KOSIŃSKI, *The Emperor Zeno Religion and Politics*, Towarzystwo Wydawnicze „Historia Iagellonica”, Cracow 2010, pp. 289 [= *Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia*, 6]

The reign of the emperor Zeno, although it has drawn the attention of scholars, has not yet been a subject of monographic works, with the exceptions of the written in the late 19th century, difficult to get and rather general work by Wilhelm Barth¹ and the unpublished doctoral dissertation of Benno Schwark². This gap is superbly filled by Rafał Kosiński, a young Polish byzantist who can already boast significant scholarly achievements³. While the work is primarily an attempt to show the religious policy of the ruler, it also sheds light on a number of other aspects of his reign.

The work is divided into eight main parts.

¹ *Kaiser Zeno*, Basel 1894.

² *Die kirchenpolitik Kaiser Zenos*, Würzburg 1950.

³ He is the autor e.g.: *ΑΓΙΩΣΥΝΗ ΚΑΙ ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ. Konstantynopoliński święci mężowie i władza w V wieku po Chr.* [*Constantinopolitan Holy Men and Authority in 5th Century*], Warszawa 2006 [= *ArF*, 56]; *The Life of Nestorius as seen in Greek and Oriental Sources*, [in:] *Continuity and Change. Studies in Late Antique Historiography*, ed. D. BRODKA, M. STACHURA, Cracow 2007, p. 155–170 [= *Ele*, 13]; *Początki kariery Tarasikodissy-Zenona* [*The Beginnings of Tarasikodissa-Zeno's Career*], [in:] *Byzantina Europea. Księga jubileuszowa ofiarowana Profesorowi Waldemarowi Ceranowi*, ed. M. KOKOSZKO, M.J. LESZKA, Łódź 2007, p. 289–304 [= *BL*, 11]; *Izauria w orbicie wpływów rzymskich do połowy V wieku* [*Isauria in the Orbit of Roman Influence until the mid V Century*], *BTH* 8, 2010, p. 11–26; *Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch*, *Bsl* 68, 2010, p. 49–73; *Struktura społeczna* [*Social Structure*] and *Religie cesarstwa rzymskiego w V stuleciu* [*Religions of Roman Empire in the V Century*], [in:] *Świat rzymski w V wieku* [*Roman World in the V Century*], ed. IDEM, K. TWARDOWSKA, Kraków 2010, p. 278–297; 365–416.

In the first (*Introduction*, p. 13–29), the author presented the significance of Zeno's religious policy and characterized sources that formed the basis of his inquiry. In the second (*Decisions of the Council of Chalcedon: Acceptance and Opposition (451–471)*, p. 31–55) he showed the situation of the Byzantine Church during the two decades after the Council of Chalcedon. Part three (*Zeno*, p. 57–59) was devoted to the – hailing from Isauria – Tarasikodissa-Zeno's way to the imperial throne. Particular emphasis was placed on determining his religious views. The next part of the book (*Basiliskos' Usurpation*, p. 79–97) covers the usurpation of Basiliskos, brother of Verina, the widow of emperor Leo I. This event was an exceptionally important moment in the history of Zeno's reign. During the brief rule of the usurper, the debate over the provisions of Council of Chalcedon came back to life with great intensity. What is particularly significant, the groups hostile to this assembly of bishops gained strength thanks to the support of Basiliskos. After regaining power, Zeno was forced to work out the rules of conduct towards those of the clergy who associated themselves with the usurper and represented anti-Chalcedonian views. Part V (*The Chalcedonian Reaction*, p. 99–124) was devoted to this issue. Removal of the anti-Chalcedonian clergy from the most important positions within the Church and replacing them with supporters of the council and men loyal to both the emperor and Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople and Zeno's chief religious advisor, exacerbated the situation. This became apparent especially in Egypt. The development of *Henotikon*, the document that was to become a middle ground for an agreement with the Egyptian anti-Chalcedonians, was supposedly intended to calm down

