

STUDIA CERANEA

Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre

for

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

3, 2013



WYDAWNICTWO
UNIWERSYTETU
ŁÓDZKIEGO

STUDIA CERANEA



3, 2013

Herb's
- CERANEUM -

STUDIA CERANEA



Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre

for

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

3, 2013



WYDAWNICTWO
UNIWERSYTETU
ŁÓDZKIEGO

ŁÓDŹ 2013

Studia Ceranea
Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture
of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe
3, 2013
University of Łódź, Poland

Editorial Board

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

Address of the Editorial Board

ul. S. 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 in Toruń), Stefano Parenti (Pontifical Atheneum of St. Anselm, Rome), Günter Prinzing (Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz), Rustam Shukurov (Lomonosov State University), Yuri Stoyanov (University of London)

Reviewers (vol. 3, 2013)

Maja Angelovska-Panova (Institute of National History, Skopje), Krystyna Bartol (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań), Jacek Bonarek (Jan Kochanowski University of Humanities and Sciences in Kielce / Piotrków Trybunalski), Małgorzata Borowska (University of Warsaw), Aneta Dimitrova (St Clement of Ohrid University of Sofia), Francesco Dall'Aglio (Italian Institute for Historical Studies, Naples), Tadeusz Grabarczyk (University of Łódź), Ryszard Grzesik (Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences), Bernard Hamilton (University of Nottingham), Mari Isoaho (University of Helsinki), Krystyna Kleszczowa (University of Silesia in Katowice), Piotr Kochanek (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin), Marzanna Kuczyńska (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań), Hartmut Leppin (Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main), Ireneusz Mikołajczyk (Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń), Przemysław Nowakowski (The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Cracow), Anna Palusińska (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin), Juan Signes Codoñer (University of Valladolid), Tomasz Stepień (Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw), Piotr Szczur (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin), Anna-Maria Totomanova (St Clement of Ohrid University of Sofia), Mariyana Tsihranska-Kostova (Institute for Bulgarian Language, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences), Elena Velkovska (University of Siena), Ivo Volt (University of Tartu)

Cooperation

Marek Majer (Harvard University), Michał Zytka (Cardiff University)

Linguistic editors

For English – Benjamin Brewer, for French – François Nachin, for German – Günter Prinzing, for Italian – Stefano Parenti, for Russian – Ivan Petrov

Cover designed by:

Sebastian Buzar

On the cover:

Saint Cyril with another unidentified saint bishop. Fresco from the cathedral church of Saint Sophia in Ohrid, ca. 1045. Fot. Elka Bakalova

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

“Studia Ceranea” is indexed in Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL).

Łódź University Press
© Copyright by Uniwersytet Łódzki, Łódź 2013
All rights reserved.
ISSN 2084-140X

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- CRISTIANO DIDI, *Le “chiavi tematiche bibliche” nel contesto della tradizione retorica e letteraria europea: un capitolo di poetica storica* 11
- VASSIL GJUZELEV, *La quatrième croisade et ses conséquences pour la Bulgarie médiévale: le tzar Kaloyan, les Latins et les Grecs (1204–1207)* 29
- ADAM JAROSZYŃSKI, ANNA KOTŁOWSKA, *Eparchikon biblion V, 2: Is Thalassai the Same as Byssos?* 39
- MACIEJ KOKOSZKO, KRZYSZTOF JAGUSIAK, ZOFIA RZEŹNICKA, *Rice as a Foodstuff in Ancient and Byzantine Materia Medica* 47
- JUSTYNA KROCZAK, *Palamas and Florensky: The Metaphysics of the Heart in Patristic and Russian Philosophical Tradition* 69
- ADAM MESIARKIN, *Examining the Slavic Identity in the Middle Ages: Perception of Common Sense of Slavic Community in Polish and Bohemian Medieval Chronicles* . . . 83
- IRENEUSZ MILEWSKI, *Vom Nutzen der patristischen Literatur für die Erforschung der spätantiken Wirtschaft: das Beispiel der griechischen Kirchenväter des 4. Jahrhunderts* 101
- GEORGI MINCZEW, *Remarks on the Letter of the Patriarch Theophylact to Tsar Peter in the Context of Certain Byzantine and Slavic Anti-heretic Texts* 113
- MAŁGORZATA SKOWRONEK, *Some Remarks on the Anathemas in the Palaea Historica* 131
- РОСТИСЛАВ СТАНКОВ, *Об одном ложном „моравизме”* 145
- YURI STOYANOV, *Medieval Christian Dualist Perceptions and Conceptions of Biblical Paradise* 149

NORBERT WIDOK, <i>Christian Family as Domestic Church in the Writings of St. John Chrysostom</i>	167
KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ WITCZAK, <i>Hystrix in Greek</i>	177
RAFAŁ ZARĘBSKI, <i>Possessive Adjectives Formed from Personal Names in Polish Translations of the New Testament</i>	187
BOGUSŁAW ANDRZEJ BACZYŃSKI, MAŁGORZATA BACZYŃSKA, <i>The Testament Donation of Knyaz Fedor Sanguszko for the Monastery of St. Paul of Xeropotamou on the Holy Mount Athos (9th November 1547)</i>	197

BOOK REVIEWS

ГЕОРГИЈЕ СФРАНЦЕС, <i>Хроника. Пад Византијског царства</i> , прев. и прир. МЛАДЕН СТАНКОВИЋ – ZOFIA BRZOZOWSKA	215
ЯРОСЛАВ Н. ЩАПОВ, <i>Византийская «Эклога законов» в русской письменной традиции. Исследование, издание текстов и комментарий</i> – ZOFIA BRZOZOWSKA	216
MICHAŁ STACHURA, <i>Wrogowie porządku publicznego. Studium zjawiska agresji językowej w Kodeksie Teodozjusza, Nowelach Postteodozjańskich i Konstytucjach Sirmondiańskich</i> – PAWEŁ FILIPCZAK	218
<i>Świat rzymski w V wieku</i> , red. KAMILA TWARDOWSKA, RAFAŁ KOSIŃSKI – PAWEŁ FILIPCZAK	221
АНАТОЛИЙ А. ТУРИЛОВ, <i>Slavia Cyrillomethodiana: Источниковедение истории и культуры южных славян и Древней Руси. Межславянские культурные связи эпохи средневековья</i> ; IDEM, <i>От Кирилла Философа до Константина Костенецкого и Василия Софьянина. История и культура славян IX-XVII вв.</i> ; IDEM, <i>Межславянские культурные связи эпохи средневековья и источниковедение истории и культуры славян. Этюды и характеристики</i> – AGATA KAWECKA	224
BORIVOJE MARINKOVIĆ, <i>Zaboravljeni bratstvenici po peru</i> – PIOTR KRĘZEL	230
<i>Z dejín slovensko-srbských vzťahov</i> , ed. MIROSLAV DANIŠ – PIOTR KRĘZEL	232
MONIKA OZÓG, <i>Inter duas potestas. Polityka religijna Teodoryka Wielkiego</i> – MIROSLAW J. LESZKA	233

VLADIMÍR VAVŘÍNEK, <i>Ciril a Metoděj mezi Konstantinopolí a Římem</i> – MIROSLAW J. LESZKA	235
AULUS GELLIUS, <i>Noctes atticae</i> 2.24. <i>De vetere parsimonia; deque antiquis legibus sumptuariis</i> , překlad, wstęp i komentarz ALDONA RITA JUREWICZ, MARIA PIECHOCKA-KŁOS – KONRAD TADAJCZYK	237
LUIGI SANTAGATI, <i>Storia dei Bizantini di Sicilia</i> – TERESA WOLIŃSKA	238
БИСТРА НИКОЛОВА, <i>Монашество, манастири и манастирски живот в средновековна България</i> , vol. I, <i>Манастирите</i> , vol. II, <i>Монасите</i> – JAN MIKOŁAJ WOLSKI	245
SHAUN TOUGHER, <i>The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society</i> – MICHAŁ ZYTKA	249
ABBREVIATIONS	253
GUIDELINES FOR THE AUTHORS	259

ARTICLES

Cristiano Diddi (Salerno)

LE “CHIAVI TEMATICHE BIBLICHE” NEL CONTESTO DELLA TRADIZIONE RETORICA E LETTERARIA EUROPEA: UN CAPITOLO DI POETICA STORICA

La straordinaria influenza della Bibbia nella produzione letteraria slavoeccelesiastica – osservabile sotto forma di immagini, motivi, citazioni e reminiscenze circolanti entro un vasto repertorio di opere originali e di compilazioni – è da tempo oggetto di studio da parte degli slavisti. Un’attenzione particolare, in queste ricerche, è stata rivolta alle citazioni bibliche presenti nei singoli testi, le quali risultano tuttavia indagate soprattutto dal punto di vista linguistico-filologico e, in secondo luogo, teologico-spirituale¹, più di rado per la loro funzione specificamente retorica, compositiva².

Un significativo progresso in questo senso è rappresentato da un celebre articolo di Riccardo Picchio, dedicato appunto alla *funzione* delle “chiavi tematiche bibliche” nel codice letterario della c.d. *Slavia orthodoxa*³, nel quale lo studioso proponeva di analizzare le citazioni bibliche dal punto di vista formale, alla stregua di un vero e proprio artificio retorico⁴.

¹ Utili strumenti di lavoro, a tale scopo, si rivelano alcuni repertori, tra cui: St. STANOJEVIĆ, D. GLUMAC, *Sveto pismo u našim starim spomenicima*, Beograd 1932; D. DUNKOV, *Die Bibelzitate in der altbulgarischen Literatur*, SSp 43, 1995, p. 1–390.

² Minore interesse hanno invece riscosso fino ad ora le citazioni tratte dai Padri della Chiesa, ovvero l’altra grande fonte di ispirazione per gli autori medievali, anch’esse in ogni caso studiate più sul piano filologico, critico-testuale, che non retorico. Su ciò cfr. ad es.: F.J. THOMSON, *Quotations of Patristic and Byzantine Works by Early Russian Authors as an Indication of the Cultural Level of Kievan Russia*, SGa 10, 1983, p. 65–102; IDEM, *Towards a Typology of Quotations in Early Slavonic Literature, with an Assessment of their Value for Textology Illustrated by Quotations from Ephraem Syrus’ Paraenesis in the Patericon Kievocryptense*, AnzSP 20, 1990, p. 15–61; cf. pure: О.Ф. ЖОЛОбОВ, *Поучения Ефрема Сирина в интертекстуальных и композиционных отзвуках оригинальной древнерусской письменности*, ВПСТГУ.Ф, 2007, fasc. 3 (9), p. 7–13.

³ Alla categoria di ‘*Slavia orthodoxa*’, comunemente adottata negli studi, preferisco l’aggettivo *slavoeccelesiastica*, meno connotato in senso confessionale e più marcatamente orientato sul piano linguistico-letterario. Quanto di seguito osservato per la tradizione slavoeccelesiastica antica varrà anche per le tradizioni regionali che da essa prendono le mosse (mediobulgara, serba e russa antica).

⁴ R. PICCHIO, *The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of “Slavia Orthodoxa”*, SHi 1, 1977, p. 1–31.

Riassumo, a beneficio del lettore, alcuni passaggi essenziali di quelle tesi, utili a sviluppare le riflessioni che seguiranno:

In several Orthodox Slavic works a special compositional device appears to be consistently used. Its purpose seems to be that of bridging the semantic gap between the literal and the spiritual sense. To achieve this effect, the writer presents to his reader, within the conventional framework of rhetorical structures, the main theme, that is, the 'higher' theme which explains the hidden meaning of any earthly event related in the narration. Since the 'true meaning', that is, the spiritual sense of a verbal expression can only be detected in the light of inspired words, the Bible is often used as general referent. It is the reader's task to establish the proper semantic connection by interpreting whatever pertains to the letter without separating it from the spirit. I call this device a 'thematic clue'. It may consist either of direct citations from Scriptures or of indirect references to sacred texts. [...]

What I call *biblical thematic clues* occur in structurally marked places, usually at the beginning of the *expositio*, that is, either in the first lines of a text or immediately after any introductory section of it. Biblical thematic clues provided the reader with general references concerning the interplay of 'senses'. Thank to these marked labels the reader find the key-words that would have helped him unveil the hidden meaning of both the historical and the fictional writing of Orthodox Slavdom. Once the reader had located the main thematic clue, the entire text acquired for him a new meaning. A theme announced at the beginning could develop into a leit-motif governing the semantic system of a work.⁵

Come già anticipato, queste tesi costituiscono un punto di partenza obbligato per qualsiasi ricerca sul tema. Ciò nonostante, alcune delle questioni qui toccate meritano, a mio avviso, qualche approfondimento, in particolare sotto il profilo metodologico.

Innanzitutto, a ormai trentacinque anni da quello studio e nonostante le numerose ricerche di dettaglio fin qui condotte su singoli testi agiografici e omiletici⁶, si avverte tuttora la mancanza di una definizione rigorosa di 'chiave tematica', tale da mettere al riparo dal rischio di interpretazioni più o meno soggettive e/o arbitrarie.

Leggendo infatti il testo citato, notiamo quanto generica risulti, in primo luogo, la *posizione* che una citazione biblica deve avere in un determinato contesto per essere identificata come 'chiave tematica' (*what I call biblical thematic clues occur in structurally marked places [...] either in the first lines of a text or immediately after any introductory section of it*). Qualsiasi studioso della tradizione serba, bulgara e russa medievale sa bene che in molti casi i confini di un testo – per le stesse modalità della trasmissione manoscritta – possono essere incerti e variare a seconda dei criteri fissati dall'osservatore. Ciò può accadere a causa di redazioni concorrenti della

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 5–6.

⁶ Tra le analisi specifiche sulla 'chiave tematica', oltre al citato lavoro di Picchio, cf.: E. ВЕЛКОВСКА, *Бележки върху библейските цитати в похвалното слово от Климент Охридски*, СЛ 12, 1982, p. 64–69; К. КАБАКЧИЕВ, *Библейската алузия – важен фактор при интерпретиране на старобългарската литература (върху материал от "Житие на Стерфан Дечански) от Григорий Цамблак*, [in:] ТКШ, vol. IV, ВЕЛИКО ТЪРНОВО 1985, p. 198–203; *Библейские цитаты в церковнославянской литературе – Biblical Quotations in Slavonic Literature*, Слав 2, 2003, p. 23–78.

medesima opera, o per la presenza di segnali testuali o paratestuali disposti in maniera non uniforme nei codici (titolature, rubriche, suddivisione in paragrafi, ecc.) o, infine, a causa di lacune meccaniche, che com'è noto ricorrono con particolare frequenza proprio nei primi (e negli ultimi) fogli dei codici, vale a dire là dove la collocazione di una ‘chiave tematica’ è più probabile⁷.

Indefinito resta pure, nella formulazione sopra citata (*It may consist either of direct citations from Scriptures or of indirect references to sacred texts*), il grado di fedeltà richiesto alla ‘chiave tematica’ affinché l’allusione all’ipotesto biblico sia riconoscibile dai lettori e produca l’effetto desiderato.

E infatti, tra le potenziali chiavi tematiche sin qui individuate, molte non producono letteralmente il dettato biblico, che il più delle volte veniva citato a memoria, mediato cioè dalla pratica liturgica, e poi ulteriormente accomodato – sul piano logico o formale – al nuovo contesto. D’altra parte, la referenza a un determinato ipotesto biblico, perché sia riconoscibile e produca il suo effetto, non può essere affidata a una generica affinità tematica, ma deve basarsi su chiare e significative *coincidenze formali* (in primo luogo, lessicali) tali da attivare nella memoria del lettore o dell’ascoltatore l’associazione al contesto cui si allude. In assenza di simili coincidenze, l’efficacia dell’allusione rimane incerta e la funzione ‘tematica’, o ermeneutica, di una citazione all’interno di un testo può assumere diversi gradi di probabilità⁸.

Il quadro si fa ancora più incerto quando dall’analisi oggettiva dei materiali si passa a una interpretazione soggettiva delle intenzioni, o addirittura della psicologia degli autori.

A tale riguardo, un aspetto importante della questione è quello di determinare il *grado di consapevolezza e intenzionalità* con cui i letterati slavi adoperavano la ‘chiave tematica’ come procedimento retorico. Da un punto di vista generale,

⁷ Alcuni di questi problemi, legati alla tradizione dei testi, sono lucidamente affrontati in: R. MARTI, *Handschrift Text – Textgruppe – Literatur. Untersuchungen zur inneren Gliederung der frühen Literatur aus dem ostslavischen Sprachbereich in den Handschriften des 11. bis 14. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1989. Alla luce dell’analisi di Marti non è meno essenziale stabilire il rapporto di un determinato testo con gli altri testi della raccolta ospitante: in questa ottica, infatti, anche una singola ‘chiave tematica’ potrebbe assumere significati diversi a seconda del contesto macrotestuale che ospita una certa opera.

⁸ Un caso in cui la presenza di una chiave tematica è altamente problematica è il presunto riferimento a Dt 2, 30 nello *Slovo o polku Igoreve* (иже испитану ѹмь крѣпостію своєю и поостри сердца своего мужествомъ...), per cui cf. P. Пиккио, “Слово о полку Игореве” как памятник религиозной литературы Древней Руси, ТОДЛ 50, 1997, p. 430–443. Al di là di una generica affinità tematica fra i due contesti paiono infatti mancare, nello *Slovo*, segnali testuali marcati che consentano l’associazione a Dt. Per il passo di *Slovo* non soccorre infatti né la più antica versione integrale di *Deut*, conservata in *Archivskij e Vilenskij Chronograf* (e trådita quasi senza variazioni nella *Bibbia di Ostrog*: cf. и не восхотѣ сѣиши ѹрѣ и се вонѣ. да линенѣтъ сквозѣ землю его. яко ожесточитѣ гѣ бѣгѣ нѣшѣ дѣхѣ его. и скрѣпи срѣце его. да са предасть в рѣцѣ твои. и во днешнии дѣнь [Vilenskij chron., f. 177r]); né i contesti liturgici, dove il libro del Deuteronomio ricorre peraltro di rado (Profetologio, il secondo cantico biblico) e mai al versetto 2, 30. — Su questa specifica questione cfr. la recente nota di M. CALDO in: RS 11(57), 2013 (i.c.s.).

la citazione *intenzionale* indica sempre un dialogo di chi scrive con un modello (in questo caso, la Bibbia), il quale, come si è detto, deve essere citato in modo da attivare la memoria del lettore/ascoltatore mediante la riproduzione di alcuni elementi formali (testuali)⁹. Da questa tipica dimensione di *intertestualità* va distinta la citazione di stilemi tradizionali, espressioni formulari e *topoi*, i quali, ispirandosi a un più vasto codice culturale – o a una vera e propria ‘*langue poetica*’ – prescindono da testi concreti e ci porta in una sfera che può essere definita di *interdiscorsività*¹⁰. Secondo una opinione comune – comunque non formalizzata sul piano teorico, né verificata nei testi – la chiave tematica slavoeclesiastica sembrerebbe iscriversi nella prima categoria (*intertestualità*), anche se proprio la massiccia ricezione del modello biblico attraverso la liturgia e la preghiera (che tende, per così dire, a ‘smaterializzare’ il testo scritto, trasformandolo in *discorso*, in *esperienza* quotidiana) suggerisce di tenere in conto un concorso attivo e non trascurabile della seconda (*interdiscorsività*).

A questo proposito occorre inoltre tenere distinte la *citazione* vera e propria (o allusione) – che presuppone l’uso consapevole di un modello da parte dell’autore – e la *reminiscenza*, che in molti casi può essere inconsapevole o preterintenzionale. Un bell’esempio di reminiscenza preterintenzionale ci è offerto da una testimonianza di Francesco Petrarca, il quale, sebbene rifuggisse dal riprodurre le parole dei suoi autori prediletti se non all’interno di citazioni esplicite, è costretto a riconoscere di aver disatteso a questa regola più di una volta e senza rendersene conto. In una famosa epistola a Giovanni Boccaccio egli infatti osserva che autori letti e riletti tante volte, come Virgilio, Orazio o Cicerone, non solo si sono depositati nella sua memoria, ma fanno a tal punto parte di lui, delle sue “midolla”, che spesso le loro frasi affiorano a sua insaputa:

Legi apud Virgilium, apud Flaccum, apud Severinum, apud Tullium, nec semel legi sed milies, nec cucurri sed incubui, et totis ingenii nisibus immoratus sum; mane comedi quod sero digererem, hausi puer quod senior ruminarem. *Hec se michi tam familiariter ingessere et non modo memorie sed medullis affixa sunt unumque cum ingenio facta sunt meo*, ut etsi per omnem vitam amplius non legantur, ipsa quidem hereant, *actis in intima animi partes radicibus*, sed interdum obliviscar auctorem, quippe *qui longo usu et possessione continua quasi illa prescripserim diuque pro meis habuerim, et turba talim obsessus, nec cuius sint certe nec aliena meminerim* (*Familiares*, XXII, 2, 11–14) [corsivo mio – C.D.].¹¹

⁹ Sulla citazione in funzione di appello a un’autorità nella letteratura teologica cristiana cf. ad. es. A. COMPAGNON, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation*, Paris 1979, p. 218–221.

¹⁰ I termini di questa distinzione concettuale sono sintetizzati in C. SEGRE, *Intertestualità e interdiscorsività nel romanzo e nella poesia*, [in:] IDEM, *Teatro e romanzo. Due tipi di comunicazione letteraria*, Torino 1984, p. 103–118.

¹¹ Cf. G.W. PIGMAN, *Neo-Latin Imitation of the Latin Classics*, [in:] *Latin Poetry and Classical Tradition. Essays in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, ed. P. GODMAN, O. MURRAY, Oxford 1990, p. 199–210, esp. 200–201.

È evidente che il fenomeno della reminiscenza involontaria, così efficacemente descritto dal Petrarca, può applicarsi nei medesimi termini agli autori ecclesiastici, adusi alla *ruminatio* della Parola divina quanto il Poeta al “digerire e ruminare” gli amati classici latini.

Tornando alla ‘chiave tematica’ slavoeclesiastica, le diverse interpretazioni sin qui avanzate sembrerebbero qualificare questo artificio come una *allusione intenzionale* (coerente con il principio della *imitatio* e, più in generale, con la finalità pedagogico-edificante della letteratura cristiana). Restano però tutte da indagare le eventuali *reminiscenze involontarie* dei contesti biblici da parte di autori e compilatori, come pure le associazioni da queste suscitate nei lettori/ascoltatori, e ancora una volta rese possibili dalla onnipresente *langue* liturgica.

Ai fini di un inquadramento quanto più possibile problematico della questione meritano infine attenta considerazione tutti quegli studi della citazione, i quali, focalizzando l’attenzione sulla figura dell’autore/compilatore, saldano in un unico processo dinamico il momento della ricezione dei modelli con quello della produzione di nuovi testi. Indagini recenti hanno ad es. evidenziato che alcune referenze bibliche nell’agiografia russa antica sono motivate da una peculiare strategia di intervento dei letterati russi, i quali, ispirandosi a modelli bizantini per la stesura di opere originali (ad es. la *Vita di Teodosio delle Grotte*, modellata sulla *Vita di Saba Santificato*), in molti casi danno la sensazione di voler colmare ciò che ai loro occhi appare come una sorta di ‘lacuna’ del testo-fonte (un ‘aliquid minus’) e, di conseguenza, di inserire la citazione come un incremento di senso¹².

Quelli qui brevemente menzionati non sono che alcuni degli aspetti metodologici che, a mio parere, dovrebbero essere tenuti presente nell’approfondire lo studio delle cosiddette ‘chiavi tematiche’ bibliche, le quali andranno comunque intese come caso particolare di una più ampia strategia (o ‘poetica’) della citazione, propria di tutta la cultura medievale.

Proprio a quest’ultimo proposito c’è un ulteriore aspetto che attende di essere preso in esame: e riguarda i *confini storici e geografici* entro cui la ‘chiave tematica’ deve essere inquadrata. Fin dal pionieristico studio di Picchio è infatti consuetudine, negli studi slavistici, inquadrare questo artificio nel contesto isolato della c.d. *Slavia orthodoxa*, considerandolo implicitamente un fenomeno circoscritto a questa tradizione. Così, nessun serio tentativo è stato fatto per verificare l’esistenza di analoghe strategie retoriche in altre letterature, sì da collocare la stessa ‘chiave tematica’ slavoeclesiastica in un orizzonte culturale più ampio e complesso.

L’analisi che segue cercherà appunto di verificare questa ipotesi. L’obiettivo dell’indagine spiega lo spazio che verrà dato alle tradizioni sviluppatesi oltre i confini cronologici e geografici del medioevo slavoeclesiastico, sul quale converrà tornare in altro luogo e che comunque rimane, anche in queste pagine, termine di paragone e sfondo implicito di ogni considerazione.

¹² Non potendoci qui soffermare su questo aspetto, si veda almeno: P. РОМАНЧУК, *Автор или читатель? Библийская цитата и библиографическая ссылка в текстах Древней Руси (XI и XV веков)*, Слав 2, 2003, p. 33–41.

La citazione d'esordio, fra tradizione classica e medievale

Un uso della citazione in esordio funzionalmente molto simile a quanto osservato nei testi di tradizione slavoeccelesiastica si incontra in epoche e in contesti tra loro assai diversi. Per definire un procedimento simile la filologia classica è solita adoperare, fin dai tempi di Eduard Norden, il termine 'motto', che possiamo considerare come uno dei segnali di intertestualità fra i più marcati¹³.

Fin dall'antichità, i poeti soprattutto manifestano il bisogno di citare il modello con cui si cimentano, il quale, in virtù della sua autorità, può essere omaggiato, emulato e, in ultima istanza, parodiato. Il rimando a questo modello ha luogo di norma in una *posizione marcata* del testo, spesso proprio nelle battute d'esordio – meglio ancora: nel primo verso –, con una movenza incipitaria che suggerisce al lettore (o all'ascoltatore) la prospettiva di ricezione del componimento, di seguito sviluppato in modo indipendente. Con una felice espressione Giorgio Pasquali definì questo artificio come un tratto tipico dell'"arte allusiva"¹⁴, poiché attraverso la citazione di un unico verso, o anche solo la ripresa di singoli lessemi o schemi ritmico-sintattici, produce una sorta di 'agnizione' in un pubblico capace di cogliere e decipitare prontamente l'allusione a modelli molto noti¹⁵.

Naturalmente l'*auctoritas* con cui gli antichi si cimentano è in primo luogo Omero, i cui versi risuonano allusivamente, in posizione incipitaria, nei lirici arcaici (Mimnermo, Alceo, Archiloco), nei tragici (Eschilo in *Persiani*, Sofocle in *Antigone*, ecc.), ma soprattutto nella poesia colta alessandrina (Apollonio Rodio, Teocrito, Callimaco), dove al modello omerico – adattato a un gusto ormai lontanissimo da quello della poesia eroica – si alternano le citazioni/allusioni ai lirici arcaici e agli stessi tragici. L'artificio si prolunga naturalmente nella poesia latina, dove svariati esempi di 'motto' sono stati da tempo evidenziati in Catullo, Virgilio, Ovidio, Orazio, i quali negli *incipit* a diversi componimenti non disdegnano di omaggiare i testi-modello dell'epica e della lirica greca arcaica (Omero, Alceo, Archiloco), ma soprattutto la modernità della lezione poetica alessandrina, che oltretutto costituisce per loro il ponte verso la tradizione greca più antica¹⁶.

¹³ Cfr. E. NORDEN, *Die römische Literatur*, [in:] *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaften*, vol. I, Leipzig-Berlin 1909, p. 504.

¹⁴ G. PASQUALI, *Arte allusiva* [1942], [in:] IDEM, *Pagine stravaganti*, vol. II, Firenze 1968, p. 275–282.

¹⁵ Una funzione simile al 'motto' d'apertura possono naturalmente svolgerla note ed epigrafi in *exergo*, che però restano fuori dal nostro discorso, poiché essendo situate oltre la 'soglia' del testo risultano dotate di un maggiore grado di esplicitazione rispetto al motto vero e proprio e se ne differenziano sensibilmente. Per questa tipologia di citazioni basterà rimandare il lettore all'approfondito studio di Gérard Genette sui paratesti a tanta poesia e narrativa moderna: cf. G. GENETTE, *Seuils*, Paris 1987.

¹⁶ Sul motto nella tradizione classica greca e latina esiste ormai una bibliografia molto vasta; per un quadro d'insieme delle diverse questioni cf. G. WILLIAMS, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford 1968; R. GARNER, *From Homer to Tragedy: The Art of Allusion in Greek Poetry*, London–New York 1990. Si vedano inoltre G.B. CONTE, *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario. Catullo, Virgilio, Ovidio, Lucano*, Torino 1985; A. CAVARZERE, *Sul limitare. Il "motto" e la poesia di Orazio*, Padova 1996; cf. infine: K. ZIEGLER, *Plagiat*, [in:] *RE*, vol. XX.2, Stuttgart 1950, col. 1956–1997.

Questo dialogo allusivo e reiterato con i modelli ereditati appare ispirato da motivazioni diverse e concorrenti. Prima fra tutte, l'intento programmatico del poeta di parlare alla posterità, iscrivendo il proprio nome in un canone poetico che giusto in età ellenistica – grazie ai poeti-filologi alessandrini – ricevette la sua codificazione definitiva, poi passata ai posteri e infine giunta, sostanzialmente intatta, sino a noi¹⁷.

Va d'altra parte osservato che se il motto, come qualsiasi altra citazione, segnava un'adesione a modelli illustri, attivando connessioni più o meno automatiche all'interno di una memoria di genere, esso implicava al tempo stesso una tensione, uno scarto rispetto all'universo poetico dell'archetipo, i cui materiali testuali venivano inevitabilmente trasformati, riorientati e rifusi in una nuova sensibilità poetica, in una nuova *Stimmung*. Bastino a puro titolo di esempio i versi d'esordio dell'*Odissea*:

Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ
πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε-
πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἶδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω,
πολλὰ δ' ὄ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὄν κατὰ θυμόν (*Od.*, I, 1–4)

che a distanza di secoli vengono ripresi da Catullo nell'*incipit* al carme 101 in morte del fratello, dove il tono da epico si fa elegiaco:

Multas per gentes et multa per aequora vectus / advenio...

dopodiché, lo stesso *incipit* catulliano passerà – con intonazione ancora diversa e sempre in posizione marcata (nel passaggio tra la parte odissiaca e iliadica dell'*Eneide*) – in Virgilio:

Quas ego te terras et quanta per aequora vectum / accipio... (*En.*, VI 692)¹⁸.

È del tutto naturale che in età cristiana la citazione di modelli come quello omerico e alessandrino ceda progressivamente spazio alla Bibbia, dato il significato che questo testo assume nel mondo tardoantico e medievale. Ovviamente, anche la funzione del motto/citazione si adegua al nuovo contesto culturale, rimandando ora al senso spirituale nascosto nella lettera dell'ipotesto biblico e assumendo il ruolo di *chiave ermeneutica* per ascendere la verticalità del testo, secondo la teoria dei quattro sensi dell'interpretazione (storico, tropologico, allegorico, anagogico).

Come nel motto di ascendenza classica, gli autori cristiani continuano tuttora a contare sulla cooperazione interpretativa del lettore, più precisamente sulla

¹⁷ Non andrà trascurato il fatto che questa codificazione si concretizzò in cataloghi (come i perduti *Pinakes* di Callimaco) che classificando tutta la letteratura greca in insiemi di classi e sottoclassi in ordine alfabetico (autori, generi, opere, ecc.) tendevano a identificare i singoli testi proprio in base all'*incipit*, il quale divenne così il principale, se non l'unico, segnale di riconoscimento delle singole composizioni (spesso prive di un titolo vero e proprio).

¹⁸ Cf. G.B. CONTE, *op. cit.*, p. 6–8.

sua *memoria e immaginazione*, entrambi imprescindibili per questa peculiare strategia dell'esordio. Al di là degli inevitabili adattamenti funzionali, l'artificio non subisce trasformazioni di sorta rispetto alle epoche precedenti, essendo stato nel frattempo metabolizzato, come tutta la retorica classica, attraverso la mediazione dei grandi autori-modello della letteratura cristiana antica (Agostino, Girolamo, Basilio, Giovanni Crisostomo, Gregorio Teologo). Così lo incontriamo immutato, in Occidente, nella poesia mediolatina di età carolingia, dove la citazione incipitaria è un artificio assai frequente. Lo illustra, ad es., il celebre *Versus confessionis de luctu poenitentiae* di Paolino di Aquileia (740–802), il cui *incipit* “*Ad caeli clara...*”, introducendo al tema penitenziale, cita quasi alla lettera il noto passo evangelico del fariseo e del pubblicano:

Paulinus Aquileiensis:
Ad caeli clara non sum dignus sydera
levare meos infelices oculos,
 gravi depressus peccatorum pondere
 Parce, redemptor!¹⁹

Lc 18, 13:
 Et publicanus a longe stans *nolebat*
nec oculos ad caelum levare [...]

O ancora, sempre in epoca carolingia, l'*Inno a Rachele* di Notker Balbulus (ca. 840–912) che per collegare la storia di Rachele al tema della festa dei Santi Martiri Innocenti allude nell'*incipit* al passo di Matteo sulla Natività di Gesù e la strage degli innocenti perpetrata da Erode:

Notker:
 Quid tu, virgo,
 mater ploras,
 Rachel formosa...²⁰

Mt 2, 8:
 Rachel plorans filios suos et noluit consolari. [...]

Il ricorso alla citazione biblica in *incipit* non rimane del resto circoscritto alla innografia sacra, come risulta dall'uso parodico che se ne fa in tanta poesia di scuola più o meno coeva, e in seguito nella tradizione goliardica. Da quest'ultimo filone si ricorderà, fra i tanti, il famoso canto potatorio dell'Archipoeta di Colonia *Estuans intrinsecus ira vehementi / in amaritudine loquor mee menti...* (ca. 1162), che proprio in *incipit* richiama immediatamente Iob 10, 1 (*Taedet animam meam vitae meae, dimittam adversum me eloquium meum, loquar in amaritudine animae meae*), qui in realtà chiamato in causa solo per operare un irriverente, carnevalesco rovesciamento dell'austero registro penitenziale²¹.

Per quanto riguarda la letteratura in volgare, basterà invece rammentare il testo più emblematico del medioevo occidentale, la *Divina Commedia*, il cui *incipit*

¹⁹ D. NORBERG, *L'œuvre poétique de Paulin d'Aquilée*, Stockholm 1979, p. 126–130, che tra l'altro segnala anche successive imitazioni dello stesso *incipit*.

²⁰ P. GODMAN, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance*, London 1985, p. 320–322.

²¹ Si tratta del canto n. 191 dei *Carmina Burana*, ed. A. HILKA, O. SCHUMANN, B. BISCHOFF, vol. I–III, Heidelberg 1930–1970, ad l.

altro non è che un'allusione a Is 38, 10 *Ego dixi: in dimidio dierum meorum vadam ad portas inferi*, il quale può valere, ad un tempo, come motto e chiave ermeneutica dell'intero poema²². Il versetto del profeta Isaia riproduce infatti – e anche questo non è un caso – un altro *incipit* famosissimo: quello del *Cantico di ringraziamento* di Ezechia re di Giuda, il quale, giunto alla fine dei suoi giorni, viene guarito da un morbo incurabile grazie all'intervento salvifico di Dio. È evidente che l'allusione a questo ispirato componimento poetico suggeriva immediatamente al lettore della *Commedia* – imbevuto di letture bibliche (e soprattutto avvezzo a recitare quel *Cantico* nella Liturgia delle Ore)²³ – il senso profondo, nonché l'esito finale, del viaggio di Dante, il quale, come Ezechia, si salva perché si affida a Dio. È grazie alla sovrapposizione intertestuale di questo brano biblico che l'avventura ultraterrena del Poeta – come la missione di Cirillo e Metodio alla luce dell'ipotesto paolino; come il martirio di Boris e Gleb, ripetizione terrena del fratricidio di Caino su Abele; ecc. – si configura subito al lettore come storicamente fondata e degna di fede, poiché certificata dall'*auctoritas* della Scrittura²⁴.

Che la citazione biblica d'esordio rimanga tuttavia, anche nella cristianità medievale, solo una fra le possibili opzioni nel complesso gioco dell'intertestualità è ben illustrato dalla lirica in volgare di poco anteriore a Dante, in particolare dalla tradizione trobadorica provenzale, dove la fitta trama di richiami tra i poeti (Marcabru, Jaufre Rudel, Cercamon, Raimbaut d'Aurenga, Bernart Marti) dà vita a una migrazione di motivi, parole-chiave e allusioni (*senhals*) che incontriamo in ogni punto del testo, ma soprattutto in posizione marcata, e specialmente in *incipit* (ed *explicit*). L'intento di queste riprese – ben integrate sul piano tematico e, benché abilmente dissimulate, del tutto trasparenti per i fruitori dei testi – è in molti casi emulativo, ma più spesso ironico, parodico o apertamente polemico (ad es. in Marcabru), ed è molto istruttivo, poiché, come nei casi precedenti, è osservabile su precisi segnali testuali.

Tra gli innumerevoli casi di citazione/allusione assimilabili al 'motto' si ricorderà qui l'*incipit* del celebre *Lanquan fuelhon li boscatge*, con cui Marcabru fa eco all'esordio della celebre canzone di Jaufre Rudel *Lanquand li jorn son lonc en mai*:

²² Ma sarà più corretto dire una delle chiavi, alla quale si potrebbero aggiungere gli insistenti riferimenti al tema profetico-apocalittico e al modello paolino, entrambi determinanti per la costruzione del personaggio di Dante nella *Commedia*: cf. i recenti G. DI SCIPIO, *The Presence of Pauline Thought in the Works of Dante*, Lewinnton-Queenston-Lampeter 1995; R. WILSON, *Prophecies and Prophecy in Dante's "Commedia"*, Florence 2007.

²³ Il precoce inserimento del *Cantico* di Ezechia nella Liturgia delle Ore, che ne prescriveva la recitazione ogni settimana (più precisamente nelle Lodi mattutine, tra il primo e il secondo salmo), diede com'è ovvio al componimento una grande notorietà. Cf. ad es. *Antiqui libri rituales Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae (Romani Ordines I-XV)*, PL, vol. XXVIII, Parisii 1895, p. 832 sq., ad. loc.

²⁴ Rimandi ben noti a contesti biblici, funzionalmente assimilabili a chiavi tematiche in Dante si registrano anche nelle *Epistole*, per cui cf. G. LEDDA, *Modelli biblici e profetismo nelle Epistole di Dante*, [in:] *Sotto il cielo della Scrittura. Bibbia, retorica e letteratura religiosa (secc. XIII-XVI)*, ed. C. DELCORNO, G. BAFFETTI, Firenze 2009, p. 57-78.

Marcabru:
Lanquan fuelhon li boscatge
 e par la flors en la prada,
m'es belhs dous chanz per
 l'ombratge
 que fan desus la ramada
l'auzelet per la verdura...

Jaufré Rudel:
Lanqand li jorn son lonc en mai
m'es bels douz chans d'auzels de loing
 e qand me sui partitz de lai
 remembra-m d'un'amor de loing. [...] ²⁵

O ancora, l'*incipit* di *Ara non siscla...* di Raimbaut d'Aurenga (ca. 1140–1173), che con elegante parafrasi riecheggia i primi versi di *Ar em al freg temps vengut...* della *trobairitz* Azalais de Porcairagues (ca. 1140–1177):

Raimbaut:
 Ara non siscla ni chanta
rossignols
ni crida l'auriols
 en vergier ni dinz forest...

Azalais:
 Ar em al freg temps vengut,
 e-l gels e-l neus e la faingna,
 e-l aucellet estan mut,
 c'us de chantar non s'afraingna;
 e son sec li ram pels plais,
 que flors ni foilla no-i nais,
ni rossignols non i crida, que la en mai me reissida.

Si deve osservare che nei provenzali il gioco sottile dell'allusività ad altri testi si esprime non solo a livello tematico o lessicale, ma nelle stesse strutture formali: con astrazioni foniche, figure metriche e sintattiche, scelta di rime, ecc. Lo illustrano bene repliche come quella di Bernart de Ventadorn, che già nell'impianto strofico del suo *Can vei la lauzeta mover* allude apertamente al precedente di Raimbaut d'Aurenga *Non chant per auzel ni per flor*, in un vertiginoso dialogo cifrato che in questo caso pare coinvolgere anche Chrétien de Troyes²⁶. Ancora più espliciti sono poi alcuni sirventesi, sempre di area provenzale, ove lo schema metrico (o la rima) di un modello preesistente viene significativamente rispettato – in forma di *incipit* – solo nella prima *cobla* (strofe): un vero e proprio 'motto', dopo il quale il poeta procede in modo indipendente con un metro diverso²⁷.

Ora, sarebbe inutile dilungarsi a illustrare la vitalità che la citazione allusiva in esordio, sulla scia della tradizione classica e tardoantica, ha nelle tradizioni poetiche medievali: come illustrano i pochi esempi qui sopra riportati, si tratta di un

²⁵ Lo stesso Jaufré a sua volta echeggia l'*incipit* della *chanson de toile* n. 1 della raccolta di Bartsch *Quant vient en mai, que l'on dit as lons jors. Altfranzösische Romanzen und Pastorellen*, ed. K. BARTSCH, Lipsiae 1870; l'esempio è citato da P. ZUMTHOR, *Langue et techniques poétiques à l'époque romane (XI–XIII siècles)*, Paris 1963, p. 209.

²⁶ Sui termini di questo raffinato dialogo poetico fra Raimbaut, Bernart e Chrétien cf.: C. DI GIROLAMO, *I trovatori*, Torino 1989, p. 120–141; M.L. MENEGHETTI, *Il pubblico dei trovatori. La ricezione della poesia cortese fino al XIV secolo*, Torino 1992, p. 101–106; cf. inoltre A. RONCAGLIA, *Carestia*, CNI 18, 1958, p. 121–137, e E. KÖHLER, *Observations historiques et sociologiques sur la poésie des troubadours*, CCM 7, 1964, p. 27–51.

²⁷ M.L. MENEGHETTI, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

procedimento che si adatta altrettanto bene alla dimensione secolare-cortese del *fin'amor* come alla gravità dell'epica e dell'innografia cristiana.

Pensando alle sue possibilità di impiego in ambito ecclesiastico non sarà però superfluo ricordare, per le analogie con la tradizione slava ecclesiastica, che anche l'omiletica francescana e domenicana del XIII–XIV secolo – abbandonando la precedente consuetudine della esposizione narrativa di un intero brano della Scrittura durante il servizio divino – era solita prendere l'abbrivio dal c.d. *versetto tematico*, che veniva estrapolato dai vari sussidi alla predicazione (*Distinctiones*, concordanze) e forniva appunto il *thema*, il *pre-testo*, al sermone del giorno²⁸. In questo caso, benché l'artificio sia non completamente sovrapponibile alla chiave tematica slavoeclesiastica (per via della diversa genesi e motivazione dei due procedimenti sul piano retorico-compositivo) è tuttavia indubbio che entrambi, richiamandosi all'*auctoritas* della Scrittura e offrendo la prospettiva di fruizione di un determinato testo, risultano legati da una profonda affinità, se non equivalenza, producendo in definitiva il medesimo effetto: quello cioè di un incremento di senso del testo alla luce della referenza biblica.

Per rimanere in una dimensione liturgica, è di qualche interesse osservare che il motto o 'motivo iniziale' (*Head-motif*) era molto diffuso anche in contesti lontani da quelli di solito frequentati dai letterati. Uno di questi è la composizione musicale, e in particolare la polifonia vocale sacra del Quattro-Cinquecento, dove l'artificio del 'motto' va altrimenti sotto il nome tecnico di *cantus firmus* ed è impiegato per dare forma alle cosiddette 'messe cicliche'²⁹.

Secondo una consuetudine molto diffusa, ciascuna delle cinque sezioni che componevano la messa ordinaria (*Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei*) cominciava col medesimo motivo musicale, il quale, agendo sul piano armonico e melodico, diveniva una sorta di motivo caratteristico di quella messa e conferiva unità e carattere distintivo al ciclo dei cinque brani. Molto spesso questo motto non era originale, ma citava o parafrasava a sua volta un punto saliente (quasi sempre l'*incipit*) di un brano musicale preesistente, che veniva attinto a un'altra messa polifonica, a un canto liturgico monodico o a una composizione vocale profana molto nota³⁰.

Le ragioni di questo richiamo intertestuale erano varie: a volte era un modo per rendere omaggio a un compositore illustre, o semplicemente per attirare l'attenzione dell'ascoltatore accennando subito a un motivo ben noto. Più spesso,

²⁸ Sul versetto tematico nell'omiletica mediolatina e volgare cf. ad es. C. DELCORNO, *'Antico' e 'moderno' nel sermone medievale*, [in:] IDEM, "Quasi quidam cantus". *Studi sulla predicazione medievale*, ed. G. BAFFETTI et al., Firenze 2009, p. 105–121; IDEM, *Bibbia e generi letterari del medio evo*, p. 87–103.

²⁹ Il termine 'motto' viene introdotto per la prima volta negli studi musicologici (si deve pensare in maniera indipendente dalla filologia) da M. BUKOFZER, *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music*, New York 1950; cf. inoltre *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, London 2001² (cetera: *New Grove Dictionary*), s.v. 'Motto', 'Cantus firmus', 'Cyclic Mass'.

³⁰ Cf. e.g. *New Grove Dictionary*, l. cit.; G. REESE, *Music in the Renaissance*, New York 1959, *passim*.

però, il brano citato era associato a una specifica dimensione rituale-liturgica, a un aspetto dottrinario o a un significato simbolico (richiami funzionali al culto mariano, allusioni trinitarie, ecc.).

Un tipico esempio di motto-omaggio da un compositore all'altro è offerto dalla *missa 'Ecce ancilla domini'* del franco-fiammingo Guillaume Du Fay (1397–1474), nella quale ogni sezione comincia con un motto, in cui le prime sei note sono basate sull'*incipit* del *tenor* dell'omonima messa di Johannes Ockeghem (1410–1497)³¹.

Un motto che invece sottolinea un particolare momento dell'azione liturgica si trova nella *missa 'Pange Lingua'* del celebre fiammingo Josquin Despres (1450–1521 ca.), dove ogni sezione comincia con un episodio polifonico-imitativo basato sul disegno melodico che dava l'abbrivio alla melodia dell'inno *Pange lingua gloriosi corporis mysterium*. Poiché il *Pange lingua* si cantava ai Vespri della festa del *Corpus Domini*, è evidente che la citazione dell'inno eucaristico aveva lo scopo di orientare il fedele verso una specifica dimensione liturgica e teologica³².

È interessante inoltre notare che la funzione di motto musicale o *cantus firmus* in molte messe cicliche latine potevano svolgerla non solo inni sacri preesistenti, ma anche celebri *chansons profane* (*l'Homme armé*, *Mille regretz*, ecc.). Tale pratica, particolarmente diffusa fra il Quattro e il Cinquecento (Du Fay, Ockeghem, Obrecht, Busnois), oltre alla sua dimensione liturgica si legò ben presto ai significati che questi brani avevano nel frattempo acquisito in relazione a fatti importanti della cultura dell'epoca. Si sa, per esempio, che la figura dell'*Homme armé* – di origine peraltro controversa – era associata al culto di san Michele Arcangelo, ma costituiva anche un'allusione alla minaccia turca: non a caso, la versione più antica della canzone appare in concomitanza con la caduta di Costantinopoli³³.

Innesti simili, benché di segno inverso, si segnalano del resto anche nella produzione poetica di poco anteriore. Dalla tradizione scolastica ricorderemo, ad es., l'usanza di inserire nei componimenti in volgare (in *incipit* o in chiusura di strofa) i c.d. *versus cum auctoritate*, ovvero versi latini la cui *auctoritas* risiedeva, oltre che nel registro linguistico, nella citazione di uno o più versi di un modello

³¹ Su quale dei due componimenti sia servito da modello all'altro cf. C. WRIGHT, *Dufay at Cambrai: Discoveries and Revisions*, JAMS 28, 1975, p. 175–229, p. 207 sq.

³² Sulla allusioni in funzione della simbologia liturgica cf. il documentatissimo lavoro di Chr. A. REYNOLDS, *Papal Patronage and the Music of St. Peter 1380–1513*, Berkeley 1996, in particolare il cap. *Contrapunctal Allusions in Polyphonic Masses*, p. 250–280, dove sono riprodotte numerose citazioni reciproche fra i compositori.

³³ Cf. L. LOCKWOOD, *Aspects of the "L'homme armé" Tradition*, PRMA 100, 1973/1974, p. 97–122; M. CARACI, *Fortuna del tenor "L'homme armé" nel primo Rinascimento*, NRMI 9, 1975, fasc. 2, p. 3–36; W. HAASS, *Studien zu den "L'homme armé-Messen" des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts*, Regensburg 1984. D'altra parte, anche le *chansons* potevano, a loro volta, riprendere motivi tratti dalle messe, il che mostra che le citazioni (talvolta anche multiple e sapientemente armonizzate) potevano andare nei due sensi: cf. ancora A. REYNOLDS, *op. cit.*, p. 263–264. Infine, non sarà forse casuale che l'area geografica in cui prende forma questo particolare tipo di intertestualità musicale (già nel XIV sec.) sia quella francese e franco-fiamminga, una regione cioè particolarmente esposta all'influsso della tradizione poetica dei trovieri del nord della Francia.

riconosciuto, ad es. un inno liturgico famoso. Il procedimento è molto diffuso nella letteratura antico-tedesca e, ancora una volta, in area provenzale, dove basterà menzionare una famosa canzone di crociata di Marcabru, che comincia appunto con un *versus* latino immediatamente riconoscibile: *Pax in nomine Domini! | Fetz Marcabrus lo vers e-l so | Aujatz que di...*³⁴

La tradizione risulta peraltro consolidata anche nella poesia mediolatina coeva (XI–XIII sec.), dove i *versus cum auctoritate* riprendono in primo luogo i poeti classici – Orazio, Giovenale, Virgilio, Ovidio, Lucano, i *Disticha Catonis* – e vengono collocati all’inizio o alla fine di una strofe, ad es. in Gautier de Châtillon e Gillebert³⁵.

In seguito, quando questa pratica di scuola si esaurì (in ambito latino verso la metà del XIII sec.), i *versus* continuarono ad essere estrapolati non più dai classici, ma dalla Bibbia o da altri inni liturgici: solo fra il XIII e il XVI secolo risultano censiti almeno 250 inni (circolanti soprattutto fra gli ordini mendicanti) che concludono la strofa con un *incipit* di un inno preesistente³⁶.

Questo rapido *excursus* vale a mostrare che quando il motto approdò infine nella musica, tale pratica, con tutte le sue possibili varianti, poggiava ormai su una tradizione consolidata. In età rinascimentale poté dunque essere adattato in modo pienamente consapevole dai compositori, i quali passarono ad usarlo sia per dare forma alle messe polifoniche, sia per instaurare immediatamente l’orizzonte liturgico, dottrinario o culturale entro cui un certo brano doveva essere recepito. Come altri procedimenti, il motto continuava ad essere un espediente eminentemente *retorico*, e in tal senso era inteso dagli autori, i quali, formatisi sulle discipline del *trivium* e del *quadrivium*, proprio dall’*ars rhetorica* mutuavano i concetti e i termini con i quali categorizzavano le tecniche musicali³⁷. Né si trattava di una acquisizione dell’ultima ora: questa associazione tra musica e retorica poggiava infatti su una tradizione antichissima, la c.d. ‘teoria degli affetti’ (*Affektenlehre*), secondo la quale il legame profondo tra le due arti risiede nella capacità di entrambe di suscitare emozioni e di predisporre l’animo ad accogliere particolari insegnamenti o a compiere determinate azioni³⁸.

³⁴ Citata in P. ZUMTHOR, *op. cit.*, p. 94, 102. Sull’evoluzione del *versus cum auctoritate* dalla tradizione mediolatina al volgare cf. lo stesso P. ZUMTHOR, *La masque et la lumière. La poétique des grandes rhétoriciens*, Paris 1978, p. 160 sq.

³⁵ V.P.G. SCHMIDT, *The Quotation in Goliardic Poetry: The Feast of Fools and the Goliardic Strophe cum auctoritate*, [in:] *Latin Poetry...*, p. 39–55.

³⁶ Cf. J. SZÖVÉRFY, *Ein Schmuckmittel der mittellateinischen Strophen: Regelmässige Zeilenentlehnung in der Hymnendichtung*, MJ 7, 1972, p. 7–40.

³⁷ Cf. A. REYNOLDS, *op. cit.*, p. 281–297 (cap. *Polyphony and Humanistic Rhetoric*); cf. pure: B. VICKERS, *Figures of rhetoric / Figures of music?*, *Rhet* 2, 1984, p. 1–44; F. RECKOW, *Zwischen Ontologie und Rhetorik: die Idee des movere animos und der Übergang vom Spätmittelalter zur frühen Neuzeit in der Musikgeschichte*, [in:] *Traditionswandel und Traditionsverhalten*, ed. W. HAUG und B. WACHINGER, Tübingen 1991, p. 145–178; C.V. PALISCA, *Ut oratoria musica: The rhetorical basis of musical mannerism*, [in:] IDEM, *Studies in the History of Italian Music and Music Theory*, Oxford 1994, p. 282–311.

³⁸ Già formalizzata nella tradizione greca (PLATONE, *Repubblica*, III, 398–399), l’idea filtra attraverso QUINTILIANO (*Inst.*, I, 10, 25; I, 10, 31) all’età medievale, senza però approdare a teorizzazioni esplicite. La piena codificazione del rapporto tra musica e retorica si avrà solo in età rinascimentale, con i trattati di Gallus Dressler (*Praecepta musicae poeticae*, 1563) e soprattutto di Joachim Burmeister (*Musica poetica*, 1606), che in un catalogo sistematico illustrerà le equivalenze tra *figure* musicali e tropi della retorica.

Qualcosa di funzionalmente simile al ‘motto’ musicale e, più in generale, alla chiave tematica si registra del resto – e così ritorniamo, in conclusione, in ambiti a noi più familiari – nella tradizione liturgico-innografica bizantino-slava.

Esemplare è a questo riguardo la forma poetica del canone, modellata sui nove cantici biblici³⁹ e perciò divisa in nove odi, ciascuna delle quali – sull’esempio del *Grande canone penitenziale* di Andrea di Creta – ha in testa, nel primo tropario (o irmo), un riferimento *tematico* alla corrispondente ode biblica⁴⁰. È utile qui ricordare che questa allusione all’ode poteva essere data da una breve parafrasi di due-tre versi, che spesso contenevano particolari segnali testuali o parole-chiave in grado di svelare il rimando al contesto biblico.