the emotions. Many works have been devoted to discussing this document, and it has become the basis for portraying emperor Zeno as an opponent of the provisions made in Chalcedon. According to the author, this view is not correct. Evidence for this is, i.a., the fact that the *Henotikon* was considered by the contemporaries to be crypto-Chalcedonian. This subject is discussed in part VI (*Henotikon*, p. 125–145). The next part, *Revolt of Illos* (p. 147–176), is devoted to the usurpation of Illos and Leontios. Here, the scholar focused his discourse not so much on the fate of the undertaking itself, but on the attitudes expressed towards it by the various groups within the Church and by religious communities (starting with Kalandion, the patriarch of Antioch, through Pagan circles, and finally the Jewish ones). The last chapter *Acacian Schism* (p. 177–201) presents the final years of Zeno's reign, during which, i.a., the titular schism, that is the division between the patriarch of Constantinople and the bishop of Rome, occurred. The work is complemented by: an appendix *The Emperor Zeno's Church Foundations* (p. 203–220; it contains an im-

portant and original conclusion that Zeno's building policy was aimed at appeasing and enlisting aid of his Isaurian, and what needs to be remembered, native, base), *Conclusions* (p. 221–223), *Bibliography* (225–269), *Index People* (p. 271–281), *Index Places* (p. 283–289).

Rafał Kosiński's book is an important voice in the debate on the reign of emperor Zeno. The author, thanks to a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the sources, presented in a new light the ruler's religious policy. Contrary to the present in the scholarship and fairly commonly accepted opinion, the researcher showed that Zeno was a supporter of the provisions of the Council of Chalcedon, and that the certain concessions that he was making for the anti-Chalcedonian groups were caused by the hope for establishment of peace in the Church, particularly needed in the face of various political problems with which the ruler had to struggle.

Translated by Michał Zytka

Miroslaw J. Leszka (Łódź)

АННА-МАРИЯ ТОТОМАНОВА, *Из историята на българския език [Из истории болгарского языка]*, Издателство ПАН Пъблишинг Къмпани ООД, София 2009, с. 334.

Историю и историческую грамматику болгарского языка вне всяких сомнений можно считать одной из наиболее интересных областей диахронической славистической лингвистики. Причиной тому является нетипичный путь развития этого языка, отличающий его (наряду с македонским) от общеславянских моделей в области морфологических и синтаксических преобразований. Помимо

традиционного описания развития языковых форм (происходивших в силу фонетических и морфологических процессов) и определения относительной и абсолютной хронологии, историк болгарского языка постоянно встает перед задачами и вопросами более широкого характера, пытаясь указать на причины изменений структуры предмета своих исследований (от синтетизма к аналитизму) – причины

как чисто лингвистического, так и внеязыкового характера.

Именно такую перспективу содержит вышедший в 2009 году сборник научных статей известной болгарской исследовательницы Анны-Марии Тотомановой, озаглавленный *Из историята на българския език (Из истории болгарского языка)*. Как пишет во введении к книге Татьяна Славова, «всяка една от представените в сборника статии е малка стъпка към отговора на въпроса защо българският език изпада от общославянския развой и променя своя морфо-синтаксис» (стр. 5). В книге собрано 39 статей, публиковавшихся на протяжении почти двадцати пяти лет (начиная с 1985 года) в научных сборниках и периодических изданиях (прежде всего – хотя и с небольшими исключениями – болгарских). Отметим также, что те статьи, которые первоначально были опубликованы на английском, итальянском или русском языках, в настоящем сборнике переведены на болгарский.

Исследования распределены не по хронологическому принципу, как часто бывает в подобного рода публикациях, а в зависимости от затрагиваемой в статьях проблематики. Таким образом читатель сосредотачивается не на эволюции научных взглядов автора, а непосредственно на предмете исследования. А. Тотоманова группирует свои работы вокруг трех основных тем, которым соответствуют три части книги: *Историческая фонетика и диалектология, Историческая морфология и лексикология. Книжная норма*, а также *Исследование средневековых памятников*.

Материалы первой части книги (8 статей, стр. 9–54) затрагивают как проблемы развития системы гласных звуков болгарского языка (прежде всего – еров и связанных с ними процессов), так и некоторые вопросы изменений консонантной системы, а именно – т.н. палатализаций и последовавшей за ними депалатализации, давшей различные результаты в болгарских диалектах¹. Своеобразным обобщающим центром этой части сборника можно считать статью *Среднеболгарский вокализм* (стр. 36–42), в которой исследовательница предлагает пересмотреть устоявшиеся в науке представления о принципиальном значении т.н. среднеболгарского периода (XII–XIV вв.) для развития болгарского языка, считая его всего лишь продолжением предшествующего периода: «...езикът, който се говори през среднобългарския период, може еднозначно да бъде определен като една късна разновидност на старобългарския език» (стр. 37). Стоит также обратить внимание, что А. Тотоманова старается в своих работах искать объяснение для фонетических изменений в процессах, происходящих на уровне морфологии, воспринимая таким образом язык как целостную систему.