Quanto osservato si riscontra in diversi componimenti che – nell’arco di molti secoli e in termini molto simili – alludono all’episodio evangelico dell’ingresso di Gesù in Gerusalemme: cfr. l’epigramma dell’*Antologia Palatina*, I, 52, V-VI sec., Χαῖρε, Σιών θύγατερ, καὶ δέρκεο Χριστὸν ἀνακτα | πῶλῳ ἐφεζόμενος καὶ ἐς πάθος αἴψα κίοντα; il distico di Giorgio Pisida, VII sec.: Ὁ συγκάθεδρος πατρικῆς δόξης ἄνω | πῶλῳ κατηξίωσεν ἰζῆσαι κάτω; e il tetrastico di Teodoro Prodromo, XII sec.: Ναί, παῖδες, εἰς ἔλεγκον ἀνδρῶν ἀφρόνων | κλάδη φοροῦντες εὐλογεῖτε τὸν Λόγον. | Ναί στρώννυτε ζύμπαντα τοῖς πέπλοις τόπον. | ὡς μηδὲ γῆς ὁ πῶλος αὐτῆς θιγγάνοι [...]). Si noterà, in tutti e tre i testi citati, la posizione incipitaria del termine πῶλος, una tipica parola-chiave dell’ingresso in Gerusalemme, sulla quale si era fissata, sin dall’età degli apologeti, una precisa esegesi allegorica (puledro = nuovi credenti).⁴¹

Più spesso, però, come mostra anche il materiale slavo, l’allusione era offerta – anziché da una parafrasi – da un fugace segnale incipitario in testa all’irmo, e quasi sempre si limitava a due o tre parole, anche abbreviate (На господи възвахъ, Съ высоты, Нынѣ въстан., На хвалитѣ), più di rado a un intero versetto (Сѣдши в славѣ на прѣстолаѣ вѣкѣтѣ., Божествѣноѣ и всесъборноѣ творачѣ праздниѣство, отроки благочестивыя в печи рожество бѣца спѣло еста)⁴². In tal modo gli irmi attivavano il collegamento tematico alla corrispondente ode biblica, la quale veniva riconosciuta anche grazie all’uso di imparare questi irmi a memoria, sugli irmologi, e alla grande popolarità dei canoni che veicolavano quegli irmi, non di rado

³⁹ Equivalenti a: Es 15, 1–19; Dt 32, 1–44; 1 Sam 2, 1–10; Hab 3, 1–19; Is 26, 9–20; Iob 2, 3–10; Dn 3, 26–56; Lc 1, 46–55; Lc 1, 68–79.

⁴⁰ L’irmo costituisce a sua volta il modello *tematico* e *ritmico-melodico* per i tropari che seguono. Com’è noto, gli irmi vennero poi sistematizzati in raccolte specifiche, gli irmologi, che fornivano i modelli per i canoni di Ottoeco, Triodio e Meneo festivo.

⁴¹ Cfr. GIORGIO DI PISIDA, *Carmi*, ed. L. TARTAGLIA, Torino 1998, p. 475 (n. 26) [= L. STERNBACH, n. 55]; *Theodori Prodrumi Tetrasticha in Sacras Scripturas*, PG, vol. CXXXIII, col. 1180A. Gli esempi sono discussi in F. GONNELLI, *Le Sacre Scritture e i generi poetici a Bisanzio*, [in:] *La Scrittura infinita. Bibbia e poesia in età medievale e umanistica*, ed. F. STELLA, Firenze 2001, p. 393–429, alle p. 415–417.

⁴² Cfr. П. А. ЛАВРОВ, *Материалы по истории возникновения древнейшей славянской письменности*, Ленинград 1930, p. 108–127; Б. АНГЕЛОВ, *Из старата българска, руска и сръбска литература*, vol. I, София 1958, p. 19–35; cf. inoltre В. ЯГИЧ, *Службѣные минеи на сентябрь, октябрь и ноябрь в цеквоно-славянском переводе по русским рукописям 1095–1097 г.*, Санкт-Петербург 1886.

composti dai più ammirati ed emulati maestri bizantini (Giovanni Damasceno, Cosma di Maiuma ed altri)⁴³.

A questa peculiare tecnica intertestuale delle Chiese d'Oriente (cui si potrà accostare l'indicazione del cosiddetto *προσόμοιον*, sl. *пѡдѡбѣнѣ*, con la quale negli sticherari si rimanda sempre allo schema melodico e metrico di un testo-prototipo)⁴⁴ è possibile infine associare, nella tradizione liturgica occidentale, quella del canto antifonale, dove nella citazione in *incipit* delle prime parole di un determinato salmo non è difficile riconoscere una funzione analoga a quella dell'irmo⁴⁵.

Da ultimo, diversamente dalla tradizione poetica e musicale vista in precedenza, non sfuggirà come in tutti questi casi il rimando intertestuale, oltre ad organizzare la strutturazione simbolica del servizio divino, assuma una funzione essenzialmente *pratica*, che consente all'officiante e ai fedeli di orientarsi rapidamente in un repertorio di testi molto complesso: di allusioni incipitarie sono pieni i *typika*.

Un capitolo di poetica storica

Dai materiali esaminati in questo breve e molto parziale *excursus* è evidente che quanto fin qui definito, negli studi slavistici, 'chiave tematica' (o 'ermeneutica') non può in alcun modo considerarsi un tratto esclusivo del codice letterario slavoecclsiastico, ma andrà più correttamente inteso come declinazione locale di un artificio retorico ben consolidato in oltre due millenni di tradizione, il quale dall'arte della parola si estese anche ad altri ambiti, per via indipendente o per le analogie offerte proprio dai modelli formali dell'*ars rhetorica*.

Dietro la molteplicità dei fenomeni osservati e i loro progressivi adattamenti ai contesti più vari ci sembra insomma di poter cogliere i segnali di una medesima strategia. Con una definizione il più possibile onnicomprensiva potremmo qualificarla come una 'strategia dell'*exordium*', che appare tanto più produttiva e vivace quanto più è viva, in una data cultura, quella tipica dimensione di intertestualità che fa appello alla memoria e alla cooperazione interpretativa del lettore, e che appunto ritroviamo in contesti storico-culturali fra loro molto distanti: nell'ambiente poetico-filologico alessandrino, nei poeti latini dell'età augustea, nella lirica trobadorica, e più in generale in tutta la tradizione medievale, specialmente ecclesiastica (mediolatina, bizantina e slava).

⁴³ *KME*, vol. II, София 1995, p. 125–126, 213–215.

⁴⁴ Sulla ripetizione formulare del *προσόμοιον*, o *пѡдѡбѣнѣ*, degli sticherari ha attirato la mia attenzione Aleksander Naumow, secondo il quale questa pratica liturgica non è altro che una declinazione particolare di quella poetica della citazione qui oggetto della mia analisi.

⁴⁵ Per rimanere in ambito slavo, cfr. le *služby* in onore di Cirillo e Metodio tramandate nei breviari glagolitici croati: П.А. Лавров, *op. cit.*, p. 128–145; più in generale cf. *New Grove Dictionary*, s.v. 'Antiphon'.

Si tratta, in tutti questi casi, di letterature (meglio: di culture) che, per quanto distanti le une dalle altre, sono tuttavia accomunate dalla subalternità degli autori a un particolare codice convenzionale, a una cultura di scuola o, più semplicemente, alla *tradizione*, dove quest'ultima va intesa come suprema fonte di autorità e repertorio di convenzioni espressive e tematiche da cui trarre i modelli per la *imitatio*. Per questo motivo, la stessa diffusione del procedimento non ha bisogno di presupporre per forza contatti e rapporti filogenetici fra una tradizione e l'altra, essendo possibili sviluppi indipendenti e spontanei⁴⁶.

Naturalmente, anche la fenomenologia del 'motto' ('chiave', ecc.) cambia da un contesto a un altro, adattandosi alle convenzioni estetiche, alle finalità e modalità di impiego, e non ultimo alle capacità ricettive dei destinatari del momento. Limitatamente al medioevo si va – attraverso un ampio spettro di possibilità – dalla cifra raffinatissima della lirica provenzale, che spinge l'allusività sin nelle strutture formali più occulte, fino all'utilizzo più o meno automatico e letterale ('lessicale') del testo biblico nella pratica agiografico-omiletica, per arrivare infine alla stereotipata segnaletica incipitaria dei generi paraliturgici, tendenzialmente riconducibile a esigenze mnemotecniche, pratiche.

Per tutte le tipologie esaminate, e per le molte altre qui sottaciute, si tratterà dunque di tracciare un quadro generale che sottragga questa peculiare strategia dell'esordio dai confini di un'unica tradizione e di ricollocare fenomeni apparentemente isolati e diversi in una prospettiva il più possibile unitaria⁴⁷. Appare a questo punto evidente che i futuri sviluppi della ricerca non dovranno ispirarsi tanto alle metodologie e agli obiettivi della tradizionale *Quellenforschung* (individuazione delle fonti, rapporti di dare e avere, ecc.), quanto segnare, in una prospettiva di *poetica storica*, accanto alla continuità, le svariate trasformazioni di un artificio che – veicolato dall'insegnamento della retorica e via via rimotivato dalle dinamiche legate alla produzione, all'esecuzione e alla ricezione dei testi – conob-

⁴⁶ Naturalmente, il riconoscimento dell'*auctoritas* della tradizione non va considerato un presupposto indispensabile alla poetica della citazione. Ce lo conferma il gusto citazionistico delle estetiche scaturite dal c.d. postmodernismo (non solo in ambito letterario), dove l'allusività e il gioco mimetico con la tradizione diventa ancor più pervasivo, avendo come premessa (ed effetto) la destrutturazione delle gerarchie di valore e dei modelli ereditati.

⁴⁷ L'attenzione si è fin qui focalizzata sulla tradizione poetica, poiché la parola della poesia, per suo statuto concentrata sul significante (così accade anche nella tradizione neoplatonica medievale), tende a manifestare la dimensione dell'intertestualità sul piano metaforico e verbale, laddove la prosa la esercita preferibilmente a livello diegetico. La scelta di concentrarsi fin qui sulla poesia pare coerente anche con il proposito di illustrare alcune caratteristiche della produzione slavoeccelesiastica. Qui infatti la prosa, ad es. quella agiografico-omiletica, per la sua tipica composizione a *collage* di motivi e *topoi* (dovuta all'osservanza di schemi ideologici e retorico-formali abbastanza fissi), sacrifica l'unità narrativa alla giustapposizione di quadri, ciascuno dei quali tendenzialmente ancorato – sul piano tematico ed espressivo – all'ipotesi biblico. La sua intertestualità appare dunque, in tal senso, paradossalmente più affine alla poesia e proprio dal confronto anche solo tipologico con quest'ultima possono ricavarsi elementi utili a una migliore interpretazione del suo codice.

be una vitalità e una capacità di adattamento straordinarie nel sistema letterario e culturale europeo.

Abstract. The Church Slavonic Biblical ‘Thematic Clues’ in the Context of European Rhetoric and Literary Traditions (Remarks for a Chapter in Historical Poetics).

The article deals with the case of the so-called “biblical thematic clue” (a definition introduced by R. Picchio), that is a rhetorical device allegedly widely spread in the medieval Church Slavonic literary code. Despite a large number of studies, appeared in the last decades and mostly inspired by Picchio’s theory, scholars have failed so far to produce a wide theoretical outline of this issue, moreover checking it on the basis of a narrow circle of texts (mostly in the field of hagiography and homiletics).

Consequently, several methodological questions remain to a large extent unexplored. For instance: What actually is a ‘thematic clue’ and at which point of the *expositio* a biblical reference is expected to be found in order to be considered as a ‘thematic clue’? What degree of adherence to a previous model a ‘thematic clue’ must have in order to be recognized as such? To what extent was a medieval man of letters aware in using this rhetorical device? And apart from this, shall the ‘thematic clue’ always be interpreted as a case of ‘intertextuality’, i.e. as result of an *intentional* quotation of a well-defined literary model, or may it sometimes be explained also as a phenomenon of ‘interdiscursiveness’, i.e. a *unintentional* quotation drawn not from a definite biblical or patristic model (*parole*), yet from a biblical-liturgical *‘langue’*?)

Besides these and other issues, still open remains the question whether it is acceptable to consider the ‘thematic clue’ as an exclusive feature of the Old Church Slavonic literature, or rather a rhetorical device known even to other traditions?

In this regard, the author offers a brief survey illustrating how different literary systems, over more than two thousand years, have made use of quotations from authoritative models in the introductory lines of a text or even in *incipit*. Examples of such a rhetorical strategy are pointed out in ancient Greek and Latin poetry, where is to be found the typical use of the so-called ‘motto’, i.e. an allusive quotation from a well-known model (primarily Homer) in the first verse of a poem, functioning as ‘self-inscription’ by the poet in a literary canon (see e.g. Callimachus, Horace, Catullus quoting Homer or Alcaeus, etc.). In more recent times, the ancient use of ‘motto’ gains strenght inside all Christian traditions, where the main source for quotations becomes the Holy Bible: for example, in Middle Latin liturgical poetry (see e.g. Paulinus of Nola, Notker Balbulus), in the Goliardic poetry (see the Archpoet of Cologne, etc.), as well as in Slavic and Byzantine hymnography. An interesting typological parallel to the Slavonic ‘thematic clues’ is to be found in Western paraliturgical practice of the so-called ‘thematic verse’, customarily in use in medieval Franciscan and Dominican homiletics. Typologically and functionally related to the ancient ‘motto’ and to medieval Greek/Latin/Slavonic ‘thematic clues’ are also several quotations from (biblical) authoritative texts in vernacular literary traditions: besides the *Divine Comedy*, that begins with the first verse of the Hezekiah’s Song of Thanksgiving (a text well-known to every reader in the Middle Ages, thanks to its inclusion in the Liturgy of the Hours), significant parallels can be cited from Old German and Provençal vernacular poetry (e.g. Marcabru, Jaufre Rudel, Raimbaut d’Aurenga, etc.). Quotations of authoritative models in *incipit* are also common, for instance, in the late medieval and renaissance music, especially in the sacred vocal polyphony, where in the overture and, subsequently, in each section composing the mass (*Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei*) it is customary to quote a passage from a previous model in order to draw the attention of churchgoers, stressing a specific liturgical and/or theological meaning.

The few examples discussed in the article clearly show that the so-called 'thematic clues' in Church Slavonic literary tradition must be considered as a local variant of a widespread rhetorical strategy, going back to Antiquity and then independently developed in several forms. The further task of the studies should be to distinguish functions, application modes and ways of reception of this rhetorical device over more than two thousand years, and to deal with this topic within a perspective of *historical poetics*.

Cristiano Diddi

Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici

Università di Salerno

84084 – Fisciano (SA), Italia

crdiddi@unisa.it

Vassil Gjuzelev (Sofia)

LA QUATRIÈME CROISADE ET SES CONSÉQUENCES POUR LA BULGARIE MÉDIÉVALE: LE TZAR KALOYAN, LES LATINS ET LES GRECS (1204–1207)¹

La quatrième croisade est directement liée à l'histoire du Royaume bulgare; elle a un impact particulièrement intéressant et spécifique et des conséquences importantes pour lui. Dans une perspective plus proche, celles-ci peuvent être considérées à la lumière des événements survenus au cours de la période allant de 1204 à 1207. Une telle analyse est nécessaire, parce que le dynamisme et la complexité des relations entre les puissances agissant à ce moment dans l'histoire du Sud-Est européen, ont conduit à plusieurs reprises les chercheurs aussi bien à une reconstruction incomplète et imprécise des événements en question, qu'à une interprétation incorrecte de leurs conséquences.

La guerre bulgaro-byzantine, déclanchée dès le début du règne du tzar Kaloyan (1197–1207), fut arrêtée en 1202 par la conclusion d'un traité de paix². En principe, il reconfirmait la légitimité du Royaume bulgare rétabli. La prise de Zara par les croisés en novembre 1202 et leur accord avec Alexis IV Ange, conclu dans le but de lui restituer le trône de son père, conduirent à une modification totale de la situation sur la péninsule balkanique. Leur avancée vers Constantinople et leur établissement devant ses enceintes (juin–juillet 1203) obligèrent le *basileus* Alexis III Ange (1195–1203) de rechercher l'aide militaire des Bulgares. Au début de juin 1203, afin de participer à des pourparlers, fut envoyé à Tărnovo le patriarche de Constantinople Jean Camatère (1198–1206) qui entra en contact avec le tzar bulgare et le chef de l'Église, l'archevêque Basile I^{er} (1186–1232)³.

¹ The paper is an abridged translation, supplemented with source quotations, of the previous author's text entitled *Четвъртият кръстоносен поход, превземането на Цариград и Българо-Латинските отношения 1204–1207 г.*, Pbg 28.2, 2004, p. 80–88.

² NICETAS CHONIATES, *Historia*, rec. I.A. VAN DIETEN, Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1975, p. 535 (cetera: CHONIATES, *Historia*); IDEM, *Orationes et epistulae*, rec. I.A. VAN DIETEN, Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1972, p. 110; F. DÖLGER, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, vol. II, *Regesten von 1025–1204*, N 1661, p. 107.

³ DEMETRIUS CHOMATENUS, *Ponemata diaphora*, rec. G. PRINZING, Berolini et Novi Eboraci 2002, p. 50–51, 426.

Dans sa lettre au pape Innocent III (1196–1216), rédigée immédiatement après ces pourparlers, le tzar Kaloyan déclare avec fierté, que les Grecs avaient envoyé auprès de lui leur patriarche, qui au nom du *basileus* de Constantinople lui avait fait la proposition suivante:

Veni ad nos, coronabimus te in imperatorem et faciemus tibi patriarcham, quia imperium sine patriarcha non staret (Viens auprès de nous, nous te remettrons la couronne impériale et ferons pour toi patriarche, car un empire ne peut rester sans patriarche).⁴

Ayant compris la raison de la décision byzantine de faire des concessions quant à la reconnaissance de sa dignité de tzar et de celle de patriarche pour le chef de l'Église bulgare, le tzar Kaloyan refusa l'aide militaire demandée et se hâta de accélérer les pourparlers pour la conclusion d'une union avec l'Église de Rome. Il préféra assister en observateur aux événements qui avaient lieu sur les bords du Bosphore, contribuant indirectement à leur déroulement malheureux pour l'Empire byzantin.

Sous la pression des croisés, le 18 juillet 1203, Alexis III Ange quitta Constantinople et se retira dans la ville de Develte, située sur la côte ouest de la Mer noire et où antérieurement il avait préparé son refuge⁵. Dans sa tentative de préserver ses droits de souverain, il n'avait pas choisi par hasard cette ville qui se trouvait à la frontière avec la Bulgarie. A propos de ces événements, il serait intéressant d'attirer l'attention sur un récit, figurant dans *L'histoire des basileus* géorgienne (XIII^e s.), lequel, en mélangeant la vérité à la légende, explique la catastrophe byzantine:

Lorsque les Francs apprirent que les Grecs avaient reçu une aide de l'Est, vinrent les Vénitiens et conquièrent la capitale, tandis que le malheureux Alexis s'enfuit en Bulgarie auprès de son gendre. Quand le tzar bulgare, son gendre, le vit, il l'emmena dans une de ses forteresses, jeta devant lui une grande quantité d'or et lui dit: *Voici Alexis, c'est ce que tu voulais. Prends cet or au lieu de nourriture et d'eau, car tu as perdu la maison royale chrétienne et as détruit l'autocratie grecque*. Dans ces conditions, le malheureux Alexis mourut de faim, privé de l'aide de Dieu.⁶

Il est évident qu'au cours de l'été 1203, Alexis III Ange pour la deuxième fois demanda de l'aide militaire aux Bulgares, mais celle-ci lui fut refusée. C'est pour cette raison que très rapidement il quitta Develte pour s'installer à Andrianople, mais sa tentative d'en faire le centre d'un mouvement de restauration de son pouvoir à Constantinople fut très vite déjouée. Le 1 août 1203, Alexis IV (1203–1204)

⁴ *Преписката на папа Инокентия III с българите*, ed. И. Дуйчев, ГСУИФФ 37, 1942, p. 31 (cetera: *Преписката на папа Инокентия III с българите*).

⁵ SCHONIATES, *Historia*, p. 549, 556; GEORGIUS ACROPOLITES, *Historia*, rec. A. HEISENBERG, Lipsiae 1903, p. 6 (cetera: ACROPOLITES).

⁶ С.Г. Клаухчишвили, *Грузинские источники по истории Византии*, vol. I, Тбилиси 1974, p. 146, 148.

fut proclamé et couronné *basileus* byzantin. La légitimité de ce couronnement ne fut pas reconnue par le tzar bulgare Kaloyan⁷. Il suivait attentivement les événements qui se déroulaient dans l'Empire byzantin en ruines, en essayant de la comprendre au mieux et de prendre la position qui correspondait à ses intérêts.

Ayant hâté, à la fin de 1203, le déroulement des pourparlers pour la conclusion d'une union avec l'Église de Rome, Kaloyan décida de miser sur une alliance avec les croisés qui se trouvaient devant les enceintes de Constantinople. Cela correspondait à sa politique essentiellement anti-byzantine, qu'il menait avec une grande conséquence. Selon le témoignage de Robert de Clari, en février 1204, par une ambassade auprès des chevaliers latins, le souverain bulgare leur proposa de mettre à leur disposition une armée de cent mille personnes afin qu'ils puissent prendre Constantinople. Le refus du Conseil des barons latins à cette proposition, exclua la participation bulgare à la future opération⁸. Cette démarche de Kaloyan était tout à fait dans la ligne de sa politique. Il essayait non seulement de tâter le terrain quant à ses rapports avec le nouveau facteur des événements dans les Balkans, mais visait une participation active et équitable au partage de l'héritage byzantine. De toute évidence, il ne se rendait pas compte que celle-ci était partagée d'avance entre les croisés et les Vénitiens, lesquels, pour cette raison, n'avaient aucun besoin d'un autre allié.

La prise de Constantinople par les Latins (le 12 avril 1204), l'élection de Baudouin de Flandre comme empereur du nouvel empire et la mise en pratique du *Partitio terrarum imperii Romanie* déjà ébauchée, modifièrent radicalement la situation. Assuré par le pape Innocent III dans sa lettre du 25 février 1204 d'être couronné très bientôt par un légat pontifical qui lui remettrait le *sceptre royal* (*sceptrum regale*) et le *diadème royal* (*regiam diadema*), le tzar Kaloyan essaya de nouveau d'arranger d'une manière pacifique ses rapports avec les nouveaux maîtres de Constantinople. Nicéas Choniates (1155–1216) note que lorsqu'il envoya une ambassade pour montrer son amitié, on lui répondit de parler dans les missives qui leur ferait parvenir non pas comme un *basileus* à ses sujets, mais comme un serviteur à ses maîtres. Sinon ils leveraient une armée et n'auraient pas de difficulté à mettre à sac la Mésie (La Bulgarie) qu'il gouvernait non pas de droit, mais en tant qu'apostat qui s'était séparé des *romaiōi*⁹. D'une façon plus détaillée ce fait est raconté dans *Les actes du pape Innocent* où l'on raconte que lorsque le tzar Kaloyan

avait reçu la nouvelle de la prise de Constantinople, il envoya une ambassade auprès des Latins et une lettre leur proposant de faire la paix, mais ils lui répondirent avec dédain qu'il n'y aurait jamais de paix avec lui s'il ne rendait les terres qui appartenaient à l'Empire de Constantinople et qu'il avait

⁷ GEOFFROY DE VILLEHARDOUIN, *La conquête de Constantinople*, 202, ed. et trans. E. FARAL, Paris 1938 (cetera: VILLEHARDOUIN).

⁸ ROBERT DE CLARI, *La conquête de Constantinople*, 64, ed. PH. LAUER, Paris 1924 (cetera: CLARI).

⁹ CHONIATES, *Historia*, p. 612.

conquises par la force. Il leur répondit qu'il avait sur ces terres davantage de droits qu'eux-mêmes en avaient sur Constantinople. Car lui-même s'était rendu les terres que ses ancêtres avaient perdues, tandis qu'ils avaient conquis Constantinople, qui n'avait jamais été leur possession.¹⁰

C'était donc comme si, avec la prise de Constantinople, les Latins avaient hérité de la doctrine byzantine qui traitait le Royaume bulgare comme un royaume surgi à la suite d'une sécession (*ἀποστασία*) du territoire grec. Cela allait à l'encontre de la conception politique bulgare d'une continuité et de rétablissement d'une tradition étatique qui avait déjà existé. S'étant incarné en héritiers de l'empire byzantin et de sa doctrine politique, les Latins ne pouvaient pas compter sur une tolérance et une soumission de la part de Bulgares.

Au cours de l'été 1204, le tzar Kaloyan fit sa troisième et dernière tentative de se réconcilier avec les Latins, juste au moment où ils entreprirent le partage réel des possessions balkaniques. Cette tentative eut lieu lors de la rencontre du souverain bulgare avec l'un des chefs de la quatrième croisade, le noble français Pierre de Bracheux, décrite en détails par Robert de Clari. Le dialogue entre les deux fait comprendre que les Latins avaient une justification idéologique et une explication historique de l'agressivité qu'ils montraient: cette terre, jadis, aurait appartenu à leurs ancêtres de Troie la Grande et ils y seraient venus pour la reconquérir¹¹. Les événements qui s'ensuivirent montrèrent que les Bulgares connaissaient bien la *Légende de Troie* mais non dans sa version contemporaine mise à jour par les Latins.

Entretiens, le légat pontifical, le cardinal Léon Brancaléon, enfin arrivé à Târnovo, le 7 novembre 1204 sacra l'archevêque de Târnovo Basile I^{er} qui devint *primas des Bulgares et des Valaques* (*primas Bulgarorum et Blachorum*) et le jour suivant il couronna Kaloyan *roi de toute la Bulgarie et de la Valachie* (*rex totius Bulgarie et Blachie*)¹². Dans sa lettre au pape Innocent III, envoyée peu de temps après, le souverain bulgare qui pensait non sans fondements avoir reçu le titre de *tzar* (*imperator*), formula d'une manière franche et précise sa position ferme aussi bien à l'égard du Royaume hongrois qu'à l'égard du nouvel Empire latin en le prévenant sans aucune ambiguïté:

De même, quant aux Latins qui s'emparèrent de Constantinople, j'écris à votre Sainteté de leur faire savoir de se tenir loin de mon royaume et de le respecter et alors mon royaume ne leur fera aucun mal. Mais s'ils entreprennent quelque chose contre mon royaume et qu'ils ne le respectent pas et tuent de ces gens qui lui sont soumis, que Votre Sainteté ne soupçonne pas mon royaume et que tout soit libre de tout [soupçon].¹³

L'adhésion du Royaume bulgare à l'union avec l'Église de Rome et la recherche du rôle médiateur du pape pour l'arrangement des relations avec

¹⁰ *Innocentii III papae gesta*, [in:] *PL*, vol. CCXIV, col. 147–148.

¹¹ CLARI, 106.

¹² *Преписката на папа Иннокентия III с българите*, p. 65–67.

¹³ *Преписката на папа Иннокентия III с българите*, p. 66.

l'Empire latin restèrent sans résultat. Il était de plus en plus difficile de maîtriser l'agressivité croissante des Latins. Selon la version aragonaise de la *Chronique de Morée* (XIV^e s.) le roi bulgare craignait que l'empereur Baudouin, qui se trouvait à la frontière de ses terres, pût (y) entrer et conquérir son royaume comme il l'avait déjà fait avec celui des Grecs¹⁴. Selon Geoffroy de Villhardouin, lors de la campagne en Thrace orientale pendant l'été de 1204, le marquis Boniface de Montferrat avait adressé à Baudouin les paroles suivantes: *Dirigeons-nous, si tel est votre désir, contre Johannes qui est roi de la Bulgarie et de la Valachie et possède d'une manière illégitime une grande partie de la terre*¹⁵. Le parti-pris anti-bulgare ferme des chefs de la quatrième croisade se voit dans le partage des terres de Romania qui comprenait des régions et des cités déjà incluses dans les frontières du Royaume bulgare: une grande partie de la Thrace et du littoral de la Mer noire, la région des Rhodopes et la Macédoine avec des villes et des places fortes comme Philippople, Sténimachos, Constantia, Béroé, Mesembria, Anchialo, Prilep, Castoria, Măglen, Ohrid etc.¹⁶ Dans les réponses aux ambassades et aux propositions bulgares transparaissait de plus en plus nettement l'agressivité de la politique latine envers le Royaume bulgare.

Au demeurant, à la fin de 1204 et au début de 1207, le conflit entre la Bulgarie et l'Empire latin paraissait inévitable. Selon le témoignage de Geoffroy de Villhardouin, à la veille de la future guerre, des envoyés des Grecs de toutes les villes du pays proposaient leur aide au tzar Kaloyan en lui faisant savoir qu'ils le feraient empereur (il le feroient empereur), que tous se soumettraient à lui comme à leur maître, tandis qu'il les gouvernerait comme ses sujets¹⁷. Quelle que soit l'interprétation de ce témoignage par la recherche scientifique actuelle, il est évident que dans la situation aux Balkans, qui fut extrêmement défavorable pour les *romaioi*, ces derniers, pour la première et la dernière fois, furent obligés de reconnaître le tzar bulgare comme leurs souverain et prêtèrent serment de le servir.

Dans la bataille d'Adrianople qui eut lieu le 14 avril 1205, un an après la prise de Constantinople, les Bulgares, alliés aux Coumans et aux Grecs, firent subir une défaite écrasante à l'armée latine, firent prisonnier l'empereur Baudouin et l'amènèrent dans leur capitale Tărnovo¹⁸. Le coup porté à l'Empire latin paraissait mortel: l'empereur fut décapité, la fleur de sa chevalerie périt. Toute la terre de Thrace se trouvait entre les mains des Bulgares, la cavalerie de leurs alliés, les

¹⁴ *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*, publiée et traduite pour la première fois par A. MOREL-FATIO, Genève 1885, p. 16 (cetera: *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*).

¹⁵ VILLEHARDOUIN, 276.

¹⁶ *Венециански документи за историята на България и българите от XII–XV в.*, ed. В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, София 2001, p. 14–15.

¹⁷ VILLEHARDOUIN, 333.

¹⁸ В.Н. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *История на българската държава през средните векове*, vol. III, *Второ българско царство. България при Асеневци (1187–1280)*, София 1940, p. 224–227; И. БОЖИЛОВ, В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, *История на средновековна България VII–XIV век*, София 1999, p. 453–454.

Coumans, atteignit Constantinople (seules les villes de Rodosto et de Selivrie demeuraient latines), les marchands, les chevaliers et les sergents s'embarquèrent sur un navire vénitien pour quitter Constantinople, le vieux doge vénitien Enrico Dandolo fut tué¹⁹. Le destin de l'Empire latin, qui inopinément s'était enclavé dans l'histoire du Sud-Est européen, semblaient entièrement entre les mains du tzar bulgare Kaloyan.

La bataille d'Andrianople de 1205, l'un des événements de l'histoire européenne les plus largement rapportés et commentés par l'historiographie occidentale du XIII^e–XV^e s., a eu une importance extraordinaire et des conséquences sans précédent pour le Royaume bulgare. Tout au début de son rétablissement, il eut subitement la possibilité d'écraser l'empire latin et de prendre possession de l'héritage byzantin dans les Balkans. Au bout de trois siècles, renaissait la chimère du tzar Siméon le Grand (893–927): la création d'un royaume bulgare-grec avec Constantinople pour capitale. Trois facteurs s'opposèrent à la réalisation de ce rêve: 1) la puissance réduite, mais pas anéantie, des chevaliers latins; 2) le soutien qu'ils recevaient de l'Eglise de Rome et de l'Occident catholique et 3) le mouvement anti-bulgare des Grecs de la Péninsule balkanique. Dans cette situation complexe et pleine de surprises, le tzar Kaloyan, qui jusqu'alors avait agi en diplomate habile et en excellent chef militaire, fit preuve d'une incohérence dans ses actions et de confusion. Avec son armée, composée de Grecs et de Bulgares il se dirigea soudain contre le marquis de Thessalonique, Boniface de Monferrat²⁰. Cette démarche était une réponse à la conquête provisoire de la ville, en juin 1205, par le souverain de Prose, Tzuzmène, qui avait profité de l'absence du marquis²¹. Alors, le tzar bulgare, qui avait pris successivement Seres, Ber (Vérea) et *les autres villes soumises au marquis*, au lieu de marcher sur Thessalonique, se dirigea vers Plovdiv où il imposa son pouvoir, soutenu par les Bulgares – popelicans (pauliciens) et combattant la résistance des *romaioi*, menés par Alexis Aspiète. Tout de suite après, le tzar se rendit à Târnovo où il écrasa le complot des traîtres qu'il punit *de peines lourdes et de nouveaux procédés de mise à mort*. C'est à ce moment qu'il décida de changer d'attitude envers ses alliés et de faire aux *romaioi* une guerre meurtrière et implacable *à cause de leur perfidie, trahison et inconséquence*²². La résistance grecque à Plovdiv et le complot de Târnovo furent les premières fissures sérieuses dans la brève alliance bulgare-grecque. Le serment des Grecs de Thrace de reconnaître le tzar bulgare comme leur *basileus* se perdit dans le passé...

Etant informé de la grave défaite des Latins à Andrinople, le pape Innocent III, par la voie diplomatique, essaya de sauver leur empire – en fait son propre enfant – qui brusquement s'était trouvé au seuil de la perdition. Dans sa lettre de juin

¹⁹ VILLEHARDOUIN, 352–388.

²⁰ VILLEHARDOUIN, 389, 392–394; CHONIATES, *Historia*, p. 618–622.

²¹ CHONIATES, *Historia*, p. 619; *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea*, p. 17.

²² CHONIATES, *Historia*, p. 625–628; VILLEHARDOUIN, 399–401.

1205, adressée au tzar Kaloyan, il lui demande de libérer Baudouin et de conclure *une paix réelle et solide* avec les Latins. Il alla jusqu'à le menacer d'une avancée des Hongrois et d'une nombreuse armée de croisés qui bientôt *serait partie des pays occidentaux pour la Grèce*²³. Il est peu probable que les menaces du pape aient troublé le tzar bulgare, ce qui l'aurait mené à faire la paix avec les Grecs.

La campagne militaire bulgare du début de 1206 se caractérise par le pillage des villes et des forteresses en Thrace orientale et la déportation de sa population grecque en Bulgarie. L'aristocratie grecque, renonçant à son alliance avec Kaloyan sous prétexte qu'il ne respecte *aucun accord*, conclut une convention avec les Latins²⁴. Son chef, Théodore Vranas, et son allié, Henri d'Hainaut, qui le 20 août 1206 (après la nouvelle de la mort de Baudouin à Târnovo) fut proclamé empereur, pour la première fois déployèrent une activité anti-bulgare²⁵.

Dans cette situation d'isolement, le tzar Kaloyan fut obligé au début de 1207 de conclure une alliance avec les Grecs de l'Asie mineure unis sous le sceptre du *basileus* de Nicée Théodore I^{er} Lascaris (1204–1222). L'alliance entre le Royaume bulgare et l'Empire de Nicée eut une importance capitale pour la liquidation ultérieure de l'Empire latin²⁶.

Pour arrêter la menace bulgare, lors de leur rencontre à Kypsela en août 1207, l'empereur Henri et le marquis Boniface de Monferrat se mirent d'accord sur l'organisation d'une campagne commune contre la Bulgarie²⁷. Cependant, le 4 septembre 1207, près de Mosynoupolis, le marquis Boniface de Monferrat fut attaqué et tué par les Bulgares de la région. Sa tête coupée fut envoyée au tzar Kaloyan pour qui *c'était une des plus grandes joies qu'il avait éprouvées*²⁸. De cette manière, les Bulgares causèrent la mort des deux représentants les plus éminents de la quatrième croisade. Par ironie de l'histoire, une mois après la mort de Boniface de Monferrat, le tzar Kaloyan fut assassiné par des conjurés devant les murs de Thessalonique. La tradition ecclésiastique attribua sa mort à saint Démètre de Thessalonique²⁹.

En fait, la quatrième croisade, surtout à ses débuts, eut des conséquences très spécifiques et pas entièrement négatives pour le Royaume bulgare. La prise de Constantinople et la mise en place initiale de l'Empire latin se déroulèrent au cours d'une période pendant laquelle ce royaume était en pleine expansion; il cherchait à s'affirmer aussi bien sur le plan balkanique qu'europpéen et était gouverné par

²³ *Преписката на папа Иннокентия III с българите*, p. 69–70.

²⁴ CHONIATES, *Historia*, p. 628; VILLEHARDOUIN, 422–423.

²⁵ VILLEHARDOUIN, 441.

²⁶ VILLEHARDOUIN, 459; V. GJUZELEV, *Bulgarien und Kaiserreich von Nikaia (1204–1261)*, JÖB 26, 1977, p. 145–146.

²⁷ VILLEHARDOUIN, 495–497.

²⁸ VILLEHARDOUIN, 498–499; A. CERUTI, *Un codice del monastero cistercense di Lucedio*, ASI 8, 1881, p. 378, an. 4: *Obiit Bonifacius marchio, fundator huius domus*.

²⁹ В.Н. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *op. cit.*, p. 252–259, 581–587.

l'un des souverain médiévaux les plus remarquables – le tzar Kaloyan. Exclu d'une manière arrogante par les barons latins du partage du territoire byzantin, celui-ci devint l'ennemi acharné de la présence occidentale dans l'espace balkanique et lui porta des coups militaires et politiques irréparables. Il obligea le nouvel empire, dès sa fondation, à prendre une position défensive et contribua largement à la conservation et à la consolidation des restes de l'étatisme byzantin, en particulier de celui de l'Empire de Nicée et du Despotat d'Epire³⁰. Le résultat historique objectif de ses actions contraste avec le jugement grec de cette époque et les appréciations ultérieures. Il reste dans la tradition historique byzantine avec les incursions dévastatrices de ses troupes en Thrace et en Macédoine et avec la déportation d'une population grecque dans les frontières de la Bulgarie. Selon Georges Acropolite (1217–1282) et Théodore Scoutariote (deuxième moitié du XIII^e s.):

Kaloyan se vengeait, comme d'ailleurs il le disait lui-même, des souffrances que l'empereur avait infligées aux Bulgares. Et en déclarant que Basile s'appelait Bulgaroctone, il se nommait lui-même Romaioctone (Ρωμαιοκτόνος)... En effet, jamais, personne d'autre n'a causé autant de mal à la terre grecque, de sorte qu'on lui donnât le surnom de *chien*: tous l'appelaient *Johanes le Chien* (Σκυλοϊωάννης).³¹

Il serait intéressant de noter que dans la mémoire littéraire bulgare, ses victoires contre les Latins occupent une place secondaire. Le patriarche Euthyme (1375–1394) le présente comme le conquérant du Royaume grecque (Γρῦχσκόε царство) *exténué* et comme l'envahisseur *d'une grande partie de la terre grecque* et de ses villes³². De même, dans le *Synodicon* de l'Église bulgare (XIII^e–XIV^e s.) on glorifie sa mémoire pour les *nombreuses victoires contre les Grecs et les Latins* (на Гръкы и Фругы)³³.

Malgré l'union avec l'Église de Rome de 1204, de fait et objectivement, le Royaume bulgare agissait contre l'Empire latin de Constantinople, prenant par là une position de défenseur de l'orthodoxie. Dans la tradition historique bulgare et slave (XIII^e–XIV^e s.) on porta un jugement fort catégorique sur ce fait:

En l'an 6712 [=1204] Constantinople fut pris par les Latins, parce que l'empereur Théodore Lascaris, soit n'y était pas, soit ne pouvait pas leur tenir tête. Mais en ces temps-là, l'Église orthodoxe avait son défenseur – le tzar bulgare... Le Royaume grecque se divisa en deux: toute la Thessalie, l'Illyrie et Thessalonique se trouvaient sous la domination de Théodore Lascaris, tandis qu' à Ponte, Galathie, Bythinie et en Asie régnait Kaloyan Vatatzes, celui qui craignait Dieu.³⁴

³⁰ G. OSTROGORSKY, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*, München 1963, p. 353–354.

³¹ ACROPOLITES, p. 23–24; THEODORUS SCUTARIOTES, *Σύνοψις χρονική*, [in:] C. SATHAS, *Bibliotheca graeca mediæ aevi*, vol. VII, Parisiis 1894, p. 459–460.

³² *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Enthymius (1375–1393)*, nach den besten Handschriften hrsg. von E. KALUŽNIACKI, Wien 1901, p. 56, 95, 197.

³³ И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилев Синодик. Издание и превод*, София 2010 [= ИК], p. 150, 20 – 151, 2.

³⁴ А. ПОПОВ, *Обзор хронографов русской редакции*, vol. I, Москва 1866, p. 190–192; vol. III, Москва 1869, p. 33–34, 36–37, 144–145.

Abstract. The Fourth Crusade and Its Consequences for the Medieval Bulgaria: Kaloyan, the Latins and the Greeks (1204–1207)

The analysis of the Bulgarian-Latin relations between 1204 and 1207, i.e. in the second half of Tsar Kaloyan's reign, leads to conclusions as follows: 1. the Bulgarian monarch played a major role in forcing the newly-created Latin empire to adopt a defensive policy in the political struggles in the Balkan Peninsula; 2. thus, the Tsar contributed to retaining and, in consequence, consolidating the remnants of the Byzantine empire (Nicaea, Epirus-Thessalonica); 3. in the Byzantine memory the actions of Kaloyan were evaluated negatively, as times of plundering the Byzantine territories and relocations of its population into Bulgaria; 4. for the later Bulgarian historiography the Tsar's wars with the Latins were of secondary significance, and despite the official union with the Roman church he was remembered as a defender of the Orthodox faith.

Vassil Gjuzelev
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
1 „15th of November” Str.
1040 Sofia, Bulgaria
byzcongress2011@yahoo.com

Adam Jaroszyński, Anna Kotłowska (Poznań)

EPARCHIKON BIBLION V, 2 IS THALASSAI THE SAME AS BYSSOS?

The *Book of the Prefect* (Τὸ ἐπαρχικὸν βιβλίον) published at the end of the reign of Leo VI (912) is an exceptionally valuable source for the historians of law and all social and economic history researchers. Among its twenty two parts one can find various regulations concerning the functioning of many areas of trade and fields craft and services. Despite the unceasing interest of researchers over the centuries, among the terms used in the source we can now yet find ones whose meaning is still vague and their unequivocal translation and description pose difficulties. Chapters IV–IX of *The Book of the Prefect* discuss the organisation of production and trade of both textiles and clothes. Given the fact that in the area of government's interest has been only the control of those goods that were luxury or have been imported, we can find a particularly rigorous regulations applying to various stages of production and trade of silk manufactures (ch. VII–VIII)¹.

The present text deals with one of these debatable expressions, namely a kind of fabric described as 'θάλασσαι.' This term appears in chapter five, containing guidelines for woolen bands salesmen, and was mentioned among articles of clothing imported from Syria. So far, both editors² and commentators of the document have not been able to satisfactorily answer to the question how this term should be understood. Proposed answers given so far are not profound and therefore were never commonly accepted.

As described in the *Book of the Prefect* certain economical activities of the guilds remain unclear. This remark applies to both – the semantic meaning of the terms used³, and more complex, contextual problems, resulting from

¹ G.B. MANIATIS, *Organization, Market Structure, and Modus Operandi of the Private Silk Industry in the Tenth-Century Byzantium*, DOP 53, 1999, p. 263–332.

² *Das Eparchenbuch Leons der Weisen*, ed. J. Koder, Wien 1991 (= CFHB, 33; cetera: *Das Eparchenbuch*), the Polish translation by Anna Kotłowska with the preface by Kazimierz Ilski (Poznań 2010) has been published recently.

³ E.g. the profession of *bothroi*, has not been thoroughly examined and clarified, see T. Κολιας, Μ. ΧΡΟΝΗ-ΒΑΚΑΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Τὸ ἐπάγγελμα καὶ ἡ ονομασία τῶν βόθρων στὸ Ἐπαρχικὸν βιβλίον τοῦ Λέοντος*

the appearance of previously known terms (predominantly verbs) in an entirely new context⁴.

Within the first category the word *thalassai* can certainly be included; it is used in the second paragraph of the chapter V Περὶ τῶν πρανδιοπρατῶν:

Ἡ εἰσερχομένη πραγματεία τῶν πρανδιοπρατῶν ὀφείλει πᾶσα ἀποτιθεσθαι ἐν ἐνὶ οἴκῳ τῶν μιτάτων, ὥστε πάντας ἐπισυναγομένους ἐπιμερίζεσθαι ταύτην· ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ ἀπὸ Συρίας ἐρχομένη σαρακηνική, εἴτ' ἐσωφόρια εἶεν εἴτε αὐδία καὶ φουφούλια καὶ θάλασσαι. χάμιά τε καὶ ψιλὰ βαγδαδικία μετὰ καὶ τῶν μεστῶν χαμίῶν καὶ βαγδαδικίων.⁵

The newly arrived merchandise belonging to bands, vendors shall be placed entirely in one of the mitatons buildings, so they can be distributed when everyone will gather together, same for the Saracenic merchandises, that have arrived from Syria: whether it would be underwear, cloaks, trousers or thalassai. Also the garments from Baghdad, without lining and long-sleeved along with those with long sleeves, with lining from Baghdad.

Because of the 'marine' origin of the word θάλασσαι the association generated by the Russian editor of the *Book of the Prefect*, Mikhail Sjuzumov⁶ seems natural, though we are of the opinion that this Book's fragment author has not thought of the fabric's color while using it.

Later on numerous authors have made an attempt to ascribe a proper meaning to the term. In a very recent modern Greek edition of the *Book of the Prefect* Taxiarchis Koliias and Maria Chronē tried to explain its meaning (modern Greek: θάλασσες) by referring to common associations with the sea. Although the editors do not quote Sjuzumov, they certainly share his view. On the one hand they refer to the lightness of the cloth, its 'waving;' on the other hand to the color of water, without, however, specifying it⁷.

It appears highly probable that the *Book of Prefect* talks about textile from bys-sos – the so-called sea silk (also: marine wool or marine silk). Both expressions can be found in the literature concerning the subject in interesting texts by Daniel McKinley, Berthold Laufer or Felicitas Maeder, which present the problem from the exceptionally noteworthy perspective of material culture⁸. Recently another

Στ' του Σοφοῦ, EEBΣ 52, 2006, p. 379–390; J. KODER, "Wer ndern eine Grube gräbt..." *Die Bezeichnung βόθρος in „Eparchikon biblion"*, [in:] *Fest und Alltag in Byzanz*, hrsg. G. PRINZING, D. SIMON, München 1990, p. 71–76.

⁴ E.g. what is the actual meaning of a prohibited process of producing 'rough coins' (X, 4: τραχύνων)? See Koder: (...) *die gesammelten (Kupfer-) Münzen aufzurauhen* (?).

⁵ *Das Eparchenbuch*, p. 94 [English translation by the authors of this article].

⁶ М.Я. Сюзюмов, *Византинская книга Эпарха*, Москва 1962, p. 159.

⁷ Τ. Κολιάς, Μ. ΧΡΟΝΗ, *Τὸ ἐπαρχικὸν βιβλίον Λέοντος τοῦ Σοφοῦ*, Αθήνα 2011, p. 111.

⁸ B. LAUFER, *The Story of the Pinna and the Syrian Lamb*, JAF 28(108), 1915, p. 103–128; D. McKinley, *Pinna and Her Silken Beard: a Foray into Historical Misappropriations*, ATe 29, 1998, p. 9–223; the numerous papers written recently by Felicitas MAEDER are mainly prepared in the frame of Projekt Muschelseide on Naturhistorisches Museum Basel (e.g. F. MAEDER, M. HALBEISEN, *Muschelseide: auf der Suche nach einem vergessenen Material*, WK 1, 2001, p. 33–41; F. MAEDER, *Sea-silk in Aquincum: First Pro-*

interesting opinion was expressed by Philip Ditchfield⁹, who in his study on material culture indicates production centers, distribution areas and numerous applications of byssos (*le byssus*) in the Mediterranean world of Late Antiquity and later in the Middle Ages. Unfortunately, in contrary to the assumption made in present article, he has not associated byssos with *θάλασσα*.

Constantine VII Porphyrogenetus, mentions *θάλασσα*¹⁰ among others in *De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae*, in the chapter devoted to ‘sewn robes’ which should be found in the emperor’s vestiarian. The Latin translation used by the editor is not of much help here (direct Latinism only: ‘thalassae’). However, one can conclude from the perspective of the analysis presented below that it is the same kind of luxurious fabrics, or robes made of them, which had been mentioned in Emperor Leo’s edict, and the fibres to manufacture them (the so-called sea silk) which were extracted from the mollusc called *pinna*.

Sea silk had already appeared in another legal source – in the *Edict on Maximum Prices* announced in 301 by Diocletian and his three co-rulers. Three chapters of the tariff, which is considered to be a real mine of information about everyday life of the empire’s inhabitants, mention the word ‘marine’ in relation to the fabric both in original Latin¹¹ and in Greek in which the copy of the edict was made¹². In the chapter XIX of the tariff entitled Περὶ ἐσθῆτος (‘On clothes’)¹³ one can find position 14 [*dalmatic*] *omafortium marinum subsericum ut s(upra)* (‘semi-silk marine dalmaticomafortium’; δελμ[ατικομαφέρτιον] θάλασσιον συνψε[ι]ρικον ευ[–]), which maximum price was 48 000 *denarii*. Position 1a. in chapter XXI, 1 Περὶ λαναρίων¹⁴ (*De lanariis*, ‘About workers in a wool spinning mill’), regulates the maximum rate for 1 libra of goods on the level of 40 *denarii* for a spinner working with wool from *Mutina* or marine wool

duction Proof in Antiquity, [in:] *Vestidos, Textiles y Tintes. Estudios sobre la producción de bienes de consumo en la Antigüedad. Actas del II Symposium Internacional sobre Textiles y Tintes del Mediterráneo en el mundo antiguo (Athenas, 24 al 26 de noviembre 2005)*, ed. C. ALFARO, L. KARALI, València 2008, p. 109–118 [*Purpureae Vestes: II Symposium Internacional*]; EADEM, *Die Edle Steckmuschel und ihr Faserbart: Eine kleine Kulturgeschichte der Muschelseide*, MNGB 11, 2009, p. 15–26; the complete list is to be found on the e-site of the project: <http://www.muschelseide.ch/en/bibliographie/Projektpublikationen.html>; also in collaboration with other authors: *Muschelseide – Goldene Fäden vom Meeresgrund / Bisso marino – Fili d’oro dal fondo del mare (Ausstellungskatalog)*, ed. F. MAEDER, A. HÄNGGI, D. WUNDERLIN, Milano 2004, with the texts by Daniela Lunghi, Felicitas Maeder, Tihana Šilietić, Gerolama Carta Mantiglia, Sergio Flore, Lucia D’Ippolito, Dominik Wunderlin).

⁹ P. DITCHFIELD, *La culture matérielle médiévale: L’Italie méridionale byzantine et normande*, Rome 2007, p. 425–427 [=Collection de l’École française de Rome, 373]; a noteworthy bibliography on the subject.

¹⁰ *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*, rec. I.I. REISKE, vol. I, Bonnae 1829, p. 470, 6–7 = 471, 5.

¹¹ For the official language of the tariff see the commentary of J. PROSTKO-PROSTYŃSKI, [rec.:] *A. and P. Barańscy, P. Janiszewski, Edictum Diocletiani de pretiis rerum venalium. Poznań 2007 – SŽ 47*, 2010, p. 289.

¹² For the remarks related to the edict, the edition by Marta Giacchero was used: *Edictum Diocletiani et Collegarum de Pretiis Rerum Venalium*, ed. M. GIACCHERO, Genoa 1974 (cetera: *Edictum Diocletiani*).

¹³ The title of this chapter is known only in the Greek version, *Edictum Diocletiani*, p. 174–175.

¹⁴ *Edictum Diocletiani*, p. 180–181.

(...). In the Latin version of the tariff the entry is as follows: *lanario in lana Mutinensi vel marina pasto in po(ndo) unum*; in the Greek version it is *λαναριῶ ἔργαζομένῳ Μουτουνήσια ἢ θάλασσια τρεφομένῳ*. Chapter XXV, 1 Περὶ ἐραίας (*De lanis*, 'About kinds of wool')¹⁵ in point 3 determines the price of 400 *denarii* for one *libra* of *marine wool* (Lat. *lanae marinae*, Gr. ἐραίας θαλασσίας). This price shall be considered as of very high level, especially given the prices of other kinds of wool, as e.g. one *libra* of common, not 'brand' wool, has a stable price of 25 *denarii*. These kinds of wool which origin determines their price are valued more highly, but not as much as marine wool which is the topic of the present article. For instance, the wool from Asturias cannot be sold at a price higher than 100 *denarii*, the wool from Tarent – 175 *denarii*, and the wool from Altinum – 200 *denarii*. Of the group of 'brand' kinds of wool it was the 'washed' wool from Mutina that maintained the highest value – its maximum price for one *libra* was 300 *denarii*. We do not possess, however, any information concerning the price occurring in the same chapter in point 10. The Latin version contains *lana marina*, again – unfortunately the remaining part of this entry has not been yet rediscovered. In the Greek copy one can read about an unknown price for ἐρέας θαλασσίας νωτιαίας. The attribute 'dorsal' seems rather doubtful, and it is vague.

The common meaning of this adjective, which can be found in Greek lexicography, does not appear adequate in this situation¹⁶. While preparing the present text we did not manage to find a convincing explanation of this word. It is significant, however, that the material described in Diocletian's edict as 'marine wool' can be definitely considered a kind of fabric made from fibres produced by *pinna nobilis*, mollusc allowing it to attach to rocks. Such hypothesis expressed by Hugo Blümner in 1893¹⁷ was confirmed by Joyce Reynolds who participated in the excavations in Aphrodisias in Caria (which resulted in the discovery of substantial fragments of the tariff)¹⁸. John Haldon has captured very similar associations between *θάλασσαι* and *byssos*: (...) *the term [θάλασσαι – A.J./A.K.] may refer to garments*

¹⁵ *Edictum Diocletiani*, p. 184–185.

¹⁶ Δ. ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑΚΟΣ (*Μέγα Λεξικόν Ὁλης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης*, vol. VII, Ἀθήναι 1953, p. 3293 and vol. X, p. 4954); Ε. ΚΡΙΑΡΑΣ, *Λεξικό τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς ἑλληνικῆς δημόδου γραμματείας 1100–1669*, vol. VI, Θεσσαλονίκη 1980, p. 72 sq and vol. XI, Θεσσαλονίκη 1990, p. 318–319 (*Που ἀνήκει ἢ ἀναφέρεται στα νώτια ἐκφρ. τα νώτια μέρη = τα οπίσθια*).

¹⁷ *Der Maximaltarif des Diocletian*, ed. T. MOMMSEN, H. Blümner, Berlin 1893 (repr. 1958), p. 159: *Und da darf man denn daran erinnern, dass in jener Zeit (und noch bis in die Neuzeit hinein) die Faserbüschel der im mittelländischen Meere heimischen Steckmuschel (pinna nobilis, auch bei den Alten pinna genant) zu Geweben verarbeitet...*

¹⁸ J. REYNOLDS, *Diocletian's Edict on Maximum Prices. The Chapter on Wool*, ZPE 42, 1981, p. 283: *marine wool is convincingly identified with the fibres by which the mollusc pinna nobilis attaches itself to rocks (...)*. B. Laufer (*op. cit.*, esp. p. 107 and 117) supposes that the beginnings of the production of marine wool from fibres produced by molluscs should be traced back to the Hellenic world, probably to pearl-divers and tradesmen. It is worth mentioning that the authors of works on the history of textiles mention *byssos* as the Golden Fleece for which Jason and his Argonauts set out on their quest. We do not aim at any detailed discussion of these views; our point is to indicate the presence of this fabric in many ancient sources.

of “sea-wool” (...) manufactured from the byssal threads produced by the marine mollusc *pinna nobilis*, the fan-mussel, which had a particularly lustrous appearance¹⁹. Unfortunately however, this brief indication has never been supported by reliable sources.

The identification: *sea silk-byssos-pinna* leads us to the assumption that the noun found in the *Book of the Prefect* is a term to describe an article which was made of the abovementioned wool.

Let us examine the sources of greatest relevance to the subject. It appears that in the common understanding of the ancient, the molluscs were characterized by specific behaviours. Aristophanes in *The Wasps*²⁰:

ὁ πινοτήρης οὐτός ἐστι τοῦ γένους,
ὁ μικρότατος, δὲ τὴν τραγωδίαν ποιεῖ.
It's a crab [i.e. Pinoterēs], —a hermit-crab,
the smallest of its kind; it writes tragedies.²¹

Pinoterēs is our small crab living next to *pinna*, as Cicero will write below. The comical effect is twofold: a) the head of the talented family is Karkinos (the authentic name) which means Crab; b) Pinoterēs behaves like an animal whose name he bears, i.e. he preys on others. The following conclusion can be made: if Aristophanes used this wordplay in a comedy on stage, our molluscs must have been commonly known, otherwise the joke would not have been understood.

Marcus Tullius Cicero, in his two moral treatises, wonders, among other things, on the essence of altruism, making an attempt to find it also in the world of animals. He gives the example of collaboration between *pinna* and small crabs (or small crayfish). In *De finibus bonorum et malorum*:

Thus certain big animals are born for each other, as the one in a broad shell which is called *pina* and the one that goes out of the shell to protect it and is called *pinoterēs*; when it comes back to it, the shell closes as if it has been warned by it...²²

In *De natura deorum* Cicero says:

Pina (as it is called in Greek), consisting of two big shells along with a small crayfish, constitutes a kind of collaboration in gaining food. When small fish get into an open shell, *pina*, alarmed by the pinch of a small crayfish, closes the shell: that is how different animals gain food.²³

¹⁹ J. HALDON, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Three treatises on imperial military expeditions*, Wien 1990 [= CFHB, 28], p. 222–223.

²⁰ ARISTOPHANES, *Wasps*, v. 1510–1511, ed. et trans. D.M. MACDOWELL, Oxford 1971.

²¹ *The Complete Greek Drama*, trans. E. O'NEILL, vol. II, New York 1938, p. 660.

²² MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO, *De finibus*, III, 63, 7–11: *...sic inmanes quaedam bestiae sibi solum natae sunt, at illa, quae in concha patula pina dicitur, isque, qui enat e concha, qui, quod eam custodit, pinoterēs vocatur in eandemque cum se recepit includitur, ut videatur monuisse ut caveret...*

²³ MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO, *De natura deorum*, II, 123, 10 – 124, 1: *pina vero [sic enim Graece dicitur] duabus grandibus patula conchis cum parva squilla quasi societatem coit comparandi cibi; itaque cum pisciculi parvi in concham hiantem innataverunt, tum admonita <a> squilla pina morsu comprimit conchas: sic dissimillimis bestiis communiter cibus quaeritur.*

The luxurious character of marine wool confirmed in Diocletian's edict had been afterwards noticed for instance by Pliny who in *Historia Naturalis* writes about the inhabitants of Achaëa making the fabric called *byssinus*: *the most similar to byssinus, is appreciated mostly by women and it is made near Elis in Achaëa; I know that 1 gram [1/24 ounce] of it is sold for four times more denarii than [implicitly 1 gram] of gold*²⁴. Also Herodotus describing the most costly process of mummification notices that the Egyptians *conceal the body for seventy days, embalmed in saltpetter (...) and when the seventy days have passed, they wash the body*²⁵ and wrap the body in bandages made of byssos²⁶. Editors of *Le dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, published in the 1887, but to some extent still relevant, emphasized the use of byssos in the Egyptian mummification process²⁷; however, differently than above, they wrongly identified byssos with linen²⁸. Regarding the sources mentioned above we cannot share this opinion. There is a clear evidence of byssos being treated separately by the Egyptians. Moreover, the manufacturing process of these fabrics was also diversified by-law. A papyrus of Tebtunis records a decree of Ptolemy VIII, Cleopatra II and Cleopatra III of 118 B.C. with cloth-weavers (τοῖς λινύφοις), byssos-makers (βυσσοουργοῖς) and robe-weavers (πλεπούφοις) as separate professions²⁹. The fact that this fabric maintained its value in ritual practices is acknowledged by Plutarch:

Then the priests perform other sad ceremonies and having covered a gold-plated cow with a mourning³⁰ robe made of byssos, they exhibit it as the suffering of the goddess (since they consider the cow as the image of Isis and Earth)...³¹

²⁴ *Plinii naturalis historiae libri XXXVII*, XIX, 20, 6–7, ed. H. RACKHAM, W.H.S. JONES, D.E. EICHHOLZ, London 1940: *proximus byssino, mulierum maxime deliciis circa Elim in Achaia genito; quaternis denariis scripula eius permutata quondam ut auri reperio.*

²⁵ HERODOTUS, *Histories*, II, 86, 20–23, trans. A.D. GODLEY, London 1920 (cetera: HERODOTUS): Ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ταριχεύουσι λίτρω κρύψαντες ἡμέρας ἑβδομήκοντα. πλεόνας δὲ τούτων οὐκ ἔξεστι ταριχεύειν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ παρέλθωσι αἱ ἑβδομήκοντα, λούσαντες τὸν νεκρὸν...

²⁶ HERODOTUS, II, 86, 23–24: ...κατελίθουσι πᾶν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα σινδόνης βυσσίνης τελαμῶσι κατατετημένοισι... A.D. Godley uses the term *fine linen cloth* instead of *byssos* or *byssinus*.

²⁷ *Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines*, ed. CH. DAREMBERG, E. SAGLIO, Paris 1887, p. 756: *Le passage le plus remarquable est celui où Hérodote dit qu'on enveloppait les momies dans des bandages de byssus.*

²⁸ *L. cit.:* *on a cru longtemps que la matière de ces bandages était du coton, mais les dernières recherches et les études microscopiques tendent à prouver que c'est du lin.*

²⁹ P.Tebt. 1, 5, l. 248–251, <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.tebt;1;5> [28 VII 2013].

³⁰ Literally 'black', but we have decided the metaphorical meaning will be more appropriate here. Otherwise one should assume that byssos was dyed black, which is not confirmed by any available sources. Such hypothesis would also contradict the cited Byzantine sources full of admiration for the natural colour of byssos.

³¹ *Plutarch's „De Iside et Osiride”*, 39 (= 366 E), ed. et trans. J.G. GRIFFITHS, Cardiff 1970: οἱ <τότε δ'> ἱερεῖς ἄλλα τε δρῶσι σκυθρωπὰ καὶ βοῦν διάχρυσον ἱματίω μέλανι βυσσίνῳ περιβάλλοντες ἐπὶ πένθει τῆς θεοῦ δεκνύουσι (βοῦν γάρ Ἰσίδος εἰκόνα καὶ γῆς νομίζουσιν).

Byssos³² is also mentioned on one of the most widely known artifacts, the famous Rosetta Stone. It is the decree from 196 B.C. containing information about the benefits conferred on priests by Ptolemy V. In its Greek version one can read that the pharaoh lowered the tax in cloth made of byssos by two parts: *βυσσίνων ὀθονίων ἀπέλυσεν τὰ δύο μέρη*³³. The next fragment coming from the same source contains the information that the ruler *returned the temples the debts which went to the royal treasury up to the eighth year [of the rule], in big amounts of corn and silver; similarly byssos cloth was not sent to the royal treasury*³⁴.

In *De aedificiis* Procopius wrote: *chlamis is made of wool, but not the one that comes from sheeps, it is the wool gathered from the sea. The animals from which this wool is born are customarily called pinnoi*.³⁵ Tertullian confirms the marine origin of the wool: *It is not enough to sew and sow for a tunic if one does not gain the garment by diving. Since this wool [comes from] the sea*³⁶, *being surrounded by slimy shells, flatter than others because of their wooliness*.³⁷

Basil of Caesarea admires sea silk ('marine wool') in one of his homilies, apparently lending credence to our definition: *What is the way in which pinnai give*

³² The essential information and sources are found in RE, vol. III.1, Stutgardiae 1897, col. 1108–1114. The article and the following updates do not associate, however, byssos with the sea-wool. Consecutive shorter versions of RE do not bring any new thoughts in this matter. *Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike*, ed. K. ZIEGLER, W. SONTHEIMER, München 1979, p. 978–979 (H. GAMS):

Byssos (βύσσος) bezeichnet verschiedene pflanzliche und tierische Fasern, βύσσινος, βύσσινον πέπλωμα usw. Aus solchen gefertigte Gewebe und Kleidungsstücke, in erster Linie wohl aus den Stängelfasern von Linnen (λίνον, Lein, Flachs), später (anscheinend schon bei Hdt) auch aus den Samenhaaren der Baumwolle (s.d.) nach Heldreich vielleicht auch denen der aus Africa eingebürgerten Aslepiadacee Gomphocarpus Fructicosus; ferner auch strangförmige Pilze und Fleischen. Kaum junger als die Bezeichnung für Leinfasern dürfte die für die bis nannte Byssos genannten Haftfasern festsitzender Meermuscheln, besonders der im Mittelmeer verbreiteten Pinna nobilis sein, aus dere 3–8 cm langen Fasern seit dem Altertum Stricke, Strümpfe, Handschuhe u.a. hergestellt werden. Byssolith is das fasrige Gestein Asbest;

Der Neue Pauly, vol. II, p. 866 (C. HÜNENÖRDER) underlines its Durchsichtigkeit: *Byssos (βύσσος). Pflanzliche und tierische Fasern, die in weitgehend durchsichtigen bewändern (βύσσινος, βύσσινον πέπλωμα) verarbeitet wurden.*

³³ *Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae*, ed. W. DITTENBERGER, Lipsiae 1903 [repr. Hildesheim 1986; cetera: *Orientis Graeci inscriptiones*], 90 A, p. 153.

³⁴ *Orientis Graeci inscriptiones*, 90, p. 158: ἀφῆκεν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐ[ν] τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὀφειλόμενα εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν ἕως τοῦ ὀγδοῦ ἔτους, ὄντα εἰς σίτου καὶ ἀργυρίου πλήθος οὐκ εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν βυσσίνων ὀθ[ονί]ων.

³⁵ PROCOPIUS, *De aedificiis*, III, 1, 19–20, [in:] *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*, rec. G. WIRTH (post J. HAURY), vol. IV, Leipzig 1964: *χλαμὺς ἢ ἐξ ἐρίων πεποιημένη, οὐχ οἶα τῶν προβατίων ἐκπέφυκεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ θαλάσσης συνειλεγμένων. πίννουσ τὰ ζῶα καλεῖν νενομίκασιν, ἐν οἷς ἢ τῶν ἐρίων ἐκφυσις γίνεται* (if not stated otherwise, all the translations are by the authors of the present paper).

³⁶ 'The wool from the sea' also appears in Alciphron's letters – *Alciphronis Rhetoris Epistularum libri IV*, I, 2, 3, ed. M.A. SCHEPERS, Groningae 1901: τὰ ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἔρια.

³⁷ TERTULLIANUS, *De pallio*, 3, [in:] IDEM, *Opera*, vol. II, *Opera montanistica*, ed. A. GERLO, E. EVANS, A. HARNACK, Turnhout 1954 [= CCSL, 2]: *Nec fuit satis tunicam pangere et serere, ni etiam piscari vestitum contigisset: nam et de mari vellera, quo mucosae lanusitatis plautiores conchae comant.*

*birth to golden wool, which no dyer has been able to imitate up to this day?*³⁸ This fact also astonished later Byzantine erudites, since John of Damascus, for instance, quotes the above fragment in his collection of noteworthy information in the 8th cent.³⁹

In order to summarize, having regarded and equally respected all the opinions presented above, in our view it is fair to conclude that both terms apply to almost the same fabric. We therefore believe that *θάλασσα* is a manufacture fabricated from byssos ('sea silk', 'marine wool') and imported from Syria as luxurious commodity. However, at the turn of centuries they were occasionally used in different contexts, which may and probably was the reason for misunderstandings and confusions. First of them was used extremely rarely, while the others were of great popularity, both in Greek and Latin sources.

Abstract. The article examines a kind of fabric described as '*θάλασσα*' in *The Book of the Prefect* (*Τὸ ἐπαρχικὸν βιβλίον*). The meaning of this term by both editors and commentators of the document has not been satisfactorily explained so far. It appears highly probable, however, that '*θάλασσα*', because of the 'marine' origin of the word, can be associated with a textile from byssos – the so-called sea silk, made from fibres produced by a mollusc *pinna nobilis*. The presence of this fabric in numerous ancient sources is indicated, incl. works of Aristophanes, Cicero, Herodotus and Plutarch. *Diocletian's Edict on Maximum Prices*, where the price of 'marine wool' is at the very high level is also investigated.

Adam Jaroszyński

Pracownia Historii Bizancjum

Wydział Historyczny

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

ul. Św. Marcin 78

61–809 Poznań, Polska

adamjar@amu.edu.pl

Anna Kotłowska

Pracownia Historii Bizancjum

Wydział Historyczny

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

ul. Św. Marcin 78

61–809 Poznań, Polska

anna_kotlowska@wp.pl

³⁸ BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Homilia VII in Haexaemeron*, 6, [in:] *PG*, vol. XXIX, col. 161A: Πόθεν τὸ χρυσοῦν ἔριον αἱ πίνναι τρέφουσιν, ὅπερ οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνθοβαφῶν μέχρι νῦν ἐμμήσατο.

³⁹ IOANNES DAMASCENUS, *Sacra Parallela*, [in:] *PG*, vol. XCVI, col. 205B.

Maciej Kokoszko, Krzysztof Jagusiak, Zofia Rzeźnicka (Łódź)

RICE AS A FOODSTUFF IN ANCIENT AND BYZANTINE *MATERIA MEDICA*¹

1. A brief history of rice in the Mediterranean in Antiquity and Byzantium

Rice (*Oryza* L.) is a genus of plants belonging to the Poaceae family (*Poaceae* Barnh.), previously called grasses (*Gramineae* Juss.). The genus includes more than twenty species grouped in the tribe Oryzaceae. Two of these, *Oryza sativa* L. (Asian rice) and *Oryza glaberrima* Steud. (African rice), have been domesticated by man². In the present article we will concern ourselves with the former, since it was the only species known to inhabitants of the Mediterranean world in the researched period.

The domestication of wild rice was a long-lasting process, which took place independently at a number of locations in the eastern part of the Indian Subcontinent and South-East Asia, in specially suited – in terms of geographical conditions – valleys and the deltas of large rivers, such as the Ganges, Brahmaputra, Irrawaddy, Yangtze, or Mekong³. The inhabitants of these areas sowed fields with rice as early as between the 6th and 5th millennium B.C.⁴, soon making it the staple of their daily diet. With the passage of time, the borders of lands allocated for growing rice

¹ The article has been written in connection with grant 2011/01/BHS3/01020.

² P. SOBCZYK, *Uprawa ryżu*, Warszawa 1952, p. 7; T.T. CHANG, *Rice*, [in:] *The Cambridge World History of Food*, vol. I, ed. K.F. KIPLE, K.C. ORNELAS, Cambridge 2000, p. 133; M. SWEENEY, S. MCCOUCH, *The Complex History of the Domestication of Rice*, AoB 100, 2007, p. 951.

³ J. LI, *Rice*, [in:] *Encyclopaedia of food and culture*, vol. III, ed. S.H. KATZ, W.W. WEAVER, New York 2003, p. 194. On the role of the territories on the Yangtze in rice domestication cf. F. PARASECOLI, *World developments*, [in:] *A cultural history of food in Antiquity*, ed. P. ERDKAMB, London–New York 2012, p. 186.

⁴ C. HIGHAM, T.L.-D. LU, *The origins and dispersal of rice cultivation*, An 72, 1998, p. 867–877; J. LI, *op. cit.*, p. 194; T.T. CHANG, *op. cit.*, p. 134; M. SWEENEY, S. MCCOUCH, *op. cit.*, p. 953; M. TOUSSAINT-SAMAT, *Histoire de la nourriture naturelle et morale*, Paris 1997, p. 173, 198–213. Although there exist archaeological findings which suggest that rice was used by the inhabitants of Asia as early as 12 thousand years B.C., but there is no clear-cut evidence as whether the crop was wild or domesticated.

expanded in every direction, both as a result of climatic change, which was favourable to rice, and because of the improvement of cultivation methods⁵.

For the purposes of the present article, we will focus our attention on the expansion of rice towards the western part of the world. In the Indus Valley, it was known and in all probability cultivated circa 2000 B.C.⁶ Next, following the conquest of a cornucopia of Indian kingdoms existing in this area by the Achaemenid monarchy towards the end of the 5th cent. B.C., rice became known to the inhabitants of a considerable part of the Persian Empire⁷. In all certainty, it was through their proxy that the plant reached the Greeks, who in the 5th cent. B.C. by the latest included it in their myth telling of how the goddess Demeter and Triptolemus offered mankind corn, as is indicated, for instance, in one of Sophocles' works⁸.

It would, however, be wrong to state that the appearance of the said species exerted a considerable impact on the dietary customs of the Hellenes⁹ and representatives of the western satrapies of Persia, or that considerable acreage was allocated to its cultivation. On the contrary, it should be said that rice was not adopted in the Mediterranean Basin on a wide scale, and until the times of Alexander the Great its cultivation did not reach further than the borderland of Babylonia and Khuzestan (actually, sources tell us that this crop was grown in the latter region)¹⁰. The two main reasons for this state of affairs would be the Mediterranean climate, which rendered the vegetation of rice difficult, and the specificity of local agriculture, which was reluctant to make use of complicated artificial irrigation systems, instead preferring cereal crops that did not require constant watering¹¹.

It is commonly assumed that the Greek world encountered the wide-scale cultivation of rice, and showed an interest in a more widespread use of the crop

⁵ The stages in which acreage allocated to the cultivation of rice developed have been discussed by Z. HUANG (*On the origin of rice agriculture in Southern China and its propagation in East Asia*, CGS 4.4, 1994, p. 289–294) and J. LI (*op. cit.*, p. 194), focusing primarily on the areas of South-East Asia and Western Africa.

⁶ A. DALBY, *Food in the ancient world from A to Z*, London–New York 2003, p. 281; G.L. POSSEHL, *Indus Valley*, [in:] *Encyclopaedia of food...*, vol. II, New York 2003, p. 266; J. MCINTOSCH, *The ancient Indus Valley: New perspectives*, Santa Barbara 2008, p. 113.

⁷ T.T. CHANG (*op. cit.*, p. 139) is of a different opinion, stating that rice reached the Middle East as early as ca. 1000 B.C., but he does not explain the details of this process.

⁸ M. WILKINS, S. HILL, *Food in the Ancient World*, Oxford 2006, p. 33, 132. According to a myth, rice came to Greece from Asia Minor, and this would correspond to the road by which the crop actually reached Europe from the east. SOPHOCLES in his work entitled *Triptolemus* (fr. 609, 1, [in:] *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, ed. S. RADT, vol. IV, Göttingen 1977) mentions *orindes artos*, namely – as ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS explains (*Athenaei Naucratisae dipnosophistarum libri XV*, III, 110e [75, 31 KAIBEL], rec. G. KAIBEL, vol. I–III, Lipsiae–Berolini 1887–1890 [cetera: ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*]) – a bread baked from rice or Ethiopian sesame seeds.

⁹ P. GARNSEY, *Food and society in classical Antiquity*, Cambridge 1999, p. 18–19.

¹⁰ A. DALBY, *op. cit.*, p. 281; Maguelone TOUSSAINT-SAMAT (*op. cit.*, p. 209) precises the date of relative popularity of rice in the region's agriculture as circa the 6th cent. B.C.

¹¹ R.J. FORBES, *Studies in ancient technology*, vol. III, Leiden 1965, p. 90.

(however still treating it as a botanical and agricultural novelty) only from the time of Alexander the Great's invasion of Persia, i.e. 330/320 B.C. There is also the commonly held view that it was the Hellenic Period that brought about the dispersal of the discussed Far Eastern cereal crop throughout Babylonia, southern Syria and northern Africa, in which regions it was observed, among others, by Aristobulus, who was later cited by Strabo¹². Nevertheless, it continued to occupy a marginal position in the menu of inhabitants of the Mediterranean Basin, and this state of affairs remained unchanged when the Mediterranean was under the sway of the Romans¹³. In the Roman period, although rice was mentioned by authors such as Horace¹⁴, moreover, listed in medical and gastronomic treatises¹⁵, and even sighted in areas so untypical for the cereal as 6th cent. post-Roman Gaul, it was noted that the product was used only sporadically as a prescription medicine, and viewed as an exotic (imported) delicacy, or as a regional – and not to be trusted – culinary ingredient, and therefore, with all certainty, one can conclude that it did not constitute a significant element of the daily diet¹⁶.

¹² *Strabonis geographica*, XV, I, 18–27; XVII, 3, 23, 12–14, ed. A. MEINEKE, vol. I–III, Graz 1969 (cetera: STRABO, *Geographica*). Unfortunately, Strabo's relation does not precise the part of Northern Africa in question. This shortcoming is all the more acute, as Egypt, seemingly obvious in this context, with its natural conditions ideal for the cultivation of rice, was aware of this Far Eastern cereal at most as a rare product imported in small quantities from Asia, cf. D. BROTHWELL, P. BROTHWELL, *Food in antiquity. A survey of the diet of early peoples*, Norwich 1969, p. 102. Concerning a summary of the history of rice in the Greek world, cf. N. MARINONE, *Il riso nell'antichità greca*, Bologna 1992, p. 15–24.

¹³ R. OWEN, *Rice*, [in:] *The Oxford companion to food*, ed. A. DAVIDSON, Oxford 1999, p. 663.

¹⁴ The poet mentions the term *tisanarium oryzae*. Thus, he is writing about a sort of soup made from rice and modelled after a famous dish with therapeutical properties, namely the *πιτσάνη (ptisánel tisana)*, cf. hereunder – HORACE, *Satirae*, II, 3, 155, [in:] IDEM, *Satires*, trans. F. VILLNEUVE, Paris 1958. Cf. A. DALBY, *Empire of pleasures. Luxury and indulgence in the Roman world*, London–New York 2000, p. 122, 197. In his works, Horace rather frequently introduces gastronomic threads – C.J. CLASSEN, *Horace – A cook?*, CQ 72, 1978, p. 333–348. As a matter of fact, such references are not a feature solely of his output, cf. E. GOWERS, *The loaded table. Representation of food in Roman literature*, Oxford 1993, *passim*, in particular 126–179, 280–310; N.A. HUDSON, *Food in Roman satire*, [in:] *Satire and society in ancient Rome*, ed. S.H. BRAUND, Exeter 1989, p. 69–87.

¹⁵ As regards the information contained in these two types of texts, cf. hereunder in the present article.

¹⁶ The staples were first and foremost grain and legumes. On their role in Antiquity cf. T. BRAUN, *Barley cakes and emmer bread*, [in:] *Food in Antiquity*, ed. J. WILKINS, D. HARVEY, M. DOBSON, Exeter 1995, p. 25; A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 162–163, 194; K.B. FLINT-HAMILTON, *Legumes in ancient Greece and Rome: food, medicine, or poison?*, *He* 68, 1999, p. 371–385; P. GARNSEY, *Food and society...*, p. 15, 119–121; P. HALSTEAD, *Food production*, [in:] *A cultural history of food...*, p. 21–39, esp. 24–27, etc. There was no deviation from the pattern throughout the Byzantine period under discussion. Cf. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, *Pallikaria of lentils. The "brave boys" of beans*, [in:] *Flavours and delights. Tastes and pleasures of ancient and Byzantine cuisine*, ed. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, Athens 2013, p. 133–137, esp. 136; J.-C. CHEYNET, *La valeur marchande des produits alimentaires dans l'Empire byzantin*, [in:] *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, p. 35–39; E. KISLINGER, *Les chrétiens d'Orient: règles et*

We do not possess precise data that would confirm an increase in the volume of rice crops in the first centuries of the Roman Empire, or in the late Roman / early Byzantine period. It would appear that during this time in the Mediterranean Basin rice was in the main an import from the East. Only the spectacular conquests of the Arabs, starting from the 7th cent., and the developments connected therewith, such as the movement of peoples resulting in an exchange of experience, led to the successful and permanent introduction of new types of plants (including rice) in lands taken over from the Byzantines (under the phenomenon of the so-called 'Arabic agricultural revolution'), and to a favourable change in the approach to such, previously exotic, types of food¹⁷. In consequence, the intensity and relative ease of communication, as well as cultural unification, which were inherent features of the Arab world, contributed not only to the spread of rice farming, but also to the adoption in the Mediterranean world of sorghum, sugar cane (and therefore sugar), banana trees and other cultivated plants, which – originating from countries with a hot climate – were present on lands that the Arabs had conquered or with which they traded¹⁸.

It may be that this popularisation of rice was somehow impacted by the Arabs' conviction – adopted from the Greeks – that it had therapeutic properties¹⁹. It should be stressed, as Bernard Rosenberger has emphasised, that the Greek tradition of treating foods as a necessary element of the process of maintaining or restoring health was adopted by Arabic medicine together with the output of the most important physicians of the Greek-Roman cultural circle²⁰. Thus, it should be assumed that under the impact of the medical theory of the Greeks and as a result

réalités alimentaires dans le monde byzantin, [in:] *Histoire de l'alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 327–332, 337–340; J. KODER, *Stew and salted meat – opulent normality in the diet of every day?*, [in:] *Eat, drink and be merry (Luke 12:19). Food and wine in Byzantium. In honour of Professor A.A.M. Bryer*, ed. L. BRUBAKER, K. LINARDOU, Aldershot 2007, s. 65–66, 72; IDEM, *Everyday food in the middle Byzantine period*, [in:] *Flavours and delights...*, p. 139–155, esp. 142–145; M. KOKOSZKO, T. WOLIŃSKA, *Zaopatrzenie Konstantynopola w żywność*, [in:] *Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym. Miasto i ludzie w okresie wczesnobizantyjskim*, ed. M. J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, Warszawa 2011, p. 462; M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki Konstantynopola*, [in:] *Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym...*, p. 474–487, esp. 474; M. KOKOSZKO, K. JAGUSIAK, *Zboża Bizancjum. Kilka uwag na temat roli produktów zbożowych na podstawie źródeł greckich*, ZW 17, 2012, p. 19; M. KOKOSZKO, Ł. ERLICH, *Rola roślin strączkowych (ospria) w diecie późnego antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (IV–VII w.) na podstawie wybranych źródeł*, ZW 17, 2012, p. 8–18; Φ. ΚΟΥΚΟΥΛΕΣ, *Βυζαντινών βίος και πολιτισμός*, vol. V, 'Αι τροφαι και τα ποτα...', Αθήνα 1952, p. 12–35, etc.

¹⁷ P.B. LEWICKA, *Food and foodways of medieval Cairenes. Aspects of life in an Islamic metropolis of the Eastern Mediterranean*, Leiden–Boston 2011, p. 68, 72. As regards the role of Arabs in the dispersal of rice, cf. J. WILKINS, S. HILL, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

¹⁸ B. ROSENBERGER, *La cuisine arabe et son apport à la cuisine européenne*, [in:] *Histoire de l'alimentation...*, p. 347–348.

¹⁹ Cf. below.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 352; B. LAURIOUX, *Cuisines médiévales (XIV^e et XV^e siècles)*, [in:] *Histoire de l'alimentation...*, p. 473.

of the borrowing of Mediterranean culinary customs, the cuisine of the Arabic cultural circle accommodated at least some of the culinary recipes known in antiquity, which were also present – as will be shown in the present study – in the Byzantine dietary tradition, for example boiling rice in milk²¹, preparing it in meat broths, or using the product as a thickening ingredient²². For this reason, the cereal – although still relatively rare and expensive, but now produced locally (and therefore not as costly an import as before) – became a permanent fixture of tables of the Abbasids, who ruled the former Persian lands and dictated the culinary standards of the time. Gastronomic tradition (both Arabic and European) contains information about a dish called *mamunia/mamonia/ma'mounia/ma'mūniyya*, which is closely connected with the aforementioned dynasty. The term (used to denote a dish of rice in milk, sweetened with sugar and aromatised by the addition of almonds) was to take its name from one of the Abbasid rulers, namely Al-Ma'mun, who reigned between 813 and 833²³. It is worth adding that the city of Baghdad, which functioned as the dynasty's capital since 762, was located on lands where rice had been known and cultivated from ancient times. We may also add that the cultivation of rice also gained importance, albeit limited, in Egypt under Arabic (and subsequently Turkish) rule²⁴. In all probability, here too the development of its cultivation was in a way the natural consequence of the introduction of this cereal to the Nile valley as far back as in antiquity. Furthermore, it is commonly accepted that the Arabs were also responsible for popularising the cultivation of rice in southern Europe²⁵, for they acclimatised it in Sicily and Spain, namely two of their conquests²⁶.

In scholarly literature there is an undisputed opinion that rice played a limited role in the diet of early and middle Byzantium. This thesis is supported by Andrew

²¹ B. ROSENBERGER, *op. cit.*, p. 352, 358, 363. Regarding the boiling of rice in milk in order to improve the latter, cf. below.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 354, 357.

²³ P.B. LEWICKA, *op. cit.*, p. 147; L. MANSON, *Ma'mounia*, [in:] *Oxford companion...*, p. 474; B. ROSENBERGER, *op. cit.*, p. 348. This dessert later became popular in Europe, cf. B. LAURIOUX, *op. cit.*, p. 473. Concerning Arabic terminology in Medieval European cuisine, cf. M. RODINSON, *Romania et autres mots en arabe en italien*, Rom 71, 1950, p. 433–449. It may be that an analogous dish was subsequently popular in Provence, and we do have information that it was eaten by the king of France, Louis the Saint (1226–1270), cf. M. TOUSSAINT-SAMAT, *op. cit.*, p. 209–210.

²⁴ A. MIKHAIL, *Nature and empire in Ottoman Egypt. An environmental history*, Cambridge 2011, p. 54–55, in particular an. 45. Paulina LEWICKA (*op. cit.*, p. 140) stated, however, that this conviction is not confirmed by archaeological data until the 10th cent.

²⁵ Its cultivation was introduced to the Po valley only in the 13th cent., but it became common only during the rule of Ludovico Sforza, called il Moro (the ruler of Milan in the years 1494–1499), i.e. in the second half of the 15th century, cf. M. TOUSSAINT-SAMAT, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

²⁶ M. MONTANARI, *Modèles alimentaires et identités culturelles*, [in:] *Histoire de l'alimentation...*, p. 322; B. ROSENBERGER, *op. cit.*, p. 361. On the lands of modern-day Portugal, its cultivation became widespread only in the 15th cent., cf. M. TOUSSAINT-SAMAT, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

Dalby²⁷, Gilbert Dagron²⁸, Johannes Koder²⁹, Phaedon Koukoules³⁰, Jacques Lefort³¹ and Marcus L. Rautman³², with the 10th cent. being suggested as the moment from which the popularity of this foodstuff in Byzantine lands started to grow³³. In all probability, however, even after this date rice remained a ‘luxury’ food in the meaning expounded by Michael Grünbart³⁴.

The research set forward in the present study did not result in the verification of this generally accepted theory, although we would at the same time like to observe that the authors of medical sources from the 7th cent. wrote considerably more about rice as a therapeutic product than authorities from earlier times, which may suggest that in this period the cereal became a relatively well-known plant in the Mediterranean Basin, including Byzantine lands. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that rice does not appear solely in Byzantine medical literature. Apart from the genre, it is highly probable that it was itemised as an element of the diet of the Byzantine army in the treatise *De ceremoniis*, written in the 10th cent.³⁵ Moreover, as a desired dish, spiced with honey, it appears in the Ptochopro-

²⁷ A. DALBY, *Flavours of Byzantium*, Blackawton–Totnes 2003, p. 80; IDEM, *Tastes of Byzantium. The cuisine of a legendary empire*, London–New York 2010, p. 80; IDEM, *The flavours of classical Greece*, [in:] *Flavours and delights...*, p. 19 (where he treats rice as a rarity hardly present at ancient and Byzantine tables).

²⁸ G. DAGRON, *The urban economy, seven-tenth centuries*, [in:] *The economic history of Byzantium*, ed. A. LAIOU, vol. II, Washington 2002, p. 445–446.

²⁹ J. KODER, *Stew and salted...*, p. 65.

³⁰ Φ. ΚΟΥΚΟΥΛΕΣ, *op. cit.*, p. 94. There is only one mention of the cereal in the whole, painstakingly detailed, narrative and this comes up in the context of *dolmadakia* preparation.

³¹ J. LEFORT, *The rural economy, seventh–twelfth centuries*, [in:] *The economic history...*, p. 231–310) makes no mention of its cultivation, which points to the marginal role of this cereal crop in the economy and diet of Byzantines.

³² M.L. RAUTMAN, *The daily life in the Byzantine Empire*, Westport 2006, p. 46.

³³ M. CANARD, *Le riz dans le Proche-Orient aux premiers siècles de l’Islam*, Ara 6, 1959, p. 113–131. Cf. the latest opinion of Ilias Anagnostakis, which shift the time of the culinary breakthrough towards the turn of the 11th and the 12th cent. – I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, *Byzantine diet and cuisine. In between ancient and modern gastronomy*, [in:] *Flavours and delights...*, p. 62.

³⁴ M. GRÜNBART, *Spartans and Sybarites at the Golden Horn: Food as necessity and/or luxury*, [in:] *Material culture and well-being in Byzantium (400–1453)*, ed. M. GRÜNBART, E. KISLINGER, A. MUTHESIUS, D. STATHAKOPOULOS, Wien 2007, p. 135–139, in particular 138–139. In all probability, however, it never spread considerably – even after the 10th cent. The basis for this observation are the conclusions drawn by Angeliki LAIOU (*The agrarian economy, thirteenth–fifteenth centuries*, [in:] *The economic history...*, p. 327), who writes about its cultivation on Crete in the 14th cent., but at the same time points out that there are no data from the same period that would confirm that it was farmed in Thrace or Macedonia. Therefore we think that Chrisi Bourbou has expressed a somewhat overgeneralized (and therefore unfunded) opinion that rice belonged to the crops which were “traditionally” grown in Byzantium – C. BOURBOU, *Health and disease in Byzantine Crete (7th–12th centuries A.D.)*, Farnham–Burlington 2010, p. 128. On the whole, the cereal has been mentioned in her research only once on the aforesaid page.

³⁵ *Appendix ad librum primum. Constantini Imperatoris Porphyrogeniti praecepta Imperatori Romano bellum cogitanti...*, [in:] *Constantini Porphyrogeniti Imperatoris de ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae libri duo*, rec. I.I.

dromic Poems, where it is presented as the food of wealthy monks³⁶. Nevertheless, references to rice are infrequent enough to support the opinion that throughout the early and middle Byzantine periods in the Mediterranean Basin, even in spite of all the transformations having taken place, rice remained a product whose consumption was a sign of affluence, and definitely did not constitute the staple of the majority of society.

2. The dietetic properties attributed to rice detailed in ancient and Byzantine *materia medica*

It should be firmly stated that medical sources are an informative and still not satisfactorily used basis for any research in food history, and its value is intrinsically connected with the very nature of ancient and Byzantine tradition of medicine. It is traditionally maintained that Hippocrates was one of the first medics to conclude that foods are in essence medicines³⁷, which, if consumed in the appropriate circumstances and in the appropriate quantities, will ensure us health. This statement applied to the entirety of foodstuffs ingested by man³⁸, and thus referred *ex definitione* to all of the groups of food present in his diet. Such a definition resulted in medicine making it a permanent subject of analyses, and over time it achieved the position of one of the most important objects of scientific medical research in Graeco-Roman civilisation³⁹.

REISKE, vol. I, Bonnae 1829, p. 463–464. Johannes KODER (*Stew and salted...*, p. 65) does, however, admit of the possibility that the term *oirizin* (ὀρίζιν) was not used to denote the expensive rice, but a variety of millet or barley. If so, the other option appears to be more likely since millet was not an overly popular cereal crop in Byzantium, cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki Konstantynopola...*, p. 474.

³⁶ PTOCHOPRODROMUS, IV, 319–330, [in:] *Ptochoprodromos*, ed. et trans. H. EIDENEIER, Köln 1991. The pudding was actually prepared with honey, various other sweets, walnuts and flavoured with quinces. On the recipe cf. J. KODER, *Everyday food...*, p. 152. Concerning the topic of food and feasting as described in the Ptochoprodromic Poems, cf. H. EIDENEIER, *Ptochoprodromos' Tafelfreud and Tafelleid*, [in:] *Fest und Alltag in Byzanz*, ed. G. PRINZING, D. SIMON, München 1990, p. 77–90. Cf. A.-M. TALBOT, *Mealtime in monasteries: the culture of the Byzantine refectory*, [in:] *Eat, drink...*, p. 118.

³⁷ HIPPOCRATE, *De alimento*, 19, [in:] *Œuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, ed. E. LITRE, vol. IX, Amsterdam 1962.

³⁸ Hippocrates' doctrinal system should be recreated on the basis of his entire output. A real wealth of information on this topic may, however, be found in *De natura hominis* (HIPPOCRATE, *De natura hominis*, [in:] *Œuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*, ed. E. LITRE, vol. VI, Amsterdam 1962) and *De diaeta* (HIPPOCRATE, *De diaeta I–IV*, [in:] *Œuvres complètes...*, vol. VI, *passim*). Concerning the assumptions of Hippocratism, and significance of individual foods, cf. V. NUTTON, *Ancient Medicine*, London–New York 2007, p. 72–86, in particular 77–85. Regarding the role of food in the entire *Corpus Hippocraticum*, cf. S. BYL, *L'alimentation das le Corpus Hippocratique*, [in:] *Voeding en geneeskunde / Alimentation et medicine. Acten van het colloquium / Actes du colloque Brussel–Bruxelles 12. 10. 1990*, ed. R. JANSEN-SIEBEN, F. DAELMANS, Brussel/Bruxelles 1993, p. 29–39.

³⁹ Concerning the history of dieticians from the times of Galen, cf. K. BERGOLDT, *Wellbeing. A cultural history of healthy living*, trans. J. DEWHURST, Cambridge–Malden 2008, p. 30–37, 41–46, 62–72.

In the 2nd cent. A.D., therefore a few hundred years after Hippocrates, Galen adopted the dietetic views of his eminent predecessor⁴⁰ and, following their elaboration and development, included them in his considerably more detailed and better articulated theory. Galen's doctrines exerted a strong influence not only on contemporaries, but also on his successors. His followers did not modify their master's opinions, but rather repeated them and, as, for example, Oribasius⁴¹, limited themselves to quoting the adopted theoretical output⁴². It is therefore not surprising that the treatises authored by Galen's successors provide a cornucopia knowledge concerning the theory of ancient dietetics, and also contain numerous comments on culinary practice, thereby constituting an essential source for those wishing to study the history of culinary art⁴³.

Although rice, as we have already determined, was never a particularly popular crop in antiquity, its properties as a foodstuff have been altogether precisely described in medical literature, and the data contained therein indicate that ancient and subsequently Byzantine dietetics developed a cohesive view of the properties of this Far Eastern cereal. Our research indicates that credit for establishing the subsequently repeated doctrine should go to Dioscurides⁴⁴ and Galen⁴⁵. Hippocratic tradition did not refer to rice at all, for in the 5th cent. B.C. this cereal did not play any role in the diet of Greeks, nor had they learned how to use products obtained therefrom in medical procedures. During Hellenistic times, in spite of an increased awareness of this food, rice must have still been

⁴⁰ Concerning Galen himself and the main assumptions of Galenism, cf. A. BEDNARCZYK, *Galen. Główne kategorie systemu filozoficzno-lekarskiego*, Warszawa 1995, *passim*; Z. GAJDA, *Do historii medycyny wprowadzenie*, Kraków 2011, p. 146–159; V. NUTTON, *op. cit.*, p. 230–247, in particular 240–244.

⁴¹ Regarding the utilisation of Galen's output by this physician, cf. R. DE LUCIA, *Oribasios v. Pergamum*, [in:] *Antike Medizin. Ein lexikon*, ed. K.-H. LEVEN, München 2005, p. 660–661; M. KOKOSZKO, *Ryby i ich znaczenie w życiu codziennym ludzi późnego antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (III–VII w.)*, Łódź 2005, *passim*. Basic information concerning his literary activity in the field of dietetics, cf. *ibidem*, p. 14–15.

⁴² V. NUTTON, *op. cit.*, p. 292–309, in particular 309.

⁴³ On the topic of the history of food in antiquity and Byzantium, cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki Konstantynopola...*, p. 471–472; M. KOKOSZKO, K. JAGUSIAK, *Zboża Bizancjum...*, p. 33–34; M. KOKOSZKO, Z. RZEŹNICKA, K. JAGUSIAK, *Health and Culinary Art in Antiquity and Early Byzantium in the light of De re coquinaria*, SCer 2, 2012, p. 164.

⁴⁴ A physician associated with the Roman army, active during the reigns of Claudius and Nero. The author of treatises entitled *De materia medica* and *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*. The works of Dioscurides had a significant impact on the views of Galen and his successors, cf. Z. GAJDA, *op. cit.*, 145–146; V. NUTTON, *op. cit.*, p. 174–177; M. STAMATU, *Dioskurides*, [in:] *Antike Medizin...*, p. 227–229.

⁴⁵ The importance of their output was obvious as early as the 11th cent. to the Byzantine dietetic expert Symeon Seth, cf. *Simeonis Sethi syntagma de alimentorum facultatibus*, Περὶ ὀρώζης, o, ed. B. LANG-KAVEL, Lipsiae 1868, p. 75 (cetera: SYMEON SETH, *Syntagma*). Concerning Symeon Seth, cf. J. NIEHOFF-PANAGIOTIDIS, *Seth, Symeon*, [in:] *Antike Medizin...*, p. 799–800.

marginal to the main current of interests of Greek culinary and medical art, for the treatises of famous ancient physicians extant in *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus of Naucratis, which is so full of information (including the reflections of medical authorities), contain no information about it⁴⁶. It is only towards the end of the 1st cent. and the beginning of the 2nd cent. A.D., in all probability due to the sufficient propagation of this cereal in the Mediterranean diet, that doctrines taking into consideration the importance of rice in maintaining health started to be formed. This led to the phenomenon of authors of Byzantine medical encyclopaedias, previously observed by us, citing Dioscurides, Archigenes (1st–2nd cent. A.D.⁴⁷), Crito (1st–2nd cent. A.D.⁴⁸), Galen, Antyllus (2nd–3rd cent. A.D.⁴⁹), or Filumenus (3rd cent. A.D.⁵⁰). Be that as it may, from the beginning of the 2nd cent. A.D. the presence of rice in medical treatises is constant, while information about the cereal is included systematically in dietetic works authored long after Paul of Aegina (7th cent.) wrote his medical encyclopaedia, and for this reason constitutes a good source for showing the evolution of views concerning its application in the medicine and cuisine of the Mediterranean Basin.

We will commence our systematic relation of dietetic views concerning the analysed cereal crop from the first of the abovementioned greats of ancient medicine, who was active in the middle of the 1st cent. A.D. Extant sources clearly indicate

⁴⁶ Cf. an analysis of medical data concerning fish in *Deipnosophists* – M. KOKOSZKO, *Ryby...*, *passim*.

⁴⁷ Archigenes of Apamea – a student of Agatinus, and a physician active during the reign of Emperor Trajan, considered a member of the Eclectic school, cf. F. KUDLIEN, *Poseidonios und die Ärzteschule der Pneumatiker*, H 90, 1962, p. 419–429; V. NUTTON, *op. cit.*, p. 204–205.

⁴⁸ A physician, who authored a treatise *On cosmetics*. As a military doctor he accompanied the Roman troops on the campaigns to Dacia. Cf. S. SANDER, *Die dreißig Schönheiten der Frau. Ärztliche Ratgeber der Frühen Neuzeit*, [in:] *Medizin, Geschichte und Geschlecht: körperhistorische Rekonstruktionen von Identitäten und Differenzen*, ed. F. STAHNISCH, F. STEGER, Stuttgart 2005, p. 42, an. 4.

⁴⁹ A physician of the Pneumatic school, a student of Archigenes and Athenaeus. Although Antyllus was considered as an authority in the field of surgery, he nevertheless devoted a considerable part of his writings to issues of dietetics. The result of this research was, among others, the work *Περὶ βοηθημάτων*, which comprised four books. Antyllus' sources of knowledge were the works of Athenaeus, Apollonius of Pergamum, Diocles, Rufus and Archigenes. Cf. H. HABERLING, *Der Hygieniker und Sportarzt Antyllus*, KW 14, 1935, p. 1615–1619; R.L. GRANT, *Antyllus and his medical works*, BHM 30, 1960, p. 154–147. Concerning certain aspects of the utilisation of the output of this physician in the Byzantine period, cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Medycyna bizantyńska na temat aiora (αἰώρα)*, czyli kilka słów o jednej z procedur terapeutycznych zastosowanych w kuracji cesarza Aleksego I Komnena (na podstawie pism medycznych Galena, Orybazjusza, Aecjusza z Amidy i Pawła z Eginy), [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. 87–111.

⁵⁰ An eminent Greek physician living in the 3rd cent. B.C. His writings were based on the doctrines of Archigenes, Soranus, Herodotus and Galen. Known and quoted during the Byzantine period, cf. K. ΓΕΩΡΓΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Ἀρχαῖοι Ἑλληνες ἰατροί*, Ἀθῆνα 1998, p. 454–455; S. IHM, *Philumenos*, [in:] *Antike Medizin...*, p. 699; M. WELLMANN, *Philumenos*, H 43, 1908, p. 373–404.

that Dioscorides classified rice as a cereal plant⁵¹. He also knew that its farming requires considerable humidity, and for this reason it grows on land that is marshy and boggy. He viewed it as a moderately nutritious food, which slows down the action of the intestines, thus leading to constipation. Furthermore, Dioscorides rated rice as less nutritious than *chóndros* (a coarse flour or fine groats usually made from wheat and emmer⁵²). This comment, which probably results from the similarity of appearance and analogous culinary applications of both products, was subsequently repeated in numerous works devoted to dietetics.

Galen, who wrote in the 2nd cent. A.D., classified rice amongst *óspría*⁵³, which he defined as grains that are not suitable for baking bread⁵⁴. In his evaluation, therefore, he referred more to the traditional culinary applications of the product than to the adopted classification of plants, and this approach differentiated him from his predecessor. We may also surmise that in this description he demonstrated his knowledge of daily practice, not a lack of material competence in the field of botany. What is more, since Galen's classification of rice will then appear systematically in works by Byzantine authors, the doctrinal tradition appears to point towards both the strict observance by dietetics of the period of the doctrine written down by the Pergamenean physician, and to the continuity of the general tendency governing the application of rice in Byz-

⁵¹ He classified it amongst foods called *sítera*, and therefore cereal products (cf. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. H.G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, Oxford 1996, p. 1601, s.v. σιτηρός [cetera: LIDDELL-SCOTT]), cf. *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei de materia medica libri quinque*, II, 95, 1, 1, ed. M. WELLMANN, vol. I-III, Berolini 1906-1914 (cetera: DIOSCURIDES, *De materia medica*).

⁵² Concerning *chóndros*, cf. A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 132.

⁵³ The term usually referred to leguminous plants, which were only sporadically used for making a flour suitable for baking. If, however, the necessity arose, they were used to bake bread. An example are broad beans, the grains of which were ground to make a flour used for baking a number of different products, including bread, cf. DIOSCURIDES, *De materia medica*, III, 59, 2, 3. Cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki Konstantynopola...*, p. 485-487.

⁵⁴ *Galen de alimentorum facultatibus libri*, 524, 11-16, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. D.C.G. KÜHN, vol. VI, Lipsiae 1823 (cetera: GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*). The statement seems of the utmost importance because of the position of bread as the staple in Antiquity and Byzantium. On different aspects of the role of bread in antiquity but also in the early byzantine period cf. A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 58-61; IDEM, *Flavours...*, p. 77-81; IDEM, *Tastes...*, p. 77-81; IDEM, *The flavours...*, p. 17-25, esp. 19; H. EIDENEIER, *Ψώμισμα*, BZ 57, 1964, p. 338-339; IDEM, *Sogenannte christliche Tabuwörter im Griechischen*, München 1966, p. 7-54; P. GARNSEY, *Famine and food supply in the Greco-Roman world. Responses to risk and crisis*, Cambridge-New York-Melbourne 1993, *passim*, esp. 49-53; IDEM, *Food and society...*, p. 12-21; N. JASNÝ, *The daily bread of the ancient Greeks and Romans*, Osí 9, 1950, p. 227-253; J. KODER, *Gemüse in Byzanz. Die Versorgung Konstantinopels mit Frischgemüse im Lichte der Geoponika*, Wien 1993, p. 15-25; IDEM, *Everyday food...*, p. 142-145; M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki Konstantynopola...*, p. 483-485; M. KOKOSZKO, K. JAGUSIAK, *Zboża Bizancjum...*, p. 34-37; J. MCCORRISTON, *Wheat*, [in:] *The Cambridge World...*, p. 158-174; Φ. ΚΟΥΚΟΥΛΑΣ, *op. cit.*, p. 15-31; M. MONTANARI, *Food is culture*, trans. A. SONNENFELD, New York 2006, p. 6-7; K.D. WHITE, *Cereals, bread and milling in the Roman world*, [in:] *Food in Antiquity...*, p. 38-43.

antine cuisine, thus suggesting its constant usage in boiled dishes rather than in the baking of bread.

As regards the specific dietetic properties of the product, in *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus* Galen described rice as a foodstuff that has slightly styptic properties, and for this reason tends to slow down the action of the alimentary tract⁵⁵. This brief description should be supplemented by another depiction of the product's values, this time given in *De alimentorum facultatibus*. In this work Galen maintained that rice is difficult to digest, of low nutritional value, and should be given only to persons whose ailments necessitate slowing down the functioning of the stomach and intestines. The physician also made a reference to the taste of the said food, observing that dishes made from it appeal neither to his palate, nor to the palates of other representatives of Graeco-Roman culture⁵⁶. It should be added that the latter opinion will undergo modification over the course of development of dietetics.

A lecture of Oribasius' works, who wrote in the second half of the 4th cent. A.D., proves that he adopted the doctrine elaborated by Dioscurides and Galen. And thus, in the first book of *Collectiones medicae*, which contains detailed descriptions of cereal plants, he stated that rice has a low nutritional value, while, by a comparison with *chóndros*⁵⁷, he suggested that it is relatively difficult to initially digest, and for this reason was used by dieticians in cases requiring stoppage of the alimentary system⁵⁸. Oribasius only refrained from giving an unequivocally negative assessment of the taste of the Far Eastern cereal, which opinion – as we have indicated above – was present in the doctrines of Galen. This may attest to the gradually changing approach of dieticians to dishes made from the plant, or at least to a greater acceptance of its taste. This consistent description of rice is not, however, the sole piece of information concerning the food which is present in the output of Emperor Julian's physician. In fact, Oribasius made a reference to the dietetic properties of rice when collectively describing individual groups of food products according to their distinguishing features. This cereal was mentioned⁵⁹ when the physician enumerated foods that do not give the body much sustenance⁶⁰, which he subsequently repeated *in extenso* in his *Synopsis ad Eustathi-*

⁵⁵ *Galenus de simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis et facultatibus libri*, 92, 5–6, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. D.C.G. KÜHN, vol. XI–XII, Lipsiae 1826–1827 (cetera: GALEN, *De simplicium medicamentorum*).

⁵⁶ GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, 525, 1–5.

⁵⁷ A comparison with *chóndros* was repeated in the twelfth book of his *Collectiones medicae*, cf. *Oribasii collectionum medicarum reliquiae*, XII, §, 15, 1–2, ed. I. RAEDER, vol. I–IV, Lipsiae–Berolini 1928–1933 (cetera: ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*).

⁵⁸ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, I, 16, 1, 1–2.

⁵⁹ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 14, 7, 3.

⁶⁰ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 14, 1, 1 – 13, 3.

*um filium*⁶¹ and *Libri ad Eunapium*⁶². Oribasius also remained loyal to the findings of Galen, including the product in his main work⁶³ in the chapter concerning foods that are difficult to digest⁶⁴. Again, he repeated the information in *Synopsis ad Eustathium filium*⁶⁵ and *Libri ad Eunapium*⁶⁶. Finally, Oribasius included rice⁶⁷ in the chapter on foods that slow down the alimentary tract⁶⁸, while an identical classification reappeared in *Synopsis ad Eustathium filium*⁶⁹ and *Libri ad Eunapium*⁷⁰.

A relatively considerable amount of information concerning the dietetic properties of rice may be found in sources originating from the 6th cent. A.D. Anthimus⁷¹, who wrote in the twenties of this century, was of the opinion that the cereal is conducive to maintaining health, however provided that it is properly cooked. If insufficiently tender, it is harmful. The author of the treatise *De observatione ciborum* stressed that the food has a particularly positive action on persons suffering from dysentery, though he also additionally emphasised that in such a case it was necessary to take all imaginable care in order to ensure that patients receive the cereal only after it has undergone thorough thermal processing⁷².

In any case, the supposition that rice became a somewhat more permanent element of 6th cent. cuisine and dietetics is supported by the fact that Aetius of Amida⁷³ also included deliberations concerning its qualities in his work. His treatise known as *Iatricorum libri* clearly shows that the findings of established authorities were strictly observed in his times, too. He was of the opinion that the food is delicately stypitic, and thus only slightly slows down the action of the stomach⁷⁴, and is

⁶¹ Oribasii *synopsis ad Eustathium filium*, IV, 13, 6, 3, [in:] Oribasii *synopsis ad Eustathium filium et libri ad Eunapium*, ed. I. RAEDER, vol. VI, 3, Leipzig 1964 (cetera: ORIBASIIUS, *Synopsis ad Eustathium filium*).

⁶² Oribasii *libri ad Eunapium*, I, 30, 1, 1 – 8, 2, [in:] Oribasii *synopsis ad Eustathium filium et libri ad Eunapium*, ed. I. RAEDER, vol. VI, 3, Leipzig 1964 (cetera: ORIBASIIUS, *Libri ad Eunapium*).

⁶³ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 18, 11, 2.

⁶⁴ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 18, 1, 1 – 13, 1.