Именно морфологии главным образом посвящена вторая и основная часть книги (18 статей, стр. 55–202), причем большинство текстов в ней касается наиболее важных с точки зрения аналитизма процессов – перегруппировки и распада системы именных склонений. В этой связи нельзя не упомянуть о «программной» статье *Оратория болгарскому аналитизму. Часть первая: начало* (стр. 108–114), где А. Тотоманова развивает свой тезис о более позднем, нежели принято считать, переходе болгарского языка к аналитизму (в начале XV века, главным образом в валашско-болгарских грамотах) и предлагает не ограничиваться в объяснениях этих

1 Тематика этой части сборника естественным образом перекликается с первой авторской книгой А. ТОТОМАНОВОЙ, *Из българската историческа фонетика*, София 1992 (второе издание – 2001).

явлений исключительно балканским влиянием: «...да кажеш, че българският е аналитичен, защото е балкански, е класическо определение в кръг» (стр. 112), а рассматривать его на фоне историческо-языковой ситуации, принципиально отличающей состояние болгарского языка от двух других языков сферы *Slavia Orthodoxa* – сербского и русского: «Може да се обобщи, че липсата на авторитетна книжовна норма е позволила на наченките на аналитизъм, които виждаме във влахо-българските грамоти, да избуят и се развият в годините на робството» (стр. 113). Подчеркнем, что «морфологическая» часть сборника посвящена не только явлениям в области номинальной парадигматики, но и вопросам исторического словообразования и лексикологии, а также проблемам развития вербальной подсистемы (главным образом – ее темпоральной составляющей). Кроме этого в данную главу включены статьи, затрагивающие проблематику региональных разновидностей (редакций) староболгарского языка и вопросы развития книжно-литературной нормы в памятниках средневековой болгарской письменности.

Исследованию самих же памятников посвящена третья часть книги (13 статей, стр. 203–334), в которой наиболее отчетливо видна основная методологическая установка А. Тотомановой – чрезвычайно уважительное отношение ко главному и по сути единственному критерию проверки всех теоретических суждений и тезисов: зафиксированному в источниках тексту. В области работы с источниками исследовательница имеет неоспоримый многолетний опыт – и как издатель, и как переводчик на современный болгарский язык и комментатор – а в качестве основных анализируемых в статьях третьей части книги памятников выбраны тексты, работу над которыми

А. Тотоманова вела на протяжении многих лет. Это и т.н. Ватиканский палимпсест, кириллический памятник X века², и произведения Константина Костенецкого *Описьменахи Житие Стефана Лазаревича* XV века³, и славянская версия хроники Георгия Синкелла, исследованием которой А. Тотоманова активно занималась в последние годы⁴. Тексты последней части сборника показывают не только лингвистическую, но и более широкую текстологическую и источниковедческую направленность научных интересов автора, являясь вне всяких сомнений очередным доказательством того, что палеославистика – это по сути междисциплинарная область филологических и гуманитарных исследований.

В завершение стоит отметить, что представленный здесь монографический по своему содержанию сборник статей – это лишь часть необычайно активной работы Анны-Марии Тотомановой на поприще широко понимаемой палеославистики⁵.

Иван Петров (Łódź)

² Cf., *Ватиканско евангелие (старобългарски кирилски апракос от X в. в палимпсестен кодекс Vat. Gr. 2502)*, ed. Т. Кръстанов, А. Тотоманова, И. Добрев, София 1996.

³ E.g.: *Константин Костенецки, Съчинения*, trans., ed. А.-М. Тотоманова, София 1993.

⁴ Cf. А. Тотоманова, *Славянската версия на хрониката на Георги Синкел*, София 2008.

⁵ Из публикаций А. Тотомановой последних лет упомянем – помимо уже перечисленных книг – участие в качестве переводчика на современный болгарский язык в томах КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ, *Слова и служби*, ed. И. Христова-Шомова, П. Петков, А. Тотоманова, София 2008 и ГРИГОРИЙ ЦАМБЛАК, *Избрани съчинения*, ed. Д. Петканова, Велико Търново 2010, а также подготовку в качестве соавтора публикации *Борислов синодик. Издание и превод*, И. Божилков, А. Тотоманова, И. Билярски, София 2010.