⁶⁵ ORIBASIIUS, *Synopsis ad Eustathium filium*, IV, 17, 9, 2.

⁶⁶ ORIBASIIUS, *Libri ad Eunapium*, I, 35, 7, 6.

⁶⁷ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 30, 9, 1.

⁶⁸ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 30, 1, 1 – 9, 3.

⁶⁹ ORIBASIIUS, *Synopsis ad Eustathium filium*, IV, 30, 13, 1.

⁷⁰ ORIBASIIUS, *Libri ad Eunapium*, I, 46, 7, 1.

⁷¹ A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 12–13; M. GRANT, *Introduction*, [in:] ANTHIMUS, *On the observance of foods. De observatione ciborum*, ed. M. GRANT, Totnes–Blackawton 2007 (cetera: ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*), p. 9–44; M. KOKOSZKO, K. JAGUSIAK, *Woda, wino i tak dalej, czyli o napojach w Konstantynopolu*, PNH 9.1, 2010, p. 25; E. KISLINGER, *Antimus*, [in:] *Antike Medizin...*, p. 56; G.M. MESSING, *Remarks on Anthimus De observatione ciborum*, CP 37, 1942, p. 150–158.

⁷² ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 70.

⁷³ A. GARZYA, *Aetios v. Amida*, [in:] *Antike medizin...*, p. 19–20; M. KOKOSZKO, *Ryby...*, p. 9.

⁷⁴ The author of *Iatricorum libri* repeats this description in the chapter of the second book that concerns foods which slow down the functioning of the alimentary tract, cf. *Aetii Amidani libri medicinales I–VIII*, II, 266, 19, ed. A. OLIVIERI, Lipsiae–Berolini 1935–1950 (cetera: AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*).

also difficult to digest⁷⁵. No small wonder, therefore, that the same expert on ancient dietetics – in the very same way as Oribasius did – mentioned rice amongst foods that do not give the body much sustenance⁷⁶, are difficult to initially digest⁷⁷, and slow down the action of the intestines⁷⁸.

Obviously, the impact of Galen's dietetic findings is visible in the output of Alexander of Tralles (6th/7th cent.). Although the Byzantine physician did not devote a lot of space to a description of the properties of rice (his *Therapeutica* informs us only that it belonged to the *óspria*⁷⁹), the cereal was frequently mentioned when the author touched upon issues connected with the preparation of medicines, and the data provided by him does not indicate a departure from previously established doctrines. He had to recognise the styptic and slowing action of rice if he used it in the treatment of ailments of the alimentary tract, and in particular dysentery.

In the 7th cent. A.D., Paul of Aegina⁸⁰ followed exactly the same path as his predecessors. Thus, he described rice in the chapter devoted to cereals⁸¹, which is more concordant with the tradition of Dioscurides and Oribasius. He considered it difficult to initially digest, not very nutritious, and slowing down the functioning of the alimentary tract⁸². In another fragment of his *Epitome*, when yet again presenting the action of the said food on the digestive system, Paul made a successive reference to the set of views already known from our lecture, stating that rice has a slightly styptic action and therefore slows down the functioning of the intestines⁸³.

3. On the preparation of rice, or a few words on the place of this cereal in ancient and early Byzantine *res coquinaria*.

Recreating the methods of serving rice in the times constituting the subject of the present paper leads to significant difficulties. First and foremost, the available data is usually imprecise and does not resemble that made readily available at any moment and printed in modern cookbooks. As we have

⁷⁵ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, I, 305, 1–2.

⁷⁶ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 251, 8.

⁷⁷ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 255, 19.

⁷⁸ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 266, 19.

⁷⁹ *Alexandri Tralliani therapeutica*, II, 251, 11, [in:] ALEXANDER VON TRALLES, ed. T. PUSCHMANN, vol. I–II, Amsterdam 1963 (cetera: ALEXANDER OF TRALLES, *Therapeutica*).

⁸⁰ As regards basic information on this physician, cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Ryby...*, p. 15–16; P. PORMANN, *Paulos v. Aegina*, [in:] *Antike Medizin...*, p. 681–682.

⁸¹ *Paulus Aegineta*, I, 78, 1, 1–25, ed. I.L. HEIBERG, vol. I–II, Lipsiae–Berolini 1921–1924 (cetera: PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*).

⁸² PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 78, 1, 20.

⁸³ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, VII, 3, 15, 54.

already determined, rice reached the Mediterranean Basin from India, where – in accordance with Strabo’s relation – it was the staple foodstuff. We may also assume that the initial culinary tradition, imported from regions where the cereal originated, impacted the development of methods of preparing rice in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Basin. Data contained in literary sources would indicate that the inhabitants of India used rice to prepare a thick, but at the same time semi-liquid dish⁸⁴, and it is also worth keeping in mind that they drank a beverage made from rice seeds. Since Strabo added that rice was used to produce the aforementioned drink instead of barley (*kríthai*)⁸⁵, one should assume that the alcoholic beverage that the author had in mind was in a way analogous to beer, the usual basis of which (most frequently, but not exclusively) was the latter cereal crop. The beverage was usually enjoyed by nations foreign to the Greeks, while for the Hellenes it was an indicator of an alien, and usually lower culture⁸⁶.

Strabo’s work does not indicate the method used by inhabitants of India to prepare dishes that included rice. The term *oryza rofete*, which he applied, suggests that they made a kind of soup with rice as its main ingredient, in all probability thick, so that it would be sufficiently nutritious. We do not learn, however, whether the cereal was boiled solely in water, or whether stocks of a certain type (for example a meat broth) were used for this purpose, nor is there any information as to the additives – including spices – that were mixed with the dish. However, *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus of Naucratis, to which there was attached an excerpt from Megasthenes’ work *Indika*, inform us that in India and, as we should probably surmise, during ceremonial meals, this cereal crop was served in silver bowls as the main course during the primary meal of the day, which the author called *deípnon* in Greek. The dish was prepared in a way that reminded the author of the method usually used by the Greeks to cook the *chóndros*⁸⁷. As a matter of fact, this comparison is so frequent in other sources that it appears to be the best hint for historians of food interested in recreating the correct recipe for the original method of preparing rice.

Our data indicates that there was no single recipe for *chóndros*. Oribasius, for example, stated that the product was simply boiled in water. During this activity the dish, which we will call a soup, had to be frequently mixed, and olive oil and a pinch of salt added. The author also mentioned that some wine with honey, i.e. *oinómeli*, or a different alcoholic beverage of this type, either sweet or dry, was mixed with the dish. Another variant of the same delicacy

⁸⁴ STRABO, *Geographica*, XV, 1, 53, 12–13.

⁸⁵ STRABO, *Geographica*, XV, 1, 53, 11–12.

⁸⁶ Concerning beer, cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki...*, p. 569–572; M. KOKOSZKO, K. JAGUSIAK, *Woda, wino...*, p. 48–52; M.J. SZYMAŃSKI, *Browary Łodzi i regionu*, Łódź 2011, p. 8–11.

⁸⁷ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, IV, 153d–e (39, 1–7, KAIBEL).

was obtained by spicing the soup with wine vinegar. The dish obtained in this way was known as *chóndros ptisanísti*, that is *chóndros* prepared à la *ptisáne*⁸⁸, i.e. in the same way as (or, rather, similarly to) the medicinal soup or gruel based on barley.

In turn, as regards the other trail, namely the *ptisáne* soup, which was famous amongst dieticians and to which we must make a reference in connection with our deliberations, a relatively legible and sufficiently detailed recipe for its preparation has been left by Oribasius, who actually cited it after Galen⁸⁹. *Ptisáne* was made from soaked barley, the seeds of which were recommended to be well cleaned of husks even before they were boiled. Next, the dish should be kept over a small fire, so that the cereal would swell as far as possible. During this activity, wine vinegar and olive oil were added to the soup. When the grains were nearly soft, fine salt, leeks and fennel were added. Sometimes, sweet must and honey were poured into the dish, although these ingredients were not recommended by Oribasius⁹⁰. The resulting soup moistened⁹¹ and purified the body⁹².

It should be added that relatively precise recipes for *ptisáne* have also survived in the treatise *De re coquinaria*⁹³, in which the said dish appears under the name *tisana*. In order to illustrate gastronomic methods, it is worth quoting the first of the recipes, namely the one for *tisana vel sucus*. It says that one day before cooking the soup, the cook would soak pearl barley, which was then washed and ground, and placed over a strong fire in a pot. When it was soft, he would add olive oil, a bunch of dill, dried onions, summer savory and pigs' trotters. Next, the mixture was boiled until the meat became soft, and coriander ground with salt was added. The dish was boiled yet again, and the dill and pearl barley – insofar as possible – removed. The barley was then placed in another pot and reground while keeping the vessel over a fire and making sure not to burn the pearl barley. The mass was then transferred to the pot containing the pork and broth, and the cook would add ground lovage, dried field mint, cumin, asafoetida, a small quantity of wine vinegar, boiled must and *garum/liquamen*. Finally, the mixture was boiled yet again and served.

⁸⁸ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, I, 5, 1, 1 – 2, 2. Cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki...*, p. 480; Φ. ΚΟΥΚΟΥΛΕΣ, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

⁸⁹ GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, 502, 7 – 504, 4. Concerning the deliberations of dieticians concerning *ptisáne*, cf. E. DARMSTAEDTER, *Ptisana: ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der antiken Diätetik*, *Ar. ASS* 15, 1933, p. 181–201; M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki...*, p. 477–480.

⁹⁰ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, IV, 1, 15, 1 – 22, 1.

⁹¹ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, I, 225, 11–12.

⁹² AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 260, 1. Cf. *Geoponica sive Cassiani Bassi Scholastici de re rustica eclogue*, II, 34, rec. H. BECKH, Lipsiae 1895 (cetera: *Geoponica*).

⁹³ *Apicius. A critical edition with an introduction and an English translation of the Latin recipe text Apicius*, IV, 4, 1–2; V, 5, 1–2, ed. Ch. GROCOCK, S. GRAINGER, Blackawton–Totnes 2006 (cetera: *De re coquinaria*).

Returning to rice, however, we should add that Dioscurides himself considered it an ingredient of *póltos*⁹⁴, namely, as is indicated by dictionary definitions⁹⁵ and an expert opinion passed by connoisseurs of ancient culinary art⁹⁶, yet another type of soup or thick cereal gruel boiled in water, but also in milk⁹⁷. A general recipe for this dish⁹⁸ may be found, for example, in the writings of Aetius of Amida, who maintained that it is prepared with water and spiced with salt, olive oil and *ánethon*, i.e. dill. Instead of using olive oil, one may add to the *póltos* fresh hen or goose fat⁹⁹. All in all, the recipe cited above clearly resembles the instructions – cited above – for preparing *chón-dros*. Such a dish must have been relatively popular, because recipes for a similar delicacy have survived in *stricte* culinary literature, or – to be precise – in *De re coquinaria*, which *nota bene* contains four recipes for *póltos*-type dishes (under the name *puls*¹⁰⁰). We should, however, reiterate the reservation that these recipes are no more than similar to the one for the *póltos* mentioned by Dioscurides, for they do not include rice itself, but spelt groats, known as *álix*¹⁰¹. Therefore, by way of an example and in order to visualise potential culinary formula variants, it is worth quoting one of the recipes¹⁰². Its author recommends that sifted *álix* groats be soaked and left to boil in water. When the groats were nearly soft, one should add olive oil, and pound the mass carefully once it thickens. Two boiled brains and a small quantity of chopped up meat were prepared separately and carefully pounded in a mortar with finely ground pepper, lovage and fennel seeds. A fish sauce and wine were added, and the mass was placed over a fire. Once the brains and meat were ready, they were slowly combine with the groats, so that the dish resembled a soup (or gruel), in all probability very thick.

Returning to medical sources, however, we should note that rice was boiled not only in water, but also in a certain type of meat stock. For example, Aetius of Amida wrote about rice prepared in a poultry broth¹⁰³. Unfortunately, he did not precise whether it was then served as a soup, i.e. together with the stock in which it was boiled, or whether the rice was strained and consumed on its own.

⁹⁴ Dioscuridis *Περὶ ἀπλῶν φαρμάκων*, II, 51, 3, 4, [in:] *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei de materia medica libri quinque*, ed. M. WELLMANN, vol. III, Berolini 1914 (cetera: DIOSCURIDES, *Euporsista vel de simplicibus medicinis*).

⁹⁵ LIDDELL-SCOTT, p. 1436, s.v. πόλτος.

⁹⁶ Cf. description of the term *puls* – A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 271. This dish was very popular in Greek and Roman culture. It was also found in the British Isles under Roman rule, cf. H.E.M. COOL, *Eating and drinking in Roman Britain*, Cambridge 2006, p. 75.

⁹⁷ *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, G, 80, 2, post I. ALBERTUM rec. M. SCHMIDT, vol. I–V, Ienae 1859–1868 (s.v. Γαλάχια). Other examples below.

⁹⁸ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, IX, 42, 62.

⁹⁹ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, IX, 42, 62–66.

¹⁰⁰ *De re coquinaria*, V, 1, 1–4.

¹⁰¹ Spelt groats, but also emmer groats. Cf. A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 127.

¹⁰² *De re coquinaria*, V, 1, 1.

¹⁰³ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, VII, 32–33.

However, in light of the above-mentioned, highly cohesive tradition we think that the first option would be much likelier. Although there are insufficient details concerning the stock itself, we may visualise the technology according to which it was made on the basis of treatises written by ancient and Byzantine physicians, especially if these are supplemented with culinary information *sensu stricto*. First of all, a stock similar to the broth mentioned by the famous 6th cent. physician would be the so-called white stock, *leukós zomós*. The authors of medical sources maintained that it was prepared using good quality potable water¹⁰⁴. A small quantity of the best olive oil was added, as was dill and some leeks. The washed meat was placed in water and boiled. When it was semi-soft, salt was added. We should note that the recipe for white stock is present in the majority of medical works. For example, it was known by Dioscurides¹⁰⁵, Galen¹⁰⁶, Oribasius¹⁰⁷ and Aetius of Amida, while their recipes did not practically differ. Secondly, *De re coquinaria* contains a few recipes very similar to those for the abovementioned broth. For example, a similar method of boiling meat is mentioned in one¹⁰⁸ of the recipes for preparing duck¹⁰⁹, according to which the meat was cooked in water with salt and dill. The treatise *De re coquinaria* also contains a short recipe for boiled bacon, which recommends processing the meat in water with a large quantity of dill, a few drops of olive oil, and salt¹¹⁰, therefore in a manner resembling *leukós zomós*.

However, medical sources inform us not only of the abovementioned rice *póltos*. Considerably more frequently, they refer to the *chylós orýzes*. Unfortunately, no definition of the term is given. We may guess that this was a thin rice stock, obtained by boiling the cereal. For example, the term *chylós* is touched upon by Galen when considering the medical and culinary applications of *chóndros*. The text indicates that he was writing about a stock made from this product, which was

¹⁰⁴ In antiquity, access to fresh water was a significant problem. Cf. A. DALBY, *Food...*, p. 346–347; G. CLARK, *Water in Antiquity*, An 18, 1944, p. 1–15; J.A. LÓPEZ FÉREZ, *Aspectos teóricos, empíricos y léxicos del agua en Galeno*, [in:] *Galen und das hellenistische Erbe. Verhandlungen des IV. Internationalen Galen-Symposiums veranstaltet vom Institut für Geschichte der Medizin am Bereich Medizin (Charité) der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 18.–20. September 1989*, ed. J. KOLLESCH, D. NICKEL, Stuttgart 1993, p. 171–193. Cf. M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki Konstantynopola...*, p. 557–560. Recently, a work has been published summarising research into the provision of water to Constantinople, cf. J. CROW, J. BARDILL, R. BAYLISS, *The water supply of Byzantine Constantinople*, London 2008. A noteworthy contribution to research into this problem was also made by Teresa WOLIŃSKA (*Zaopatrzenie Konstantynopola w wodę we wczesnym średniowieczu (IV–VII w.)*, [in:] *Człowiek w średniowieczu. Między biologią a historią*, ed. A. SZYM CZAKOWA, Łódź 2009, p. 27–52; EADEM, *Zaopatrzenie w wodę*, [in:] *Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym...*, p. 433–462).

¹⁰⁵ DIOSCURIDES, *De materia medica*, II, 33, 1, 1–5.

¹⁰⁶ GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, 725, 6–13.

¹⁰⁷ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, II, 51, 6, 1–7, 3.

¹⁰⁸ *De re coquinaria*, VI, 2, 1.

¹⁰⁹ *De re coquinaria*, VI, 2, 1–6.

¹¹⁰ *De re coquinaria*, VII, 9, 4.

diluted with a large quantity of water, boiled for a length of time in a vessel placed over a charcoal fire (in order to ensure a stable and not excessively high temperature for the entire period of boiling) and mixed throughout the process, spiced only with a small quantity of salt and olive oil¹¹¹. However, the text also suggests that sometimes the broth contained overcooked grains, which were pulverised so that the whole resembled an emulsion. This liquid – or thin soup – would be drunk in order to alleviate problems of the alimentary tract¹¹². A further analogy would be information concerning *chylós ptisánes*, which we may find in Oribasius' writings, and which he himself took from the output of Antyllus¹¹³. The said *chylós* was obtained by diluting *ptisáne* with water (one measure of *ptisáne* per fifteen measures of water), and reducing the solution thus received to one fifth. Before drinking, the liquid was strained¹¹⁴. We may also surmise that this *chylós* could be also described using different other terms, for example *afépsēma*, as Paul of Aegina preferred¹¹⁵.

Medical data indicates that rice was also boiled in milk. It is worth noting that the latter was the subject of widespread interest amongst ancient and early Byzantine dieticians, while Byzantine medical treatises based their assessments on Galen's findings, expounded in *De alimentorum facultatibus*¹¹⁶. It is not surprising that Oribasius¹¹⁷, Aetius of Amida¹¹⁸, Anthimus¹¹⁹ and Paul of Aegina¹²⁰ all quoted the doctrines of their master. And although Alexander of Tralles¹²¹ did not cite him word for word, he also remained amongst the followers of the great doctor from Pergamum. The authors of medical treatises considered milk as having a favourable impact on the organs situated in the chest¹²². However, when consumed too frequently, it caused headaches and contributed to the generation of gases, negatively impacted the liver and facilitated the formation of stones in the urinary system¹²³. In order to lessen its negative action, they recommended adding starch, *ámylon*, flour *semídalís*, and also rice, etc.¹²⁴

¹¹¹ GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, 497, 5–12.

¹¹² GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, 497, 14 – 498, 3.

¹¹³ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, IV, 11, 1, 1 – 14, 4.

¹¹⁴ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, IV, 11, 4, 1–4.

¹¹⁵ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, V, 61, 1, 5. The physician also used the term *χυλός* (*chylós*); cf. PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, II, 57, 1, 25.

¹¹⁶ GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, 681, 11 – 689, 7.

¹¹⁷ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, II, 59, 1, 1 – 14, 5.

¹¹⁸ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 87, 1 – 91, 3.

¹¹⁹ ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 75–76.

¹²⁰ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 86, 1, 1–10.

¹²¹ ALEXANDER OF TRALLES, *Therapeutica*, I, 539, 16 – 545, 18. Regarding this physician, cf. Z. GAJDA, *op. cit.*, p. 179; A. GARZYA, *Alexander v. Tralles*, [in:] *Antike Medizin...*, p. 27–28.

¹²² This property was emphasised by ANTHIMUS (*De observatione ciborum*, 76).

¹²³ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 86, 1, 3–5.

¹²⁴ ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 76; PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 88, 1, 6–8.

Recipes referring to the boiling of rice in milk are rather imprecise. Usually, physicians gave the cereal only marginal treatment in their deliberations devoted to improving the properties of milk. It is interesting to note that Aetius of Amida called the soup obtained by boiling rice in milk *póltos*¹²⁵, however his writings do not contain a recipe for the dish. Medical deliberations concerning methods of boiling milk itself may shed some light on the technology applied by cooks. Since it had a tendency to burn and stick to the porous walls of clay vessels when boiled over an open fire, and also boiled over, by far the most common practice was to throw hot stones or red-hot metal disks into the vessel containing the milk¹²⁶. The most detailed recommendations concerning the boiling of rice in milk have been given by Anthimus. In accordance with his instructions, rice should be boiled in water until soft, then strained, immersed in goat's milk and boiled until the whole mass thickens¹²⁷.

It is worth noting that dishes made from rice were sometimes sweetened. This conclusion may be drawn from numerous references in medical sources, that authors of which recommend adding sweet wine (or must) and honey to the product. A good example of such recommendations are the deliberations of Anthimus¹²⁸. Aetius of Amida informs us that there was a method of boiling the cereal in – or with the addition of – water with honey, namely *melikraton*¹²⁹. Butter was also added to rice dishes¹³⁰. In accordance with information provided by Galen, the cereal – boiled with the addition of this fat – was administered to persons suffering from diarrhoea and a general debilitation connected with a reluctance to take food¹³¹.

As we learn from one of the ancient commentaries concerning Aristophanes' comedy *The Knights*, rice could have been one of the ingredients of a dish known as *thrion*¹³². The commentary maintains that the delicacy was prepared by boiling the appropriate quantities of wheat groats, rice or the best quality wheat flour in a pot. Next, the water was poured out and the mass mixed with soft cheese and a few eggs. When ready, it was wrapped in fig leaves and tied with jute – a plant with strong fibres – papyrus or flax, and boiled in a meat stock. After taking the ready *thría* out of the pot, the leaves were removed, while the rest was fried in

¹²⁵ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, IX, 20, 50–57.

¹²⁶ ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 75; PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 88, 1, 6–8.

¹²⁷ ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 70. Cf. a modern recipe for the same dish, developed by Mark GRANT (*Roman cookery. Ancient recipes for modern kitchens*, London 2002, p. 154).

¹²⁸ ANTHIMUS, *De observatione ciborum*, 76.

¹²⁹ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, VIII, 31, 18. The mention of *μελικρατον* (*melikraton*) does not, however, connect this practice with the preparation of rice in milk.

¹³⁰ *Galenii de compositione medicamentorum secundum locos libri*, 170, 5–6, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. D.C.G. KÜHN, vol. XII–XIII, Lipsiae 1826–1827 (cetera: GALEN, *De compositione medicamentorum*).

¹³¹ GALEN, *De compositione medicamentorum*, 169, 7–9.

¹³² A. DALBY, *On thria*, PPC 31, 1989, p. 56–57.

a pan in fresh honey until it turned brown. The dish was served with addition of fresh honey, or the honey in which it had been prepared. The name of the delicacy stems from the Greek word denoting fig leaves¹³³, and the popularity of such dishes is attested to not only throughout antiquity, but also in Byzantium¹³⁴. Traces of the recipe may be found in modern Greek cuisine, which is rich with numerous variations of the delicacy known as *dolmadákia*¹³⁵. These are grape leaves stuffed with a filling made from rice and spices, which are stewed in water and olive oil¹³⁶.

Although, as we have already mentioned, Galen classified rice amongst the so-called *óspria*, that is products which are not suitable for making bread¹³⁷, we do know that rice was in fact used in baking. For example, Athenaeus of Naucratis mentioned a type of bread known as *oríndes ártos*. It was also mentioned by Sophocles in his *Triptolemus*, while the author of *Deipnosophists* wrote that it was made from rice¹³⁸ (or from some other type of cereal growing in Africa, which resembled sesame¹³⁹). The same author also cited fragments of the work *On baking*¹⁴⁰ by Chrysippus of Tyana, a specialist in the baking of cakes, known as *pemmatológos*¹⁴¹, who enumerated therein a great many different types of cakes (the so-called *plakoúntes*) amongst which there figures the rice cake, *plakoús oryzites*¹⁴².

Finally, we should note that rice was also used to thicken sauces. Proof of this are two recipes, surviving in the *De re coquinaria*¹⁴³, for a starch sauce (*amulatum*), which list rice as an ingredient, while the water in which the cereal was boiled was said to give the sauce the appropriate consistency. In accordance with the first recipe¹⁴⁴, it was necessary to combine a thick pepper sauce (made from pepper that had been ground and soaked in water a day earlier) and fish sauce (*liquamen*),

¹³³ *Scholia in Aristophanis equites vetera et recentiora Triclinii*, 954b, 1–10, [in:] *Scholia in Aristophanem. Scholia in equites scholia vetera et recentiora Triclinii*, ed. D.M. JONES, N.G. WILSON, Groningen 1969. Cf. a modernised version of this delicacy, the recipe for which has been developed by Mark GRANT, mentioned above (*Roman cookery...*, p. 94).

¹³⁴ A.N.J. LOUVARIS, *Fast and abstinence in Byzantium*, [in:] *Feast, fast or famine. Food and drink in Byzantium*, ed. W. MAYER, S. TRZCIONKA, Brisbane 2005, p. 189–196.

¹³⁵ I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, *Eating flowers*, [in:] *Flavours and delights...*, p. 72.

¹³⁶ *Culinaria Greece. Greek specialities*, ed. M. MILONA, Cambridge 2008, p. 91, 278–279.

¹³⁷ GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, 524, 11–16.

¹³⁸ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, III, 110e (75, 32, KAIBEL).

¹³⁹ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, III, 110e (75, 32–34, KAIBEL).

¹⁴⁰ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XIV, 647c (57, 1–3, KAIBEL).

¹⁴¹ ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XIV, 648a (57, 50, KAIBEL).

¹⁴² ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, XIV, 647d (57, 16, KAIBEL).

¹⁴³ *De re coquinaria*, II, 2, 8–9. Concerning Apician sauces, cf. J. SOLOMON, *The Apician sauce. Ius Apicianum*, [in:] *Food in Antiquity...*, p. 115–131, in particular 125 (where the author discusses the role of rice as a thickener for dishes). Also cf. J.P. ALCOCK, *Food in the ancient world*, Westport–London 2006, p. 34; P. FAAS, *Around the Roman table. Food and feasting in ancient Rome*, New York 2003, p. 181.

¹⁴⁴ *De re coquinaria*, II, 2, 8.

together with a syrup obtained from common quince, fig must and starch diluted with water or a rice stock (*oryzae succus*). The second type of sauce¹⁴⁵ was prepared on the basis of a stock made from chicken bones, to which there were added leeks, dill and salt. Once these ingredients were boiled, the cook would add pepper, celery seeds, ground and previously soaked rice, fish sauce and raisin wine or reduced must (*defrutum*). The sauce was to be served with meatballs¹⁴⁶.

Having led our analysis to an end, it is time for a summary. The abovementioned information indicates that rice, although one of the least popular cereals in terms of cultivation acreage and the number of applications in the daily life of the Mediterranean, was nevertheless, treated with attention by contemporary physicians interested in dietetics, from Dioscurides up to Paul of Aegina. As a foodstuff, however, it was not highly appreciated. The approach to rice as a food underwent a positive evolution over the centuries. Over time, the cereal was introduced to lands further afield, which the new conditions that came into being after the Arab conquests (the so-called Arab agricultural revolution) particularly facilitated, although – and this is important to note – as early as the 6th cent. mentions of rice in Greek sources increased in number. It may be that medicine's relatively widespread interest in this cereal crop should be interpreted as a symptom of the increasing popularity of rice in lands belonging to Byzantium more than one hundred years before the spectacular victories of the Arabs. Nevertheless, we should keep in mind that in the *Imperium Romanum/Byzantinum* during the period covered by our research rice failed to attain a position similar to that of wheat and barley, which were much more common in the region, and existed only as a more or less marginal product in the daily diet of the majority of consumers. The situation did not change at least until the beginning of the modern era.

Abstract. The present study discusses dietetic qualities of rice and culinary recipes pertaining to its preparation as demonstrated in ancient and Byzantine medical treatises compiled between 1st and 7th cent. A.D. (Dioscurides, Galen, Oribasius, Anthimus, Alexander of Tralles, Aetius of Amida and Paul of Aegina). The evidence (in the part touching on gastronomic applications of rice) also includes *De re coquinaria* attributed to Apicius.

The article consists of three parts. The first analyzes sources and modern literature to assess the impact of rice on the Greco-Roman and Byzantine agriculture. The results of the analysis confirm the scholarly opinion that rice was never popular in the Mediterranean in the ancient and early Byzantine periods. A slow and gradual change in its status appeared along with the Arab agricultural revolution.

The second chapter of the study is devoted to dietetic characterizations of rice and presents features attributed to the cereal over the ages. The authors come to the conclusion that the most frequent

¹⁴⁵ *De re coquinaria*, II, 2, 9.

¹⁴⁶ For some interesting information on the role of rice in ancient culinary art, cf. N. MARINONE, *op. cit.*, p. 15–24.

characteristics of the crop which appear in the analyzed sources are its indigestibility, unwholesomeness, astringency (styptic action) as well as the ability to slow down the work of the alimentary tract. The final part of the article tries to retrieve from medical and culinary writings main culinary guidelines according to which rice was prepared as food. The authors conclude that, as a rule, the cereal was not used for bread baking, though it is likely that it was utilized in making cakes. Rice usually was the basis for preparation thick, gruel-like dishes which were normally compared to *chónndros* or *póltos*, less thick soups which were said to be similar to *ptisáne*, and watery, thin concoctions called *chyloi*, created by diluting rice stock.

Maciej Kokoszko

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

Krzysztof Jagusiak

Katedra Historii Bizancjum
Wydział Filozoficzno-Historyczny
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. A. Kamińskiego 27a
90–219 Łódź, Polska
krzysztof_jagusiak@o2.pl

Zofia Rzeźnicka

Katedra Historii Bizancjum
Wydział Filozoficzno-Historyczny
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. A. Kamińskiego 27a
90–219 Łódź, Polska
zosia_pwp.historyk@wp.pl

Justyna Kroczak (Zielona Góra)

PALAMAS AND FLORENSKY THE METAPHYSICS OF THE HEART IN PATRISTIC AND RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITION¹

The metaphysics of the heart can be thought of as the religious concept. In fact, this metaphysics is implicitly based upon a Biblical understanding of heart, while one may speak of the heart in a physical or in a spiritual sense, a religious person considers it the center of their being. To such a believer the heart is the mystery above all mysteries². While this metaphysics was first articulated by the Eastern Church Fathers, it was subsequently elaborated upon by Russian religious philosophers. However, Byzantine theology, in particular Palamism, had dealt with this concept long before it became an inspiration for Russian religious philosophers. Consequently, there are wholly legitimate grounds for a comparison of the conception present in the work of Gregory Palamas with that present in the later work of Pavel Florensky. The latter – a theologian, mathematician, philosopher, scientist and ultimately martyr – was one of the most visible personalities of the twentieth-century Russian religious renaissance. Palamas, on the other hand, inscribed himself in the pages of Byzantine history both for his theological work (his having formulated a theory which distinguished the divine essence from its energies) and for his apologetic work (his having been a staunch defender of the Hesychastic monks). As scholars have noted, the influence of Palamas' philosophy on that of Florensky is evident, above all, in those deliberations concerning the nature of the heart and its role and meaning in mystic experience³. As for Florensky, while the metaphysic of the heart features most prominently in *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* (*Столп*

¹ Polish version of this article can be found: J. KROCZAK, *Palamas i Florenski. Metafizyka serca w patrystycznej i rosyjskiej tradycji filozoficznej i literackiej*, [in:] *Metafizyka a literatura w kulturze rosyjskiej (Метафизика и литература в русской культуре)*, red. T. OBOLEVIČH, Kraków 2012, p. 311–326. The article is part of the research project financed by National Science Centre Poland, decision number: DEC-2012/05/N/HS1/03256.

² В.Н. ТОПОРОВ, *О сердце в ранних произведениях Достоевского*, RLit 54, 2003, p. 311–313. All the translations are mine, unless I have noted different.

³ Е.В. МОЧАЛОВ, *Антропологические темы в философии всеединства в России XIX–XX в.*, Нижний Новгород 2002, p. 206.

и утверждение Истины, 1914)⁴, it also figures in the *Iconostasis* (*Иконостас*, 1922)⁵ and the Mariological period of his work. In Palamas' writings, on the other hand, the problematic of the heart is nearly ubiquitous. This paper, however, proposes to limit itself to relevant fragments of two of Palamas' works: *In Defense of Those who Devoutly Practise a Life of Stillness* ('Υπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχάζοντων, 1338)⁶ and *On Prayer and Purity of Heart* (Περὶ προσευχῆς καὶ καθαρότητος καρδίας, 1333)⁷. Examples will be cited, and commentary will be provided.

1. The Metaphysics of the Heart: an Introduction

In Greek patristic theological texts, the metaphysics of the heart is particularly prominent in fourteenth century Hesychasm and in the Jesus Prayer. When considered in its wider context, Hesychasm appears less as a new phenomenon and rather as a continuation of an Orthodox form of religious experience dating to the very roots of Christianity⁸. Nonetheless, over the course of the past three centuries, scholars have above all been interested in the problematic of the heart in connection with Hesychasm and Palamism⁹.

The spirituality of Orthodox Christianity can be characterized by a contemplative attitude, mediated through the symbolism of the liturgy or of the cult of icons¹⁰. Polish researcher writes that: *Russian Orthodox thought places a special emphasis on cultivation of the spiritual sphere, the center of which is the heart*¹¹. We can find a similar remark in Florensky's *Iconostasis*:

the spiritual world, invisible, is not found somewhere distant from us, but rather it surrounds us [...]. However, be it due to a lack of experience or be it due to the imperfection of our spiritual eyes, we do not perceive this light-giving realm and often fail to suspect its existence. Only by the heart do we indistinctly intuit the general nature of the spiritual currents flowing around us.¹²

⁴ P. FLORENSKY, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth: An Essay in Orthodox Theodicy in Twelve Letters*, trans. B. JAKIM, Princeton 2004; П.А. ФЛОРЕНСКИЙ, *Столп и утверждение истины*, Москва 1990.

⁵ P. FLORENSKY, *Iconostasis*, trans. D. SHEEHAN, O. ANDREJEV, New York 1996; П.А. ФЛОРЕНСКИЙ, *Иконостас*, [in:] IDEM, *Имена*, Москва 2008.

⁶ ST. GREGORY PALAMAS, *In defense of those who devoutly Practice a Life at Stillness*, [in:] *The Philokalia. The complete text*, trans. G.E.H. PALMER, P. SHERRARD, K. WARE, vol. IV, London 1995, p. 331–342; *Gregorii Palamae De Hesychastis*, [in:] PG, vol. CL (cetera: PALAMAS, *De Hesychastis*), col. 1101B–1116B.

⁷ ST. GREGORY PALAMAS, *On Prayer and Purity of Heart*, [in:] *The Philokalia...*, p. 343–345; *Gregorii Palamae De oratione et puritate cordis*, [in:] PG, vol. CL, col. 1117D–1122B.

⁸ L. OUSPENSKY, *La Théologie de l'icône*, Paris 1980, p. 183–185; V. LOSSKY, *Vision de Dieu*, Neuchâtel 1962, p. 118.

⁹ В.Н. ТОПОРОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

¹⁰ Cf. E. BEHR-SIGEL, *The Place of the Heart: An Introduction to Orthodox Spirituality*, trans. S. BIGHAM, Torrance 1992, p. 80–85.

¹¹ J. KAPUŚCIK, *Sens życia. Antropologiczne aspekty rosyjskiego renesansu duchowego XX wieku w świetle prawosławia*, Kraków 2000, p. 157.

¹² П.А. ФЛОРЕНСКИЙ, *Иконостас...*, p. 349.

Therefore, a pure heart which directs the course of one's life is the most precious possession a person may have. In the ascetic tradition of the Orthodox Church, the heart represents the center of the human being, it is the source of abilities, intellect and the will. It is the point from which all spiritual life issues and to which all spiritual life returns¹³. The ascetic desires to close his heart to sin (Gr. ἀπάθεια) and to constantly hold vigil over it¹⁴. Such a goal presupposes a constant struggle to maintain the heart's purity¹⁵, the defense of the heart (Gr. φυλακή καρδίας).

The concept of heart was used in the Bible to designate the psychophysical center of a person's life. It was the seat of all the vital energies. As Mikhail Meslin has pointed out, because in general the Hebrews were not completely aware of its function, the heart in any literal or scientific sense of the word rarely appears in the Holy Scriptures. Nevertheless, they seemed to be cognizant of the importance of the organ¹⁶. Might be said that for the Jews, the heart was rather the intellectual center, where were seated all the faculties of the human spirit. The heart represented one's essence and core; it was the spiritual center of the person and, therefore, the real, essential person (Prv 4, 23). Heart is the center from which the entire person radiates and emanates, but it itself remains hidden in the deepest recesses¹⁷ – Jesus is described as having been gentle and humble of heart (Mt 11, 29). Saint Peter (1 Pe 1, 3-4) himself spoke of the heart's being hidden to the person, (Gr. ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἀνθρώπου): by which he may wished to express that a person's real essence is hidden in the depths of the heart.

This is the biblical foundation from which Hesychasm and the Prayer of the Mind arose. The unbroken imprecation, *Lord Jesus Christ, have mercy on me, a sinner*, is derived from Jesus' mysterious invocation in the Gospel of Luke: one must always pray and not give up (Lc 18, 1)¹⁸. Saint Paul reiterated this in his admonition to *pray without ceasing* (1 Thess 5, 17). In mystical and ascetic literature, the Jesus Prayer is also referred to as the Prayer of the Heart. This follows from the fact that heart is the primary human organ, the conjunction of the spirit and matter, which unites the physical and psychological construction with the spiritual. For this reason, prayers ought to be accompanied by alertness and attention (Mt 26, 41). It is considered that Saint Macarius of Egypt¹⁹ was the first teacher of

¹³ Cf. J.-Y. LELOUP, *Being Still: A Forgotten Mystical Tradition*, trans. M. LAIRD, Mahwah 2003, p. 136–140.

¹⁴ T. ŠPIDLÍK, *The Spirituality of the Christian East: A Systematic Handbook*, trans. A.P. GYTHIEL, Kalamazoo 1986, p. 433–436.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 432–434.

¹⁶ Cf. M. MASLIN, *Heart*, trans. K. ANDERSON, [in:] *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. M. ELIADE, vol. V, New York 1993, p. 236–237.

¹⁷ Π. Α. ΦΛΟΡΕΝΣΚΙЙ, *Στολν...*, p. 351–352. Cf. also P. ΕΥΔΟΚΙΜΟΝ, *L'Orthodoxie*, Neuchâtel 1959, p. 73–77.

¹⁸ All citations from the Bible come from: *World English Bible*, published by Rainbow Missions.

¹⁹ Saint Macarius of Egypt (300–390), also Macarius the Great was the famous ascetic and hermit. He is thought to have been the author of *Spiritual Homilies*. Cf. *An Athonite Gerontikon: Sayings of the Holy Fathers of Mount Athos*, ed. I. KOTSONIS, Thessaloniki 1997.

pure prayer, this consisted of the continual repetition of short sentences, the most important element of which was the name of God, Jesus Christ. With the aid of his disciple, Evagrius Ponticus²⁰, Saint Macarius articulated all the key elements which would recurrently characterize later Eastern monastic traditions. Saint Macarius identified the Evagrian intellect, the so-called νοῦς, with the heart²¹. In so doing, he affected a certain transformation: in the Orthodox context, the Prayer of the Mind was reconceptualized as the Prayer of the Heart. This was to be a personal prayer addressed to the incarnate Word, conspicuously characterized by a ceaseless recourse to the name of Jesus²². Palamas was one of the foremost theoreticians of such prayerfulness, and it is to him we shall now turn our attentions.

2. Gregory Palamas and Hesychastic Spirituality

Palamas was a well-educated monk. However, as he himself did not aspire to the title of a great thinker, coherent theological system is presented in his work²³. Palamas' writings are topical treatises on Orthodox mysticism, prompted by the accusations of the anti-Hesychasts²⁴ (Hesychastic controversy).

Hesychastic controversy (also known as: Palamite controversy) erupted in Byzantium during the first half of the fourteenth-century. In brief, it was a struggle between Palamas, a monk from Athos, and the Calabrian theologian Barlaam (1290–1384). The initial dispute concerned the doctrine of God's knowability to the person as well as other essential theological issues. Palamas, for his part, believed that a person could attain to immediate knowledge of God and, for him, this was the goal and primary criterium of all theology. His doctrine held that, while a sincere mystic could not perceive the essence of God (Gr. οὐσία), it was possible to perceive His energies (Gr. ἐνέργειαι). In other words, the mystic could experience the eternal divine light. Barlaam, for his part, maintained that God was ultimately unknowable. He consequently criticized the devotional practice of

²⁰ Evagrius Ponticus (345–399) was one from the most famous Desert Fathers. He is the author of many ascetic writings. Cf. EVAGRIUS OF PONTUS, *The Greek Ascetic Corpus*, trans. R. SINKEWICZ, Oxford–New York 2003.

²¹ S. Macarii *Ægyptii Homiliae*, hom. XV, [in:] PG, vol. XXXIV (cetera: MACARIUS), col. 589B.

²² Cf. И. МЕЙЕНДОРФ, *Жизнь и труды святителя Григория Паламы*, trans. Г.Н. НАЧИНИКИН, Санкт-Петербург 1997, p. 193.

²³ A. TORRANCE, *Precedents for Palamas' Essence-Energies Theology in the Cappadocian Fathers*, VC 63, 2009, p. 48.

²⁴ The term "Hesychasts" (Gr. ἡσυχῆτοι) was employed by the Eastern Church to designate those monks who led a peaceful, ascetic life contemplation, directed towards the achievement of personal holiness and complete union with God. In other words, the Hesychast is a person maintaining silence and giving themselves fully over to a life of prayer. The forty-first canon of the Council in Trullo (692) treats such forms of attaining holiness. Palamas' own work represented an apologetic on behalf of the monks who practiced this devotional method.

the Hesychastic monks, which was supposed to lead to deification. More specifically, Barlaam discerned in this practice a variant of Messalian materialism, and he therefore accused Palamas of heresy when the latter maintained the absolute reality of the deification.

Monk from Calabria also joined the attack on the Hesychastic spirituality and Palamas, their most prominent apologist. Hesychasm, as practiced in the fourteenth-century, made use of a psychosomatic method of contemplation. This was intended to involve the entire body in the act of prayer, and it was a direct consequence of the Hesychasts' philosophical position. With relations to practice, for the Byzantine Hesychasts this prayer was a passionate imprecation accompanied by rhythmic breathing²⁵. In the late Byzantine era, there arose a marked tendency to coordinate the two halves of the prayer with the process of inhalation and exhalation. The first part: *Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God*, was pronounced with the intake of breath, the second part: *have mercy on me, a sinner* was pronounced when the adept exhaled²⁶. When praying, one was to sit on a twenty-centimeter table, one was to relax one's head and arms, and one was to direct one's attention inward toward the heart. As mentioned, the rhythm of the prayer was to be matched to the rhythm of the breath. A spiritual guide was essential, as was maintaining constant vigil and discipline and directing all attention toward the depths

²⁵ *Mnisi Góry Atos o duchowości prawosławnej*, ed. G. KRAŃCZUK, Hajnówka 1995, p. 113; J. TOFILUK, *Hezychazm i jego wpływ na rozwój duchowości*, *Elp* 6, 2002, p. 83.

²⁶ J. NAUMOWICZ, *Wstęp*, [in:] *Filokalia. Teksty o modlitwie serca*, ed. IDEM, Tyniec 1998, p. 39–40. An additional technique, testified to by the heartfelt writings of an anonymous nineteenth-century Russian pilgrim, appeared later. In addition to the rhythm of the breath, the prayer was to be synchronized to the beating of the heart, each successive word was uttered to a corresponding heartbeat (cf. *The Way of a Pilgrim: and The Pilgrim Continues His Way*, trans. R.M. FRENCH, Pasadena 1993, p. 38–37). This variant of prayer was not yet known in *Philokalia*. Laypeople first became acquainted with the Jesus Prayer through the writings of a pilgrim, first published in Kazan' in 1870. Contemporarily, the Jesus Prayer is known by the term onomatodoxy (Russian: имяславие). Its twentieth-century history can be traced to the appearance of a book *On the Caucasus mountains (На горах Кавказа)*, 1907) (cf. ИЛАРИОН (АЛФЕЕВ), *Священная тайна церкви. Введение в историю и проблематику имяславских споров*, vol. I, Санкт-Петербург 2002, p. 291–341) by an author whose identity remains unknown, but who was most probably the monk Illarion. This book contained, besides a description of the anchoritic life, the traditional Orthodox doctrines concerning the Jesus Prayer. Particularly stressed is that neither for the monk nor for the lay believer can there be salvation without the name of Jesus (Russian: мирянин; Gr. κοσμικός). In the twentieth century, practitioners of the Jesus Prayer included, along with Florensky, Sergei Bulgakov and Aleksei Losev (П.А. ФЛОРЕНСКИЙ, *Имяславие как философская предпосылка*, [in:] IDEM, *Сочинения в четырех томах*, vol. III, pars 1, Москва 1999, p. 252–287; IDEM, *Об имени Божиим*, [in:] IDEM, *Сочинения...*, p. 352–362; IDEM, *Отрывок письма, написанного П.А. Флоренским по просьбе о. Архимандрита Давида в ответ на письмо Афонских имяславцев с Кавказа*, [in:] IDEM, *Сочинения...*, p. 362–363; IDEM, *Общечеловеческие корни идеализма*, БВе 1.2, 1909, p. 284–297; С.Н. БУЛГАКОВ, *Философия Имени*, Санкт-Петербург 1999; А.Ф. ЛОСЕВ, *Имяславие*, [in:] IDEM, *Имя*, Санкт-Петербург 1997, p. 7–17; IDEM, *11 тезисов о Софии, церкви, имени*, [in:] IDEM, *Имя...*, p. 23)

of the heart²⁷. In contrast to both Platonism and prevailing Orthodox traditions, Palamas viewed the body as naturally good and for him, heart represented depth of the body and its primary intellectual organ²⁸. It is worth remembering that earlier, during the Middle Ages, thanks to Nicephorus the Monk²⁹, there had emerged in Byzantium a distinction between intellectual mysticism and the mysticism of heart. Whereas the first was derived from Neoplatonist anthropological dualism, the second was more akin to Biblical sources and the Stoic tradition. For their part, Palamas and the Hesychasts advocated the mysticism of heart.

It was in conjunction with the practice of controlled breathing that the Jesus Prayer attained its privileged status on Mount Athos. For his part, Barlaam derisively referred to his opponents as *navel-psychics* (Gr. ὀμφαλοψύχοι), or those who would locate their soul in their navels³⁰. Such a slur irritated the Hesychasts to no end, seeing as they were fully convinced of the validity of their psychosomatic practice. Hesychastic prayer was to involve the entire person, soul and body, in prayer and had been developed with such a purpose in mind³¹.

Here we will focus upon a fragment of *In Defense of Those who Devoutly Practise a Life of Stillness*, a treatise extracted from the larger work generally referred to as *The Triads*. *The Triads* derives its name from its tripartite structure, consisting of three parts each containing three treatises. The title *Triads* was first used by Philotheus Coccinus³² in his *Encomium Palamae*³³. Yet for our purposes let us turn directly to Palamas:

Therefore the soul possesses multiple faculties, and by virtue of our nature, it is one of the bodily organs and lives being generated by the body. Which organ(s) make use of the faculties for the soul? We term this organ the intellect. At any rate, while no one has suggested that the intellect is situated in the fingernails, eyelashes, nostrils or lips, all agree that the intellect is seated somewhere inside us. Disagreement arises as to precisely where. Some locate the intellect, so to speak, *on the acropolis* (that is, in the head). Others prefer that most central location, the heart, that part which has been purified from natural life and serves as

²⁷ SAWA (HRYCUNIAK), *Modlitwa Jezusowa*, [in:] *Prawosławie. Światło ze Wschodu*, red. K. LEŚNIEWSKI, Lublin 2009, p. 470–471.

²⁸ PALAMAS, *De Hesychastis*, col. 1108A.

²⁹ Nicephorus the Monk lived in the second half of the thirteenth century. His major work is *On Watchfulness and the Guarding of the Heart*. The edition: PG, vol. CXLVII, col. 945–996; English translation: *The Philokalia...*, p. 194–206.

³⁰ PALAMAS, *De Hesychastis*, col. 1116A.

³¹ On Palamas and Hesychasm vide also e.g. J. MEYENDORFF, *Byzantine Hesychasm: Historical, Theological and Social Problems – collected Studies*, London 1974; IDEM, *St Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*, New York 1974; R.E. SINKEWICZ, *The 'Solutions' Addressed to George Lapithes by Barlaam the Calabrian and Their Philosophical Context*, MS 43, 1981, p. 151–217; IDEM, *Saint Gregory Palamas, The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters*, Toronto 1988; Y. SPITERIS, *Ostatni Ojcowie Kościoła. Kabisilas. Palamas*, trans. B. WIDŁA, Warszawa 2006, p. 151–356.

³² Philoteus Coccinus (1300–1379) was a patriarch of Thessaloniki. He was also a disciple of Palamas and author of his biography.

³³ Cf. PG, vol. CLI, col. 551–656.

its support. For our part, we know that the intellect, being incorporeal, exists neither precisely inside nor outside us; however we hold that it is joined to us via the organ of the heart. We derive this not from any human doctrine, but from the Creator of humanity, who states in the Gospel: *That which enters into the mouth doesn't defile the man; but that which proceeds out of the mouth, this defiles the man* (Mt 15, 11). He adds: *For out of the heart come forth evil thoughts [...]* (Mt 15, 19). Saint Macarius of Egypt echoes this: *The heart governs the entire human organism and, when grace takes possession of the heart with its laws, it thereby takes possession of all the thoughts and elements of that person. This is why the intellect and thoughts are seated there [in the heart – J.K.]*³⁴. Therefore it follows that the heart is the treasury of reason and the primary intellectual organ of the body. Hence, were we to investigate and analyze in detail our intelligence, how else was one to treat the myriad of thoughts scattered and distracted by the senses, save by tracing them back to the depths of that selfsame sacred organ, the heart? It was fully consistent with what we have cited for Saint Macarius of Egypt to state: *it is there [in the heart – J.K.] one must look to see whether grace has written provided us with spiritual laws*. Where else but in the governing organ and the seat of grace, where the intellect and all thoughts are housed? Having comprehended this, one is in a better state to understand how crucial it was for those who had elected the quietist tenants of Hesychasm that they circumscribe and locate the intellect in the body, and especially in that most profound and intimate place, the heart.³⁵

The fragment cited above is an extract from Palamas' response to the question of an anonymous monk. In his question (col. 1101B–1104A), the monk had expressed concerns as to the orthodoxy of Hesychasm, particularly the practice whereby controlled breathing was to direct the attention inward. To Hesychasts, after all, the intellect was situated inside and not outside the individual. For their part, the anti-Hesychasts ridiculed those monks who believed disciplining the breath was any pathway towards being granted God's grace (col. 1104A). This accusation was at any rate unfair, as the controlled breathing was only considered a means of concentrating the attention, and not any method of achieving salvation in and of itself. Having expressed these doubts, the monk deferred to Palamas, who he hoped could resolve them and thereby strengthen his resolve in the Hesychastic practice.

According to Palamas, the *law of sin* dominates the body. It is therefore necessary to negate it and institute the *law of mind* (Rom 7, 23). When this is accomplished, the body can become rather an asset and a guard for the intellect. This transformation is only possible through love. Through love, the body purifies itself and desire becomes a stimulus to virtue (col. 1105A). The glory and light of God arises in the heart. In Palamas' conception, the spirit is one of the organs of the body and loves being generated thereby (col. 1105B). However, all the faculties of the spirit are utilized by a different organ, the intellect (col. 1105B). The intellect is one of the organs located within the body. As cited above, some associate it with the head and others with the heart. In reality, Palamas states, the intellect is seated in the heart, which, enjoying a certain primacy, thereby governs all the subordinate

³⁴ MACARIUS, col. 589B.

³⁵ PALAMAS, *De Hesychastis*, col. 1105B–1108A.

faculties of soul³⁶. While it would be ridiculous to locate the intellect in the fingernails, eyelashes, nostrils or lips, it is certainly somewhere within us (col. 1105C). Since the Holy Scriptures (as cited above) establish the primacy of the heart, for Palamas it is certain as well. Furthermore, Saint Macarius of Egypt, a significant authority for Palamas and one whom he repeatedly cites, along with other Holy Fathers had maintained as much³⁷. Thus, the heart was the treasure-house of reason and the chief intellectual organ (col. 1105D). It was there one was to turn one's spiritual eyes to discover spiritual laws. Locating the intellect in the heart, the most central organ (col. 1108A), was fully justifiable: by means of the heart, the entire person could dwell in the Holy Spirit both in intellect and in body.

The identification of the intellect with the heart is so crucial for Palamas that it is worth citing yet another fragment, this one being from the *On Prayer and Purity of Heart*. This short ascetic treatise, which dates from Palamas' earliest activity as a writer, states:

By intellect we designate the activity of the intellect, consisting of reasoning and thoughts. The intellect is also that active force which the Holy Scriptures describe as the heart. Secondary to that, above all the powers extant in us, the spirit is intellectual. The activity of the intellect can be easily purified and tamed through prayer exercises and, above all, by contemplating one thing [that is, God] Our soul, which is the cause of this, is only purified if all our other powers and faculties are simultaneously purified as well. The soul is after all a unity consisting of multiple powers. When any of its faculties are tainted by sin, it becomes impure seeing as all those faculties form a community. If these faculties occasionally appear distinct, this is only due to the zealotry with which specific faculties are occasionally purified. The act of purification does not necessarily insinuate a faculty has become pure, as they form a union: in conjunction, a particular faculty may still be more impure than pure. Yet in this manner, in the moment of fervent prayer the intellect becomes pure and progressively purifies, either through the light of reason or through the reasonable light. Yet, if by this one consider oneself cleansed one has fallen into error and opened the door to temptation. Nonetheless, when the intellect, cognizant of the heart's impurity, does not become arrogant and remains humble through the aid of the spirit, it will more easily discover the impurity of its various faculties. Through progressing in humility and sadness, the intellect simultaneously discovers the remedy for all the various faculties and powers. By activity, it purifies the active faculties; by knowledge, it purifies the cognitive faculties; by prayer, it purifies the apprehensive faculties and thereby it may attain a lasting purity of heart and mind. Yet no one can attain this save through perfection in action and ceaseless vigilance against sin: constant observation guided by prayer.³⁸

According to Palamas, the most precious gift God has given humanity is intellect. It is, of course, worth remembering that he does not conflate intellect with reason. Rather, he firmly distinguishes the two concepts. In his conception, intellect is the means of immediate knowledge of the fundamental truths of existence (and above all of moral behavior), whereas reason is the discursive organ (that

³⁶ Cf. G. MANTZARIDIS, *The Deification of Man*, trans. L. SHERRARD, New York 1984, p. 90–94.

³⁷ MACARIUS, col. 589B.

³⁸ *Gregorii Palamae De oratione et puritate cordis*, [in:] PG, vol. CL, col. 1120C–1121A.

is, the organ of reasoning). Reason quite often succors the intelligence, but it is impotent without it. The intelligence itself is not ideal and often falls into error when it becomes engrossed in worldly matters. When, however, the intelligence is focused on itself and the higher intelligence (of God), then that intelligence becomes centered in the heart³⁹. Polish researcher Józef Naumowicz writes that the *νοῦς* refers to a dual human faculty: secular comprehension and the contemplation of God. In contrast to the intellect and reason, it does not operate by means of discursive apprehension, but through the intuitive apprehension of divine truths thanks to the light of grace⁴⁰.

It is often considered that Palamas was a precursor of Blaise Pascal. Indeed, when Pascal states that we know God through the heart, he was close to the Eastern conception of the cognition of God. As does Palamas, Pascal views the heart not as the seat of mere emotions but rather of emotions bound to intuition, a faculty which he distinguishes from the discursive and the rational faculty⁴¹. It was thanks to his logic of the heart, *ordre du coeur* that Pascal found a way out of his radical, universal doubt. Pascal saw the source of understanding in the heart and in faith: not, as did the Cartesian formulation, in reason. Yet an even more fitting analogy to that of the author of *The Triads* presents itself in Florensky's conception of the heart.

3. The metaphysics of heart in Russian philosophy and literature

In Russian culture, the heart has long been a symbol invoked by writers, poets, philosophers and theologians. In Russian thought, the metaphysics of the heart was subsequently a preoccupation of Gregory Skovoroda (1722–1794)⁴², as is evident in his statement that *heart is the real person*⁴³. This problematic was then an interest for the elder Slavophiles Ivan Kireevsky (1806–1856) and Aleksey Khomyakov (1804–1860). Kireevsky contrasted the Western metaphysics of reason with the Eastern metaphysic of the heart⁴⁴. Khomyakov expressed a similar view and criticized the West's rationalist approach to philosophy, theology, culture and life. For Khomyakov, the heart was the life-giving source of faith⁴⁵. Evgeny Trubetsky (1863–1920), who wrote that a person achieves the spiritual experiences which

³⁹ A. SIEMIANOWSKI, *Tomizm a palamizm. Wokół kontrowersji doktrynalnych chrześcijańskiego Wschodu i Zachodu w średniowieczu*, Poznań 1998, p. 42.

⁴⁰ *Filokalia...*, p. 327.

⁴¹ B. ТАТАКИС, *La philosophie byzantine*, Paris 1959, p. 273.

⁴² Г.С. СКОВОРОДА, *Начальная дверь к христианскому добронравию*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Собрание Сочинений в 12 томах*, vol. I, Москва 1973, p. 111; ИДЕМ, *Разговор пяти путников об истинное счастье*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Собрание...*, vol. I, p. 341.

⁴³ В.В. ЗЕНЬКОВСКИЙ, *История русской философии*, vol. I, Paris 1948, p. 72.

⁴⁴ Zob. М.А. МАСЛИН, *Сердца метафизика*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Русская философия. Словарь*, Москва 1999, p. 435–436.

⁴⁵ А.С. ХОМЯКОВ, *Церковь одна*, Москва 1991, p. 24–33.

make revelation possible by means of the heart⁴⁶, is also worth a mention. Vladimir Solovyov (1853–1900) touched similar issues when considering love, mainly in *The Meaning of Love*⁴⁷.

Earlier Pamphil Yurkevič (1826–1874) presented the heart as a fundamental philosophical concept⁴⁸. Yurkevič was highly esteemed both by Vassily Zenkovsky, the historian of Russian philosophy⁴⁹, and by Solovyov, who consider Yurkevič his teacher. Yurkevič considered the heart to be fundamental ontological and anthropological category, and by it he also referred to the whole of a person's spiritual life. In his work, the heart was the deciding factor in moral valuations and crucial to any apprehension of God⁵⁰. In his primary treatise regarding the heart, *Сердце и его значение в духовной жизни человека по учению Слова Божия*, Yurkevič writes:

Anyone who reads the Word of God attentively will easily notice that, in all the holy books and by all the inspired writers, the heart is seen as the spiritual center of the person. It is presented as being the primary organ and the focus of all the motor, volitional, sensual and intellectual faculties of the person.⁵¹

In the first part of this work he analyzes the Biblical concept of the heart and synthesizes the doctrine of the Church Fathers concerning this question. He asserts that the heart is the moral center of the person⁵². The heart binds together all the bodily faculties and serves as the organ of spiritual life⁵³. It can express and reveal spiritual states too delicate to be apprehended by the rational intellect⁵⁴. Yurkevič's work sought to defend the role of the heart and *the formation of the internal person* against contemplatory science, specifically against its tendency to explain the heart in biological, medical and chemical terminology. As is well-known, in Yurkevič's day materialism and positivism were at the height of their influence⁵⁵.

In the twentieth-century, the heart would appear in the work of Boris Vyšeslavcev, Semyon Frank, Vasily Rozanov and Ivan Ilyin⁵⁶. Having concluded

⁴⁶ Е.Н. ТРУБЕЦКОЙ, *Смысл жизни*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Избранное*, Москва 1995, p. 240. See also chapters 6 and 7 from this book: *Религиозный смысл человеческой мысли* and *Всемирная катастрофа и всемирный смысл*.

⁴⁷ V. SOLOVYOV, *The Meaning of Love*, New York 1947.

⁴⁸ П.Д. ЮРКЕВИЧ, *Сердце и его значение в духовной жизни человека по учению Слова Божия*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Философские произведения*, Москва 1990, p. 69–103.

⁴⁹ В.В. ЗЕНЬКОВСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

⁵⁰ Т. ОВОЛЕВИТШ, *Wiara jako locus philosophicus myśli rosyjskiej*, [in:] *Rosyjska metafizyka religijna*, red. ЕАДЕМ, W. KOWALSKI, Tarnów 2009, p. 48.

⁵¹ П.Д. ЮРКЕВИЧ, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 71.

⁵³ *Ibidem*, p. 73–74.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 85.

⁵⁵ J. КАРУŚЦИК, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

⁵⁶ М.А. МАСЛИН, *op. cit.*, p. 435.

this brief survey of examples, one would emphasize what is common to all these Russian thinkers – the notion that the heart somehow represents the fundamental unity of the person.

4. Pavel Florensky and the mysticism of the heart

At the outset, it is worth noting that Florensky is one of the main representatives of this trend in Russian philosophy. While Yurkevič and the Church Fathers were influences on him, Florensky's own perspective was unique by virtue of its generality. His metaphysics of heart corresponds to and is completed by his metaphysics of light. For Florensky light was the light of the sprit of the godfearing person, a higher type of personality. The Orthodox temple was a symbol of this light to him, the heart of the believer was also such⁵⁷.

Florensky's metaphysics of heart is primarily developed in *The Pillar and the Ground of the Truth*. This work opens with a discussion of the phenomenom of the body, he writes that the body is not substance, in the sense of physical matter, but rather form, in the sense not of externate contours but rather of substantial structure. The etymology of the word *body* suggests its connection with *wholeness*, a body is a certain unity, individual and exceptional⁵⁸. When speaking of the body, it is important to stress that the body itself and worldly corporeality are two different things. Certainly a person exists as a being connected to the world of matter via the body, and, in Florensky's view, this connection is so close... that *the fate of a person and of the whole of creation are inseperable. Hence the fall of humanity led to the fall of all creation*⁵⁹. Yet the body is a necessary liability, for according to the Eastern tradition the union of body and soul is integral. One should not therefore ascribe to these thinkers a dualistic perspective.

With respects to the body, Florensky's thought partitioned the human being into three parts: the abdomen, chest and head. Each region of the body could give rise to its own respective mysticism; taken as a whole, the specific goal of mysticism was the proper development of the three bodily partitions, under the government of the chest (it being *above all connected with the human essence*). Progressing in a mystic understanding of each respective partition, be it the abdomen, chest or head, was conducive to the overall goal of bringing harmony to the individual. That is:

each particular mysticism necessarily increases the vital balance, and therefore ameliorates the sinful nature of man. However, it is only the mysticism of the human center, that particular mysticism which the person eminently capable of attaining grace practices, which revitalizes the interior, rectifies the person and favours their gradual growth. Monastic

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 436.

⁵⁸ Cf. П.А. ФЛЮРЕНСКИЙ, *Стол...*, p. 263–264.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 268–270.

mysticism is therefore naturally that of the chest, and of the heart: seeing as the heart has been considered the center of the chest for longer than we can remember. It is specifically to the heart that monastic mystic practice directs the attention.⁶⁰

So says Florensky. The heart is the center of psychological and spiritual life. In the heart originate decisions concerning better or worse behavior. Desires and intentions are born there. It is the seat of the will and the nexus of all its activities (Prv 23, 26; Phil 1, 7). Furthermore, it is also the seat of all the spirit's apprehensive faculties (Prv 16, 1). According to scripture usage, to perceive something in the heart is synonymous with comprehending it (Dt 8, 5)⁶¹. As a rule, thoughts are of the heart. In addition, as language is the expression or manifestation of thought, and seeing that thought occurs in the heart, it follows that words also uttered from this organ (Iob 1, 5).

The heart is the center of the myriad spiritual feelings, desires and passions. For example, the heart attests to the various degrees of joy, which range from mere carefreeness to supernal delight in the face of God (Act 2, 46–47). The other side of the coin is that the heart experiences the various stages of suffering, which range from a mere melancholic depression to overpowering misery, when the person cries out from sorrow in the heart (Is 65, 14)⁶². The many functions ascribed to the heart include that of being the locus of a person's moral life. Similarly, the heart is where all the various moral states to which a person is subject occur; these range from the highest, mystic love of God (Ps 73, 26) to the pride, which idolizing oneself takes one's own heart for the heart of God (Ez 28, 2). In brief, it is the heart which is the root of everything good or evil in word, thought or deed which emanates from the person, and it is the treasury where a person's virtue or wickedness is stored (Lc 6, 45).

It follows from this that one ought to give their heart to God, that they might be faithful in word, thought and deed (Prv 23, 26)⁶³. The goal of an ascetic's life is purity of a specific kind: the purity of the heart (Ps 51, 12). When the heart is cleansed, the believer begins to merge with God. This progressive union rectifies and regulates the ascetic's entire being. Spiritualization denotes the process of cleansing the heart, and the heart is the fiery focus of spiritual life. The very word heart in Indo-European languages has connotations of *core* or *center*⁶⁴. In terms of usage it is frequently employed to express such meanings as *interior*, *bosom*, *center* or *core*⁶⁵. As the heart is the essential 'core' of a person, the possession of a clean heart opens vistas of a higher, spiritual world and thereby transforms the entire

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 264–265.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, p. 535.

⁶² *Ibidem*, p. 536.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, p. 538.

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 267–268.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 269–270.

person. According to Florensky, *through possession of a pure heart, a person comes to understand that all being is continuous negation: one great refusal, 'No', and, above all, 'Not-I'*⁶⁶. Yet, this rift between that which is and which is not the ego can be bridged through love. Love is understood as a substantial act, emanating from the subject to the object yet having its support in the object. Through love, the soul and body are sanctified. The chapter about body, heart and mind referenced above leads into a chapter concerning Wisdom-Sophia. This concerns *in what manner creation is thought, or in what manner it thinks itself, or in what manner it exists as itself*⁶⁷. This wisdom is the mysterious mediate essence which renders possible to the believer a perception of God in their innermost *core*⁶⁸.

Mariology presents one final field where the significance of heart has been analyzed. In this tradition, the greatness and wealth of Mary was the purity of her heart and her heart's purity implied its transparency. Bulgakov, one of the Russian Sophiologists, even went so far as to claim that the incarnation of Christ was realized not merely in one person, but in two: both in Jesus Christ himself and in the Virgin Mary⁶⁹. There is no contradiction involved in seeing the Mother of God as the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit and in there simultaneously being an exteriorization of the cult of the nature of Christ in her own. Mary was the person who first and most perfectly realized what a gift had been received from God, quite possibly this was due to the purity of her heart, where were concealed her wealth and greatness⁷⁰. In the opinion of Florensky, because of her unsurpassed virginity and purity, Mary appeared as the entity most similar to Sophia and was characterized by total transparency. Mary received the eternal spark of the life of the Trinity. Moreover she accepted the love of the Father, who personally gave himself through His Son⁷¹. She was the Mother of God, beauty incarnate, the glory of the world and the ornament of all Creation⁷².

5. Summary

It would be interesting to situate the work of Dostoyevsky – the main Russian metaphysician – among the various metaphysics of the heart which have been mentioned above. Dostoyevsky was not really an academic philosopher and

⁶⁶ Г.Ф. ГАРАЕВА, *Павел Александрович Флоренский*, Краснодар 2007, p. 35.

⁶⁷ П.А. ФЛОРЕНСКИЙ, *Столт...*, p. 318.

⁶⁸ Cf. Z. KIJAS, *Maryja w tajemnicy wcielenia w świetle antropologii trynitarniej Pawła Florenskiego*, SMat 2.1, 2000, p. 147.

⁶⁹ J. KLINGER, *Zarys prawosławnej mariologii*, [in:] IDEM, *O istocie prawosławia. Wybór pism*, Warszawa 1983, p. 225.

⁷⁰ Z. KIJAS, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

⁷¹ V. СИО, *Wziąć Maryję do siebie*, Kraków 1993, p. 21.

⁷² More on that issue: J. MEYENDORFF, *Wisdom-Sophia: Contrasting approaches to a complex theme*, DOP 41, 1987, p. 398–400.

considered himself rather an artist, particularly in that his notion of philosophy would not have been in any way scientific. He distrusted Reason and believed that the heart and faith served as better guides. In various contexts, the problematic of the heart appears throughout his work, and several publications have already broached this subject⁷³.

Dostoyevsky's entire oeuvre could essentially be characterized as an exploration of Pascal's basic idea of the *greatness and the poverty of man*. It is an idea also forcefully expressed in the well-known poem by Gavriila Deržavin (1743–1816): *I the master, I the slave, I the insect, I God*. To paraphrase Dostoyevsky, God and the devil battle within the human heart⁷⁴, and his conception of the organ and its meaning in the works from 1860 to 1870 shows a clear affinity to the biblical understanding. The heroine of the short story *The Meek One* provides an example of a positive figure characterized by humility and a pure heart (Russian: смирение)⁷⁵. On the contrary, a negative character dominated by an empty and callous heart is portrayed in Stavrogin from *The Demons*.

The above analysis suggests that the problematic of the heart, particularly in the metaphysical sense, permeates some aspects of Russian Orthodox culture. The Russian concept of heart is by equal parts philosophical, theological and mystic, but one should remember the assertion of Vladimir Lossky that Russian Orthodox is the mystical theology *par excellence*⁷⁶. At any rate, for Russian theologians, philosophers or religious writers, heart is the core of the integral human being.

Abstract. This paper focuses on the philosophical issue known as the *metaphysics of the heart* within Orthodox Christianity – both Russian and Byzantine versions. Russian religious thought is based on patristic tradition. Influences and connections can be seen in Florensky's philosophy of All-Unity. This Russian philosopher was highly inspired by Gregory Palamas, fourteenth-century Eastern Church. These two Orthodox thinkers, mainly their metaphysics of heart are objects of interests.

Justyna Krocak

Instytut Filozofii

Uniwersytet Zielonogórski

al. Wojska Polskiego 71A

65–762 Zielona Góra, Poland

J.Krocak@ifil.uz.zgora.pl

⁷³ В.Н. ТОПОРОВ, *op. cit.*; Н.Т. АШИМБАЕВА, *Особенности «сердцеведения» Достоевского*, [in:] ЕАДЕМ, *Достоевский: Контекст творчества и времени*, Санкт-Петербург 2005, p. 67–87.

⁷⁴ Б.П. ВЫШЕСЛАВЦЕВ, *Вечное в русской философии*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Кризис индустриальной культуры*, Москва 2006, p. 618.

⁷⁵ S. ROMAŃCZUK, *Cichość serca (кротость)*, [in:] *Idee w Rosji. Идеи в России. Ideas in Russia*, red. A. DE LAZARI, vol. II, Łódź 1999, p. 208.

⁷⁶ V. LOSSKY, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, New York 1976, p. 9.

Adam Mesiarkin (Bratislava)

EXAMINING THE SLAVIC IDENTITY IN MIDDLE AGES PERCEPTION OF COMMON SENSE OF SLAVIC COMMUNITY IN POLISH AND BOHEMIAN MEDIEVAL CHRONICLES

The closing report of a press centre of the organizing committee of the tenth Slavic Congress (Kiev, November 2010) does not discuss only a concept of the *literary reciprocity*. Firstly, it presents a complex ideological program which includes cultural, economical as well as political integration. Secondly, it encourages work with the youth, ecological education and inspires re-establishment of the forgotten spirituality. The report also highlights the necessity of mutual communication among scholars, journalists, politicians, artists, sportsmen and businessmen¹. There is no need to emphasise that the main idea of this congress – in the mechanism of throwback – refers to the distant historical Slavic unity.

The identification with the ethnonym *Slav* has alternately appeared in both Czech and Polish history along the development of an idea of Slavic nations/tribes' congeniality.

The question of Slavic identity is essentially interconnected with such terms as ethnogenesis and topogenesis. The problem is that a great number of previously published works intended to discuss ethnogenesis does not address the questions of mechanisms behind the emergence of the Slavic identity. This has been caused by inadequate methodology as well as terminology. Since written accounts are rather scarce, it is necessary to apply an archaeological and a linguistic approach while researching the question of Slavic ethnogenesis as a process of forming and transforming identity. Complications of using a language as a distinguishing and identifying ethnical feature were obvious already in the works of antique

¹ *Správa tlačového centra organizačného výboru X. Vseslovanského zjazdu v Kyjeve 2010* http://www.sppr.org.pl/xzw_s_pl.htm [4 I 2013]. The reference is being used only as an illustration how various political (and popular) initiatives and movements trace the sense of cooperation of the modern day Slavic nations to the former imaginary unity. Author of the article has no sympathy towards the ideological conclusions and intentions of this meeting. The reference to this happening in an academic article is caused by the rhetoric it uses, which tries to emphasise the historical unity of the Slavs. The article will try to show the possible basis of medieval chronicles and try to show the evolution of the sense of proximity between groups and nations, which we can denominate as Slavs.

and medieval scholars². Particularly in the case of the Slavs, it is difficult to abandon linguistics as the “sacred” method of making such distinctions – especially when the perception of the Slavism has been based predominantly on a linguistic congeniality up until now.

The existence, as well as the form of the Slavic identity is traditionally interconnected with the emergence and forming of Slavic languages, which seemed to have been present at the emergence of individual Slavic tribes/nations³. It would be highly fortunate if in these areas we could find an overlapping evidence of the most original pottery.

Methodological works are also no novelty within archaeology. On the other hand, these works do not make an ethnical classification of material sources any easier⁴. Authors of these texts maintain that changes in material culture do not have to reflect an immediate change of population within a relevant area. Even if this thesis is accepted to the most extreme extent, it still does not disrupt the model of a massive expansion from Proto-Slavic homeland which appears in all archaeological and historical schools as well as textbooks. This model, in a way, represents a paradigm of nations’ migrations since the Tower of Babel and Jewish migration.

The works dealing with ethnical identities in the Middle Ages often refer to studies of sociologists and anthropologists⁵. Objective categories have become less important than a mental level, consciousness as a bound binding a community together. The ethnical identity is perceived as a set, and system, of common features which represent the community both inward and outward and distinguish such a community from other similar ethnical groups⁶.

² ISIDOR ZE SEVILLY, *Etymologiae*, trans. I. ZACHOVÁ, ed. I. ZACHOVÁ, H. ŠEDINOVÁ, vol. IX, Praha 1998, p. 17, 13; H. POPOWSKA-TABORSKA, *Co językoznawca powiezieć może o wczesnych dziejach Słowian*, [in:] *Praojczyzna Słowian. Zbiór wypowiedzi*, ed. W. MAŃCZAK, Kraków 2001, p. 32. For optional summary of opinions see H. POPOWSKA-TABORSKA, *The Slavs in the Early Middle Ages from the Viewpoint of Contemporary Linguistic*, [in:] *Origins of Central Europe*, ed. P. URBAŃCZYK, Warsaw 1997, p. 91; latest *Sprache und Identität im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. W. POHL, B. ZELLER, Wien 2012, p. 302.

³ P. GEARY, *The Myth of the nations. The medieval origins of Europe*, Princeton–Oxford 2002, p. 37.

⁴ J. SIÂN, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*, London 1997, p. 115; P. URBAŃCZYK, *Foreign Leaders in Early Slavic Societies*, [in:] *Integration and Herrschaft. Etnische Identitäten und soziale Organisation im Frühmittelalter*, ed. W. POHL, M. DIESENBERG, Wien 2002, p. 258; H. MAMZER, *Problem etniczny w archeologii*, SA 40, 1999, p. 189; P. MÁČALA, *Etnogenéza Slovanov v archeológii*, Košice 1995, p. 59; E. KREKOVIČ, *Etnická interpretácia v archeológii*, [in:] *Etnos a materiálna kultúra*, ed. E. KREKOVIČ, Bratislava 2000, p. 13–16; P. URBAŃCZYK, *Archeologia etniczności – fikcja, czy nadzieja?*, [in:] *Archeologia w teorii i praktyce*, ed. A. BUKO, P. URBAŃCZYK, Warszawa 2000, p. 140; *Archaeology of identity – Archäologie der Identität*, ed. W. POHL, M. MEHOFER, Wien 2010, p. 325.

⁵ B. ANDERSON, *Imagined Communities*, London–New York 1991, p. 1–9; A.D. SMITH, *Myths and Memories of the Nations*, New York 1999, p. 6; T.H. ERIKSEN, *The Cultural Context of Ethnic Differences*, JRAI 26, 1991, p. 141.

⁶ F. BARTH, *Ethnic groups and boundaries*, Boston 1969, p. 9–39.

If objective criteria⁷ are put aside as being impossible to apply – one defining criterion remains – and that is *a myth*.

The myth of a common origin, ancestor, enemy, inner system of symbols and the whole communication within the group are key factors of holding the group identity together⁸. The name of *gens* is the most essential identifying feature as well as its outer representation. The name was subsequently spread by power or some form of attraction for other (predominantly military) groups⁹. It is well known that medieval tribes emerged in a revolutionary, not evolutionary manner. Key decisions were made directly and rationally, usually by a completely heterogeneous community.

Some scholars find this concept vague and difficult to grasp. Therefore it is quite natural that they insist on an own recorded/written memory as an inevitable element of identity's reproduction. One may encounter a theory which might be called a methodological nihilism here¹⁰. This discourse claims an impossibility of interpretation of relevant written sources.

In case of the ethnogenesis of the Slavs, the most recent works offer a deconstruction of the Slavic identity in general. The Slavs have become an amorphous population and have been claimed to be only a construct of scribes who were claimed to be unfamiliar with the tangle of groups and communities at the borders of *Imperium Romanorum*. They (the Slavs) could also have been a construct of scholars who connected a linguistic group to a group represented by a special type (types) of material culture as well as to communities recorded in written sources¹¹.

The problem is that there is no text pertaining to the Slavs left, so called *origo gentis* which appears only six centuries after first written sources mentioning Slavs¹². Own texts represented a tool of collective consciousness' reproduction – though often for a limited layer of society only. These texts also assisted in shap-

⁷ As for instance the language, skin colour, religion, material culture, dress, hair style.

⁸ A.D. SMITH, *op. cit.*, p. 10. Called as a *Myth-symbol complex*.

⁹ R. WENSKUS, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung: das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes*, Köln–Wien 1977, p. 86.

¹⁰ W. GOFFART, *The Theme of 'The Barbarian Invasions' in Late Antique and Modern Historiography*, [in:] *Rome's Fall and After*, ed. W. GOFFART, London 1989, p. 111–132; R. KASPERSKI, *Problem etnogenezy Gotów w ujęciu Herwiga Wolframa: refleksje nad metodą*, KH 118, 2011, p. 399–431.

¹¹ D. DZINO, *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat*, Leiden 2010, p. 159, or P. BARFORD, *The Early Slavs: Culture and Society in Early Medieval Eastern Europe*, London 2001. Cf. for mainly Polish literature A. MESIAR-KIN, *Prehľad pohľadov na etnogenézu Slovanov: Hľadanie pravlasti jazykovedou a archeológiou*, [in:] *Štúdie k slovenským dejinám. Historia nova II – 2011–2*, Bratislava 2012, p. 9–27. Available online on <http://www.fphil.uniba.sk/f ileadmin/ user upload/editors/ksd/HinoII-2011-2.pdf> [4 I 2013].

¹² It properly suits the concept of culture and history of the Slavs. In case of Slovaks, it is for instance *Slovanstvo a svet budúcnosti* (Slavism and the world of the future) as an eternal "antithesis of Europe" – M. BOBROWNICKA, *Narkotyk mitu*, Kraków 1995, p. 15; M. MAJ, *The myth of Slavonic Unity*, [in:] *Se-arch of paradigm*, ed. A. ZAMBRZYCKA-KUNACHOWICZ, Kraków 1992, p. 41–52.

ing community's memory and strengthening its myth. The name Slav persisted despite the Avar domination over the area which they had previously ruled. They never succeeded in establishing a hereditary kingdom and no Alarich or Geiseric occurred in order to unite the Slavic nations' migration¹³. Notations of Al-Masudi about Walinjana and their king Madž.ak (followed by all tribes of Slavs), or the first Slavs – the Zerviani of *Bavarian Geographer*, (same as the earliest history of Slavs from *Primary Chronicle*) are hard to identify and still wait for their examination in scientific literature¹⁴. It looks like both of these texts preserved an ethnogenetical construction, a tradition of the first king “mužik” – son of muž, the man – human, the first in the genealogical line passing the rule and “existence” to other tribes¹⁵.

Academic literature presents also an opinion of some medieval intellectuals of a Pannonian origin of all the Slavs¹⁶. However, while considering the relevant area as well as chronologically defined observed period it is obvious that the territory of the Slavic nations' emergence shifts and changes.

Tribes called *Slavic* (in this adjective form) are to be found in both Frankish and Byzantine literature constantly since *Miracula Sancti Demetrii*¹⁷. These are often ethnonyms adopted by scribes from topography. In other cases, the option of a tribe's name containing itself an inner distinguishing feature cannot be excluded.

Doubtlessly, the name “Slav” has become a literary criterion applicable together with other names as e.g. Moravian or Croat or it has been applied entirely generally, as for instance in the case of Polabian Slavs.

At some point, historiography stops discussing *the Slavs*, but rather simplifies the matter by referring to Bohemians, Poles and Croats. Later Pan-Slavic theories were also based on this concept¹⁸ and aimed to span these new self-identifications by an old, original cultural and political unity of Slavs.

Natural attempts to create the history of a dynasty (or of a political entity) as far to the past as possible have had an increasing tendency since the times of the most ancient texts. It was just natural that dynasties tried to challenge the *empire* based on the imperial Roman ideology with their own legendary genealogies

¹³ IDEM, *Verlaufsformen der Ethnogenese: Awaren und Bulgaren*, [in:] *Typen der Ethnogenese unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bayern*, vol. I, ed. H. WOLFRAM, W. POHL, Wien 1990, p. 123; W. POHL, *Awaren: ein Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa 567–822 n. Chr.*, München 1988, p. 94.

¹⁴ J. BANASZKIEWICZ, *Slawische sagen De origine gentis (Al-Masudi, Nestor, Kadlubek, Kosmas) – dioskuri-sche matrizen. Der Überlieferung*, MHB 3, 1993, p. 3–34; IDEM, *Tradycje dynastyczno-plemienne Słowiańszczyzny północnej*, [in:] *Ziemia polskie w X wieku i ich znaczenie w kształtowaniu się nowej mapy Europy*, ed. H. SAMSONOWICZ, Kraków 2000, p. 275.

¹⁵ D. TŘEŠTÍK, *Mýty kmene Čechů*, Praha 2008, p. 54.

¹⁶ *Kronika Wielkopolska*, ed. B. KÜRBIS, trans. K. ABGAROWICZ, Kraków 2010, p. 13.

¹⁷ *Cuda św. Dymitra*, I, 13, p. 175, [in:] *Testimonia najdawniejszych dziejów Słowian. Seria grecka*, z. 2, *Pisarze z V–X w.*, ed. W. SWOBODA, A. BRZÓSTKOWSKA, Wrocław 1989, p. 175.

¹⁸ M. TÉRA, *Slovanská identita v raném středoveku*, [in:] *Slovanství ve středoevropském prostoru. Iluze, dez-iluze a realita*, ed. D. HRODEK et al., Praha 2004, p. 53.

which they kept setting into broader and broader contexts (Roman history, biblical history, common Slavic origin). However, one may only ask how much of motivation was of an ideological and propagandistic character and how much of it represented actual geographical knowledge.

Any occurrence of claiming the Slavic background may have had various interpretations. It is not clear whether it signifies preservation of such memory among political and intellectual elite. A reflection of common origin myth cannot be expected within the foreign affairs of those states where the mythical genealogies had been created (either by literary centres or individuals). Therefore it is only to be discussed to what extent the Slavism served as an ideological concept of those wielding the power. The tradition captured in the Pope Dukljanin's Chronicle stressing the memory of Slavic empire led by Svätopluk as *rex iustus* is still waiting for the further and deeper analysis¹⁹. There is no need to remind the vision of Sclavonia²⁰ of Saint Adalbert and Emperor Otto as a part of *Imperium Romanorum*. On the other hand, reminiscences of a Slavic king and realm in Pulkava's Chronicle must be emphasized – which could have served as a background of imperial politics of Charles IV (or more concretely for stretching the empire to the East).

There are three key coexisting and mutually supplementing lines in texts concerning the Slavic ethnogenesis, topogenesis or mythical genealogy. These are represented by three stories: biblical (by Arabic authors of the 10th century, *Primary Chronicle*, *Chronicle of Dzierzwa* and the later tradition), Antique or Roman, (quite common especially since the spread of university education) and dynastic²¹. A dynasty was a key element of a nation's emergence though it would be daring to maintain that it applied Slavic motifs within its ideology.

Contaminations caused by blending of traditions and myths may be frequently found even within a single text. This fact confirms that chroniclers (often political imaginers) had no lesser troubles to interpret history and own origin than current historians. Building the consciousness upon differences from the others? It should be mentioned that the “emergence” of a nation does not have to rely on

¹⁹ *Historia Królestwa Słowian czyli Latopis popa Duklanina*, trans. et ed. J. LEŚNY, Warszawa 1988, p. 67–73; L.E. HAVLÍK, *Dukljanská kronika a Dalmátska legenda*, Praha 1976 [= *Rozprawy československé akademie věd. Řada společenských věd*, 86.2], p. 13–45. I have to draw the attention to a monograph of Martin Homza dealing with this historical personality which is being currently prepared. At this moment some ideas can be found in M. HOMZA, N. RÁCOVÁ, *K vývinu slovenskej myšlienky do polovice 18. storočia*, Bratislava 2010 in the part about historical person and legend of Svätopluk on pages 39–74.

²⁰ N. VEREŠOVÁ, *Koncepcie geografického termínu Sclavinia v historických prameňoch 6.–14. storočia*, Dissertation thesis, Bratislava 2011, p. 239; F. GRAUS, *Die Nationenbildung der Westslawen in Mittelalter*, Sigmaringen 1980, p. 151–153.

²¹ J. WYROZUMSKI, *Mity o pochodzeniu*, [in:] *Współcześni Słowianie wobec własnych tradycji i mitów: symposium w Castel Gandolfo 19–20 sierpnia 1996*, ed. M. BOBROWNICKA, Kraków 1997, p. 9.

a “conflicting” model. It does not have to be a result of antagonisms contributing to a quicker self-identification. Nor it has to be a result of a winner/defeated relationships nor other linguistic or any perceived differences²².

Some authors have recorded the emergence of “a feudal nation” more easily, some with more difficulties²³. Benedykt Zientara maintains that a nation needs a myth (this magical term again) and a crisis for its reproduction and function.²⁴ Myths of “old good times” or “a bloody, heroic war”²⁵ constituted medieval memories, which were later recalled by “nations of the estates”²⁶.

This paper does not aim to discuss so-called Nestor’s Chronicle as this work, its information to beginnings of the Slavic history, its narrative and interconnection with the history of Rus’ would deserve a separate study²⁷. A chronicles’ overview addresses to political organisations which can be nowadays without hesitation defined as *Slavic*. Texts of these chronicles show how much it is relevant to actually use the adjective *Slavic*.

As its title signifies, this paper discusses self-identification of the Poles or the Czechs with the *Sclavi*, *Sclaveni*, *Slawi* in sources, perception of their common

²² J. EHLERS, *Was sind und wie bilden sich nationes im mittelalterlichen Europa (10.–15. Jahrhundert)? Begriff und allgemeine Konturen*, [in:] *Mittelalterliche nationes – neuzeitliche Nationen. Probleme der Nationenbildung in Europa*, ed. A. BUES, R. REXHEUSER, Wiesbaden 1995, p. 25.

²³ For terminology and examples see D. TŘEŠTÍK, *Moderne Nation, hochmittelalterliche politische Nation, frühmittelalterliche gens und unsere genetische Software. Der Fall Mitteleuropa*, [in:] *Mittelalterliche nationes – neuzeitliche Nationen. Probleme der Nationenbildung in Europa*, ed. A. BUES, R. REXHEUSER, Wiesbaden 1995, p. 173.

²⁴ H. SCHULZE, *Deutschland in der neuzeit*, [in:] *Mittelalterliche nationes...*, p. 103, as for instance in case of Cosmas. Cf. B. ZIENTARA, *Nationale Strukturen des Mittelalters. Ein Versuch zur Kritik der Terminologie des Nationalbewußtseins unter besonderer Berücksichtigung osteuropäischer Literatur*, Sae 32, 1981, p. 306. With a reference to above mentioned role of language in “group formation” B. ZIENTARA, *Powstanie świadomości narodowej na obszarze Europy pokarolińskiej*, Warszawa 1985, p. 31–33.

²⁵ *Děje Uhrů Mistra P. Řečeného Anonymus*, [in:] *Legenda a kroniky koruny uherské*, ed. R. PRAŽÁK, J. NECHUTOVÁ, Praha 1988, p. 224.

²⁶ J. SZÜCS, “Nationalität” und “Nationalbewusstsein” im Mittelalter: versuch einer einheitlichen Begriffssprache, AH.ASH 18, 1972, p. 27. Nation as a category containing something atavistic and biological have survived all the religious and humanistic traditions concerning one origin and goal of a human, the human equality of rights and cohesion. Nation had to be bound to a tradition of the statehood according to Marx and Engels. On the other hand, Stalin considered a nation to be an evolutionary stage of an ethnical group in the capitalistic era though all the societies had previously been only nationalities. (according to Jenő Szűcs feudal nation created a functional framework for integration of various links: social, ethnical, political, religious) cf. B. ZIENTARA, *Nationale Strukturen des Mittelalters...*, p. 304.

²⁷ *Повесть временных лет*, vol. I, ed. Д.С. ЛИХАЧЕВ, Москва–Ленинград, 1950, p. 11; *Древний текст летописи Нестора по Лаврентьевскому списку (852–1110 гг.)*, [in:] *Полное собрание русских летописей*, vol. I, Санкт Петербург 1846, p. 3; О.П. ТОЛОЧКО, *The Primary Chronicle’s ‘Ethnography’ Revisited. Slavs and Varangians in the Middle Dnieper Region and the Origin of the Rus’ State*, [in:] *Franks, Northmen, and Slavs: Identities and State Formation in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. I.H. GARIPZANOV, P.J. GEARY, P. URBAŃCZYK, Turnhout 2008, p. 169–188.

history and attitude to the mission of Constantine and Methodius²⁸. When considering the historically possible reconstructible reality, it turns out that it is more precise to talk about ideas of elites (intellectual ones?) in both Poland and Bohemia about the history of the Slavs and their eventual ideological use. Own origins' interpretation is a dynastic propaganda's issue²⁹. It is an expression of a tradition and continuity which are both indispensable for a dynasty. These things worked as a magnet for those interested in joining a family – and therefore to have an access to different options; to participate in the system. The most powerful theory influencing them was the long-lasting and trustworthy one. Possession and power represented the one serious issue, but only being an exceptional personality within the layer of the powerful could have meant legitimacy.

Firstly, Nestor's contemporary, first Polish/non-Polish chronicler Gallus Anonymus shall be addressed. He did not go back to the remote past of *Primary Chronicle's* *Ljachove* (and their from they rising *Poljane, Lutiči, Mazovšane, Pomorjane*).³⁰ He reflected only the echo of a political takeover, a dynastic exchange of Popiels for Piasts (exchange of tribe of Polans instead of Goplan tribe). It is possible that he deliberately avoided references to the more distanced past as he had known that he would have come across the myth of Popiels. As he himself states, his text is moved from a root to a branch – which means from geographical to political definition³¹. More specifically, this means placing Polonia ruled by Christian Piasts to the north of Sclavonia. Gallus does not work with a motif of a direct identification of the Poles with the Slavs not with a concept of direct genealogical line from Jafet to the dynasty of Piasts. However, he incorporated the term of a Slavic land (from Thrace through the Kingdom of Hungary and Carinthia to Bavaria, from Epirus through Dalmatia, Croatia, Istria to Aquileia, from the land of Sarmatians to Saxony and Dacia)³², which included also Poland. This passage was not based on real observations, rather on political ambitions of a young Polish state³³. From Gallus' point of view, the essential part is that when a son of a poor ploughman was raised to a position of a prince, the truce between the God and the Poles began.

²⁸ In my opinion, through the spread of texts of Constantine, Methodius and their disciples as well as the defense (and later rejection) of the Slavic language (in whatever form) as a language of literature, law and ecclesiastical life – the Slavic tradition spread over Balkan to Ruthenia.

²⁹ Henry IV (*ex gente Saxonum*) ruled as *rex Teutonicorum* and no longer as *Imperator Romanorum* (J. EHLERS, *op. cit.*, p. 16).

³⁰ *Повесть временных лет*, p. 11.

³¹ *Anonima tzw. Galla Kronika czyli dzieje książąt i władców polskich*, [in:] MPH, Nova Series, vol. II, ed. K. MALECZYŃSKI, Kraków 1952, p. 6–7; *Galli Chronicon*, [in:] MPH, vol. I, ed. A. BIEŁOWSKI, Lwów 1864, p. 392.

³² His ethno-geographical information are divided, firstly he names neighbours (Ruthenia, Kingdom of Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia, Saxony, Dacia). The second group has been quoted above, according to N. KERSKEN, *Geschichtsschreibung im Europa der "nationes": nationalgeschichtliche Gesamtdarstellungen im Mittelalter*, Köln–Wien 1995, p. 525–526.

³³ *Ibidem*, p. 526.

His story describes the mechanism of gaining and losing the rule. Further on, no Slavic adjective occurs nor the above mentioned ethnonym, except the moment when *Latinorum et Slauorum* (settlers of the realm) are asked to mourn the death of Boleslaw I Chrobry in a “few sad verses”³⁴.

In addition, no word about a Byzantine mission can be found. But there is mention of a (often emphasised as typical Slavic element) “peasant” background in inthronation-dynastic ritual (as in Bohemia, Carinthia), which special Slavic dissimilarity was disproved in a wider Indoeuropean scope³⁵.

In comparison, the first part of Cosmas’ Chronicle of Bohemians takes place in Roman Germania. The society to be ruled by Přemysl’s family had arrived under the leadership of a father – Čech – *whoever he might have been*³⁶, as Cosmas puts it. A motif of *patriarch Boemus*’ arrival with his tribe in an empty homeland stands as a decisive argument for full property rights to take over the relevant area³⁷. It is known that Cosmas completely omitted the existence of Slavic monkship or scholarship³⁸. His approach to the Byzantine mission is quite similar – he does not mention Constantine – Cyril at all; Methodius is mentioned only in respect to the baptism of Bořivoj. In contrast to Gallus he identifies the Bohemians with Slavs at three occasions. This is the case of Břetislav’s victory over armies of the Emperor Henry III as well as preceding diplomatic negotiations. Thirdly, it is mentioned at the abduction of Judith of Schweinfurt, when Břetislav considered what he had done and how aggressively *Germans who had always despised Slavs and their language with arrogance would react*³⁹. Cosmas perceived an ability to speak the Slavic language as an added value for instance in case of the first and third bishops of Prague (Dětmar/Thietmar and Bohdal/Thidagg). It seems to be clear that this identification with some sort of the “sec-

³⁴ *Gesta principum Polonorum. The deeds of the princes of the Poles*, ed. J. BAK, U. BORKOWSKA, G. CONSTABLE, G. KLANICZAY, ed. et trans. P. W. KNOLL, F. SCHAEER, Budapest–New York 2003, p. 71–73. As in this edition is mentioned, the division may refer to Christians of Roman and Slavic liturgy, or to western settlers and Poles, demarked by language.

³⁵ With the symbol of a king – breadwinner, provider. Cf. J. BANASZKIEWICZ, *Podanie o Piaście i Popielu*, Warszawa 1986, p. 24, 40.

³⁶ *Cosmae Chronicon Boemorum cum continuatoribus*, [in:] *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, ed. J. EMLER, vol. II, Praha 1874, p. 5; *Kosmasa kronika Czechův*, trans. et ed. M. WOJCIECHOWSKA, Wrocław 2006, p. 88; D. TŘEŠTÍK, *Mýty kmene Čechů...*, p. 57; D. TŘEŠTÍK, *Od příchodu Slovanů k říši českých Boleslavů*, [in:] *Přemyslovci. Budování českého státu*, ed. P. SOMMER, D. TŘEŠTÍK, J. ŽEMLIČKA, Praha 2009, p. 71. Authors have agreed that the story of father Čech’s wayfaring is original, therefore Cosmas did not take it from his source base, cf. H. SCHREUER, *Untersuchungen zur Verfassungsgeschichte der böhmischen Sagenzeit*, Leipzig 1902, p. 9.

³⁷ R. WENSKUS, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

³⁸ He disclosed himself while commenting on a foundation of the nunnery at Saint George’s church. Pope John II wrote to Boleslaus II that in any case no rites of “*Bulgarian or Ruthenian sect or in Old Slavonic*” could take place. *Cosmae Chronicon Boemorum*, p. 35.

³⁹ *Cosmae Chronicon Boemorum*: abduction of Judith/Jitka, p. 61, Henry’s ultimatum, s. 80, Ekkehard, the prince of Saxony finds out about the victory of the Slavs over the Emperor, p. 83.

ond identity” or linguistic – cultural group where Bohemians according to Cosmas belonged represented the way how they defined themselves against the Empire (*Saxons, Teutons*). In comparison to Piast, Přemysl the ploughman was called to rule over a society without a king⁴⁰, while Piast has a clear (same) position in society already ruled by a king.

It is especially the Monk of Sázava of all the Cosmas ‘continuator’ who replaces the ethnonym *Bohemian* with ethnonym *Slav*. Saxons do not attack Bohemians, but Slavs. Boleslav the Brave is a *prince of Slavs*, Bretislaus I is described as a *jewel of Slavs*. From the position of the monk of Sázava (where still a positive attitude towards Slavic language and liturgical books banished in 1096 could be present), he did not hesitate to provide new information regarding the Sázava monastery (as for instance its possession of relics of saints Boris and Gleb) after Cosmas who systematically concealed any notes about the fourth oldest monastery in Bohemia⁴¹.

Master Vincent Kadłubek, the bishop of Cracow, later supplemented so-called legends of Greater Poland (that means mainly the dynastic legend of the Piasts) with legends of Lesser Poland – about Krak, Wanda and foundation of Cracow. Thus, the new dynastic tradition interconnected myths of Poles and Vistulans (Cracowians – Gracchovians) in order to establish ideology for a firm, legal and politically organised society. According to Brygida Kürbis Kadłubek perceived Poles on a basis of a taught tradition as a synonym for the Slavs and incorporated their history to the Roman history⁴². *Slaviae* was not the only *monarchy* under Prince Popiel’s rule (however serves as an evidence of the self-identification), he gave the law and the principles of succession also to the neighboring countries⁴³. Furthermore, Kadłubek illustrated education

⁴⁰ I particularly did not examine the *Vita et passio sancti Vencaslai et sanctae Ludmilae aviae eius* because of long lasting problems with its dating and because of the program of the text – which is focused on christianization and legitimacy of rule. Direct identification of particular groups appears when adjective forms are used in the references to the paganism of the regions, e.g. regions of Polabian Slavs, Moravia and Bohemia (or Czechs in a form of noun). It can be said, that *Sclavus* – *paganus*. In comparison, the role of the mission of saint Constantine and Methodius carries a positive image, namely because of the translation of Holy Scripture into Slavonic language. The language therefore has a sacral importance. *Život a umučení svatého Václava a báby jeho svaté Ludmily*, [in:] *Na úsvitu křesťanství. Z naší literární tvorby doby románské v století IX–XIII*, ed. V. CHALOUPECKÝ, Praha 1942, p. 104, 106. For the datation of the *Vita et passio sancti Vencaslai et sanctae Ludmilae aviae eius* in the context of the filiation of the legends of saint Wencelaus see P. KUBÍN, *Sedm Přemyslovských kultů*, Praha 2011, p. 149; J. KALIVODA, *Nejstarší svatováclavská hagiografie v evropském literárním kontextu přelomu tisíciletí*, [in:] *Svatý Václav. Na památku 1100. výročí narození knížete Václava Svatého*, ed. P. KUBÍN, Praha, 2010, p. 51–61.

⁴¹ *Mnich Sázavský*, [in:] *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, ed. J. EMLER, vol. II, Praha 1874, p. 239, 240, 251; *Mnich Sazawski*, [in:] *Kronikarze czeszy*, ed. M. WOJCIECHOWSKA, Wrocław 2006, p. 119, 142.

⁴² B. KÜRBIŚ, *Kształtowanie się pojęć geograficznych o Słowiańszczyźnie w polskich kronikach przeddlugoszowych*, SA 4, 1953, p. 272.

⁴³ MISTRZ WINCENTY KADŁUBEK, *Kronika polska*, ed. B. KÜRBIŚ, Wrocław 2003, p. 31.

and knowledge of authors of the Antiquity gained during university studies by the dialogue between Matthew, bishop of Cracow, and John, archbishop of Gniezno. However, it is not easy to determine and distinguish all the tribes to be identified with these antique Poles (Slavs). Nevertheless, it is Caranthonia where they chose Gracchus – Krakus⁴⁴ as their leader and king after having fought Dacians, Gauls and Romans. From this point onwards, a continuous narrative of the history of Poles as Wandals of Wanda, Lechites (though yet without Lech), including the entry about Alexander the Great up to Piast, the son of Chościsko, follows⁴⁵. We don't know how or from what "base" Vincent Kadłubek fabricated the Lechites – there was no tradition of father Lech in that time. Maybe they were the people of Lestek, or the Ljachs of Nestor (or Lędzians a group situated in Wolynhia and Sandomierz)⁴⁶, or a contamination of all of the terms. However, the formula Wanda – Wandal (river) – Wandals is invention of the chronicler, it was his contemporary Gervase of Tilbury who used *Wandalorum gens ferocissima* for the whole Slavic world⁴⁷.

However, there is no mention of a Slavic "sentiment" further on – as well as no appearance of the ethnonym, even in its adjective form. Hungarians are Pannonians, Ruthenians are Ruthenians and any relatedness (e.g. linguistic) is not emphasised neither between the above mentioned nor Poles. The same applies in respect to relations with Pomeranians, Bohemians or even Silesians. Scholastic Vincent Kadłubek created wide and rich history of Poles⁴⁸, forming a base of this ethnic-heterogenous *regnum*⁴⁹. Popularity as well as quality of Vincent's work (being a textbook of rhetoric in the 15th century) caused its deep influence on formation process of both Polish identity and political doctrine of the independence

⁴⁴ At this place another "Slavic" similarity appears, namely choosing a "foreign" ruler. Gracchus, Rurik, Přemysl, Samo, Hildigis – all of them were people from a foreign community; J. BANASZKIEWICZ, *Polskie dzieje bajeczne mistrza Wincentego Kadłubka*, Wrocław 2002, p. 24.

⁴⁵ *Chronica Polonorum. Magistri Vincentii dicti Kadłubek*, [in:] MPH, Nova Series, vol. XI, ed. M. PLEZIA, Kraków 1994, p. 23, 31.

⁴⁶ D. TRĚŠTÍK, *Mýty kmene Čechů...*, p. 62; For etymological analysis, examination of sources, geographical localization and observation of the term and its relation to term *Lach* – *Lęch* see G. LABUDA, *Studia nad początkami państwa polskiego*, vol. II, Poznań 1988, p. 167–209; entry word in *Wczesna słowiańszczyzna. Przewodnik po dziejach i literaturze przedmiotu*, ed. A. WĘDZKI, Warszawa 2008, p. 294.

⁴⁷ He might follow older texts, such as *Gesta Hammaburgensis* and *Chronica Slavorum*, where Vandals appear as a former name for all Slavs, or still act as a description for actual Slavic tribe. Cf. R. STEINACHER, *Wenden, Slawen, Vandalen. Eine frühmittelalterliche pseudologische Gleichzeitung und Ihre achwirkungen bis ins 18. Jahrhundert*, [in:] *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen. Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, ed. W. POHL, Wien 2004, p. 336.

⁴⁸ S. GAWLAS, *Die mittelalterliche Nationenbildung am beispiel Polens*, [in:] *Mittelalterliche nationes...*, p. 131. Enriching the story of losing the rule of Popiels through the sins of the ruler, cf. J. BANASZKIEWICZ, *Die Mäuseturmsage – the symbolism of annihilation of an evil ruler*, APH 51, 1985, p. 13,

⁴⁹ A. BLACK, *Political thought in Europe 1250–1450*, Cambridge 1992, p. 86. With Gnezdno as *omnium Lechitarum metropolis*.

from the Empire (as a reaction to attempts of Frederick I)⁵⁰. Before we will start with the chronicles of 14th century we have to mention that there are no narrative sources speaking about the “Polish-Bohemian affinity” of queen Kunigunda, wife of Ottokar II of Bohemia and his cancellor Henrich the Italian (later on same position for Wenceslaus II) and it’s ideological sense⁵¹.

A biblical tradition firstly appeared in the *Chronicle* of Dzierzwa (at the turn of the 13th and of 14th century); Latin and Germanic history were been incorporated as well. Genealogical line from Jafet (known also from Arabs or Nestor) leads via Troy to Vandal, the ancestor of Vandals, *qui Poloni nunc dicuntur*⁵². Nations in the area which could be nowadays described as at least linguistically Slavic (from Pomerania, through Silesia, Rus’, Poland, Bohemia, Moravia, Pannonia, Carinthia, to Dalmatia, Croatia, Bulgaria) descended from Vandal’s sons. The reminiscence of memory or rather a perception of proximity – here justified by a blood bond (family) and reflected within a geographical framework can be observed⁵³. Dzierzwa’s contemporaries *Chronicon imperatorum et pontificiarum Bawarie* (at the turn of the 13th and of the 14th century) and *Descriptio Europae Orientalis* (the beginning of the 14th century) contain original excerpts which greatly influenced other researched chronicles. *Sclavonia* as a term as well as a motif of common roots of the Slavic-speaking nations were strongly influenced also by work of Bartholomew the Englishman *De proprietatibus rerum* spread by Friars Minor, especially in the 14th century excerpt *Brevis descriptio Slavoniae*⁵⁴. Following Dzierzwa’s story, Iustinian led *vandalica bella* against all the Slavs (taken from Hugo of Fleury) aiming to repel them to the broad area between the rivers Saale and Vistula. Bartholomew’s work denoted Poles as Vandals who had destroyed Italy and Africa in the times of Saint Augustine⁵⁵. Dzierzwa’s genealogical and geographical arguments show that Slavic unity had paradoxically emerged through Vandals. As predominantly Poles are Vandals, their position among other Slavic nations is quite a unique one. It needs to be emphasised that this work reflects not only geographical proximity of nations and ethnicity but also congeniality established by mythical family ties. A spread of the Polish identity can be also connected with forming of corporations of

⁵⁰ N. KERSKEN, *op. cit.*, p. 505; J. BANASZKIEWICZ, *Polskie dzieje bajeczne...*, p. 256–260.

⁵¹ A. BARCIAK, *Czechy i ziemie południowej polski w XIII oraz w początkach XIV wieku. Polityczno-ideologiczne problemy ekspansji czeskiej na ziemie południowej Polski*, Katowice 1992, p. 138–145.

⁵² *Miersuae Chronicon*, [in:] MPH, vol. II, ed. A. BIEŁOWSKI, Warszawa 1961, p. 163.

⁵³ It is appropriate to mention that Adam of Bremen or Helmond’s *Chronicle* had already located Vandals among e.g. Polabian Slavs or among Slavs dwelling between the rivers Oder and Vistula. Cf. A.F. GRABSKI, *Polska w opiniach obcych X–XIII w.*, Warszawa 1964, p. 135–149.

⁵⁴ *Anonymi descriptio Europae orientalis: Imperium Constantinopolitanum, Albania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Ruthenia, Hungaria, Polonia, Bohemia*, ed. O. GÓRKA, Cracoviae 1916, p. 41.

⁵⁵ J. BANASZKIEWICZ, *Kronika Dzierzwy: XIV-wieczne kompendium historii ojczystej*, Wrocław 1979, p. 44.

nobility in the 13th century⁵⁶. However, it has to be noticed that exact geographical description was on the second place, program of chronicler was to construct a rich *origo gentis/regis*⁵⁷.

It is only to be discussed whether this political imagination comes from political circles connected with Łokietek's court (reflecting the idea of unifying the reign) or represents only a reaction to the above mentioned (geographically) Western works. The logic of the text of the creation of the history for *gentis polonicae* is simple – it was master Vincent who wrote about Vandals – who were sons of Vandal, the son of Negno and those, who conquered the quarter of Europe⁵⁸.

The *Chronicle of Dalimil* written in verses is dated to the same period as the *Chronicle of Dzierzwa* as well as the *Chronicle of Greater Poland* which is going to be discussed below. In case of this work, the Serbs are called *Slavs*. According to so-called Dalimil, their origin could be traced back to the Tower of Babel. However when he discusses the particular topogenesis, he claims that “Serbian race” came into being *where lands of Greeks lie. They took over sunny world from sea to the gates of Rome*⁵⁹. Another of Dalimil's texts or rather its interpretation initiated spread of a myth of Slavic brothers whose descendants represent cognate nations. Namely, Croatia (written at the times of the Emperor Stephen Dušan) is in Serbia and it had been ruled by *lech* whose name was Čech⁶⁰. Dalimil was the first who located the homeland of Slavs into southern Europe and the first who mentioned *senior Boemus* as Čech – in Slavic language⁶¹. This is Dalimil's way to supplement a tradition already reflected by Cosmas or to interpret a common base used by Cosmas, too – probably contaminated with the White Croatia from the story of Croats from Constantine Porphyrogenetus⁶². Referring to the title of this paper, Dalimil reflected neither the Byzantine mission nor later activities of the Slavic monks. However, venerable Methodius sanctified *translatio regis* from Great Moravia to Bohemia. Further on, *Serb* (meaning *Slav*) appears only twice – in regards to Polabian Slavs. It is important, that the mentioned title *lech* transformed to a denomination used for the forefather of Lechits – Poles, as we can observe e.g. in Silesian *Chronica Principum Poloniae*⁶³, or in later oncoming texts.