Abbreviations

AClas	Acta Classica: Proceedings of the Classical Association of South Africa
AJAH	American Journal of Ancient History
An	Antiquity
ArF	Archiwum Filologiczne
ArtB	The Art Bulletin: a quarterly published by the College Art Association of America
AUL.FH	Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica
B	Byzantion. Revue internationale des études byzantines
BBg	Byzantinobulgarica
BF	Byzantinische Forschungen. Internationale Zeitschrift für Byzantinistik
BHR	Bulgarian Historical Review/Revue bulgare d'histoire
Bi	Bizantinistica
BL	Byzantina Lodziensia
BMd	Bulgaria Medievalis
BMGS	Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies
BSGR	Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana
Bsl	Byzantinoslavica. Revue internationale des études byzantines
BTH	Białostockie Teki Historyczne
BZ	Byzantinische Zeitschrift
CFHB	Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae
CPhil	Collectanea Philologica. Cathedra Philologiae Classicae Universitatis Lodziensis
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum
CSHB	Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae
Cyr	Cyrrillomethodianum
DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers
EB	Études balkaniques. Revue trimestrielle publiée par l'Institut d'études balkaniques près l'Académie bulgare des sciences.

Ele	Electrum. Studia z historii starożytnej
FGHB	Fontes graeci historiae bulgaricae
FLHB	Fontes latini historiae bulgaricae
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
GR	Greece & Rome
Hi	Historia. Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte
JDAI	Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
JÖB	Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik
JÖBG	Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
LSJ	H.G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, H.S. JONES et al., <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , Oxford 1996
LT	Literature and Theology
MGH.SS	Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptorum
Neo	Neophilologus
ODB	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> , ed. A. Kazhdan et al., New York–Oxford 1991
OSB	Oxford Studies in Byzantium
Pbg	Palaeobulgarica/Старобългаристика
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca</i> , ed. J.-P. Migne Paris 1857–1866
PGL	<i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> , ed. G.W.H. LAMPE, Oxford 1961
PNH	Przegląd Nauk Historycznych
PNUS	Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
RE	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, Stuttgart 1894–1978
REB	Revue des études byzantines
RESEE	Revue des études sud-est européennes
RHR	Revue de l'histoire des religions
SA	Slavia Antiqua
Sbyz	Series Byzantina. Studia nad Sztuką Bizantyńską i Późnobyzantyńską
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SEER	The Slavonic and East European Review
SeS	Scripta & e-Scripta

SG	Sicilorum Gymnasium. Rassegna semestrale della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Catania
SMed	Studi medievali
Star	Starine
TM	Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines
VC	Vigiliae christianae: A Review of Early Christian Life and Language
VP	Vox Patrum. Antyk Chrześcijański
WAGSO	Wiener Archiv für Geschichte des Slawentums und Osteuropa
Βκα	Βυζαντιακά
Βυζ	Βυζαντινά. Ἐπιστημονικό Ὄργανο Κέντρου Βυζαντινῶν Ἑρευνῶν Ἀριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου
ΠΘΕΕΦΣ	Πανεπιστήμιον Θεσσαλονίκης Ἐπιστημονική Ἐπετηρίς τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς
АрП	Археографски прилози
Библ	Библиотекар
БПр	Български преглед
БПЦВ	Библиотека. Приложение на Църковен вестник
БС	Български старини
БФСКОГЗ	Богословски факултет "Свети Климент Охридски". Годишен зборник
ВБ.И	Византийская библиотека. Источники
Век	Векове
ВГ	Враньски гласник
ВИС	Вопросы истории славян
ГСНД	Гласник Скопског научног друштва
ГСУ. ИФФ	Годишник на Софийския Университет. Историко-Филологически Факултет
ГСУ.НЦСВПИД	Годишник на Софийския Университет" Научен център за славяно-византийски проучвания „Иван Дуйчев”
ЖМНП	Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения
ЗЛУ	Зборник за ликовне уметности
Зог	Зограф
ЗРВИ	Зборник Радова Византолошког Института
ИБАИ	Известия на Българския археологически институт
ИБПЦИАИ	Известия на Българската патриаршия и Църковно-историческия и архивен институт