After Dzierzwa's biblical enrichment of master Kadlubek's *Slavic-Vandalic-Polish* identification, later *Chronicle of Greater Poland* reduces the biblical story

⁵⁶ S. GAWLAS, *op. cit.*, p. 129. This is also the period of emergence of the term *lingua Polonica*.

⁵⁷ N. KERSKEN, *op. cit.*, p. 527.

⁵⁸ B. KÜRBIS, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

⁵⁹ *Kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*, ed. M. BLÁHOVÁ, Praha 1977, p. 11.

⁶⁰ *Kronika tak řečeného Dalimila*, p. 12.

⁶¹ N. KERSKEN, *op. cit.*, p. 609.

⁶² D. TŘEŠTÍK, *Mýty kmene Čechů*, p. 59 stand against it.

⁶³ *Chronica Principum Poloniae*, p. 430, [in:] *MPH*, vol. III, ed. A. BIEŁOWSKI, Lwów 1878.

and offers wider vision of Slavdom, based on concrete geographical terms, tribes and political organisations⁶⁴.

The aforementioned *Chronicle of Greater Poland* offers an extensive etymological digression maintaining that *already the most ancient books claim Pannonia to be a mother and a cradle of all the Slavic nations – mater et origo omnium Slauonicarum nacionum*. The interpretation and argument is etymological⁶⁵. ‘Pán’ is translated into both Greek and Slavic languages as the one who possesses everything and therefore Slavic ‘pán’ can be used to address a magnate – *maior habens – wojewodij – totum habens*⁶⁶. Pannonians were ruled by biblical Nimrod (a Slav, of course)⁶⁷. Three brothers originated from this tribe and these were the first Lech (!), the second Rus and the third Čech. Their descendants established kingdoms of Lechites, Ruthenians and Bohemians. Among them, the Lechites should have maintained the most powerful position within the Empire and ruled the largest territory. An anonymous author of the *Chronicle of Greater Poland* not only incorporated the well-known Čech, but also joined Lech (Lestko) of the *Lechitae* of Kadłubek with Dalimil’s *lech* in order to create a protoplasmic figure of this Lech. In addition, he created Rus for Ruthenians. The identification with the Slavs as well as an identity common for various branches of the Slavs is obvious within the *Chronicle of Greater Poland*. This identity hinges upon an original common language – the language of one father Slav – *ab uno patre Slavo* – whose name served as a suffix in many Slavic names as for instance Tomislav, Stanislav, Janislav, Venceslav. There is a controversy here, as two forefathers *Pan* and *Slav* appear in the text, though this might be just a matter of synonymous understanding. The chronicler also states that these nations lived in Slavic kingdoms of Pannonians, Poles, Ruthenians, and Bohemians. Later on, more Slavic kingdoms and principalities were established (namely of Bulgarians, Serbs, or the Kingdom of Dalmatia and Rascia)⁶⁸. As well as other above mentioned chroniclers, this author also does not mention the Byzantine mission. Significant is placing the big Sclavonia as equal to Germania, even maintaining that Slavonia was actually “bigger”⁶⁹. The “central” and strongest tribe of Slavs were the Lechits with their father Lech, chronicle served as a literary background for whole Polish kingdom

⁶⁴ B. KÜRBIS, *Dziejopisarstwo wielkopolskie XIII i XIV wieku*, Warszawa 1959, p. 316.

⁶⁵ N. KERSKEN, *op. cit.*, p. 529–530.

⁶⁶ *Kronika wielkopolska*, [in:] MPH, Nova Series, vol. VIII, ed. B. KÜRBIS, Warszawa 1970, p. 4; *Kronika Boguchwała i Godysława Paska*, [in:] MPH, vol. I, ed. A. BIEŁOWSKI, I, Lwów 1872, p. 468.

⁶⁷ B. KÜRBIS, *Studia nad Kroniką wielkopolską*, Poznań 1952, p. 130.

⁶⁸ *Kronika wielkopolska*, p. 5; *Kronika Boguchwała i Godysława Paska*, p. 469. Slavic interpolation continues up to the page 472. It is quite remarkable that the anonymous chronicler/s wrote that both Slavs and Germanic people had descended from Jafet therefore there were according to the author no other nations in the world being so open and friendly to each other. Could it be also the reflection of political ideology of Venceslas II?

⁶⁹ B. KÜRBIS, *Dziejopisarstwo wielkopolskie...*, p. 317.

and its unity – of course, with its cradle in Greater Poland (after Kadlubek's and Dzierzwa's Cracow)⁷⁰. In comparison to so called Dzierzwa, the description of Slavic lands tries to be more actual, more real and it is clear that the incorporation of Poland into the whole Slavic geography and history (and incorporation of Slavic history and geography into Polish history) originates in the times of Casimir the Great⁷¹.

Jan of Maringola's *Bohemian Chronicle* seems to be quite a complicated issue. The chronicle claims that Elys (one of those being responsible for a destruction of Troy) was the father of Elysans. After having changed their scripture – they became the Slavs (!). Eliška, mother of Charles IV, descended from this lineage and Charles himself is named as “the greatest glory of the Slavic tribe”⁷². On the other hand, he provides also the second genealogical variant where Slavs (Bohemians) are sons of Noah, though according to the history Bohemians might have descended from Gomer – as well as Gauls (Franks). Subsequently he continues by locating Bohemia as a part of Germania, marked off from Pannonia by mountains and forests. His etymology has been applied up to now (in some texts) – the Slavs call themselves according to “sláva” – glory⁷³. Placing Bohemia into the frame of Germania – similarly as Kosmas did, or binding the history of Slavs with Germania – was not a general and usual issue. It was caused by literary (ideological) ambitions. The picture of “big Germania” (e. g. stretching towards Vistula in the *Chronicle* of Martin of Opava) is a matter of Bohemian chronicles, it hardly finds its ground in Poland⁷⁴.

A bit later *Chronicle of Pulkava* begins with the First Book of Moses. At the confusion of languages, the Slavic language emerged as well. People were named after it as the Slavs – *Slouani*⁷⁵. Passing the fields of Sennar, they crossed countries of the Greeks to lands being possessed by the Slavs also up to his period – Bulgaria, Ruthenia, Serbia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Bosnia, Carinthia, Istria and Carniola⁷⁶. A man called Čech later left Bohemia (from *Boh* – God) for Croatia because of a murder. Pulkava applies the direct identification. The Bohemians are simply Slavs. They share the common identity based on the sib of Lech and Čech. Moreover, some of Lech's lineage came to Ruthenia, Pomerania and Kashubia while descendants of Čech crossed the river Morava and populated the land bearing the same name as the river. Brothers' continuity can be seen also in another mythical history when there were two brothers clever, wealthy and just – Krok and Krak

⁷⁰ N. KERSKEN, *op. cit.*, p. 531.

⁷¹ B. KÜRBIS, *Kształtowanie się pojęć geograficznych...*, p. 277.

⁷² *Kronika česká Jana z Marignoly*, [in:] *Kroniky doby Karla IV*, ed. M. BLÁHOVÁ, Praha 1987, p. 454.

⁷³ *Kronika česká Jana z Marignoly*, p. 458.

⁷⁴ B. KÜRBIS, *Kształtowanie się pojęć geograficznych...*, p. 266, 288.

⁷⁵ N. KERSKEN, *op. cit.*, p. 613.

⁷⁶ *Kronika česká Přibrika z Radenína, řečeného Pulkava*, [in:] *Kroniky doby Karla IV*, ed. M. BLÁHOVÁ, Praha 1987, p. 272.

who founded a castle and town of Cracow. Proclaimed affinity of Slavic nations – in this case Polish and Bohemian – could also serve as a literary and ideological concept for ambitions of Charles IV to gain the Polish throne⁷⁷.

Pulkava is the first to emphasise the missionary activities of Constantine, particularly his supposed conversion of Moravians as well as numerous Slavic lands. As the forefather Čech held the primacy among the Slavic nations, so the emperor made Bohemia a kingdom that continued the tradition of Great Moravia with subjected principalities and dukedoms, as for instance Poland or Ruthenia⁷⁸. Pulkava often applies *Slav* as an umbrella term for both Pomeranian and Polabian Slavs, though he also refers to the Polish dynasty as to Slavic princes. Therefore it is quite confusing when *Slav* functions as a defining term when the contrast between Poles and Slavs (meaning Bohemians) is stressed. Pulkava re-worked the story of Dalimil's Čech/Kosmas's Boemus and incorporated the brother Lech into it. The Dalimil's *lech* – probably a term that was unclear even in his times, or was of a foreign origin⁷⁹, has to be clarified – but not according to the *Greater Poland Chronicle*, because Pulkava does not mention the third brother, Rus.

The Byzantine mission is clearly positively perceived by Pulkava. Saint Constantine baptised the Slavs but when he saw their obstinacy he asked the Pope to permit masses and other sacraments in the Slavonic language. It is quite surprising that similar elements or the Slavic sentiments cannot be traced in other contemporary works as for instance the one authored by Francis of Prague or *Life of Charles IV*.

Another Pulkava's contemporary was Jan (Janko) of Czarnków, writing in the 1370s. However, he mentions the term "Slavic" only once while giving an account of escalation of violence between Poles and Hungarian garrisons in the streets of Cracow. Poles were searching inns and slaughtering supporters of Queen Elisabeth. This episode exactly describes multiple layers of this complicated identity. Poles pulled out of the inn *one Hungarian, named Michael, called the Pagan, who was a Hungarian nobleman though of Slavic origin – they killed him in the street*⁸⁰.

Jan Długosz authored a compendium of (not only) the Central European medieval chronicles, composed in the 15th century. Spiritual and intellectual setting of the University of Cracow responded after the Battle of Grunwald to a controversy with Habsburgs or a work of Eneas Silvio Piccolomini⁸¹. Alan being the first man to come to Europe does not appear in the Bible but represents an innovation in medieval chronicles⁸². His ancestor was Negno whose sons, partic-

⁷⁷ N. KERSKEN, *op. cit.*, p. 603.

⁷⁸ *Kronika česká Přibřika z Radenína, řečeného Pulkava*, p. 281.

⁷⁹ B. KÜRBIS, *Studia...*, p. 135.

⁸⁰ *Kronika Jana z Czarnkowa*, ed. M.D. KOWALSKI, Kraków 2001, p. 67.

⁸¹ S. GAWLAS, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁸² Długosz derived from an outstanding number of works from *Historia Brittonum*, Hugo of Flavigny, *Historie Salonitana*, Bohemian chronicles to Ruthenian annals, etc.

ularly the third one named Saxo established some lands⁸³ (neither languages nor nations.) In the beginning, it seems that there is no feeling of Slavic congeniality in Długosz – nor does he emphasise any proximity between individual groups of the Slavs. However, then he refers to the origin of Slavs (similarly to Pulkava, or Nestor, the *Chronicle of Greater Poland* or Arabic sources earlier): he mentions the wayfaring from Sennar valley, crossing of the Danube and settling down in Pannonia – which is *the oldest and most primary cradle and nurture of the Slavs*⁸⁴. However, the God later took this land from Slavs for their sins and so they had to face barbaric cruelties of other nations. Mutual envy as well as conflicts over borders and rule over the land even caused a departure of Slavic tribes led by Lech and Čech who had been previously in control of Syrmian Dalmatia, Slavonia, Croatia and Bosnia⁸⁵. Długosz also briefly addresses the issue of the origin of Rus. He maintains that *some claim* that Rus was not the son of Lech, but he was in fact his brother (!). All three brothers set out from Croatia in order to find a new homeland.

Długosz mentions the linguistic proximity of Poles, Ruthenians and Bohemians at many points, especially as far as geographical names are concerned. The linguistic proximity and common origin create the image of the Slavic identity⁸⁶. He connected Slavic tribes of Obodrites, Rugians or others by consanguinity to Poles. This bond is a motivation for mythical prince Leszko to help Hungarian people who are the Slavs as well to fight against the Greeks. Cyril and Methodius are according to Długosz apostles of the Slavs, those who translated the *Holy Scriptures* into Slavonic language and established an archbishopric in Velehrad⁸⁷.

His extensively refined biblical and dynastic myth does not represent only a re-writing of Kadłubek, Dzierzwa, the *Chronicle of Greater Poland* or Pulkava. It is a genuine tractate based on profound knowledge of sources of different provenience. It is also interesting that the Slavs – meaning Poles – are for the first time referred to also as Sarmatians⁸⁸. Except for a confirmation of the common origin of the Slavs and their congeniality, Długosz as an authority inspired also humanist

⁸³ That means Ruthenia, Poland, Pomerania, Cashubia, Saxony, Norway and also Bohemia, Moravia, Styria, Carinthia, Lizna, Croatia, Pannonia, Serbia, Bulgaria and Helysa – the lineage of Helysa (present since Pulkava to Maciej Miechowita).

⁸⁴ *Ioannis Dlugossii Annales seu cronicae incliti regni Poloniae*, ed. J. DĄBROWSKI, W. SEMKOWICZ-ZAREMBA, vol. I, Warszawa 1964, p. 69 (cetera: *Annales seu cronicae*). And from there spread and populated Bulgaria, Dalmatia, Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia, Rascia, Carinthia and Illyria as well as islands in Adriatic, Ionian and Aegean Sea.

⁸⁵ Their former centre should have been the castle of Psary-Krapina? over the river Huj, dividing Slavonia and Croatia.

⁸⁶ S. GAWLAS, *Świadomość narodowa Jana Długosza*, SŻ 27, 1983, p. 5.

⁸⁷ *Annales seu cronicae*, p. 167.

⁸⁸ T. ULEWICZ, *Z zagadnień słowiańskich XV i XVI wieku: Sarmacja i Sarmaci*, [in:] *Sprawozdania PAU*, vol. LX.2, Kraków 1950, p. 64; J. STRADOMSKI, *Spory o "wiarę grecką" w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, Kraków 2003, p. 66.

authors as for instance Jan of Dąbrowka or Maciej Miechowita⁸⁹ as well as other various interpretations of the origin of Slavs⁹⁰ (and also e.g. its applications within the political ideology of Sigismund II Augustus)⁹¹.

On the examples of mentioned Polish and Bohemian chronicles we can observe, that perception of common Slavic origin was not a simple topic even for their authors. Various literary threads and traditions (biblical, Roman, dynastic) were combined with the raise of geographical texts and we cannot always describe their political and ideological background (however, sometimes easily). The cradle of Slavs is firstly localized into Pannonia, in the *Chronicle of Greater Poland*. Other texts, namely former texts are not so clear about the original homeland. Firstly mentioning only the geographical term of *Sclavonia* (sometimes used only for Polish realm, or lands of Polabian Slavs), later constructing the common “Slavic sense” on the story of brothers-forefathers of Slavic nations. Language which the nations inherited *ab uno patre Slavo* as an unifying element is mentioned namely for the first time also in *Chronica Poloniae Maioris*. In chronological following Czech chronicles we can observe an evolution of the “language based Slavic feeling”, with the first reference to the mission of Saint Constantine and Methodius in the Chronicle of Pribík Pulkava from Radenín and more interesting note of John of Marignola that becoming a Slav is caused by the “change” of the scripture. We cannot claim whether the “start of the identification process” was based on a memory of common origin and history, e.g. on the Danube, in Pannonia, or it was build on a memory in a shape of an administrative-ideological unit – *regnum Sclavorum*. At the first sight, the authors of narrative sources worked with fabricated progressing intellectual concept where the closeness of languages (geographical as well) was interconnected with mythical genealogical relationships between nations. Some of the ideas are typical for the chronic will to demonstrate the knowledge of classical and coeval authors. However the will of the intellectuals to incorporate the dynasty and administrative which they served into a wider “commonwealth” is important for our conclusion. We can assume that this scholarly tradition has built a stable base for later (and much later) Slavic and Pan-

⁸⁹ A. BORZEMSKI, *Kronika Miechowity. Rozbiór krytyczny*, Kraków 1891, p. 38; K. BUCZEK, *Maciej Miechowita jako geograf Europy wschodniej*, [in:] *Maciej z Miechowa. Geograf, historyk, lekarz, organizator nauki*, ed. H. BARYCZ, Wrocław–Warszawa 1960, p. 82. Maciej Miechowita defended his tutor Długosz, therefore he desired to root his Slavs and Poles descending from Jafet more firmly within the history. Cf. MACIEJ MIECHOWITA, *Opis Sarmacji Azjatyckiej i Europejskiej*, trans. T. BIENKOWSKI, intr. H. BARYCZ, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk 1972, p. 46.

⁹⁰ An exotic reference to renaissance poetry. T. ULEWICZ, *Świadomość słowiańska Jana Kochanowskiego. Z zagadnień psychiki polskiego renesansu*, Kraków 2006, p. 83; J. STRADOMSKI, *Problem etnogenezy i chrystianizacji Słowian w historiografii i polemice wyznaniowej I Rzeczypospolitej*, [in:] *Krakowsko-wileńskie studia slawistyczne*, vol. III, ed. W. STĘPNIAK-MINCZEWA, A. NAUMOW, Kraków 2001, p. 103.

⁹¹ L. HAJDUKIEWICZ, *Biblioteka Macieja z Miechowa*, Wrocław 1960, p. 69; T. ULEWICZ, *Zagadnienie Sarmatyzmu w kulturze i literaturze polskiej*, ZNUJ 59, 1963, p. 36.

Slavic (cultural or other) mutuality and solidarity more than the imaginary unity of Slavs in the pre-historic times.

Abstract. The concept of Slavic solidarity is taken by some political or ideological movements as obvious. In its later tradition it is based mainly on the language and cultural solidarity emphasised by romantic (and earlier) literature. The very origin of closeness of nowadays (and historical) Slavic nations is there traced to assumed bio-historical root. From the perspective of scientific analysis the examination of the whole term Slav should be done at first place. In medieval Polish and Bohemian chronicles we can observe a growing phenomenon of the identification with wider name Slav and with the common history of Slavs as well. In the *Chronicle of Greater Poland*, followed by chronicle of the Pulkava of Radenín and with the work of Jan Długosz was defined the model of biblical genealogy of Slavic nations. The solidarity was based mainly on the perception of similar languages and geographical closeness and was transformed in a literary way into blood relations. Reflection of this literary concept in foreign affairs is hardly to declare, but some dynastical representatives used the intellectual concept in a literary propaganda of their goals.

Adam Mesiarkin

Comenius University in Bratislava

Faculty of Philosophy

Department of Slovak history

Šafárikovo nám. 6, 811 02

Bratislava, Slovakia

mesiarkin.a@gmail.com

Ireneusz Milewski (Gdańsk)

**VOM NUTZEN DER PATRISTISCHEN LITERATUR
FÜR DIE ERFORSCHUNG DER SPÄTANTIKEN WIRTSCHAFT:
DAS BEISPIEL DER GRIECHISCHEN KIRCHENVÄTER
DES 4. JAHRHUNDERTS¹**

Immer intensivere Forschungen über die Spätantike zwingen zur Analyse der möglicherweise umfangreichen Quellen, auch der bis jetzt nicht besonders geschätzten. Auf Grund jahrelanger Forschungen, zu denen ich in letzter Zeit zurückgekehrt bin, und der Untersuchung der Fachliteratur zur Geschichte des Römischen Reiches im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert, die in den letzten zehn Jahren entstanden ist, stelle ich fest, dass die Schriften der spätantiken christlichen Autoren weiterhin eine Gruppe solcher vernachlässigten Quellen darstellen. Die altchristliche Literatur ist eine riesige Schatzkammer von Angaben, besonders für die aufmerksamen Forscher, die durch die oft ermüdende Narration der christlichen Autoren nicht entmutigt werden. In ihrer Mehrheit sind diese Quellen keine Briefe mit konkreten Angaben, sondern in erster Linie Predigten (beziehungsweise Reden) und Homilien, von denen in der Forschung zu oft gesagt wird, dass die Realität und Fiktion in ihnen vermischt wurden. Aus diesem Grund verwenden die Althistoriker in ihren Forschungen nur gelegentlich die altchristliche Literatur, wobei sie zumeist die bekanntesten Berichte heranziehen. Selbstverständlich gibt es viele Arbeiten, die die römische Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft im 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts betreffen, und die auf Grund der zeitgenössischen christlichen Literatur geschrieben wurden. In ihrer Mehrheit entstanden sie in den siebziger und achtziger Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts und wurden zum großen Teil von Forschern verfasst, die aus den kirchlichen Kreisen stammen².

¹ Der Text dieses Beitrages wurde als ein Vortrag gehalten am 6. 10. 2010 im Institut für Alte Geschichte der Wiener Universität.

² Siehe beispielsweise: R. TEJA, *Organizacion economica y social de Capadocia en el siglo IV, segun los Padres Capadocias*, Salamanca 1974; Th.A. КОРЕЦЕК, *Social and Historical Studies in the Cappadocian Fathers*, Hamilton 1972; B. GAIN, *L'église de Cappadoce au IV s. d'après la correspondance de Basile de Césarée (330–379)*, Rome 1985; I. HAHN, *Theodoretus von Cyrus und die frühbyzantinischen Besteuerung*, AA.ASH 10, 1962, p. 124–131; P. EVIEUX, *Isidore de Péluse*, Paris 1995.

In den letzten Jahren entstand keine Monographie, aber – auch kein Beitrag zur spätantiken Wirtschaft anhand der gründlichen Analyse der griechischen patristischen Literatur (wenigstens in den Fachzeitschriften oder in Kongressakten). Es ist aber nicht so, dass diese Quellen schon vollständig zugunsten dieser Forschung ausgeschöpft wurden. In vielen Fällen sollte man versuchen, einige noch offene Fragen zu beantworten und besonders den Fortschritt, der sich in den letzten zwanzig Jahren in der Forschung über die Geschichte des späten Römischen Reiches vollzogen hat, zu berücksichtigen.

Um den Wert der spätantiken patristischen Literatur bei Erforschung der damaligen Wirtschaft zu zeigen, möchte ich mich auf das Beispiel der Schriften ausgewählter griechischer Kirchenväter des 4. Jahrhunderts beschränken, und zwar auf Johannes Chrysostomus und die kappadokischen Kirchenväter: Basilius den Großen, Gregor von Nyssa und Gregor von Nazianz. Diese christlichen Autoren lebten und wirkten fast zur selben Zeit, vornehmlich in der zweiten Hälfte des 4. Jahrhunderts, in den nicht weit voneinander entfernt liegenden oströmischen Provinzen *Cappadocia prima et secunda*, sowie auch in der Provinz *Syria*.

Weil das Geld ein wichtiger Bestandteil der Wirtschaft ist, möchte ich mit einer kurzen Besprechung der Terminologie der Geldeinheiten beginnen, die in der griechischen patristischen Literatur des 4. Jahrhunderts erwähnt sind³. Oft wird in diesen Schriften über die Goldmünzen berichtet, oder eigentlich über das Gold, selten über konkrete Summen von Goldmünzen. Das bei den griechischen Kirchenvätern erwähnte Goldgeld wird als χρυσός, χρήματα, νόμισμα, δαρεικός oder στατήρ bezeichnet⁴.

Selbstverständlich erscheint in der griechischen patristischen Literatur auch das Silbergeld, oder eigentlich das Silber. Das bei den Kirchenvätern erwähnte Silbergeld ist mit dem Begriff ἀργύριον und ἀργυρος bezeichnet, wobei der Begriff ἀργύριον auch als allgemeine Bezeichnung für Geld verwendet wird. Mit diesem Begriff wird zum Beispiel der erzielte Gewinn im Handwerk, Handel oder auch im Wucher bezeichnet⁵. Generell erscheint das Silbergeld selten bei griechischen Kirchenvätern. Analog gilt dies auch für die spätrömische lateinische patristische Literatur. Die Dominanz des Geldmarktes des Spätromischen Reiches durch Gold- und Bronzegeld (wie sie aus der zeitgenössischen patristischen Literatur hervorgeht), könnte also die Behauptung der Numismatiker bestätigen, die meinten, dass der

³ Mehr davon siehe beispielsweise: I. MILEWSKI, *A Few Remarks on the Terminology of Coin Units in Greek Patristic Literature of the Fourth Century*, MBAH 21.2, 2002, p. 24–43.

⁴ Siehe beispielsweise: GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Quod non sint tres dñi*, PG, vol. XLV, col. 132; IDEM, *Epistula 25*, [in:] IDEM, *Lettres*, ed. P. MARAVAL, Paris 1990 [= SC 363]; GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS, *Testamentum*, PG, vol. XXXVII, col. 392–393; IDEM, *Oratio IV*, 83, 88, PG, vol. XXXV; JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In paraliticum per tectum demissum*, 4, PG, vol. LI.

⁵ Siehe beispielsweise: JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Matthaëum*, III, 5; LXVI (LXVII), 3, PG, vol. LVII; IDEM, *In Epistolam ad Philippenses*, X, 3, PG, vol. LXII; IDEM, *In Epistolam ad Romanos*, VII, 7, PG, vol. LX; IDEM, *Ad populum Antiochenum*, XX, 6, PG, vol. XLIX.

damalige Geldmarkt in der Tat durch das Gold- und Bronzemünzen dominiert wurde. Die Numismatiker stützen sich bei ihrer Behauptung darauf, dass die datierten Funde von Schätzen aus dem 4. und 5. Jahrhundert in der Mehrheit, außer den verschiedenen Kostbarkeiten, aus Gold- und Bronzemünzen bestehen⁶.

Ich sollte aber mit der Ausführung beispielhafter Berichte beginnen, welche die mich interessierende Problematik betreffen. Leider finden wir in der griechischen patristischen Literatur des 4. Jahrhunderts fast keine konkreten Informationen zu den damaligen Löhnen und Preisen. Wenn diese Angaben auftauchen, so sind sie in der Regel unglaublich (wie zum Beispiel hundert Goldsolidi als Honorar für einen Arzt⁷, hundert oder mehr Goldsolidi für ein prachtvolles Kleid⁸) oder lakonisch, wie zum Beispiel ein Goldsolidus als Lohn für dreißig Arbeiter für die Ausführung nicht näher bezeichneter Steinmetzarbeiten⁹. Meistens aber bedienen sich die altchristlichen Autoren bei der Bestimmung der Preise mit der Feststellung, dass diese oder jene Ware oder Dienstleistung viel oder wenig Geld kostet, eine kleine Silbermünze, einige Silbermünzen oder auch einige Goldstücke. Nutzlos sind auch Angaben, in denen die Preise und Löhne mit einer Summe von einem, zwei, drei oder mehreren Obolen bezeichnet werden¹⁰.

Die griechischen Kirchenväter sprechen sehr viel über das Kreditgewerbe (*δάνεια*), wo man die Kreditgeber in der Regel Wucherer nennt (*τοκιζωνταί, δανειγται / foenerati, creditores*)¹¹, dagegen die durch sie betriebene Tätigkeit ohne Rücksicht auf den Charakter und die angewandten Methoden als Wucher (*τοκισμός; δανεισμός*) bezeichnet¹². Ihrer Meinung nach konnte sich im Grunde mit dieser Tätigkeit jeder beschäftigen, angefangen von Bettlern und Handwerkern, die über den erbet-

⁶ Siehe beispielsweise: W. HAHN, *Moneta Imperii Byzantini*, Bd. I, Wien 1973, p. 22; J.P. CALLU, *The Distribution and the Role of the Bronze Coinage from 348–392*, [in:] *Imperial Revenue, Expenditure and Monetary Policy in the Fourth Century A.D.*, ed. C.E. KING, Oxford 1980, p. 104; I.V. SOKOLOVA, *Byzantinische Numismatik*, [in:] *Quellen zur Geschichte des frühen Byzanz des 4–9 Jahrhunderts. Bestand und Probleme*, ed. W. BRANDES, F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1990, p. 61–62.

⁷ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In paraliticum per tectum demissum*, 4, PG, vol. LI.

⁸ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Epistolam ad Philippenses*, X, 3, PG, vol. LXII.

⁹ GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Epistola XXV*, 12. Siehe auch: E. PATLAGEAN, *Pauvreté économique et pauvreté sociale à Byzance IV–VII s.*, Paris 1977, p. 400.

¹⁰ Siehe beispielsweise: JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Catechesis ad illuminandos*, IX, 22, [in:] *Trois catéchèses baptismales*, ed. L. DOUTRELEAU, A. PIÉDAGNEL, Paris 1990, [= SC, 366]; GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSUS, *Adversus mulieres se nimis ornantes (Carmina I, II, 29)*, v. 23–24, PG, vol. XXXVII; GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Contra usurarios*, PG, vol. XLVI, col. 449; BASILIUS MAGNUS, *In illud: destruaam horrea mea*, 4, PG, vol. XXXI. Siehe auch: S. MROZEK, *Lohnarbeit im klassischen Altertum. Ein Beitrag zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Bonn 1989, p. 144; I. MILEWSKI, *Löhne und Preise bei den Kappadokischen Kirchenvätern und bei Johannes Chrysostomus*, MBAH 19.1, 2000, p. 48–58.

¹¹ GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Contra usurarios*, 449, PG, vol. XLVI.

¹² Mehr davon siehe bei P. GRUSZKA, *Die Stellungnahme der Kirchenväter Kappadoziens zu der Gier nach Gold, Silber und anderen Luxuswaren im täglichen Leben der Oberschichten des 4. Jh.*, K 63, 1981, p. 661–668; I. MILEWSKI, *Bankers, Usurer and Merchants. Businessmen of the Late Antiquity Cities in Reports of Greek Church Fathers of the Fourth Century*, MBAH 20.1, 2001, p. 96–113.

telten Geldüberschuss verfügten, bis zum vermögenden Kaufmann oder Senator¹³. Indem man die Kreditgeber (oder Geldverleiher) Wucherer nannte, stützten sich die altchristlichen Autoren selbstverständlich auf ihre eigenen Auffassungen und nicht auf römisches Recht, welches Zinsnehmen im Umfang von einem Prozent monatlich von der geliehenen Summe erlaubte¹⁴.

Für die griechischen Kirchenväter ist es selbstverständlich, dass für die Gewährung eines Kredites die Festlegung der Konditionen unter denen dieser gewährt wurde, vorausgegangen ist. Zu diesem Zweck schließt man einen Vertrag, in dem sich der Schuldner zur Rückzahlung des gewährten Kapital (κεφάλαιον) verpflichtete, so wie auch zur Auszahlung von Zinsen (τόκοι) in Kalenden der folgenden Monate¹⁵. Dagegen erfolgte die Absicherung eines Kredites durch eine Hypothek (ὑποθήκη), ein Pfand (ἐνέχυρα) oder die Sicherheitsgarantien (ἐγγραφή) durch eine dritte Person¹⁶. In einer von seinen Homilien beschreibt Chrysostomos einen solchen Vertrag:

Testamente (διαθέκαι), Eheverträge (...γραμματεία τα περι γάμων), Schuldscheine (...τὰ περι οφλημάτων) und die Verträge in anderen Angelegenheiten (...τὰ περι τῶν ἄλλων συμβολαίων) ungültig sind, wenn sie am Anfang nicht mit dem Namen des Konsuls und mit dem Datum, an dem der Vertrag geschlossen wurde, versehen sind¹⁷.

Im Dokument müssen die Zeugen dieser Transaktion genannt werden, dagegen bedeutete das Zerreißen eines Schuldscheines (durch den Wucherer) die Annullierung der Schulden. Aus diesem Grund bewahrten die Wucherer diese Dokumente (χάρταις, ὁμολογίαις) besonders sorgsam auf, denn Verpflichtungen die aus den gewährten Darlehen entstanden sind, waren erblich¹⁸. Wie die Kirchenväter berichten, war die Mehrheit der geschlossenen Kreditverträge aber nicht so formell geschlossen. Meistens beschränkte man sich auf einen mündlichen Vertrag, was Möglichkeiten zum Missbrauch schaffte, besonders von Seite der unehrlichen Wucherer.

Wie hoch waren die Kredite verzinst? Meistens, wie die Kirchenväter berichten, beliefen sie sich auf ein Prozent monatlich (ἐκατοστὴ / centesima), also zwölf

¹³ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Matthaëum*, LVI (LVII), 6; LXI (LXII), 2, PG, vol. LVIII; IDEM, *Catechesis ad illuminandos*, 4, 24; GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSUS, *Oratio XVI*, 18, PG, vol. XXXV.

¹⁴ *Codex Theodosianus*, II, 33, 1, ed. Th. MOMMSEN, P.M. MEYER, [in:] *Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*, vol. I–II, Berolini 1954 (cetera: CTh).

¹⁵ GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Contra usurarios*, PG, vol. XLVI, col. 448.

¹⁶ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *De poenitentia*, VII, 7, PG, vol. XLIX.

¹⁷ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Homilia II in Ozias*, 3, ed. J. DUMORTIER, Paris 1981, [= SC 277].

¹⁸ GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Contra usurarios*, PG, vol. XLVI, col. 435; BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Homilia II in Psalmum XIV*, 1, PG, vol. XXIX; JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *De poenitentia*, VII, 7, PG, vol. XLIX; IDEM, *In Matthaëum*, XXVIII (XXIX), 5, PG, vol. LVII; LVI (LVII), 5, PG, vol. LVIII; IDEM, *In Epistolam ad Colossenses*, I, 6, PG, vol. LXII; IDEM, *Homilia II in Ozias*, 3.

Prozent jährlich. Einen über diese Summe hinausgehenden Gewinn definierte das römische Recht als Wucher. Nicht selten praktizierte man auch die tägliche Berechnung der Zinsen und sogar die Berechnung von Zinsen für ungezahlte Zinsen (τόκοι τόκων / *usura super usura*)¹⁹. Im Fall der erfolgten Missbräuche hat das Recht dem Wucherer eine Geldstrafe (das so genannte πολυθρύλητος τετραπλή / *quadrumplum*) auferlegt, die den vierfachen Gewinn von der geliehenen Summe ausmachte.

Wem wurde das Geld geliehen? Wie die Kirchenväter berichten, meistens den Menschen mit plötzlichem oder auch dauerhaftem Geldbedarf, und denen, die Finanzinvestitionen planten. Im hohen Maße waren es die Kaufleute (ἔμποροι, beziehungsweise ἀγοραῖοι), so wie auch Handwerker (δημιουργοί, χιροτέχνη), die für den Einkauf von Rohstoffen Bargeld benötigten²⁰. Unter den Klienten der Wucherer sehen wir auch viele Arme. Es ist aber schwer festzustellen, bis zu welchem Grad die Berichte darüber glaubwürdig sind²¹. Die Armen nämlich (in vielen Städten auch Nichtchristen) nutzten die Unterstützung der Kirche, die ihnen damit eine wenn auch bescheidene, so doch ziemlich gesicherte Existenz ermöglichte.

Die griechischen Kirchenväter berichten meistens von Konsumdarlehen, die Menschen mit vorübergehenden oder dauerhaften finanzielle Problemen aufgenommen haben²². Diese Art von Darlehen wird von ihnen besonders angeprangert und das aus zwei Gründen. Zum Ersten, weil die Wucherer die schwierige Finanzlage der Schuldner ausnutzten und ihnen Geld zu einem hohen Zinssatz entliehen, zweitens richtet sich deren Kritik auch an die Kreditnehmer (δανειζόμενοι), die anstatt völlig oder mindestens teilweise auf ihre Bedürfnisse zu verzichten, sich leichtsinnig in finanzielle Schwierigkeiten stürzten. Dabei setzten die Kreditnehmer auch nicht selten die Freiheit ihrer Familienangehörigen auf Spiel, die für die Auszahlung der Schulden verkauft werden konnten²³. Die Kirchenväter nennen als Kreditnehmer unter anderen verarmte Aristokraten, besonders junge Leute, die sich, sobald Landgut geerbt hatten, große Geldsummen auch für einen prachtvollen Lebensstil geliehen haben, da sie keine Erfahrung in deren Bewirtschaftung besaßen. Nach einiger Zeit, wie zum Beispiel Basilius berichtet, umkreisten die Wucherer diese jungen Aristokraten und lockten mit zusätzlichen Krediten, ver-

¹⁹ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Epistolam I ad Corinthios*, XV, 6, PG, vol. LXI.

²⁰ BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Homilia II in Psalmum XIV*, 4, PG, vol. XXIX. Siehe auch: GREORIUS NYSSENUS (*Contra usurarios*, PG, vol. XLVI, col. 440–441). Cf. L. DE SALVO, *Distribuzione geografica dei beni economici, provvidenza divina e commercio nel pensiero dei padri*, [in:] *Hestiasis. Studi di tarda antichità offerti di Salvatore Calderone*, vol. II, Messina 1986, p. 115–116.

²¹ BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Homilia II in Psalmum XIV*, 2, 4, PG, vol. XXIX; IDEM, *In destruam horrea mea*, 4, PG, vol. XXXI; JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Adversus ebriosos et de resurrectione*, 3, PG, vol. L; IDEM, *Ad Demetrium monachum et de compunctione*, II, 6, PG, vol. XLVII. Cf. auch: IDEM, *In Epistolam ad Romanos* X, 2, PG, vol. LX; GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Contra usurarios*, PG, vol. XLVI, col. 448; BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Homilia II in Psalmum XIV*, 4, PG, vol. XXIX.

²² BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Homilia II in Psalmum XIV*, 1; 4, PG, vol. XXIX; JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Matthaicum*, LVI (LVII), 5, PG, vol. LVIII; IDEM, *De poenitentia*, VII, 7, PG, vol. XLIX.

²³ GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Contra usurarios*, PG, vol. XLVI, col. 430, 436, 448.

meintlich zu günstigen Bedingungen. Die Folge dieses Handelns war nicht selten, dass die unerfahrenen Darlehensnehmer, vorübergehend im Luxus schwimmend, in eine Schuldenspirale gerieten und nach einer gewissen Zeit das väterliche Erbe den Wucherern zu einem niedrigen Wert überlassen mussten.

Die griechischen Kirchenväter berichten auch über langfristige Investitionskredite, was belegt, dass mindestens ein Teil der damaligen Gesellschaft von der Stabilität des Geldmarktes überzeugt war. Im Vergleich zu den Krediten für Konsumgüter haben die Investitionskredite keine große Aufmerksamkeit bei den altchristlichen Autoren erregt²⁴. Trotzdem finden wir in deren Schriften einige Angaben zu diesen Darlehen. Die sogenannten Handelskredite, oder vor allem Seedarlehen, waren sehr risikoreich für beide Seiten: für den Kreditnehmer, weil diese Kredite in der Regel mit einem hohen Zinssatz belegt waren (was im Fall eines Gewinns, der niedriger ausfiel als erwartet, den Schuldner in finanzielle Schwierigkeiten stürzen konnte), und auch für den Wucherer, der unter gewissen Umständen (Tod des Kreditnehmers infolge eines Schiffbruches oder Verlust der Ware durch Piratenüberfälle), nicht nur die ihm zustehenden Zinsen sondern auch das geliehene Kapital verlor²⁵. Aus diesem Grund, wie wir in der Rede *Contra usurarios* lesen, verfolgten die Wucherer aufmerksam die Nachrichten, die von den Besatzungen der ankommenden Schiffe in den Häfen verbreitet wurden. Täglich schickten sie deshalb ihre Sklaven dorthin, damit diese die neuesten Nachrichten über Schiffskatastrophen sammelten²⁶. Der Bedarf an Kredit, über den wir oft in den Schriften der griechischen Kirchenväter lesen, kann, meines Erachtens nach, von einer intensiveren Entwicklung der damaligen Wirtschaft zeugen.

In den Schriften der griechischen Kirchenväter finden wir auch Bemerkungen zur Tätigkeit der Bankiers (*τραπέζιται*)²⁷. In diesen Berichten (aber auch bei zeitgenössischen lateinischen christlichen Autoren) wird die Tätigkeit der Bankiers nicht mit dem im großen Umfang betriebenen Kreditgewerbe in Verbindung gebracht. Sie praktizierten vielmehr ein Kreditgewerbe, dessen Zielgruppe vermögende Klienten waren, denen sie zumeist Investitionskredite gewährten oder die ihnen ein Gelddepot anvertraut hatten. Eine wichtige Tätigkeit der Bankiers war

²⁴ Cf. JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Joannem*, I, 3, PG, vol. LIX; IDEM, *In illud: Vidua eligatur non minus sexaginta annorum*, 16, PG, vol. LI; IDEM, *In Epistolam I ad Corinthios*, XIV, 3; XXIII, 5; XXVI, 8, PG, vol. LXI; IDEM, *In Matthaeum*, XXIII (XXIV), 9; XLIX (L), 5, PG, vol. LVII; IDEM, *Ad populum Antiochenum*, III, 3, PG, vol. XLIX; IDEM, *Ad Theodorum lapsum*, II, 1, PG, vol. XLVII; GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Contra usurarios*, PG, vol. XLVI, col. 441.

²⁵ Eine solche Situation berücksichtigte ein kaiserliches Gesetz aus der Zeit Theodosius den Großen, siehe *CTh*, IV, 20, 1.

²⁶ GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Contra usurarios*, PG, vol. XLVI, col. 440.

²⁷ Siehe beispielsweise auch: JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In principium Actorum*, IV, 2, PG, vol. LI; IDEM, *De virginitate*, LXVIII, 2, ed. H. MUSURILLO, B. GRILLET, Paris 1966 [= SC 125]; BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Homilia II in Psalmum XIV*, 4, PG, vol. XXIX; IDEM, *Regulae brevius tractatae*, CCLIV, PG, vol. XXXI.

auch die Kontrolle der Qualität von Münzen (die aus Gold und Silber geprägt waren), die man in ihre Wechselstube (ἐργαστήριον) brachte²⁸.

Wie die Kirchenväter berichten, waren nicht alle Einwohner des Imperiums von der Stabilität des damaligen Geldmarktes überzeugt. Für sie ist die Thesaurierung weiterhin die beste Absicherung der Kostbarkeiten sowie des verdienten oder ererbten Geldes. Bei den Beweggründen für die Thesaurierung nennen die Kirchenväter meistens gesellschaftliche Unruhen. Das Geld vergrub man in Lehmkrügen, wobei Chrysostomus bemerkt, dass ein so verstecktes Vermögen manchmal in fremde Hände fallen könnte. Dann aber, ohne sein Geld, verbliebe dem Reichen nur das Konto seiner schlechten Taten, die er bei Anhäufung seines Vermögens begangen habe²⁹. Die gleichen Feststellungen formulieren die altchristlichen Autoren (im Verhältnis) zu den Wucherern, die nach dem Tod das angesammelte Vermögen ihren Kindern oder Verwandten hinterlassen haben. Der verstorbene Wucherer komme dagegen zum Jüngsten Gericht nur mit dem Verzeichnis seiner Ungerechtigkeiten, die er zu Lebzeiten verübt hatte³⁰.

Es ist offensichtlich, dass sich die griechischen Kirchenväter des 4. Jahrhunderts den Steuerfragen mit großem Interesse widmen. Basilius zum Beispiel stellt in einem Brief fest, dass auf dem Markt am häufigsten die Stimmen der Steuereintreiber (ὑποδέκται) zu hören sind, aber wahrscheinlich ist vieles bei dieser Behauptung übertrieben³¹. Auf jedem Fall äußern sich auch die anderen Kirchenväter mit bitteren Worten über die Missbräuche der Steuereintreiber und stellen fest, dass die von den Kaisern geführten Kriege zu immer höheren Steuerbelastungen führen³². Steuerfragen tauchen meistens in Briefen auf, wo über konkrete Probleme berichtet wird, wie zum Beispiel einen Versuch zur Steuersenkung und sogar zum Steuererlass im Fall von Dürre oder beim Tod des Familienvaters.

Man muss allerdings bemerken, dass sich die griechischen Kirchenväter des 4. Jahrhunderts nicht so sehr über das eigentliche Steuerzahlen beklagen, sondern über die Missbräuche der Beamten beim Steuereintreiben. Aber manchmal musste sogar ein strenger Steuereintreiber (meistens auf Intervention eines Bischofs) angesichts des Unglücks eines Steuerzahlers nachgeben, besonders in

²⁸ R. BOGAERT, *Changeurs et banquiers chez pères de l'église*, AS 4, 1973, p. 257.

²⁹ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Epistolam I ad Thessalonicenses*, X, 4, PG, vol. LXII; IDEM, *Homilia in decem milium talentorum debitoris*, 4, PG, vol. LI.

³⁰ Siehe beispielsweise: JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Ad populum antiochenum*, XII, 2, PG, vol. XLIX; IDEM, *In Epistolam I ad Corinthios*, XXXIII, 3, PG, vol. LXI; GREGORIUS NYSSENUS, *Contra usurarios*, PG, vol. XLVI, col. 449.

³¹ BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Epistola 74*, 3, PG, vol. XXXII. Siehe auch: I. HAHN, *Theodoretus von Cyrus...*, p. 124; S. MÉTIVIER, *La Cappadoce (iv^e-vi^e s.). Une histoire provinciale de l'Empire romain d'Orient*, Paris 2005, p. 54–55; I. MILEWSKI, *Late Roman Tax System in View of the Writings of Greek Church Fathers of the Fourth Century*, MDAH 25.1, 2006, p. 11–27.

³² GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS, *De exterioris hominis vilitate (carmina I, II, 15)*, v. 63–65, PG, vol. XXXVII; IDEM, *Oratio XIX*, 14, PG, vol. XXXV; JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Epistolam ad Collosenses*, II, 6, PG, vol. LXII. Cf. auch: A.D. LEE, *War in Late Antiquity. A Social History*, Oxford 2007, p. 104–122.

Zeiten von Dürre und Missernte. In so einem Fall, wurden, wie z.B. Basilius berichtet, die unbezahlten Steuern (τελέσματα, συντέλεια, εισφοραί) in ein Schuldenverzeichnis (γραμματεῖον) eingetragen, um sie dann beim nächsten Steuertermin einzuziehen³³.

In diesem Beitrag ist es nicht nötig, über die konkreten spätantiken Steuern zu referieren, die in den Schriften der griechischen Kirchenväter behandelt werden. Unter den genannten Steuern finden wir: χρυσάργυρον, genannt auch als χρυσίον πραγματευτικόν (Gewerbsteuer)³⁴, ἐπικεφάλαιον (Grundkopfsteuer)³⁵, oder ἡγεμονική τάξις („freiwilligen“ Ehrenabgaben, welche die Provinzen bei Kaiserbesuchen zu entrichten hatten)³⁶.

Die spätantike patristische Literatur ist auch eine wertvolle Quelle, um die wirtschaftliche Tätigkeit der damaligen Kirche zu erfassen. In dieser Hinsicht sind besonders die Reden des Chrysostomus und Basilius von großer Bedeutung. In ihren Berichten erscheint uns die Kirche von Antiochien und Caesarea (in Kappadokien) als Disponent über die „Güter der Armen“ (πτώχικα χρήματα), das heißt, als großer Grundbesitzer, Eigentümer von Immobilien, Handwerkswerkstätten, und als eine Handel treibende Institution. Wir erfahren auch etwas über konkrete Funktionen der kirchlichen Gutsverwalter, und zwar über die Vollstrecker der Pachten (φορολόγοι), die Schatzmeister (ταμίαι) oder Ökonomen (ἐπίτροποι, beziehungsweise οἰκονόμοι), welche die Aufsicht über das gesamte Vermögen des Bistums hatten³⁷.

Obwohl wir eine ziemlich umfangreiche Dokumentation von der Wirtschaftstätigkeit der Kirche in Antiochien besitzen, sind wir nicht imstande die Größe ihres gesamten Vermögen, auch nur annähernd zu schätzen. In einer seiner Homilien behauptet Chrysostomus lediglich, dass das Jahreseinkommen der antiochenischen Kirche nur dem eines reichen Einwohners dieser Stadt

³³ BASILIUS MAGNUS, *De baptismo*, I, 3, PG, vol. XXXI. Siehe auch Th.A. KOPEČEK, *op. cit.*, p. 105–106, 109; M. FORLIN-PATRUCCO, *Aspetti del fiscalismo tardo-imperiale in Cappadocia: la testimonianza di Basilio di Cesarea*, Ath 51, 1973, p. 294–295, 306; K.L. NOETHLICH, *Beamtenum und Dienstvergehen. Zur Staatsverwaltung in der Spätantike*, Wiesbaden 1989, p. 129.

³⁴ BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Epistola 88*, PG, vol. XXXII; GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSUS, *Epistola 98*; JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Comparatio regis et monachi*, 3, PG, vol. XLVII. Cf. O. SEECK, *Collatio lustralis*, RE, vol. XLVII, 1907, p. 370–376; J. KARAYANNOPULOS, *Das Finanzwesen des frühbyzantinischen Staates*, München 1958, p. 129; Th.A. KOPEČEK, *op. cit.*, p. 54, 111, 108; M. FORLIN-PATRUCCO, *op. cit.*, p. 302–303.

³⁵ BASILIUS MAGNUS, *Epistolae 37; 104; 285; 315*, PG, vol. XXXII; GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSUS, *Epistola 67*, PG, vol. XXXVII; IDEM, *Ad Julianum (Carmina II, II, 2)*, v. 1477–1480, PG, vol. XXXVII; IDEM, *Ad Hellenium (Carmina II, II, 1)*, v. 15–18, PG, vol. XXXVII. Siehe auch: B. TREUCKER, *Politische und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zu den Basilius-Briefen*, München 1961, p. 15, 72; S. MÉTIVIER, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

³⁶ GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSUS, *Epistola 9*, PG, vol. XXXVII. Siehe auch: M.-M. HAUSER-MEURY, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz*, Bonn 1960, p. 79–80; Th.A. KOPEČEK, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

³⁷ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Matthaëum LXXXV (LXXXVI)*, 3–4, PG, vol. LVIII. Siehe auch: E.F. BRUCK, *Kirchenväter und soziales Erbrecht. Wanderungen religiöser Ideen durch die Rechte der östlichen und westlichen Welt*, Göttingen–Heidelberg 1956, p. 23–29.

glich, was einerseits lakonisch klingt und andererseits unglaublich ist, besonders im Fall einer Stadt, in der, wie Chrysostomus feststellt, ein Zehntel der Bevölkerung aus Armen bestand, die im kirchlichen *κατάλογος* eingetragen waren und eine regelmäßige Unterstützung von der Kirche bekamen³⁸. In den Schriften der griechischen Kirchenväter des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts finden wir leider auch keine konkreten Angaben über die Größe des Vermögens der Kirche von Konstantinopel³⁹.

In der griechischen patristischen Literatur finden wir auch Hinweise auf die Vermögensverhältnisse der spätrömischen Aristokratie. Das sind aber ziemlich allgemeine Angaben, wie zum Beispiel eine Feststellung von Basilius, dass die Aristokraten ihre Einkommen (*πρόσοδοι*) für luxuriöses Leben ausgeben (was die Kirchenväter besonders betonen) oder in Gold, so wie auch im Ankauf neuer Landgüter investiert haben. Dagegen könnte nach Ansicht des Chrysostomus, ein Jahreseinkommen der Großgrundbesitzer aus der Provinz Syria zehntausend Talente Gold betragen⁴⁰. Dieser Angabe würde ich aber keine Bedeutung beimessen. Ansonsten, prangern natürlich die Kirchenväter die Ungerechtigkeit und Habgier der Aristokraten und die Ausbeutung der Armen an.

Seit vielen Jahrzehnten herrscht unter den Erforschern der Spätantike ein Streit über den Zustand der damaligen Wirtschaft und auch darüber, welcher Typus in ihr dominierte: die Geld- oder die Naturalwirtschaft?⁴¹. Berichte der griechischen Kirchenväter des 4. Jahrhunderts zwingen zur Feststellung, dass in der Spätantike beide Wirtschaftsformen parallel funktionierten: Die Geldwirtschaft dominierte in den Städten, die Naturalwirtschaft vorwiegend auf dem Lande. Ist das ein Beweis für die Primitivität der damaligen Wirtschaft, wie einige Historiker meinten? Ich glaube nicht, jedenfalls nicht gegenüber der frühen Kaiserzeit. Meiner Meinung nach waren in der Spätantike Geld- und Naturalwirtschaft keine

³⁸ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Mathaeum*, LXVI(LXVII), 3, 58. Siehe auch *In Mathaeum*, LXXXVI (LXXXVII), 4, PG, vol. LVII.

³⁹ Außer allgemeinen Feststellungen aus denen hervorgeht, dass das Bistum von Konstantinopel im Besitz großer Landgüter war, einzig ein Anonymus aus dem 5. Jahrhundert beschreibt eine große Schenkung der Aristokratin Olympias an das Bistum Konstantinopel (*Vita Olimpiadis*, 5, 17–33, ed. A.M. MALINGREY, Paris 1947 [= SC 13bis]). Unter den an das Bistum übertragenen Gütern erwähnt er zehn Tausend Pfund Gold, zehn Tausend Pfund Silber, zahlreiche Immobilien in Konstantinopel und in den Vorstädten, sowie auch viele Landbesitze in Trazien, Bithynien, Galatien und Kappadozien. Selbstverständlich verwendete die spätantike Kirche auch viel Geld für Wohltätigkeits- und Missionszwecke (die jedoch nicht in großen Umfang durchgeführt wurden), wie auch für die Bezahlung des Klerus, Übernahme von Baukosten, Unterstützung der Armen, Einrichtung der Wohltätigkeitsanstalten oder Loskauf von Gefangenen. Auch darüber berichten die griechischen Kirchenväter des 4. Jahrhunderts in ihren Schriften (meistens aber ziemlich allgemein).

⁴⁰ JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In Matthaem*, LXVI(LXVII), 3, PG, vol. LVIII.

⁴¹ Siehe beispielsweise: A. DOPSCHE, *Naturwirtschaft und Geldwirtschaft in der Weltgeschichte*, Wien 1930; H. KLOFT, *Die Wirtschaft der griechisch-römischen Welt. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt 1992; G. MIKWITZ, *Geld und Wirtschaft im Römischen Reich im IV. Jahrhundert nach Christus*, ²Amsterdam 1965.

sich einander ausschließenden Gegensätze, sondern sie ergänzten und durchdrangen sich gegenseitig.

In den oströmischen Städten im 4. Jahrhundert basierte das Wirtschaftsleben auf Geld, was zahlreichen Aussagen der zeitgenössischen Kirchenväter bestätigen. Das wesentliche Argument für das Funktionieren der Geldwirtschaft in den Städten ist auch die Tatsache, dass die griechischen Kirchenväter des 4. Jahrhunderts in ihren Predigten, oft Gleichnisse mit Geld und Finanztransaktionen verwenden, um ihrer Gemeinde den Sinn der verkündigten Lehren zu erklären. Diese Predigten mussten daher so konstruiert werden, dass sie den Zuhörern, also den Menschen, die die Geldgeschäfte aus dem Alltag kannten, verständlich war. Wir sollten aber auch nicht vergessen, dass sich die altchristlichen Autoren, im Rückgriff auf Metaphern des Geldes im Alltagsleben, sich bis zu einem gewissen auf das Neue Testament stützten, in dem man sich ziemlich oft der Symbolik des Geldes bedient.

In den Berichten der griechischen Kirchenväter zum Thema Wirtschaft dominieren meistens sehr allgemeine Angaben, die das Alltagsleben in den Städten betreffen, meistens in den größten Provinzstädten. Analog verhält es sich mit den christlichen Autoren des 4. Jahrhunderts im Westen⁴². Obwohl man in ihren Schriften konkretere Angaben über Löhne, Preise oder über das Steuersystem findet, so ist doch das Bild der Wirtschaftsbeziehungen in ihren Schriften sehr ähnlich mit dem im Werk der griechischen Kirchenväter. Dieser Eindruck entsteht nicht nur dadurch, dass wir über das gleiche Römische Reich reden, aber auch deswegen, dass sowohl die einen, als auch die anderen Autoren (also griechische und lateinische Kirchenväter) ihre besondere Aufmerksamkeit auf bestimmte gesellschaftliche und wirtschaftliche Probleme ihrer Epoche richteten. Dennoch sehen wir, anders als die lateinischen Kirchenväter des 4. und vor allem 5. Jahrhunderts, in Berichten der zeitgenössischen griechischen Kirchenväter keine Entvölkerung des Landes oder auch keine Verarmung der Städte im Osten, was natürlich eng mit politischen Situation verbunden war.

Es muss bemerkt werden, dass für die altchristliche Literatur die Betonung extremer sozialer Gegensätze in der damaligen Gesellschaft charakteristisch ist, so dass man einerseits von nur wenigen Reichen, andererseits aber von der großen Schar von Armen berichtet. Nur im geringen Maß verweisen die altchristlichen Autoren in ihren Schriften auf die gesellschaftliche Mitte: die kleinen Handwerker, Kaufleute oder Bauern. Außerdem ist für die altchristliche Literatur auch das Fehlen einer neuen Reflexion und Sichtweise in der Frage zur Rolle des Geldes

⁴² Cf. J. JUNDZIŁŁ, *Pieniądz w łacińskiej literaturze chrześcijańskiej późnego Cesarstwa Rzymskiego* (Das Geld in der lateinischen christlichen Literatur des späten Römischen Kaiserreiches), Warszawa 1984. Dabei siehe auch: S. EJGES, *Das Geld im Talmud. Versuch einer systematischen Darstellung des wirtschaftlichen Geldtheorien und Praxis nach talmudischen Quellen*, Giessen 1929; R. MALONEY, *Usury in Greek, Roman and Rabbinic Thought*, T 27, 1971, p. 79–109; R. BOGAERT, *Geld – Geldwirtschaft*, RAC 9, 1976, p. 824–854.

im menschlichen Leben charakteristisch. Wir haben es hier im Grunde mit einer Wiederholung von Meinungen zu tun, die aus der heidnischen und jüdischen Tradition stammen. Die Hauptgedanken kann man eigentlich mit folgender Feststellung definieren: Das Geld bedeutet etwas Gutes in den Händen von gerechten und klugen Menschen, wird dagegen zum Bösen wenn es von unmoralischen und gierigen Menschen gebraucht wird. Hingegen ist die körperliche Arbeit die eigentliche Art des Gelderwerbs. Aus diesem Grunde war der Mensch der Mittelklasse, der sein Vermögen durch eigenhändige Arbeit erwirtschaftet und vermehrt hat und kein Gefangener seines Vermögens (in diesem Fall *νεκρὸς πλοῦτος*) war, das Ideal der sozialen Vorstellungen der griechischen Kirchenväter des 4. Jahrhunderts.

Wie sollte man die Berichte der griechischen Kirchenväter beurteilen, in denen sie den verschwenderischen Lebensstil der damaligen Aristokratie, die Tätigkeit der Wucherer und ähnliches kritisieren? Obwohl viele Historiker vor vielen Jahren ihre Überzeugung über den geringen Wert dieser Berichte veröffentlicht haben, so gestatte ich mir, dazu eine andere Meinung zu vertreten. Wir sollten nämlich nicht vergessen, dass ein großer Teil des Auditoriums der damaligen Prediger gerade aus den durch sie kritisierten Aristokraten, Bankiers, Wucherern, Kaufleuten und ihren Klienten bestand. In so einem Fall hätten sich Geistliche, nehmen wir z. B. Chrysostomus, nicht getraut, ihnen in ihrer Gegenwart Fehlverhalten vorzuwerfen, wenn ihnen (also den Reichen) ein solches Benehmen fremd gewesen wäre. Viele verehrten aus diesem Grund Chrysostomus und kommentierten stundenlang die am meisten berührenden Predigten (diese Bemerkung betrifft den ärmeren Teil des Auditoriums), andere wiederum waren über den Redner empört (diese Bemerkung betrifft den reicheren Teil seines Auditoriums, auch die Wucherer). Davon berichtet der Antiochener mehrmals in seinen Homilien⁴³.

Meine Bemerkungen zum Nutzen der patristischen Literatur bei der Erforschung der spätantiken Wirtschaft sind ausschließlich auf Grundlage der Schriften ausgewählter Autoren des 4. Jahrhunderts und zwar der bedeutendsten griechischen Kirchenväter jener Zeit, formuliert worden. Dabei bin ich auch davon überzeugt, dass man, um in der Forschung noch unbekannte Angaben über die Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts zu finden, sollte man die Schriften der anderen spätantiken griechischen christlichen Autoren analysieren (zum Beispiel hagiographischen Werke).

Bei Beurteilung der Schriften von griechischen Kirchenvätern zur Erforschung der spätantiken Wirtschaft sollten wir nicht vergessen, dass diese Berichte von, in diesem Fall, Laien niedergeschrieben wurden. Deshalb können

⁴³ Siehe beispielsweise: W. MEYER, *Who came to hear John Chrysost preach? Recovering a late fourth-century preacher's audience*, ETL 76, 2006, p. 73–87; J. MAXWELL, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and his Congregation in Antioch*, Cambridge 2006, p. 65–87.

ihre Beobachtungen teilweise auch nicht dem wahren Tatbestand entsprechen. Den gleichen Vorwurf könnte man aber auch den damaligen heidnischen Autoren (wie zum Beispiel Libanius) machen, deren Berichte von den Historikern hochgeschätzt werden. Es muss auch betont werden, dass man im Nachlass der altchristlichen Autoren fast keine ausführlichen Texte findet, die der wirtschaftlichen Fragen betreffen. Es dominieren kurze und nicht selten zerstreute Bemerkungen oder Anknüpfungen an diese Problematik. Nur sporadisch findet man in diesen Quellen Texte, in denen die wirtschaftlichen Fragen umfangreicher behandelt werden.

Wie soll man also den Nutzen der spätantiken griechischen patristischen Literatur zur Erforschung der damaligen Wirtschaft beurteilen? Trotz mehrerer Widersprüche und eines gewissen Mangels an Präzision in ihren Berichten erlauben diese Quellen eine Rekonstruktion der sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse im Römischen Reich im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert. Mit anderen Worten: Die aufmerksame Lektüre dieser Quellen wäre ein verdienstvolles Vorhaben und könnte sich für die Erforschung der Spätantike als fruchtbar erweisen.

Abstract. Some Remarks on Making Use of Ancient Christian Literature in the Study of the Late Roman Economy (the Example of Greek Church Fathers of the Fourth Century).

The writings of ancient Christian Writers are still an unappreciated group of sources in the study of the economy of Late Antiquity. They provide a vast amount of information, especially for attentive readers. Within the last fifteen years, neither a monograph nor even a papers concerning some aspects of the Roman economy in the light of the late antique Patristic literature were written (at least not in those widely known and available journals). And the sources have not yet been exploited completely as far as the study of the economy of Late Antiquity is concerned. Also, in many instances, some of the issues should be analysed once more. One needs to take into consideration the progress which was made in the study of the history of the Later Roman Empire in the last years.

Ireneusz Milewski
Zakład Historii Starożytnej
Uniwersytet Gdański
ul. Wita Stwosza 55
80-952 Gdańsk
hisim@univ.gda.pl

Georgi Minczew (Łódź)

REMARKS ON THE *LETTER OF THE PATRIARCH THEOPHYLACT TO TSAR PETER* IN THE CONTEXT OF CERTAIN BYZANTINE AND SLAVIC ANTI-HERETIC TEXTS

The oldest Byzantine testimony to the Bogomil movement is a letter of Theophylact, patriarch of Constantinople (933–956), to Peter, tsar of Bulgaria (927–969), from the middle of the 10th century. The letter was discovered by the Benedictine Bernard de Montfaucon in the archives of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana as early as at the close of the 17th century. It was for a long time misattributed to Theophylact of Ohrid (about 1050 – after 1126), the esteemed Byzantine writer and ecclesiastic; the authorship by the patriarch of Constantinople was established as late as at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries¹. In 1913, the first edition of the letter appeared²; though burdened with errors in the Greek text and above all in the interpretation³, for a long time it remained (reprinted along with a commentary in V. Zlatarski's *History of the Bulgarian State in the Middle Ages*⁴) the sole edition of this critically important source for the history of neo-Manichaean medieval heresies. This only changed with the appearance of the study by I. Dujčev mentioned in the first footnote⁵.

¹ For the history of the discovery of the letter and a survey of research on the text, cf.: I. DUJČEV, *L'epistola sui Bogomili del patriarcha Teofilatto*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Medioevo bizantinoslavo*, vol. I, Roma 1965, p. 283–315 (text edition on p. 311–315). The article was first published in: *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, vol. II [= Studi e Testi, 232], Città del Vaticano 1964, p. 63–91.

² Н.М. ПЕТРОВСКИЙ, *Письмо патриарха Константинопольского Феофилакта царю Болгарии Петру*, [in:] ИОРЯС 18.3, 1913, p. 356–372.

³ I. DUJČEV, *op. cit.*, p. 289–290.

⁴ В. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *История на българската държава през средните векове*, vol. I.2, *От славянизацията на държавата до падането на Първото царство (852–1018)*, София 1927 (repr. София 1971), appendix XI, p. 840–845.

⁵ The text of the letter with a parallel Bulgarian translation was also published in: *FGHB*, vol. V, София 1964, p. 183–189. In this article, citations from the Greek text come from I. Dujčev's edition. Unless otherwise noted, the English text is cited from: *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650 – c. 1450*, ed. J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, assist. Y. STOYANOV, Manchester–New York 1998, p. 98–102.

Tsar Peter assumed the throne of his father, Symeon the Great, during a difficult period for the First Bulgarian Tsardom⁶. Superficially, the political situation appeared to be stable: emperor Romanus I Lecapenus confirmed both Peter's imperial title (*βασιλεύς*) and the autocephaly of the Bulgarian Church; a 30-year peace treaty between the Bulgarian and Byzantine empires was signed, corroborated by Peter's marriage with Romanus Lecapenus' granddaughter, Maria-Irene. On the other hand, however, strengthening the ties with Constantinople meant reinforcing Byzantine influence in the imperial court. The powerful neighbour had not forgotten the aggressive anti-Byzantine policy of Peter's father; resorting to diplomatic intrigues, Romanus and his successors were able to antagonize most of the nearby states against Bulgaria, damage its international standing, and in the long run – bring about the 1018 annihilation of the First Tsardom and the disestablishment of the Bulgarian autocephalous church. In this respect, Peter's reign could be viewed as the 'beginning of the end' of the Tsardom, although recent research has seen attempts to approach the sources from a different angle and appreciate the tsar's *less easily noticeable effort towards a peaceful development*⁷ of the state.

Peter I also looked after the interests of the young Bulgarian church. Himself a deeply pious man, presumably proclaimed a saint not long after death (feast day on 30 January)⁸, he strove to consolidate Christianity and was naturally vexed by the emergence of an alternative religious movement. Sometime before 950 a new dualist heresy arose in the Bulgarian lands, not yet referred to as Bogomilism at the time (at any rate not in the oldest Greek and Slavic sources). In the opinion of certain scholars, the entire period between the Christianization of Bulgaria in the second half of the 9th century and the reign of Peter (as well as the earlier times before and after the founding of the Bulgarian state in 681) can be conceived as the 'prehistory' of this neo-Manichaeism movement, or as the gradual formation of a doctrine influenced by Early Christian dualist thought (above all Gnosticism), Iranian dualism, Thracian Orphic mysteries, Manichaeism and later neo-Manichaeism doctrines – Massalianism and Paulicianism⁹. It can be surmised that the new heresy was indeed closely tied to Man-

⁶ For recent research on the reign of Peter and the Bulgaro-Byzantine relations in the middle of the 10th century see: M.J. LESZKA, *Wizerunek pierwszego państwa bułgarskiego w bizantyńskich źródłach pisanych (VIII – pierwsza połowa XII wieku)*, Łódź 2003 [= BL, 7], p. 124–138; И. Билярски, *Покровители на Царството. Св. цар Петър и св. Параскева-Петка*, София 2004.

⁷ И. Билярски, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁸ The oldest liturgical texts devoted to the tsar saint are found in Bulgarian manuscripts dating back to the early 13th century, which means that the cult must have arisen much earlier. See: И. Билярски, *op. cit.*, p. 21–42.

⁹ Cf.: I. DUJČEV, *I bogomili nei paesi slavi e la loro storia*, [in:] IDEM, *Medioevo bizantinoslavo*, vol. I, Roma 1965, p. 251–282. The article was originally published in: *Atti del Convegno internazionale sul tema 'L'Oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà'*, AANL 62, 1964. Some researchers opine that when

ichaeism and Paulicianism – religious movements that had already terrified Peter’s father, tsar Symeon I (913–927), in his own time – if we assume that a certain anti-heretic fragment of the *Hexameron* by the 10th cent. Old Bulgarian writer John Exarch, who worked in Symeon I’s court¹⁰, indeed refers to the Manichaeans¹¹. It is acknowledged, however, that Manichaeism ceased being a threat to orthodox Christianity in the Byzantine Empire after the 5th–6th century. Regardless of this, in later Byzantine and Slavic legal, liturgical and polemical texts the term “Manichaeans” is still traditionally used in reference to adherents of other heterodox dualist doctrines – predominantly the Paulicians and the Massalians. Did the Old Bulgarian author have such a meaning in mind as well? That is, did he use the word “Manichaeans” to denote the followers of another dualist heresy that had appeared in the Bulgarian lands? Moreover, did John Exarch specifically refer to the Bogomils (as suggested by M. Loos), which would mean that the origins of the Bogomil heresy have to be sought not within the reign of Peter, but earlier – already in the times of Symeon? The answer to these significant questions is not directly related to Theophylact’s letter; what needs to be emphasized is that already by the times of Peter, neo-Manichaean dualist doctrines had become deeply entrenched in the Bulgarian territory, putting the orthodox Christian religion in serious jeopardy.

The patriarch of Constantinople was not a typical representative of upper clergy. The fourth son of Romanus Lecapenus, appointed for the post (according to the will of his father) at the age of 16, was *more interested in horseflesh than in theology*; in 954 *the Patriarch met with a severe riding accident and thenceforward he was incapable of work*¹². It is assumed that the letter was written and sent to the Bulgarian tsar before this date.

Peter I had sent two inquiries to Theophylact, asking what measures he should take in order to combat the heresy emerging in his empire. His letters have not been preserved; what survives is the second of Theophylact’s responses – or rather

considering the influence of neo-Manichaean heresies on the territories of the First Tsardom, one should also take into account the dualist elements of the Proto-Bulgar religion, themselves imported from Zurvanism. Cf. B. HAMILTON, *The Cathars and Seven Churches in Asia*, [in:] *Byzantium and the West c. 850 – c. 1200: Proceedings of the XVIII Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*. Oxford, Amsterdam 1988, p. 284–290; Y. СТОЯНОВ, *The Other God: Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, New Haven–London 2000, p. 125–161.

¹⁰ On John Exarch see: *KME*, vol. II, p. 169–194.

¹¹ Да се срами'кють оубо вси пошнзени и сквр'ни манихи и вси погани слов'ене... тоже не ст'ядет" се днзвора г'люще стар'киша с'на. The first to attract attention to this passage from John Exarch’s *Hexameron* was Й. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги и легенди*, repr. София 1970, p. 20. Cf. the analysis of the fragment in: M. LOOS, *Le pretendut moignage d'untraité de Jean Exarque in titulé "Šestodnev" et relative aux Bogomiles*, Bsl 1, 1952, p. 59–88.

¹² S. RUNCIMAN, *The Medieval Manichee: A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge 2003, p. 67–68. On Theophylact cf. also A. KAZHDAN, *Theophylaktos*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. III, p. 2068.

a response penned in his chancery by chartophylax John and signed by the patriarch. I. Dujčev presumes that the rejoinder to Peter's original letter must have been too abstract, for which reason the Bulgarian tsar decided to send one more inquiry, requesting from Theophylact concrete directions on how to fend off the heretics¹³.

The text of the letter has a tripartite structure. In the opening, the patriarch applauds Peter's devotion to the Christian faith, also making a point of alluding to the family connections between the Bulgarian and the Byzantine courts (Peter's wife was Theophylact's niece): *A faithful and pious soul, my spiritual son, best of kinsmen and most illustrious, is a great matter...*

Thus, the initial part contains conventional phrases typical for an official letter; nevertheless, here already the stance of the Church with regard to heretics (or, more precisely, the relationship of canon law to secular legislation) is laid out clearly. Extolling the tsar's Christian virtues, the patriarch emphasizes that the Church should nurture the souls of the faithful, but ecclesiastical authorities cannot take over the prerogatives of the secular administration: it is the ruler who *cuts off the roots*¹⁴ of the accursed devil, and it is civil law that ensures that *the multi-headed hydra of impiety* perishes in holy fire. To be sure, the phrases cited here can be treated as metaphors, skillfully woven into the opening of the letter. Importantly, however, they prove to be more than a mere rhetorical device when viewed in the context of the text as a whole – in the later parts of the letter the basic principle of the Church's non-interference with secular legislation is defended again:

... as for those who persist in vice and suffer from the disease of impenitence, the Church of God cuts them off totally like gangrenous and deadly limbs, handing them over to immediate punishment and anathema as well. The laws of the Christian state – since, O most prudent of men, you asked me to tell you about them – inflict death on them, judging the penalty a capital one, especially when they see the evil creep and extend widely, harming many.

The Church issues an anathema against the heretics, whereas the death sentence is pronounced in accordance with secular laws. This is not an original view of Theophylact; the actual author of the letter, chartophylax John, draws on Byzantine legal documents (the *Ecloga privata aucta* according to I. Dujčev¹⁵), prescribing the death penalty for heretics.

At the end of the opening we find a phrase that has been commented on extensively in the research on Bogomilism:

ἐπεὶ δέ σοι καὶ ἤδη περὶ τῆς νεοφανοῦς ἀντεγράφη κατὰ τὰ ἐρωτηθέντα αἰρέσεως...¹⁶

¹³ I. DUJČEV, *L'epistola sui Bogomili...*, p. 296–298.

¹⁴ This and the following fragment are omitted from the edition in *Christian Dualist Heresies...*

¹⁵ On the codex *Ecloga privata aucta*, a compilation of previous legal codices: *Ecloga* (8th cent.) and *Ecloga aucta*, cf. the respective entries of L. BURGMANN in: *ODB*, vol. I, p. 673.

¹⁶ I. DUJČEV, *L'epistola sui Bogomili...*, p. 311.

Apart from revealing the existence of the previous, now lost, correspondence between Peter and Theophylact, the letter also features a direct reference to the religious situation in Bulgaria. The phrase ‘ή νεοφανής αίρεσις’ recurs in a slightly changed context further in the letter, in the tenth anathema:

Οί άρχηγοί και διδάσκαλοι τής παλαιάς ταύτης και νεοφανούς αίρέσεως, άνάθεμα έστωσαν.¹⁷

It should be analysed in conjunction with the opinion expressed by the theologians from the patriarch’s chancery that the *heresy which has newly appeared* is not a complete novelty, but an amalgam of Manichaeism and Paulician teachings:

Μανιχαϊσμός γάρ έστι παυλιανισμῶ συμμιγής, ή τούτων δυσσέβεια...

The expression ‘ή νεοφανής αίρεσις’ and chartophylax John’s conviction that Bogomilism is in essence an *ancient and newly appeared heresy*¹⁸ (παλαιάς ταύτης και νεοφανούς αίρέσεως) are usually interpreted by means of the assumption that the actual situation in Bulgaria was unknown at the patriarch’s chancery, and that the ‘original’ quality of the heresy was not apprehended in Constantinople. Hence, the letter was composed based on the previously existing Byzantine anti-heretic literature:

He [Theophylact – G.M.], however, was well acquainted with the anti-heretic literature which existed in Byzantium, notably the works of Timothy the Presbyter against the Manichaeans as well as the anti-Paulician texts by Peter of Sicily and patriarch Photius. Consequently, when expounding the Bulgarian heresy and pronouncing an anathema on its teachers, he makes it clear that the heresy is nothing more than a continuation of Paulicianism, with an admixture of Manichaean dogmas¹⁹.

Such an approach requires some clarification, however. It can be surmised that the two lost letters of Peter contained detailed information on the Bogomils, since – as long as I. Dujčev is correct in supposing that the Bulgarian tsar had asked the patriarch for specific guidelines on how to counter the heretics – we would expect him to have included a thorough description of their doctrine. In such an account, he would presumably have mentioned the founder of this neo-Manichaean movement, the priest Bogomil, whose name was (according to most historians) transferred onto his disciples. There is no basis for assuming that the heresiologists

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 314.

¹⁸ The fragment is omitted from the edition in *Christian Dualist Heresies...*; the English text is cited from: D. OBOLENSKY, *The Bogomils: A Study in Balcan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge 1948, p. 115.

¹⁹ Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Богомилството в България*, София 1969, p. 39. For critical editions of the aforementioned works by Peter of Sicily and Photius, cf. *Les sources grecques pour l’histoire des Pauliciens d’Asie Mineure*, ed. et trans. Ch. ASTRUC, W. WOLSKA-CONUS, J. GOUILLARD, P. LEMERLE, D. PAPACHRYSSANTHOU, J. PARAMELLE, TM 4, 1970, p. 7–67 and 99–183. For an English translation of Peter’s *History* together with an extensive commentary cf.: *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 65–92.

in Constantinople were not aware of the state of affairs in Bulgaria: had the lost letters of Peter contained information on Bogomil and the basics of his doctrine, chartophylax John should have mentioned both the name of the emergent heresy and the originality of the Bogomil teachings with regard to the other neo-Manichaean heresies. Still, having analysed the letters, he did not come to the conclusion that the deviations from orthodox dogmas discussed therein constituted anything new in comparison with the Early Christian dualist religions and neo-Manichaean teachings widespread in the Byzantine lands; perhaps it is for this reason that he considered Bogomilism an *ancient and newly appeared heresy*.

It is not in the letter to the Bulgarian tsar that the phrase ἡ νεοφανῆς αἵρεσις is encountered for the first time. In this case as well, chartophylax John makes use of older Byzantine anti-heretic texts. Thus, e.g. patriarch Photius labels the Manichaean heresy as “newly appeared” in the title of one of his polemic works (in the text itself, however, the word “newly appeared” refers to the Paulicians):

Φωτίου τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐν συνόψει διήγησις τῆς νεοφανοῦς τῶν Μανιχαίων ἀναβλαστήσεως²⁰.

Later Byzantine sources referring to the Bogomils continue the tradition of calling the Bogomil heresy “new” or “newly appeared”, but considering it an unoriginal religious doctrine, adapting beliefs originating from previous neo-Manichaean teachings. In the *Letter of Euthymius of the Periblepton* (half of 9th cent.), a reliable source of information on the Bogomils of the Byzantine provinces in Asia Minor and the Balkans²¹, the heretics are already referred to as the “Bogomils”, and their doctrine is described as influenced by Massalian teachings:

ἐπιστολὴ Εὐθυμίου μοναχοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μονῆς... πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ πατρίδα στηλιτεύουσα τὰς αἵρέσεις τῶν ἀθεωτάτων καὶ ἀσεβῶν πλανῶν τῶν τε Φουνδαγιαγῶν ἤτοι Βογομίλων καὶ Μασσαλιανῶν λεγομένων.²²

The Byzantine monk also remarks that in Asia Minor, the heretics are called “Phundagiagitae”, but in the West (Δύσις), i.e. in the Balkans – “Bogomils”.

The Bogomil heresy is depicted in a similar fashion at the beginning of chapter (*titulus*) 27 of Euthymius Zigabenus’ (ca. 1050–1122) prominent anti-heretic work *Δογματικὴ πανοπλία*, commissioned by Alexius I Comnenus. In the title and first

²⁰ Cf. TM 4, 1970, p. 121.

²¹ Text edition in G. FICKER, *Die Phundagiagiten*, Leipzig 1908. On Euthymius of Akmonia (or Euthymius of the Periblepton), cf.: M. JUGIE, *Phundagiagites et Bogomiles*, EO 12, 1909, p. 257–262; D. OBOLENSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 175–176; A. СОЛОВЬЕВ, *Фундајажити, патерини и кудугери у византијским изворима*, [in:] FGHB, vol. I, София 1952, p. 122–126; M. LOOS, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages*, Praha 1974, p. 67–77; Д. ДРАГОЛОВИЌ, В. АНТИЌ, *Богомилството во средновековната изворна граѓа*, Скопје 1978, p. 172–174; A. K[AZHDA]N, *Euthymios of Akmonia*, [in:] ODB, vol. II, p. 756.

²² G. FICKER, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

sentence of the chapter, Zigabenus asserts that Bogomilism *arose recently, in our generation*. He adds that the movement is akin to Massalianism, with the restriction, however, that certain Bogomil dogmas are original. Especially interesting is the attempt to etymologize the word ‘Bogomil’ in the title of chapter 27:

Κατὰ Βογομίλων. Βόγον μὲν γὰρ ἢ τῶν Βουλγάρων γλῶσσα καλεῖ τὸν Θεόν, Μίλον δὲ τὸ ἐλέησον. Εἶη δ’ ἂν Βογόμιλος κατ’ αὐτοῦς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλεος ἐπιστῶμενος.

Ἡ τῶν Βογομίλων αἴρεσις οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ συνέστη τῆς κατ’ ἡμᾶς γενεᾶς, μέρος οὐσα τῆς τῶν Μασσαλιανῶν, καὶ συμφερομένη τὰ πολλὰ τοῖς ἐκείνων δόγμασι, τινὰ δὲ καὶ προσεξυρούσα, καὶ τὴν λύμην ἀυξήσασα.²³

Zigabenus’ report is of extraordinary value, as it constitutes first-hand information. The lively theological activity of the learned monk working at the imperial chancery becomes clearly visible during the trial of Bogomil leader Basil the Physician²⁴. Zigabenus is present during the hearings and has the opportunity to question Basil; subsequently, he portrays the Bogomil doctrine in accordance with the testimony of the preeminent heresiarch. Not unlike his predecessor from the Peribleptos monastery, he offers a brief comment on the name of the movement. To him, Bogomilism is a Bulgarian heresy: *For Bog (ὁ Θεός) means ‘God’ in the Bulgarian language, and milon (ἐλέησον) – ‘have mercy’*. Neither at the beginning of chapter 27 nor in any further part of the treatise does he mention the name of the mythical founder of the heresy: *thus, among them a Bogomil would be someone who obtains God’s mercy*. One can only speculate on the source from which Zigabenus had this information – he could have hardly been proficient enough in Bulgarian to undertake such etymological investigations on his own. Possibly Basil the Physician himself, in an attempt to mitigate the tsar and the various secular and ecclesiastical officials present at the trial, put forth this explanation of the word, sounding utterly foreign to the Greek ear. On the one hand, the etymology would express the Constantinopolitan Bogomils’ respect towards their Bulgarian predecessors; on the other hand, it would provide an alternative interpretation of the word, divergent from the one accepted by most scholars. Accordingly, *Bogomil* would not be an eponym – it would rather denote ‘someone who obtains God’s mercy’. The explanation is thus compatible with the religious exclusivism of the Bogomils, who viewed themselves, as opposed to the orthodox Christians, as the ones distinguished by receiving “God’s grace”.

Furthermore, Zigabenus writes that the Bogomil heresy *arose recently, in our generation; it formed part of [the heresy of] the Massalians and in many respects agreed*

²³ PG, vol. CXXX, col. 1309a.

²⁴ According to some older investigations, the trial of Basil the Physician took place in Constantinople between 1109 and 1111. For critique of these conclusions, cf.: A. RIGO, *Il processo del bogomilo Basilio (1099 ca.): una ricostruzione*, OCP 58, 1992, p. 185–211. A. Rigo conjectures that the trial took place ten years earlier and connects it with the events in Byzantium linked to the taking of Jerusalem by the 1st Crusade.

with their dogmas, but some [dogmas] it additionally invented itself, and increased the corruption. The idea that Bogomilism appeared as late as around the middle of the 11th century is an anachronism, revealing Euthymius' unfamiliarity with the history of this religious movement, known to have originated over a century earlier. It cannot be excluded, however, that he refers to the situation in the Byzantine Empire itself, which the heresy reached at a later time; thus, the Byzantine coreligionists of the Bulgarian Bogomils indeed only established their presence in Constantinople during the time of Zigabenus' "generation".

To my mind, the second sentence is of more importance for the reconstruction of the neo-Manichaean teachings. There, Euthymius compares the Bogomil doctrine to Massalianism, clinging to the time-honoured anti-heretic tradition; he does admit, though, that some of the Bogomil dogmas are innovative. Further, in chapter 27, he also juxtaposes Bogomil beliefs with other heresies – Paulicianism, Sabellianism, and Arianism – referring the reader to the previous chapters of the *Δογματική πανοπλία*, where he describes the dualist and trinitarian heresies anterior to Bogomilism in more detail. Frequently, however, he unmasks the heretic cosmogony, dogmas and moral-ethic norms without comparing them with their counterparts in the other dualist movements, ostensibly persuaded that these components of the teaching as laid out by Basil the Physician are original.

A survey of the later Greek sources for Bogomilism does not alter the picture reached so far in any major way. For instance, recounting the trial of Basil the Physician, Anna Comnena writes that in Bogomilism

two doctrines, each known to antiquity and representative of what was most evil, most worthless, now merged together: one might say that the impiety of the Manichaeans, which we have also referred to as the Paulician heresy, was united with the blasphemy of the Massalians²⁵.

Anna Comnena was not a first-hand witness of Basil's trial – she learned about the event from the *Δογματική πανοπλία*²⁶. Still, her testimony is valuable in that it provides yet another example of describing Bogomilism as a contamination of Paulicianism and Massalianism (while Paulicianism itself is regarded as a continuation of Manichaeism).

The expression 'ἡ νεοφανῆς αἵρεσις' used in Byzantine anti-heretic literature in reference to Manichaeism, Massalianism and Paulicianism, also makes its way (as a calque) into Slavic polemical texts – as seen e.g. in the title of Cosmas the Priest's late 10th or early 11th century work known as the *Sermon Against the Heretics*: *Нѣдостѣиннаго Козмы Прозвитера вѣсѣда на новобавившю сѧ ересь*

²⁵ ANNA COMNENA, *The Alexiad*, trans. E.R.A. SWETER, rev. P. FRANKOPAN, London–New York 2009, p. 455.

²⁶ PG, vol. CXXX, col. 1309a. Cf. also: A. RIGO, *op. cit.*, p. 191–192.

Богѡмилѡу²⁷, where **новобавившата сѧ ересь** strictly corresponds to Gr. ἡ νεοφανής αἵρεσις. The presence of the phrase **новобавившата сѧ ересь** in Cosmas' text testifies to the author's impressive education – he was presumably conversant in the Byzantine heresiological literature (perhaps even familiar with the *Letter of Theophylact* itself?), from where he transferred the name of the heresy to the Slavic text.

The connection between Slavic and Greek anti-heretic texts also becomes apparent if we consider the similar ways in which the sources of the Bogomil doctrine are indicated. In the *Synodicon of Tsar Boril*, written on the occasion of the council against the Bogomils in Tărnovo in 1211²⁸, its compiler or compilers emphasize that the codex is a translation of a Greek original: *tsar Boril ordered the synodicon to be rewritten* [i.e. translated, G.M.] *from the Greek into his own Bulgarian tongue: И по сѣмь повелѣ блѡгочестивын црѣь бориль прѣписати съборникъ ѿ грѣчьскаго на блѣгарскын свои азыкъ*²⁹. Relying on the Byzantine anti-heretic tradition, the *Synodicon of Tsar Boril* renounces the Bogomil doctrine as a continuation of Manichaeism: *Попа Бѣѡмила иже при петре црѣи блѣгарстѣмь. въсприемшаго манихейскѡж сѣж ересь и въ блѣгарстѣи земли разсѣвшаго... анафема*³⁰.

As a blend of Manichaeism, Paulicianism and Massalianism, the heresy of the Bogomils is also stigmatized in other Slavic ecclesiastical legal and liturgical texts, themselves translated or compiled from Byzantine legal sources: in the *Kormča*, in euchologia and elsewhere³¹. In this connection, one more type of influence of Byzantine works on Slavic legal texts is noteworthy. Greek ecclesiastical legal sources render the Syriac lexeme 'Massalians' as εὐχταί. In certain Slavic texts it appears in the form *молитвѣнници: Масалиане. иже съказаѣми млѣтвѣнници*³², which corresponds to Gr. *Μασσαλιανοὶ οἱ ἐμνηνεύμενοι Εὐχταί*. That is to say, the principle of handling foreign lexemes is identical: Byzantine authors

²⁷ Cf.: Ю.К. БЕГУНОВ, *Козма Пресвитер в славянских литературах*, София 1973, p. 297. One should be cautious when interpreting the title of the treatise, however, since most of the copyists from the late 15th, 16th and 17th century make no mention of either the "newly appeared heresy" or "Bogomil" in the title, e.g.: *Слово свѣтааго Козмы пресвѣтера на еретики. прѣпрѣнѣе. и поученіе ѿ божественныхъ кнѣиъ; Слово блаженаго Козмы ѡ спасенни дѣшевиѣмъ и на еретики*. Cosmas himself does not speak of "the Bogomils" or "priest Bogomil" anywhere in the text – he attacks the heretics without calling them by name.

²⁸ Cf. the new edition of the text in: *Борилов синодик. Издание и превод*, ed. И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, София 2010.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 154.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 121–122.

³¹ As regards newer research on Slavic ecclesiastical legal literature referring to heretics, two studies are especially noteworthy: М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, *Кратки сведения за богомилите в южнославянските текстове на църковното право*, БЕ 1, 2004, p. 40–50; М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, М. РАЙКОВА, *Богомилите в църковно-юридическите текстове и паметници*, СЛ 39/40, 2008, p. 197–219.

³² Cited from В.Н. БЕНЕШЕВИЧ, „Синагога в 50 титулов” и другие юридические сборники Иоанна Схоластика, Санкт-Петербург 1914, p. 670.

replace the Syriac term ‘Massalians’ with εὐχίται, whereas in Slavic texts the latter is translated as молитвенници. The triad ‘Massalians – Euchitai – молитвенници’ is likewise attested in another Slavic manuscript – the 15th century copy of Matthew Blastares’ *Syntagma* housed in the library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, call number 131, k. 18:

О оудалентинѣнѣ. рекше богумилѣ. масаліанѣ. рекше евхитѣ. сирѣ, млтѣвнициѣ. Оудалентинане же, паже въ врѣмена оудалентіна и залента прозеши ересь богумилскаа. рекше масаліанска. се же на еллиньскыи прѣлож ше (!) аззыкь, молитѣвники галѣть, мнгого бо оу ѡнѣ еже молитвы има...³³

The principal part of the letter can be seen as consisting of two mutually interconnected components.

The first one is a concise enunciation of the official position of the Church with regard to three distinct groups of heretics who can be absolved and received back into the Church after suitable penance.

The first group are repentant active teachers; the second – followers of unorthodox religious communities who *by their own simplicity and guilelessness* are not able to grasp the essence of false doctrines, but obey the orders of the leaders; the third, finally, consists of those who neither preach the heresy nor participate in the rituals, but are attracted to the ascetic habits and ostentatious morality of the heretics.

The two segments are bridged by a practical liturgical suggestion (Ὁ δὲ ἀναθεματισμὸς πάντων ὁμοῦ τούτων οὕτω γινέσθω – *Let the anathematization of all these together take this form*) and a general formula – an anathema against all those who forsake the orthodox Church and do not respect the dogmas as delineated by the ecumenical councils.

What follows is 14 anathemas referring to dualist religious movements:

– anathemas 1–2: against dualism, the belief in two principles and Satan as the creator of the material world. Radical dualism is the key notion in both the Manichaeans and the Paulician doctrine. The anathema does not reveal whether the Bulgarian heretics were radical or mitigated dualists;

– anathema 3: against the “law of Moses”, i.e. the *Old Testament* canon, rejected completely or in part by ancient Gnostic movements (notably Marcion), the Manichaeans and the Paulicians;

– anathema 4: against the renunciation of marriage. Matrimony and procreation were repudiated by Gnostics, Manichaeans and neo-Manichaeans as leading to the multiplication of the despised matter. The negative attitude of the Massalians towards marriage and procreation is also condemned in other Greek sources. Similarly, the orthodox opponents of the Paulicians brought against

³³ Cited from: М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, М. РАЙКОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

them the charges of grave immorality due to their non-recognition of the sacrament of marriage³⁴;

– anathemas 5–6: against Docetism – a fundamental accusation against Manichaeans and later dualist religious movements;

– anathema 7: against the neo-Manichaean views on the Eucharist, according to which bread and wine are not transformed into the Flesh and Blood of Christ during the anaphora;

– anathemas 8–9: against the disrespect towards the cult of Mother of God, an attitude common to all neo-Manichaean doctrines, which especially outraged the authors of anti-heretic texts;

– anathemas 10–14: against the chief Manichaean and Paulician heresiarchs.

The anathemas contained in the Letter were closely studied by Ivan Dujčev, Jean Gouillard and Dragoljub Dragojlović³⁵. I. Dujčev justifiably assumes that the text is influenced by older anti-heretic literature, to wit: *l'opera di Pietro Siculo, l'opera detta dell'igumeno Pietro, i libri del patriarca Fozio contro i manichei*³⁶. The Bulgarian medievalist's hypothesis – no doubt correct, but rather non-specific – was substantiated by J. Gouillard and D. Dragojlović. The anathemas in the *Letter of patriarch Theophylact to tsar Peter* represent the second version of the so called 'short formula', a reworking of anathemas from the *History* by Peter of Sicily, with interpolations excerpted from other heresiological works directed against the Manichaeans and the Paulicians (by Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret of Cyrus and Timothy the Presbyter)³⁷.

Less attention has been paid to the first part of the exposition, where the procedure of readmitting penitent heretics back to the Church is laid out. I. Dujčev, similarly to the author of the letter itself, comments on the punishment for the first group of heretics (active teachers – 'διδάσκαλοι')³⁸ in the spirit of canon 19 of the First Council of Nicaea, according to which they are to be rebaptized³⁹.

³⁴ S. RUNCIMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

³⁵ I. DUJČEV, *L'epistola sui Bogomili...*, p. 301–308; J. GOUILLARD, *Les formules d'abjuration*, TM 4, 1970, p. 185–207; Д. ДРАГОЛОВИЋ, *Богомилство на Балкану и у Малој Азији*, I, *Богомилски родоначалници*, Београд 1974, p. 131–132; ИДЕМ, *Манихејска формула проклињања у словенском преводу*, Balc 6, 1975, p. 51–61.

³⁶ I. DUJČEV, *L'epistola sui Bogomili...*, p. 303. For a critical edition of Peter the Hegumen cf. TM 4, 1970, p. 69–97.

³⁷ J. GOUILLARD, *op. cit.*, p. 186–187; Д. ДРАГОЛОВИЋ, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

³⁸ I. DUJČEV, *L'epistola sui Bogomili...*, p. 298–299.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 312. I. Dujčev, citing a later Latin translation of the canon (*De Paulianistis, qui deinde ad ecclesiam confugerunt, statutum est, ut ii omnino rebaptizentur*), emphasizes that the text refers to the Paulicians. However, this seems to be a later interpolation, since the rise of Paulicianism is first mentioned in the sources at the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th century. D. BOLENSKY (*op. cit.*, p. 115) links this fragment with the heresy founded by Paul of Samosata.

The Bulgarian medievalist does not investigate in great detail the standpoint of the Church towards the second and third categories of repentant heretics (members of unorthodox religious communities and those passively following propagators of dualist doctrines), limiting himself to recounting the relevant part of the letter and enumerating the measures administered to them before they can be reintegrated into the Church: the second group is to undergo anointment, while the third is to serve a 40-day penance. Notably, the holy orders of the priests classified in both categories remain valid, on condition that they abjure the heresy in writing.

This part of Theophylact's letter to Peter repays closer analysis, since, together with the liturgical direction following it (and introducing the list of anathemas), it sheds fresh light on the sources that served as models for writing new texts at the patriarch's chancery. At the same time, it helps amend certain errors in the interpretation of the letter as regards its structure and contents.

First and foremost, one should mention four canons of the Church councils (one regional and two ecumenical), thematically interconnected and clarifying canon 49 of the First Council of Nicaea. Canons 7 and 8 of the regional Council of Laodicea (343) address the issue of reintroducing contrite heretics to the Church community. Canon 7 prescribes a lighter punishment for members of heretical religious movements whose teachings do not pose a serious threat to the dogmas of the orthodox Church. This refers primarily to some groups with close ties to Arianism: the Photinians, the Novatianists and the related Quartodeciman movement. Having recanted the heresy and learned the Apostles' Creed, they are anointed and admitted to the Eucharist. In the ensuing canon, a more severe punishment is prescribed for the Phrygians (i.e. the Montanists): they are to undergo the full baptism ritual, designed for pagans – including a formal renouncement of their errors and a catechumenate preceding the baptism itself.

A similar division into two categories is found in canon 7 of the second ecumenical council, in Constantinople (381). The first class of heretics encompasses the Arians, the Novatians and the Quartodecimans (mentioned in canon 7 of the Council of Laodicea) as well as supporters of other trinitarian movements: the Macedonian heresy and some groups of the Sabellians. They are to be admitted after anointment, but only after publicly anathematizing their heresy as well as *giving a written renunciation* (διδόντας λιβέλλους)⁴⁰. Eunomians, Montanists and those Sabellians *qui eumdem esse Patrem et Filium opinantur simul confundentes, et alia gravia et indigna faciunt* are to be rebaptized, after a catechumenate, in accordance with how one proceeds with heathens⁴¹.

⁴⁰ Council resolutions cited from: *Dokumenty Soborów Powszechnych*. Tekst grecki, łaciński, polski, vol. I–II, Kraków 2004–2005; *Concilium Quinisextum. Das Konzil Quinisextum*, ed. et trans. H. OHME, Brepols 2006.

⁴¹ On the attitude towards receiving heretics to the Church as expressed in the canons of the councils of Laodicea and Constantinople, cf.: M. ARRANZ, *Les Sacrements de l'ancien Eucologe constantinopolitain* (2). 1^{ère} partie: *Admission dans l'Église des convertis des heresies oud'autres religions non-chrétiens*, OCP 49, 1983, p. 48–49.

The Council *in Trullo* (691–692) confirms in canon 95 the resolutions of the councils in Nicaea, Laodicea and Constantinople, at the same time adding further unorthodox religious movements to the list as well as – crucially – defining a third rank of repentant heretics. Arians, Macedonians and Novatians, Quartodecimans and Apollinarists are admitted to the Church following a *presentation of certificates*. What follows is an extraordinarily interesting sentence, introducing the procedure of rebaptizing followers of the heresies deemed particularly hazardous: Περὶ δὲ τῶν παυλιανιστῶν, εἶτα προσφυγόντων τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὄρος ἐκτέθειται, ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξάπαντος. This testimony allows two explanations. On the one hand, the pronouncement can be treated as a mere restatement of canon 7 of the Council of Nicaea. On the other hand, it can be assumed that before the end of the 7th century the attitude of the Church towards Paulicianism had not yet taken a definite shape and the heresy was not judged to pose an immediate danger. Therefore, it was sufficient for the heretics to undergo anointment and not baptism, which latter procedure is explicitly prescribed for adherents of other dualist doctrines: the Eunomians, the Manichaeans, the Sabellians, the Valentinians and others. The canon also introduces a third category of heretics showing remorse: for Nestorians, Eutychians or Severians a written renouncement of the false doctrine satisfies the requirements for partaking in the Holy Communion, which is equivalent to restoring the severed bond with the Church.

The stance of the orthodox Church regarding dualist heresies – as reflected in the council documents – evolves in a curious way. In the early 4th century (the times of the Council in Nicaea) the attitude towards these heterodox doctrines is quite lucid: heretics are only admitted to the community of the Church by being rebaptized, i.e. even if they have previously received the sacrament of baptism, it is declared null and void. Less than a century later, the perspective on penitent heretics diversifies: for some of them anointment is sufficient (i.e. baptism retains its validity), while for others – those involved in heresies that jeopardize the dogmas and liturgical practice of the Church the most extremely – it is necessary to be baptized just as though they were ordinary pagans, as e.g. in the case of the Montanists or the Eunomians, baptized *with one immersion* only (τοὺς εἰς μίαν κατάδυσιν βαπτίζομένους), or the Sabellians, rejecting the dogma of the Holy Trinity. Only towards the end of the 7th century does canon law announce a third group of repentant heretics: the Nestorians, the Eutychians and the Severians, recognizing the legitimacy of both the sacrament of baptism and of anointment, i.e. considering their deviations from the dogmas as less severe and not leading to their absolute dissociation from the Church. To be sure, their error is considered a mortal sin, but a sin of a Christian, possible to atone for by confessing the blunder and going through a 40-day penance before being admitted to the Eucharist.

A step forward in the research on the process of readmitting heretics to the Church is the above-mentioned study by J. Gouillard, who notes that

the tripartite categorization of repenting heretics (codified by regional and ecumenical councils) recurs in other Byzantine sources as well: the work of Timothy the Presbyter (8th cent.) and certain texts from the 8th–9th century, such as the letters of Theodore the Studite or the anti-heretic treatises of patriarch Photius. The first rank (those in need of being rebaptized) includes Manichaeans and Paulicians, although certain hesitation is detectable in the case of the latter, characteristic of the conclusions reached at all councils through *Trullanum*⁴².

This ecclesiastical legal practice concerning the readmission of heretics to the Church, established after centuries of development, was exploited by charophylax John in the letter to tsar Peter. The immediate template could have been furnished by the *Σύνταγμα κανονικόν*, approved in 692 by the Council in *Trullo*. Penned by patriarch Photius in the second half of the 9th century and henceforth known as the *Nomocanon of Photius*, it comprises the decisions reached at regional and ecumenical councils, Epiphanius of Cyprus' treatise on heresies, the work of Timothy the Presbyter, and in chapter (*titulus*) 12 it specifies the methods of readmitting heretics to the Church⁴³.

Legal documents of the Church provide general instructions regarding administering ecclesiastical penalties to those led astray by heterodox doctrines, but these instructions only find practical implementation in liturgical codices and euchologia that contain formulae for rebaptizing heretics. In his 1983 article, M. Arranz discusses this rite (*τάξις*), analysing the text according to the oldest euchologia stemming from both Constantinople and the provinces, as well as some older printed works and later editions⁴⁴. The work of the Spanish liturgist and the reconstruction of the rite allow us to conclude that in the liturgical sources the legal directives of the councils are codified in practice as prescribed by the *Nomocanon*. Euchological texts classify heretics according to three categories: a) Arians, Macedonians, followers of Dioscorus⁴⁵, some groups of Sabellians, Quartodecimans, Apollinarists (the rite requires a written renouncement of the heresy and an anointment); b) Nestorians and Eucharites, i.e. Massalians (a less severe penalty, amounting to a written renouncement and a penance period, after which the former heretics may participate in the Holy Communion); c) Eunomians, baptized with one immersion only, Manichaeans, Montanists and those of the Sabellians who preach subordinationism (admitted to the church according to the procedure for pagans, i.e. they are to be rebaptized)⁴⁶.

⁴² J. GOUILLARD, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

⁴³ On the Greek *Nomocanon* and its reception in the *Slavia Orthodoxa*, cf.: В.Н. БЕНЕШЕВИЧ, *Древнеславянская Кормчая XIV титулов без толкования*, Санкт-Петербург 1906 [Leipzig 1974]; И. ДОБРЕВ, *Номоканон*, [in:] *КМЕ*, vol. II, София 1995, p. 825–833 (with a rich bibliography).

⁴⁴ M. ARRANZ, *op. cit.* For the list of sources cited see p. 42–43.

⁴⁵ On Dioscorus and his views cf. T.E. GREGORY, *Dioskoros*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. I, p. 632–633.

⁴⁶ M. ARRANZ, *op. cit.*, p. 53–59.

The textual dependence of the liturgical directions indicated above on the decisions of the ecumenical and regional councils is self-evident. As an example, let us compare the ritual for heretics as prescribed by the oldest Byzantine euchologium – Barberini gr. 336 from the second half of the 8th cent.⁴⁷ – with canon 95 of the Council *in Trullo*:

(Barb. gr. 336) Εὐνομιανὸς μέντοι τοὺς εἰς μίαν κατάδυσιν βαπτίζομένους, καὶ Μοντανιστὰς τοὺς λεγομένους Φρύγας, καὶ Μανιχαίους, καὶ Σαβελλιανούς τοὺς υἰοπατορίαν διδάσκοντας καὶ ἕτερά τινὰ χαλεπὰ ποιούντας αἱρέσεις ἤγουν τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτῶν θέλοντας προστίθεσθαι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ὡς ἑλληνας δεχόμεθα⁴⁸.

(*Quinisextum*, can. 95) Εὐνομιανὸς μέντοι, τοὺς εἰς μίαν κατάδυσιν βαπτίζομένους, καὶ Μοντανιστὰς, τοὺς ἐνταῦθα λεγομένους Φρύγας, καὶ Σαβελλιανούς, τοὺς υἰοπατορίαν δοξάζοντας, καὶ ἕτερά τινὰ χαλεπὰ ποιούντας, καὶ πάσας τὰς ἄλλας αἱρέσεις, ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ εἰσὶν ἐνταῦθα, μάλιστα οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Γαλατῶν χώρας ἐρχόμενοι, πάντας τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτῶν θέλοντας προστίθεσθαι τῇ ὀρθοδοξίᾳ, ὡς ἑλληνας δεχόμεθα.

It bears emphasizing that the rite as reconstructed by M. Arranz does not mention the Bogomil heresy, which is utterly natural for an euchologium from the late 7th–8th century, i.e. a time when Bogomilism either did not yet exist or had not yet infiltrated the Byzantine Empire from its Bulgarian cradle. It is striking, however, that Bogomilism is likewise not taken into account (among the heresies whose adherents are obliged to be rebaptized) in later euchologia – both manuscripts and printed works. This is remarkable, because already in the times of Euthymius of the Periblepton and Euthymius Zigabenus, Byzantine anti-heretic literature refers to the Bogomils by their real name and unmasks their doctrine as an alarmingly dangerous dualist heresy.

The reason for this is, perhaps, to be sought in the Byzantine and Slavic heresiological tradition, according to which neo-Manichaean dualist heresies (Masalianism, Paulicianism, Bogomilism) are typically matched with the teachings of their predecessor Mani. This hypothesis can be verified by examining the structure of the rite allowing the heretics to be readmitted to the Church, in which the part on the Manichaeans constitutes an independent entity. The section containing the anathemas that they are to pronounce before being rebaptized is especially sizeable. M. Arranz highlights the fact that ...*à partir de BAR... nos euchologes portent un longue texte d'anathème antimanichéen, encore rallongé dans BES COI EBE*⁴⁹. The abbreviations used here refer to the following manuscripts: BAR = Barberini gr. 336 (anathemas inf. 141^v–144^v, p. 156–158 in the edition by S. PARENTI, E. VELKOVSKA); BES = Grottaferrata Γ. β. I, a provincial euchologium from the 13th

⁴⁷ *L'Eucologio Barberini gr. 336*, ed. S. PARENTI et E. VELKOVSKA, Roma 1995 [= Biblioteca Ephemerides Liturgicae. Subsidia, 80].

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 155.

⁴⁹ M. ARRANZ, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

cent.; COI = Paris, Coislin 213, from 1027, the oldest preserved euchologium from Constantinople; EBE = Athenes 662, 13th–14th cent. The article contains an attempt at a reconstruction of the whole rite of the baptism of Manichaeans based on Γ. β. I, Coislin 213 and Athenes 662⁵⁰; it is regrettable that the anathemas as found in Barberini gr. 336 were not compared with later texts, preserved in euchologia stemming from Constantinople and the provinces, which could have led to interesting thoughts on the later interpolations. These might contain elements of the doctrines of medieval Manichaean heresies, including Bogomilism, as long as the conjecture that the rite for baptizing Manichaeans was also applicable for Bogomils turns out to be correct.

At this point, it should be noted that post-12th century Byzantine legal and liturgical texts are not unambiguous with regard to the ecclesiastical penalties imposed on heretics. Antonio Rigo published an anti-heretic text from a Vatican manuscript (Vat. gr. 867, a. 1258/59)⁵¹, according to which, after confessing in the church and renouncing the Bogomil doctrine before a priest, they pass through a period of catechization, following which they are *introduced to the Holy Church of God* – “εἰσήξαμεν αὐτοὺς τῇ ἁγίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησίᾳ”⁵². Of course, the question how to interpret the phrase ‘are introduced’ remains open: does it refer to the physical process of leading the heretics into the church building (given that we have “ἔπειτα ἀπὸ τούτου προσέδραμον τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ”⁵³ earlier in the text), or should the “introduction” in this case be understood as a synonym for the renewed baptism by which they are restored to the Church?

The *Letter of patriarch Theophylact to tsar Peter* is the oldest, but seemingly not the most informative Greek source for the history of Bogomilism. A closer look at the text reveals the obstacles faced by the reader and scholar of medieval anti-heretic texts. A comparison of the *Letter...* with other Greek and Slavic sources for neo-Manichaean religious doctrines necessitates an evaluation and adjustment of some of the previous findings concerning the position of the letter in the corpus of anti-Bogomil literature. We may draw the following conclusions:

1. Byzantine anti-heretic literature past the 10th century takes advantage of earlier models, in search of similarities between the respective neo-Manichaean dualist movements. In the *Letter...*, the expression ἡ νεοφανῆς αἵρεσις, a topos known from earlier anti-heretic works, is expounded in an excessively abstract way, but it is not chartophylax John who is to blame: Bogomilism had not yet become a serious menace to Constantinople, so that the response to Peter’s inquiry was designed as a pastoral letter, consisting of intertwined quotations from earlier Byzantine polemical literature, council canons, or various legal documents

⁵⁰ *L’Eucologio Barberini gr. 336...*, p. 156–158.

⁵¹ P. ELEUTERI, A. RIGO, *Eretici, dissidenti, Musulmani ed Ebrei a Bisanzio*, Venezia 1993, p. 153–157.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 156.

⁵³ *Ibidem*.

and liturgical rites of the orthodox Church. Viewed in this context, the *Letter...* is in essence a standard document, a typical product of the patriarch's chancery; it is not conceived as an in-depth investigation into the theological minutiae pertaining to the cosmogony, dogmas and social doctrines of the heretics and the orthodox Church, but rather as a practical tutorial on how to thwart any given neo-Manichaean dualist heresy.