ИЗ.ОИИЦГ	Историјски записи. Орган Историјског института НР Црне горе
ИИД	Известия на Историческото дружество
ИИИ	Известия на Института за История
ИП	Исторически преглед
ИРАИК	Известия руского археологического института в Константинополе
КЗб	Крушевачки Зборник
КМЕ	Кирило-Методевска енциклопедия
КМС	Кирило-Методиевски студии
КњЈ	Књижевност и језик
ЛИФО.ВО	Лѣтопись историко-филологического общества при императорскомъ Новоросийскомъ университетѣ, Византий-ское отделение
ПИ	Проблеми на изкуството
ПКШ	Преславска книжовна школа
Пр. Сб	Преслав. Сборник
ПСБКД	Периодично списание на Българското книжовно дружество
СБАН	Списание на Българската академия на науките
СБАН.КИФ	Списание на Българската академия на науките. Клон историко-филологически
СБАН. КИФФО	Списание на Българската Академия на Науките. Клон Историко-Филологичен и Философско- Обществен
СББАН	Сборник на Българската Академия на Науките
СбНУ	Сборник за народни умотворения
СЛ	Старобългарска литература
СНУНК	Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина
Спом	Споменик
Стр	Струмица. Зборник на Археолошкиот музеј на Македонија

STUDIA CERANEA
 JOURNAL OF THE WALDEMAR CERAN RESEARCH CENTER
 FOR THE HISTORY AND CULTURE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN AREA
 AND SOUTH-EAST EUROPE

Guidelines for the authors

Footnotes

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).

Number of the book 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.

- with the same source cited subsequently the shortened version (signalized in the first use), and not 'ibidem' should be used, e.g.:

²⁵ ZONARAS, XV, 13, 11.

²⁶ ZONARAS, XV, 13, 19–22.

2. books of modern scholars should be referenced as below:

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.

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.

Names of the journals are used only in their abbreviated versions – the full list of abbreviations is available in the e-site of “Studia Ceranea” www.ceraneum.uni.lodz.pl/s-ceranea/instrukcja-wydawnicza

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. are cited as below:

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. DAŹBROWA, 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 the web pages or sources available in the internet:

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.

The footnote number should be placed before the punctuation marks.

In all of the footnotes only the conventional Latin abbreviations should be used to literature both in Latin and in Cyrillic alphabet. These are:

cetera:	IDEM/EADEM	s.a. [here: <i>sine anno</i>]
cf.	IIDEM/IIIDEM/EAEDDEM	s.l. [here: <i>sine loco</i>]
col. [here: <i>columna</i>]	[in:]	sel. [here: <i>selegit</i>]
coll. [here: <i>collegit</i>]	<i>l. cit.</i>	sq, sqq
e.g.	<i>op. cit.</i>	trans.
ed.	p. [here: <i>pagina</i>]	v.
et al.	<i>passim</i>	vol.
etc.	rec. [here: <i>recensuit / recognovit</i>]	
<i>ibidem</i>	[rec.:] [here: <i>recensio</i>]	

References to the Bible are also used in typical Latin abbreviations.

Greek and Latin terms are either given in original Greek or Latin version, in nominative, without italics (a1), or transliterated (a2) – italicized, with accentuation (Greek only)

- (a.1.) φρούριον, ιατροσοφιστής
 (a.2.) *ius intercedendi, hálme, asfáragos, proskýnesis*

The Editorial Board kindly asks the authors to send texts written in English, German, French, Russian or Italian.

Texts should be sent in size 12 (footnotes 10), with spacing 1,5.

Authors are suggested to use the font Minion Pro. For Greek citations Garamond Premier Pro is recommended, for early Slavonic – CyrillicaBulgarian 10 Unicode, for Arabic, Georgian and Armenian – the broadest version of Times New Roman, for Ethiopian – Nyala.

Greek, Slavonic, Arabic, Georgian, Armenian, Syriac, Ethiopian citations should not be italicized.

Articles should be sent in .doc and .pdf files to the e-mail address of the Editorial Board (s.ceranea@uni.lodz.pl) as well as in printed versions at post office address:

Centrum Badań nad Historią i Kulturą Basenu Morza
Śroziemnego i Europy Południowo-Wschodniej im. prof. Waldemara
Cerana, *Ceraneum*.
ul. Kopcińskiego 8/12, pok. 1.29
90–232 Łódź, Polska

Pictures should be sent in .bmp or .jpeg (.jpg) files of minimal resolution 300 dpi; CMYK colour model is highly recommended. Captions should be attached as a separate .doc file, they must contain information about the source and the copyright, as well as, the date of the execution. The authors are responsible of acquiring and possessing of reproduction approvals with regard to the pictures used.

English abstract is obligatory, regardless of the language used in the whole text. It should not exceed half of the standard page (size 10, spacing 1).