2. When examined against the background of other anti-heretic works, the *Letter of patriarch Theophylact to tsar Peter* brings to light the fact that the 'new' heresy was treated as 'old' – as a 'reactivation' of earlier gnostic-dualist and neo-Manichaean movements. This explains why the *Letter...* contains anathemas based on earlier formulae against dualist heresies (chiefly Paulicianism). Most anti-heretic treatises against the Bogomils lay particular emphasis on their anti-clerical pathos as well as their social and ethical views, which were – perhaps – seen as a novelty of sorts. But even so, the Bogomils were not the first – ardent anti-clerical and anti-feudal views were the trademark of the Paulicians, and it can be surmised that the Bulgarian heretics adopted these ideas from them.

3. The second part of the *Letter...*, containing an abridged variant of the baptism rite for heretics enriched with fragments of certain legal documents (mostly the *Nomocanon*), is especially thought-provoking. It could be said that roughly by the 9th century the legal and liturgical sanctions against dualist heterodox doctrines had already been codified and functioned in an essentially unchanged form since then. Gradual change is apparent as regards the categorization of the heretics. The First Council of Nicaea unmistakably recognizes but one category and one kind of punishment – all heretics have breached their union with the church, a deed that can only be repaired by baptism. The subsequent stage is exemplified by the regional Council of Laodicea and the ecumenical Council of Constantinople, where the attitude towards alternative religious movements undergoes diversification: the supporters of milder heresies only need to undergo anointment, while all others must be rebaptized as earlier. Finally, at the end of the 7th century the Council *in Trullo* announces a third, even less 'offending' class: for adherents of heterodox doctrines who can be readmitted to the Church without either being rebaptized or anointed, but only following a certain period of penance. In any case, Manichaeans and Paulicians (after the 7th century) qualify as those heretics for whom baptism is considered a necessary measure. These legislative norms were finally systematized in the 8th century in the *Nomocanon*, from where they found their way to Slavic legal codes (the *Kormča*) and liturgical texts (euchologia), diffusing all over the *Slavia Orthodoxa* area after the 9th century.

4. The letter also bears a peculiar innovative feature, though not one directly related to the Bogomil heresy itself – rather, it differentiates the text from other Byzantine documents. Chartophylax John transfers the classification of

heretics and the procedures ensuing from it from the general to the specific level, i.e. he does not speak of several religious doctrines grouped into three categories, but of one category, within which he implements the aforementioned hierarchy. However, he makes use of a different criterion: the degree of commitment to preaching the dogmas of the dualist heresy on the part of the supporters. Correspondingly, the teachers of the heresy are to be rebaptized, ordinary members of the community are to be anointed, whereas uninvolved, passive followers have to do no more than serve a penance.

5. As a final point, it may be noted that the analysis of the *Letter of patriarch Theophylact to tsar Peter* also raises the more general issue concerning the detailed study of Byzantine and Slavic liturgical texts as a source of information on neo-Manichaean doctrines. This subject, however, can only be addressed in a separate study.

Translated by Marek Majer

Abstract. The *Letter of patriarch Theophylact to tsar Peter* is the oldest, but seemingly not the most informative Greek source for the history of Bogomilism. It is in essence a standard document, a typical product of the patriarch's chancery; it is not conceived as an in-depth investigation into the theological minutiae pertaining to the cosmogony, dogmas and social doctrines of the heretics and the orthodox Church, but rather as a practical tutorial on how to thwart any given neo-Manichaean dualist heresy. It brings to light the fact that Bogomilism, the 'new' heresy was treated as an 'old' one – as a 'reactivation' of earlier gnostic-dualist and neo-Manichaean movements. The letter also features a peculiar innovative feature, though not one directly related to the Bogomil heresy itself: the degree of commitment to preaching the dogmas of the heresy is used for differentiating the situation of the followers. The analysis of the *Letter of patriarch Theophylact to tsar Peter* raises the more general issue concerning the detailed study of Byzantine and Slavic liturgical texts as a source of information on neo-Manichaean doctrines.

Georgi Minczew

Katedra Sławistyki Południowej

Wydział Filologiczny

Uniwersytet Łódzki

ul. Lipowa 81

90–568 Łódź, Polska

georgi.minczew@gmail.com

Małgorzata Skowronek (Łódź)

REMARKS ON THE ANATHEMAS IN THE *PALAEA HISTORICA*

The *Palaea Historica* is a Byzantine text based on the narratives contained in the first books of the *Old Testament* (Gn. – 1 Sam.): from the creation of the world to the reign of David. The *Palaea* can also be perceived as a document testifying to the times in which it arose and came to function as a presumably more popular and more available alternative to the Bible, recounting the history of the creation of the world and mankind, as well as narrating stories involving various *Old Testament* figures and events¹.

It is believed that the *Palaea Historica* dates back to *no earlier than the end of the 9th century*². The collection, previously believed to have been compiled by authors such as John Chrysostom or John of Damascus³, contains material from diverse sources: apart from Psalm verses, we find quotes from the Church Fathers (e.g. John Chrysostom, Gregory the Theologian, Josephus), portions of the apocryphal *Assumption of Moses*, *legends and apocryphal stories from the Old Testament living in the popular oral tradition*⁴, and last but not least – fragmentary pieces of poetry penned by the hymnographers Andrew of Crete († 712) and Theodore the Studite († 826)⁵. It is these latter works that enable us to determine the *terminus post quem* of the composition. That the text was written at the end of the 9th century at the latest has been widely accepted and left essentially uncommented upon by over a hundred years.

¹ М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *Югославянские тексты Исторической палеи и русские ее тексты*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей*, Москва 1960, p. 105.

² According to the editor of the Slavic text and the first scholar to study the Slavic *Palaea Historica*, A.N. Попов (cf. А.Н. ПОПОВ, *Книга бытия небеси и земли (Палея историческая) с приложением сокращенной Палеи русской редакции*, ЧИОИДР 1, 1881, p. XXIX–XXXII). Cf. also e.g. О.В. ТВОРОГОВ, *Палея историческая*, [in:] *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина 14–16 в.)*, pars 1 et 2, ed. Д.С. ЛИХАЧЕВ, Ленинград 1988–1989, 2, p. 160–161; А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Палея*, [in:] *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник*, coll. Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, ed. Ив. ДОБРЕВ, А. МИЛТЕНОВА, Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, Велико Търново 2003², p. 345–346.

³ Д. ДРАГОЛОВИЌ, В. АНТИЌ, *Богомилството во средновековната изворна граѓа*, Скопје 1978, p. 167.

⁴ Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *Русская историческая палея*, ФЗ 2, 1888, p. 3–4; D. FLUSSER, *Palaea Historica – An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends*, [in:] *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature*, ed. J. HEINEMANN, D. NOX, Jerusalem 1971, p. 48–79 [= *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 22].

⁵ Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 3; М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

A critical edition of the *Palaea Historica*, relying on a number of Greek versions of the text, was published in 1893 by A.V. Vassiliev⁶. The basis of the edition is the Vienna text from the 15th century (Cod. Theol. 247 Nesseli). The ‘chapter’ Περὶ τοῦ Ἀδάμ, located almost at the very beginning of the text, traces the story of the forefathers Adam and Eve up to their expulsion from the Garden of Eden. The author of the *Palaea* decided to take advantage of this opportunity to remind the reader of the correct interpretation of this event:

τοῖς δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι συνουσία τῷ Ἀδάμ ἐγένονεν σὺν τῇ Εὐά ἐν τῷ τοῦ παραδείσου ἀνάθεμα [καὶ οὗτοι ψεύδονται μὴ εἰδότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν]. ὁ γὰρ Ἀδάμ τὸ ἐξελεῖν τοῦ παραδείσου τριάκοντα χρόνους ἐποίησεν πενθῶν καὶ οὕτως συνεγένετο τῇ Εὐά. ὅθεν καὶ [ὁ] Γρηγόριος ὁ Θεολόγος εἰς τὸ „Χθὲς τῇ λαμπρᾷ τῶν φωτῶν ἡμέρα” οὕτως ἔφησεν. ὅτι Ἰησοῦς τριακονταετῆς βαπτίζεται διὰ τὴν τριακονταετῆ ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ Ἀδάμ. ὅς τε καὶ αὐτὸς μαρτυρεῖ. ὅτι ἀφ’ οὗ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου τριάκοντα χρόνους ἐποίησε καὶ οὕτως συνεγένετο τῇ Εὐά. Τοῖς δὲ ἀπευκταίοις Φουνδαῖταις τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι ἀντικείμενος συνῆλθε τῇ Εὐά καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔτεκεν τὸν Κάϊν ἀνάθεμα. Ἐγὼν δὲ Ἀδάμ Εὐαν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκεν τὸν Κάϊν.⁷

In the unpublished 14th-century manuscript of the *Palaea Historica* housed at the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice (Cod. Marc. Gr. 501), Coll. 555, f. 4–72⁸, the same fragment recurs in almost identical form:

τοῖς δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι συνουσία τῷ Ἀδάμ ἐγένονεν σὺν τῇ Εὐά ἐν τῷ τοῦ παραδείσου ἀνάθεμα. ὁ γὰρ Ἀδάμ [...] τὸ ἐξελεῖν τοῦ παραδείσου τριάκοντα χρόνους ἐποίησεν πενθῶν καὶ οὕτως συνεγένετο τῇ Εὐά. ὅθεν Γρηγόριος ὁ Θεολόγος εἰς τὸ „Χθὲς τῇ λαμπρᾷ τῶν φωτῶν ἡμέρα” οὕτως ἔφησεν. ὅτι Ἰησοῦς τριακονταετῆς βαπτίζεται διὰ τὴν τριακονταετῆ ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ Ἀδάμ. ὅς τε καὶ αὐτὸς μαρτυρεῖ. ὅτι ἀφ’ οὗ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου λ̄ [=τριάκοντα, MS] χρόνους ἐποίησε καὶ οὕτως συνεγένετο τῇ Εὐά. Τοῖς δὲ ἀπευκταίοις Φουνδαῖταις τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι ἀντικείμενος συνῆλθε τῇ Εὐά καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔτεκεν τὸν Κάϊν ἀνάθεμα εἶναι. Ἐγὼν ὡς Ἀδάμ Εὐαν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκεν τὸν Κάϊν.⁹

Whatever small differences there are between the two versions, they do not alter the overall sense of the passage. Evidently, the apostates nurtured two views pertaining to humanity’s original parents. The first one concerns Adam and Eve’s union before they were banished from the Garden of Eden; it was – as maintained by the author/compiler of the *Palaea* – rejected and compromised already by Gregory the Theologian. The second one relates to the birth of Cain as the son

⁶ A.V. VASSILIEV, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina*, Москва 1893 [Сборник памятников византийской литературы, 11], p. 188–292.

⁷ Cited from: A.V. VASSILIEV, *op. cit.*, p. 191. The editor’s addenda and variant readings from other manuscripts are included in square brackets.

⁸ Miscellanea, described as “Palaea historia, sive collectio historiarum Veteris Testamenti et Scripturis sacra et apocryphis excerpta”, in *Bibliotheca Divi Marci Venetiarum codices graeci manuscripti*, rec. E. MIONI, vol. II, Roma 1985, p. 338–341. Vassiliev dates the manuscript to the 12th century. I would like to thank Prof. Georgi Minczew of the University of Łódź for information on the manuscript, and Prof. Aleksander Naumow of Ca’ Foscari University of Venice for sending me photographs of the *Palaea*.

⁹ Ff. 4’–5.

of Eve and Satanael. Already the first researchers to study the text point towards the Gnostic-Manichaeic sect of the Archontians as the source of this idea¹⁰.

The anathema is thus motivated by a dualist view on Adam and Eve's contact in the Garden of Eden. Its manifestation is also to be found in two important monuments of the medieval age, the former having originated in a heterodox environment and the latter being a critical response from the viewpoint of orthodoxy. The *Secret Book of the Bogomils* (also known as the *Liber Sancti Iohannis*), a theological work expounding the cosmological, anthropological, eschatological and soteriological views of the Bogomils, written around the 11th century, presents a *rather complicated and not always sharp image of the world*¹¹, but it also provides a thorough discussion of Satan's *modus operandi* with regard to the first people:

Initiator autem peccati cum sua seductione ita fecit: plantavit paradisum et misit homines intra et praecepit ne comederent ex eo. Diabolus introivit in paradisum et plantavit arundinem in medio paradisi, et de sputo suo fecit serpentem et praecepit ei in arundine manere. Et sic Diabolus ascondebat sapientiam deceptionem suam. Et introibat ad eos, dicens: de omni fructu comedite, qui est in paradise, de fructu iniquitatis ne comedatis. Postea malignus Diabolus, intrans in serpentem malum, et deceptit angelum, qui est in forma mulieris, et effudit super caput ejus concupiscentiam peccati, et fuit concupiscentia Evae sicut fornax ardens. Statimque Diabolus, exiens de arundine in forma serpentis, fecit concupiscentiam suam cum Eva cum cauda serpentis. Ideo non vocantur filii Dei, sed filii Diaboli et filii serpentis voluntates patris facientes diabolicas usque ad saeculi finem. Postea Diabolus effudit suam concupiscentiam super caput angeli, qui erat in Adam, et ambo inventi sunt in concupiscentia luxuriare simul generando filios Diaboli et serpentis usque ad consummationem saeculi.¹²

On the other hand, chapter (*titulus*) 27 of Euthymius Zigabenus' (ca. 1150–1122) treatise *The Dogmatic Panoply / Panoplia dogmatica* (Δογματικὴ πανοπλία) alludes to this account in the following manner:

Ἔπειτα τῆς Εὕας ὁμοίως ἐκείθεν ποιηθείσης, καὶ ταῖς ἴσαις ἀπαστραψάσης λαμπρότησι, φθονῆσαι τὸν Σαταναῆλ, καὶ μεταμελήθησαι, καὶ χινηθῆσαι πρὸς ἐπιβουλήν τοῦ πλάσματος τοῦ ἰδίου, καὶ εἰσρῆναι τοῖς ἐγκάτοις τοῦ ὄψεως, καὶ ἐξαπατήσαι τὴν Εὐάν, καὶ συγγενέσθαι αὐτῇ, καὶ ποιῆσαι ἔγκυον, ἵνα τὸ σπέρμα τούτου προλαβὸν κατακυριεύῃ τοῦ ἀδαμιαίου σπέρματος, καὶ ὡς οἶόν τε διαφθεῖρη, καὶ μὴ συγχωρῇ αὐξάνεσθαι καὶ πληθύνεσθαι. Τὴν δὲ ταχέως ὠδινήσασαν ἀπογεννήσαι τὸν Κάϊν ἐκ τῆς συνουσίας τοῦ Σαταναῆλ, καὶ ἀδελφὴν διδυμον ὁμοιότροπον, ὄνομα αὐτῇ Καλωμενά, ζήλοτυπήσαντα δὲ τὸν Ἀδάμ συνελθεῖν καὶ αὐτὸν τῇ Εὐά, καὶ γεννήσαι τὸν Ἀβελ, ὃν ἀνελῶν εὐθύς ὁ Κάϊν, τὸν φόνον εἰς τὸν βίον εἰσήγαγε. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Ἰωάννην εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ὁ Κάϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονυροῦ ἦν.¹³

The purport of both these passages is quite lucid: firstly, Eden is the work of Satan; secondly, devilish children are born of Eve's relationship with

¹⁰ A.V. VASSILIEV, *op. cit.*, p. XLIX.

¹¹ M. STAROWIEYSKI, *Zapytania Jana*, [in:] *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, vol. III, *Listy i apokalipsy chrześcijańskie*, ed. M. STAROWIEYSKI, Kraków 2001, p. 312.

¹² Cited from the edition of the so-called Vienna variant of the text: *Ταῖντα βιβλία*, [in:] Ἰ. ΙΒΑΝΟΒ, *Βογομιλски книги и легенди*, София 1925, p. 78–79.

¹³ *PG*, vol. CXXXI, col. 1297.

Satan, whereas Godly children do not enter into relationships. The testimony of Euthymius Zigabenus does not diverge substantially from the message in the anathemas of the *Palaea*. Here, evil is additionally multiplied by the birth of two people, i.e. Cain along with his sister Calomena, the children of Eve and the blasphemous, deceitful Satan, who has assumed the form of a serpent¹⁴. The variant from the *Panoplia dogmatica* also corresponds closely to the primary text, i.e. the *Liber Sancti Johannis*, according to which Eve and Satan's offspring – the “sons of the serpent” – *commit devilish deeds until the end of the world*. Such an interpretation of the history of the world must have appealed to the dualists, who rejected matter as stemming from the evil origin. Still, in no other text accessible to me (be it a theological commentary, historical treatise, nomocanon or synodicon, as e.g. the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy) does it become the object of the ultimate and decisive rebuke against the heretics, namely the anathema.

The content of the first anathema is also indirectly related by Euthymius Zigabenus; admittedly, he does not specify where according to the heretics Adam and Eve's act took place, but he makes no mention whatsoever of the expulsion from the Garden of Eden within the timeline of the events he relates. Besides, the story of the conception of Cain and the union of Adam and Eve squares well with the widely known dualist views on the origin and quality of matter: the cohabitation of humanity's original parents still in Eden would indicate that the Garden is a foul place, deriving not from the good God, but the evil demiurge, who thus conduces to the multiplication of matter in yet another fashion. At the same time, Satan's seduction of Eve turns out to bring misery upon himself as well:

In the [...] Bogomil version of the seduction of Eve by the Demiurge she begot twins, Cain and his sister Calomena, from Samael-Satan while Abel was born after her human union with Adam. Cain, the 'seed of Samael', slew Abel, 'the seed of Adam', and brought murder and death into the world. However, after his shape-changing and intercourse with Eve, Samael-Satan lost his creative potency, even his divine form, to become dark and abhorrent.¹⁵

Already the ancient gnostic cosmogony clearly distinguishes the pleroma, i.e. the seat of the invisible God, from the further heavens and earths situated below it, governed by the evil archon/archons. According to this concept (as endorsed by the Valentinian sect), Paradise is to be situated between the pleroma and the heavens, just beneath the *circle of darkness*; consequently, it is not inhabited by the good God, but rather forms part of the sphere occupied and controlled by the evil demiurge¹⁶.

¹⁴ A motif present in a number of pseudo-canonical texts, e.g. the *Legend of the Sea of Tiberias*.

¹⁵ Y. STOYANOV, *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, New Haven-London 2000, p. 267.

¹⁶ K. RUDOLPH, *Gnosis*, ed. R. McLachlan Wilson, San Francisco 1983, p. 67–69.

This is the very belief denounced in the anathema: the denial of God's having *planted a garden in Eden* (Gn. 2, 8-9). These facts have attracted the attention of researchers for a long time – in one of the 19th-century studies devoted to the *Palaea*, we find the following comment with regard to the first (extant) anathema:

Богумиловская ересь проповедовала, что грехопадение прародителей состояло в том, что они считались в раю. Опровержение это важно еще и в том отношении, что оно проливает некоторый свет на время составления греческой исторической палеи.¹⁷

Still, the author of these words did not proceed to draw any concrete conclusions.

The originality of the anathemas in the *Palaea* consists not only in their content, but also their uniqueness: they are not found in any collections of anathemas known to me, although these abound in formulas condemning dualist beliefs concerning the beginning of the world and matter, e.g.:

τοῖς τὸν Σατανᾶν δημιουργὸν τῆς ὀρωμένης κτίσεως γενέσθαι λέγουσι καὶ οἰκονόμον αὐτὸν ἀποκαλοῦσι τῆς τε βροχῆς, τῆς χαλᾶς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀναδιδομένων ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀνάθεμα. τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ Εὐάν ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐδημιούργησε ἀνάθεμα.¹⁸

Possibly the belief in the offspring of Eva and Satanael has its echo in another anathema from the *Synodicon of Tsar Boril*:

Глѣщии јако жена зачинаеть (въ) чрѣвѣ съдѣлованіемъ сатанинѣ. прѣвываетъ же ѿтѣждѣ сатана не ѿстѣпно даже и до рождѣства мааденцоу. стѣнимъ же крѣщеніемъ не моци ѿгнаноу быти, нѣ матвожъ тѣкмо и постомъ. Глѣщій оубо тако, анаѣма.¹⁹

To be sure, this anathema is in principle directed against those who abjure procreation, but the sense of the beginning of the text seems to approach the anathema from the *Palaea*. It makes reference to all of Eve's daughters, however, not merely the primordial mother herself.

Who are the Phundagiagitae, threatened with anathematization in the *Palaea*? In Byzantine literature the term 'Phundagiagitae' only occurs sporadically.

Euthymius of the Periblepton (also known as Euthymius of Acmonia), living in the middle of the 11th century, is the author of the lengthy *Letter (Epistula Invective contra phundagiagitas sive bogomilos haereticos)* – a testimony to his own

¹⁷ Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 5–6.

¹⁸ Cited from: *Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril: la lettre inédite du patriarche Cosmas*, TM 4, 1970, p. 371. A parallel passage from the *Synodicon of Tsar Boril*: Иже сатанѣ видяше твори творца нарицаещиѣхъ бытии иконьма нарицаещиѣ дѣждевн и градоу. и всемоу исходащомоу ѿ земли, анаѣма. Глѣщииѣхъ адам и евежъ сатана създа, анаѣма (cited from: И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилев синодик. Издание и превод*, София 2010, p. 123).

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 123–124.

observations and immediate contact with the followers of the dualist heresy called *the Phundagiagitae or the Bogomils or the Massalians*, from the north-western part of Anatolia in Asia Minor:

[Επιστολή Εὐθυμίου μοναχοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μονῆς...] [...] πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ πατρίδα στηλιτεύσαν τὰς αἱρέσεις τῶν ἀθεωτάτων καὶ ἀσεβῶν πλάνων τῶν τε Φουνδαγιαγιτῶν ἤτοι Βογομίλων καὶ Μασσαλιανῶν λεγομένων²⁰.

The epistle constitutes a compendium of sorts, a source of information on the heretics, at the same time issuing a warning for orthodox Christians – Euthymius’ compatriots.

The *Letter* is in all likelihood the most reliable source of information on this religious movement; the author even goes so far as to list the names of the contemporary ‘teachers’ of the heresy (Vatina, Churilo, Racheas)²¹. Apart from an elaborate description of the dogmas, cosmology and anthropology of the dualists, who reject the sacraments and believe in the “evil trinity”, Euthymius of the Periblepton provides some clarification of the terminology involved – he explains that those who are called Phundagiagitae in Asia Minor are known as Bogomils in the West (i.e. the Balkans)²².

The Phundagiagitae are mentioned virtually without comment in the mystical treatise by bishop Theodore of Andida:

καὶ ἵνα μὴ ἔχωσιν χώραν τινὲς λέγειν ὅτι ταύτην τὴν εὐχὴν μόνην ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Χριστὸς λέγειν ἡμᾶς, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο τι, ὡσπερ λέγουσι καὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι Εὐχίται αἰρετικοί, οὐς καὶ Μασσαλιανούς καὶ Φουνδαίτας κατονομάζουσιν²³.

Here in turn the name *Phundagiagitae* functions as an equivalent of ‘Massalians’ and ‘Euchites’. A. Solovjev dates Theodore’s work to the turn of the 11th and 12th centuries²⁴, and the editor of his writings in the 140th volume of the *Patrologia Graeca* – as late as the 13th century²⁵. Irrespective of the correct date, difficult

²⁰ G. FICKER, *Die Phundagiagiten. Ein Beitrag zur Sektengeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters*, Leipzig 1908, p. 3.

²¹ А. СОЛОВЬЕВ, *Фундајажити, патерини и кудугери у византијском изворима*, ЗРВИ 1, 1952, p. 122, where the history of the editions of the text (and particularly the relevant passage) is discussed as well.

²² εἰς δε τὸν Κιβυρραϊώτην, εἰς τὴν Δύσιν καὶ εἰς ἑτέρους τόπους καλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς βογομίλους, cited from: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Богомилството в България*, София 1969, p. 384 and ἔστιν ἡ αἵρεσις τῶν ἀθέων Φουνδαγιαγιτῶν τῶν ἑαυτοῦς ἀποκαλούντων Χριστοπολίτας, ἐν δὲ τῇ Δύσει καλουμένων βογομίλων αὕτη, cited from: PG, vol. CXXXI, col. 47f. On the ‘eastern’ and ‘western’ dualists cf. also: M. JUGIE, *Phundagiagites et Bogomiles*, EO 12, 1909, p. 257–262. Cf. the comprehensive, over 2500-item long bibliography of studies devoted to the heresy in: К. ГЕЧЕВА, *Богомилството и неговото отражение в средновековна християнска Европа. Библиография*, София 2007².

²³ THEODORUS ANDIDENSIS, *Brevis commentario de divinae liturgiae symbolis ac mysteriis*, PG, vol. CXL, col. 461.

²⁴ А. СОЛОВЬЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

²⁵ *Anno Domini MCC...* (?), PG, vol. CXL, col. 414.

to establish today, this source does not contribute significantly to what we know about the religious movement itself.

We find a reference to the Phundagiagitae in a similar context in an ecclesiastical document from Athens, anathematizing Peter known as Lycopetrus: Πέτρῳ τῷ ἀρχηγῷ τῆς τῶν Μασσαλιανῶν ἤτοι Λυκοπετριανῶν καὶ Φουνδαδιτῶν καὶ Βογομίλων αἰρέσεως [...] ἀνάθεμα²⁶; the wording corroborates the claim that the views of the Phundagiagitae (Bogomils) were similar, or indeed the same, as those of the Massalians²⁷. The crucial source texts on the Phundagiagitae (the letter of Euthymius of the Periblepton, the treatise by Euthymius Zigabenus and the letter of Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, against the Bogomils) were edited over a hundred years ago by Gerhard Ficker²⁸.

Relatively shortly after it was composed, the *Palaea Historica* was deemed by the Slavs a text worthy of translating into their own tongue. There are theories according to which it was translated into Slavic as many as three times²⁹, although – in the light of recent research – the exact time periods within which these translations were completed remain unclear³⁰. The first one is believed to have appeared sometime between the turn of 10th and 11th (Verevskij³¹, Stankov³²) to the end of the 12th (Popov³³, Speranskij³⁴, Zhdanov³⁵) or even possibly the early 13th century (Sumnikova³⁶). According to Speranskij, the 2nd and 3rd translations date back to the 15th–16th centuries³⁷. However, in his re-

²⁶ Cited from: J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie. Édition et commentaire*, TM 2, 1967, p. 65.

²⁷ У познатој формули анатемисања масалијана као оснивач секте спомиње се Петар, са надимком Ликопетар, по коме се и масалијани зову ликопетријани, фундајажити или богомили, cited from: Д. ДРАГОЈЛОВИЋ, *Богомилство на Балкану и у Малој Азији. 1. Богомилски родоначалници*, Београд 1974, p. 68. More on Peter and his followers cf. *ibidem*.

²⁸ G. FICKER, *op. cit.*

²⁹ Contrary to the opinion of É. Turdeanu, according to whom the *Palaea* was translated only once, in western Bulgaria, after which subsequent variant 'revisions' arose: cf. É. TURDEANU, *La Palaea byzantine chez les Slaves du Sud et chez les Roumains*, RES 40, 1964, p. 195–206.

³⁰ A fact helping us indirectly establish the date of the first translation is the (supposed) use of the *Palaea* by the author of the *Tale of Bygone Years* – Nestor, at the beginning of the 12th century: [...] места из Несторовой Летописи позволяют сделать предположение, что Нестор не только знал о существовании Малой Палеи, но и был знаком с содержанием ея, cited from: Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

³¹ Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

³² Р.А. СТАНКОВ, *Обица характеристика на лексикалния състав на Историческата палея*, ЕЛ 5, 1986, p. 39–56.

³³ А.Н. ПОПОВ, *op. cit.*, p. XXXII.

³⁴ М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

³⁵ И.Н. ЖДАНОВ, *Палея*, КУИ, 1881, fasc. 9 (сентябрь), p. 235–258.

³⁶ Т.А. СУМНИКОВА, *К проблеме перевода Исторической палеи*, [in:] *Изучение русского языка и источниковедение*, ed. В.Ф. ДУБРОВИНА, Москва 1969, p. 27–39.

³⁷ М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

cent study on the history of the Slavic translations of the *Palaea Historica*, based on newly discovered (or rather newly identified) fragments, Johannes Reinhart concludes that the 2nd translation (determined to be of Serbian origin, though not devoid of certain Middle Bulgarian linguistic traits) is the product of the 14th century³⁸.

In the so-called 1st Slavic translation of the text, the aforementioned passage is rendered in the following way:

а иже глѡтъь, тако съчѣтасѧ аѡамъ съ еввою в рани, анафема. нбо аѡамъ тако изыде из рана .л. лѣ сътвори плача. и тако съчѣтасѧ съ еввою. тѣмь григоріе бгословъ в зачалѣ. иже вчѣра свѣтлаго бгѡавленіа днь. тако рѣ. тако тѣтъ въ .л. лѣтъь крѣтисѧ естъ. Позна же аѡамъ еввою женоу свою, и заченши роди канна, и бѣ каннѣ прелоукавъ, и ѡреченъ ѡ бѣ, и все лѣкавое дѣло тѣи стѣжа.³⁹

On the other hand, in a 15th century manuscript of the *Palaea*, representing – according to M. Speranskij – the so-called 2nd Slavic translation (conventionally believed to date back to the 15th–16th century), the fragment appears in the following form:

глѡще иже тако смѣшнѣе. аѡаму съ еввою въ рани бѣ анафема да да [!] боудѣ аѡамъ оубо повьнегда изити емоу из рана л сътвори плаче се. и тако потомъ бѣ съ еввою. бгѡмрьскимъ же. фѡгдгагистомъ глѡщійимъ, тако сопостатъ съ еввою бѣ, и роди канна проклети да боудѣтъ. познае же аѡамъ женоу свою и зачетъ и роди канна.⁴⁰

(We shall return to the question of the relationship between this passage and the Greek original later below.) A remarkable feature of the Slavic translation of the *Palaea* is the introduction of the term фѡгдгагисти, because it was not in use in the Balkans, ousted by the designation ‘Bogomils’ (although Slavic texts also employ a number of other words to refer to the group in question, mostly derived from the names of other dualist heresies⁴¹). Nine hundred years after Euthymius of the Periblepton’s identification of the Phundagiagite with

³⁸ J. REINHART, *Die älteste Bezeugung der historischen Paläa in slavischer Übersetzung (cod. Slav. Vindob. Nr. 158)*, ПКЖИФ 73, 2007, p. 60.

³⁹ А.Н. Попов, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

⁴⁰ The so-called *Krušedol Palaea*, from the collection of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Belgrade, call number 42, f. 57’ (consulted personally). Cf. the fragment of a copy of the 2nd translation of the *Palaea* in the manuscript originating from the Velika Remeta monastery, now № 141 in the collection of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, 1420–1430, f. 60–60’: глѡще иже тако смѣшнѣе аѡамъ съ еввою въ рани бѣ анафема да вѣдѣтъ. аѡамъ оубо повьнегда изити емоу из рана л сътвори плаче се и тако потомъ бѣ съ еввою. бгѡмрьскимъ же фѡгдгагистомъ глѡщійимъ. тако сопостатъ съ еввою бѣ. и роди канна. проклети да [вѣдѣтъ]. Познае же аѡамъ женоу свою. и зачетъ и роди канна.

⁴¹ *Прието е да се счита, че към този тип еретици [богомили, М.С.] се отнасят още следните названия: бабуни, патарени, навликяни, манихеи, масалиани, кутугери, торбешии и др.* – М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, М. РАЙКОВА, *Богомитите в църковноюрисдикционните текстове и паметници*, СЛ 39/40, 2008, p. 198. Cf. also: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 384–385.

the Bogomils, some scholars derive their name from the Latin word *funda* (via Greek φούντα < φούνδα), denoting a sack or bag⁴² that heretic preachers would carry when traversing what is now the state of Macedonia. This name would have been replaced by the local terms торбеши, торбоносци (supposedly translated from Greek), which appear in sources contemporaneous to the Turkish invasion of the Balkans⁴³. Accordingly, the two key terms: the Slavic ‘Bogomils’ (богомили) and the presumably Slavicized ‘Torbeshi’ (торбеши) are used to denote the group called the ‘Phundagiatae’ in the East⁴⁴.

In the second anathema, present in the 2nd Slavic translation, we find a noteworthy syntactic peculiarity; one even gets the impression that the construction might be flawed. The usual syntax is the following: the addressee of the anathema in the dative or accusative (Subst_{Dat}, Subst_{Acc}) + the word ‘anathema’, e.g.: Гл҃ашихъ јако къ б҃гѡмъ хрїстїане къ икѡнамъ пристѣпающе, анафема от Гл҃амъ

⁴² Latin dictionaries also give other meanings, some of them closely related to ‘sack, bag’: ‘ventrale, belly-band, band with a pocket’ (E.A. SOPHOCLES, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, repr. Hildesheim–Zürich–New York 1992); ‘sling’ (CH.T. LEWIS, CH. SHORT, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1879: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A-1999.04.0059%3Aentry%3Dfunda>); ‘money pouch’ (M. PLEZIA, *Słownik łacińsko-polski*, vol. II, Warszawa 1962).

⁴³ A. СОЛОВЬЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 126. Other theories concerning the etymology of the term ‘Phundagiatae’ are reported by Д. ДРАГОЛОВИЋ, *op. cit.*, p. 68–69. According to one of them, the lexeme is derived from the Italian toponym Funde. More intriguing is the hypothesis by which the religion of the Phundagiatae is a continuation of a branch of Massalianism, founded by the aforesaid Lycopetrus and revived by Churilo and Racheas, while the word ‘Phundagiatae’ itself is of Semitic origin and is semantically akin to Greek ‘entusiast’ or ‘euchite’ (*ibidem*). On the relationship between terms denoting various neo-Manichaean movements in Syriac, Byzantine and Slavic texts, cf.: G. MINCZEW, *Observations on the Letter of Patriarch Theophylact to Emperor Peter in the Context of Certain Byzantine and Slavic Anti-heretic Texts*, SCer 3, 2013, p. 113–130. Conversely, D. Angelov links the terms торбеши and торбоносци to certain toponyms found in the southern Balkans: Torbal’ (south of Smyrna) as well as the village Torbači in the region of Debar in modern Macedonia. According to this theory, these places are considered to have witnessed intensive activity on the part of the Bogomils (and to have acquired their names from that of the heretic group), cf.: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 384–385. All the same, the word *torba* is not to be found in any dictionary of Old Church Slavonic or historical lexicon of any of its recensions, since in all probability the lexeme entered the Slavic linguistic sphere from Turkish, where it had the same meaning (‘bag, sack, pouch’); different variants (*tobra/tovra > torba*) are attested starting in 1341 (following the *Turkish Etymological Dictionary*, www.nisanyansozluk.com). The Torbeši were considered members of Bogomil communities by J. Ivanov, who emphasized that the population thus called converted partly to Islam and partly (in northern Albania) to Catholicism, *preserving the original name funda*, cf. Й. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 36. A number of supposed (often popular) etymologies of the term Torbeši originating from the Balkans, predominantly Albania, are cited by the Albanian scholar Nazif Dokle, cf. N. DOKLE, *Torbeši – posljedni sljedbenici bogumila*, trans. M. BALJE, http://www.prizren-web.com/magazin/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=225:torbei-posljednji-sljedbenici-bogumila&catid=60:historija&Itemid=184 [03 V 2013]. Almost all of them relate in one way or another to the process of Islamization of the local communities.

⁴⁴ On the relationship between the Phundagiatae and the Torbeši cf.: Д. ДРАГОЛОВИЋ, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

equivalent). In the case at hand, however, there can be no certainty. It is also rather dubious to posit the existence of the Phundagiagitae/Bogomils in the period before the 11th century, given the evidence furnished by the letter of Euthymius of the Periblepton.

Steven Runciman delivers the following remarks on the *Palaea [Historica]*:

[The *Palaea*] retells the narrative given in Genesis and Exodus, with a brief summary of events till the time of David, but it retells it with a luxuriant embroidery of apocryphal legend in which all the old Judeo-Gnostic and Dualist-Gnostic stories reappear. [...] Now the Bogomils particularly disapproved of the Pentateuch, which they found inconsistent with Christian doctrine. The *Palaea* seems to be a deliberate attempt to provide an Old Testament which would not be liable to that objection. [...] Like the individual legends it was either the translation of a Greek version or was compiled from various Greek versions; and it was almost certainly disseminated at first by Bogomil sympathizers [emphasis mine – M.S.], but eventually circulated on its own merits as a story-book. Theologically, however, it does not reproduce strict Bogomil truths.⁴⁸

Sir Runciman's tone is so general that he seems not to differentiate between the *Palaea Historica* and the *Palaea Interpretata (Commented Palaea, Толковая палея)*, citing the anti-Jewish invocations from the latter. More to the point, however, in spite of manifestly siding with the "Bogomil faction" in the discussion on how the text of the *Palaea* evolved, he never suggests that the text arose within or under the influence of dualist circles – judging by the last sentence of the cited passage⁴⁹.

The *Palaea* is described as an *apocryphal Old Testament book* by the expert and editor of Slavic apocryphal writings, Jordan Ivanov⁵⁰. Dimitri Obolensky also counts the *Palaea* among the works that display *the dualistic bent of a Bogomil intermediate*, claiming that it *shows evidence of having been remodelled on its way from Byzantium by the Bulgarian Bogomils*⁵¹. Rostislav Stankov, a modern student of the text, highlights the fact that:

Историческая Палея не является богомилским сочинением, но могла побывать в руках богомилов, о чем свидетельствует отсутствие второй антибогомилской анафемы в болгарском тексте ИП.⁵²

⁴⁸ S. RUNCIMAN, *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge 2003, p. 85.

⁴⁹ It bears emphasizing that Runciman is possibly the sole author who calls the *Palaea* a holy book. I concur with this assessment, since the *Palaea* is a sacral narrative dealing with the origins of the world and the chosen people; it is also not listed in any index of prohibited (or even unrecommended!) books.

⁵⁰ Й. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁵¹ D. BOLENSKY, *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge 2004, p. 281.

⁵² Р. СТАНКОВ, *Историческая палея – памятник древней болгарской культуры*, Pbg 10.4, 1986, p. 57. Also, elsewhere: *Текстологични и други данни – връзка на ИП с Тайната книга на богомилиите [...]; отсъствие на втората антибогомилска анафема, която по всяка вероятност се отнася към началото на XI в.* – Р. СТАНКОВ, *Обща характеристика на лексикалния състав на Историческата палея*, ЕЛ 5, 1986, p. 55.

As I see it, this statement can be reversed: the lack of the second anathema cannot be treated as evidence for that the *Palaea* was compiled by the Bogomils.

An attempt to prove that the *Palaea* functioned in both spheres, i.e. heterodox and orthodox, is vulnerable to the charge of internal incongruity of the text. It can probably be assumed – provided the text was confined to orthodox circles after all – that its author tried to ‘neutralize’ the non-canonical, ‘heretic’ narratives (i.e. so-called apocrypha) that he had collected and utilized as a commentary or extension of the text of the *Old Testament*. Thus, the purpose behind placing the anathemas at the beginning of the *Palaea* would be to protect the readers from receiving the apocrypha as credible/officially sanctioned works, and from endorsing the heretic, dualist truths of faith as valid.

It appears fairly pointless to ask the question who wrote the *Palaea*.

What shows through the text of the *Palaea* are indubitably the traits of an author educated in the spheres of orthodox Christianity, displaying expertise in and making exquisite use of *Old Testament* texts, the writings of the Church Fathers, as well as liturgical works of the orthodox Church (rejected by just about all heretic movements of the period in question). Hence, we can assume that even if the *Palaea* did in fact infiltrate heretic spheres, it was merely a secondary development⁵³. Incidentally, we know that the Bogomils also accepted and used other pseudo-canonical *Old Testament* texts (such as the *Gospel of Thomas*, the *Vision of Isaiah*, or the *Apocalypse of Baruch*)⁵⁴. If the original Greek text had contained two anathemas, to what end would the heretics who adapted it (be they the Phundagiagitae of Asia Minor or the western/Bulgarian Bogomils) have eliminated only one of them, in spite of being called by name in both? The first anathema challenges their beliefs no less than the second one. Even if we assumed that the work did indeed originate within the heretic/dualist zone of influence, wouldn't we still expect the author to have omitted (or removed, in case of revising an earlier text) all the accusations in his first step? Certainly he would have disposed of any passages discrediting his own beliefs.

The notion of the *Palaea* being a ‘Bogomil’ text can likewise be entirely rejected. To be sure, the work does contain elements that are irreconcilable with the official doctrine of the Church, but the presence of the anathemas seems an

⁵³ As noted by Stanisław Bylina, *it is remarkable that the Bogomil elites boasted a relatively high level of education, which was partly caused by the development of the ecclesiastic school system (as we know, some of the ‘perfect’ were former members of the Eastern Church clergy). The theological knowledge they possessed enabled them not only to undertake missionary work, but also to compose religious works and perform doctrinal censorship of foreign texts translated into the Slavic tongue* – S. BYLINA, *Bogomilizm w średniowiecznej Bułgarii*, BP 2, 1985, p. 142.

⁵⁴ Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 220–221; M. ANGELOVSKA-PANOVA, *Eastern Dualistic Heresies: the Challenge of Bogomilism*, Исто 66.1/2, 2010/2011, p. 15–25.

argument sound enough to prove the author's awareness of these elements' non-canonicity⁵⁵.

The hypothetical history of the *Palaea*, connected with the many modifications of its text, is no less important – especially in the light of the passages adduced above. Thus e.g. according to M. Speranskij, the fragment ('chapter') retelling the history of Uzziah is a secondary addition, inserted at some indefinite time into the original text⁵⁶. The views on the creation of the world and mankind presented in the *Palaea* also presumably underwent an 'update' of sorts. It can be assumed that the original variant of the text was indeed composed before or around the end of the 9th century, perhaps shortly after the rejection of iconoclasm⁵⁷. Inasmuch as its author successfully related the 'non-canonical' motifs from the lives of Adam and Eve (including their expulsion from Eden, their penance and the place of their act), providing a suitable interpretation sanctioned by the Church, he would not have been able to show that they were characteristic of the Phundagiagitae – dualists who probably only emerged as a group and acquired their name one hundred years later, if not more. Possibly a later editor of the (Greek) *Palaea* linked the content of the first anathema with the views of the Phundagiagitae and decided to include them in the text in a thematically appropriate place. Unfortunately, since a (Greek) variant of the text not containing the second anathema is wanting, this surmise must remain speculative. Nevertheless, modifications of the Greek text of the *Palaea* are indirectly attested through its Slavic copies/translations.

This gets us close to answering the question concerning the Byzantine originals of the Slavic translations. It can be conjectured that the so-called 1st translation was based on the 'old' variant, which only included the first of the two anathema (the one concerning Adam and Eve's union in Eden) – a version that presumably arose soon after the end of the iconoclast period. It can furthermore be

⁵⁵ It remains problematic, however, that numerous episodes appear in the *Palaea Historica* in manifestly different form than in the *Old Testament*. Some typical examples are the stories of Abel's funeral, priest Melchizedek, the penance of Lot, or the death of Moses. The fact that their non-canonicity is not indicated in the text in any way can of course be regarded as the manifestation of a concealed heretic (or at least 'subversive') plan. Another explanation seems more plausible to me, however: namely, that so-called apocrypha were not thought of as 'unholy' or 'improper', but as a kind of natural supplement or commentary to the Scripture, and therefore something 'endemic' and inherently acceptable. Addressing the issue of so-called apocrypha in detail would be beyond the scope of this paper; we may add that it has already been dealt with in a number of studies on the Slavic translations (cf. for instance: D. FLUSSER, *op. cit.*; É. TURDEANU, *Apocryphes bogomiles et pseudo-bogomiles*, RHR 138, 1950, p. 22–52; 139, 1951, p. 176–218; É. TURDEANU, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament*, Leiden 1981, p. 392–403; G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, *Słowińskie starotestamentowe utwory pseudokanoniczne: między literaturą oficjalną a kulturą ludową*, [in:] *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych*, ser. XI, *Literaturoznawstwo – kulturologia – folklorystyka. Prace na XIV Międzynarodowy Kongres Slawistów w Ochrydzie 2008*, ed. L. SUCHANEK, K. WROCŁAWSKI, Warszawa 2008, p. 17–26).

⁵⁶ М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

⁵⁷ Another fact corroborating this hypothesis is the inclusion of the *Sermon* (*Slovo*) on Icons into the 'chapters' of the *Palaea* (as seen in the material from the fragmentary 14th century Slavic copy from the Synodal Library of the Romanian Orthodox Church in Bucharest, SB III 22).

hypothesized that the so-called 2nd translation derives from a variant like the one seen in Vasiliev's edition or the manuscript from the Biblioteca Marciana, i.e. already featuring the anathema against the Phundagiagitae. This would have likely been an 11th or 12th century manuscript.

The anathemas against heretics contained in the *Palaea Historica* are only seemingly an insignificant fragment. Byzantine sources attest the name of this religious movement in a number of divergent forms: Φουνδαῖται, Φουνδαγιαῖται, Φουνδαδίται. Writing on the heretics, the Slavic translator simply adapted the Greek word: Фундагигисти, possibly indicating the existence of yet another Greek variant of this name – or perhaps merely deforming the original word. It was apparently a cryptic term in the Slavic linguistic sphere – otherwise the Phundagiagitae would surely have been referred to by their customary Balkan name, 'the Bogomils', especially since the memory of the Bogomils (and even some limited activity on their part) remained alive into the 15th century.

Regarding the aspect of cosmogony and theology of the dualists mentioned in the anathemas, two beliefs are particularly noteworthy: firstly, Cain's being born as the son of Satanael, and secondly, Adam and Eve's act prior to their expulsion from Eden. This variant, also known from sources other than the *Palaea*, shows the Bogomil view on mankind's place in the history of the world and salvation – a view no doubt prone to incite outrage among orthodox circles.

Thus, consulting the Byzantine original(s) enables us to formulate a reasonable explanation for the ostensibly bizarre 'lack' of the second anathema in the older Slavic translation of the *Palaea Historica*.

Translated by Marek Majer

Abstract. The original text of the *Palaea Historica*, a Byzantine narration based on the initial books of the Old Testament, contains two anathema directed against the Phundagiagitae (adherents of a medieval neo-Manichaean heresy), accusing them of the belief in Cain's being the son of Satanael and in that the union of Adam and Eve occurred in the Garden of Eden already. The analysis of the relevant passages and their counterparts in two Slavic translations of the *Palaea*, as well as certain other Byzantine and Slavic medieval texts with related content, contributes to illuminating the circumstances under which the Slavic translations arose. The paper also discusses the very term *Phundagiagitae* (practically absent from all other Slavic sources) and addresses the issue of the supposed non-canoncity of the *Palaea*.

Małgorzata Skowronek

Katedra Sławistyki Południowej,
Wydział Filologiczny
Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. Lipowa 81
90–568 Łódź, Polska
malgorzata.skowronek@uni.lodz.pl

Ростислав Станков (София)

ОБ ОДНОМ ЛОЖНОМ „МОРАВИЗМЕ”

В последнее время мы не раз обращались к проблеме лексических „моравизмов” в памятниках древней славянской письменности, показывая, что методика выявления этих „моравизмов” страдает многими недостатками¹.

Более того, некоторые лексические „моравизмы” Киевских Листков (КЛ) и *Бесед* на Евангелие Григория Двоеслова возводятся В. Ф. Марешом к докирилло-мефодиевскому времени. Речь идет об *инокоеть* в КЛ и *Беседах*, которому обычно приписывают значение лат. *peregrinatio* и толкуют как ‘странствование по чужбине’². *Инокоеть* – образование от *инокъ*: ‘тот, кто живет один, одиночка’³. Слово *инокъ* обычно этимологизируется как калька с греч. *μοναχός*⁴. В. Мареш естественно связывает происхождение *инокоеть* с *инокъ*, но при этом вынужден признать, что расхождение между этимологией (‘unicus’) и значением (‘peregrinatio’) трудно объяснимо⁵. Автор обратил внимание на *инокоетьникъ* в *Беседах*, соответствующее *pauper* в оригинале, толкуемое как ‘странствующий монах’. Это подтверждает, по его словам,

¹ Р. Станков, *О лексических моравизмах в древних славянских рукописях*, [in:] ПКСШ, vol. IX, Шумен 2006, p. 29–52; ИДЕМ, *О лексических моравизмах в древних славянских рукописях (2)*, [in:] *Българска филологическа медиевистика. Сборник научни изследвания в чест на проф. И. Харалампиев*, Велико Търново 2006, p. 261–287; ИДЕМ, *Еще раз о неприазни*, [in:] *60 години руска филология в Софийския университет. Сборник научни изследвания*, София 2006, p. 71–80; ИДЕМ, *О лексических моравизмах в древних славянских рукописях (3)*, [in:] ПКСШ, vol. X, Шумен 2008, p. 40–71; ИДЕМ, *Из наблюдений над лексикой раннего славянского перевода Хроники Георгия Амартола: оръ ‘жеребец’*, [in:] *Русистика: язык, культура, перевод*, София 2012, p. 441–447; ИДЕМ, *Судьба древнеболгарской рукописной книги в свете проблемы моравизмов*, [in:] *Старобългарската ръкописна книга. Съдба и мисия. В памет на проф. Куйо М. Куев по случай 100-годишнината от рождението му*, Велико Търново 2012, p. 74–106.

² *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského* (cetera: SJS), vol. I, Praha 1958, p. 772; толкование основано на статье Мареша: F.V. MAREŠ, *Stopa předcyrilometodějských moravských misií iroskotských v česko-staroslověnské slovní zásobě?*, [in:] *Vznik a potky slovan*, Praha 1964, p. 7–11.

³ *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков)*, ed. Э. БЛАГОВА, Р. ВЕЧЕРКА, Р.М. ЦЕЙТЛИН, Москва 1994 (cetera: CC), p. 261; SJS, vol. I, p. 773.

⁴ М. ФАСМЕР, *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, vol. II, Москва 1986, p. 13; *Български етимологичен речник*, vol. I, София 1971, p. 80–81.

⁵ F.V. MAREŠ, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

догадку, что *инокость* возникло под влиянием непосредственных контактов с ирландско-шотландским монашеством, так как последнее известно своим „кочевым” образом жизни. Автор отмечает, что объяснение это ослабевает в некоторой степени, если учесть средневековое значение лат. *peregrinatio* ‘*vita monastica*’⁶. Следует отметить, что *инокостьникъ* в *Беседах* имеет вариант *иноко странникоу*⁷. Этот вариант можно прочесть как недописанное словосочетание (*инокоу странникоу*) или как сложное слово с соединительным гласным *о* (*инокостранникоу*), в обоих случаях смысл остается один и тот же – ‘странствующий инок’. *Инокостьнъ* в *Беседах* имеет вариант *нищини*, а *инокостьство* (избыточное образование от *инокость* с добавлением суффикса *-ство*) – *странъство* и *иноплемьнство*. Эти различия не комментированы Марешом, который в конце концов пришел к выводу, что *инокость* в КЛ и *Беседах* является отголоском докирилло-мефодиевского пребывания ирландско-шотландского монашества в чешских землях („*našich zemich*”)⁸.

Инокость в значении ‘одиночество, уединение’ встречается в Сборнике слов и поучений XII–XIII вв. (№ 12 Троице-Сергиевой Лавры): (1) *добра юсть инокость. югда молити сѧ подобаетъ боу. ибо хсѣ се твораши. на гороу вѣсхода и мола сѧ.* 163 об.⁹. На первый взгляд, между употреблением *инокость* в КЛ и *Беседах* и Сборнике XII–XIII вв. есть серьезное различие, но его легко объяснить. Прежде чем сделать это, необходимо обратить внимание на деталь, о которой Мареш начисто забыл, а именно, – каким образом в чешской языковой среде, да еще в дописьменную эпоху, относимую к позднему праславянскому периоду, возникло производное *инокость*, если в самом чешском языке не было (и нет данных, что оно вообще когда-либо в нем было) производящего *инокъ*? В ЭССЯ, например, при **jьнокъ(jь)* приводятся только данные южно- (древнеболгарского, болгарского, сербского, хорватского) и восточнославянских (древнерусского, русского) языков. Новый взгляд на происхождение *инокъ* предлагает О.Н. Трубачев, который считает **jьнокъ(jь)* исконным образованием от **jьпъ* с суффиксом *-окъ* и объясняет его связь с греческим *μοναχός* как вторичную¹⁰. Значение ‘одинокий’ у слова *инокъ* объясняет семантику *инокость* в (1). Что касается употребления *инокость* и его производных в КЛ и *Беседах*, то оно объясняется наличием сочетания *инокъ дивни* (*μονὸς ἄγριος*) в Словах Григория Богослова¹¹; ср. также рус. диал. *инок* ‘раз-

⁶ *L. cit.*

⁷ *SJS*, vol. I, p. 772.

⁸ F.V. MAREŠ, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

⁹ *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.)* (cetera: *СДЯ*), vol. IV, Москва 1991, p. 158; указание листа, видимо, неточно, так как на сайте Лавры [<http://www.stsl.ru>] не удалось обнаружить цитированный контекст в указанном месте.

¹⁰ *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* (cetera: *ЭССЯ*), vol. VIII, Москва 1981, p. 232–233.

¹¹ *СДЯ*, vol. II, Москва 1989, p. 463, *дивни*; *СДЯ*, vol. IV, p. 158, *инокън*.

бойник¹², сохранившееся на периферии русской языковой территории (Карелия), в котором можно усмотреть древний синкретизм идеи одиночества и идеи движения, странствования. Можно добавить, что *инюкын*: *инюкын* известно древнеболгарскому языку (XIII Слов Григория Богослова, Ефремовская Кормчая)¹³. Со всей очевидностью следует, что *инюкостъ* не могло возникнуть в чешской языковой среде, да еще в докирилло-мефодиевскую эпоху¹⁴. Наоборот, слово появилось в письменную эпоху как окказиональное образование, не удержавшееся в языке. На окказиональный характер слова указывает другой окказионализм – *инюкостъство* (с избыточным суффиксом *-ство*), отмеченное только в *Беседах*. Если последнее появилось в чешской языковой среде, то следовало бы ожидать использование „чешского” суффикса *-ствине*. Слово *инюкостъ* и его производные – хороший пример того, что текст КЛ и *Бесед* не мог возникнуть в чешской языковой среде. Но это еще и пример того, как в науке можно создавать несуществующие культурные традиции.

Abstract. About one false „moravism”

The article deals with a false „moravism” registered in Kievan fragments and in *Orationes* on Gospel of pope Gregory the Great: *инюкостъ* ‘peregrinatio’. It is showed off how on a single world, non-existing cultural traditions could be made.

Rostislav Stankov

St. Clement of Ohrid University of Sofia
15 Tsar Osvoboditel blvd.
1504 Sofia, Bulgaria
r_stankov@abv.bg

¹² ЭССЯ, vol. VIII, p. 232.

¹³ И.И. Срезневский, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка*, vol. I, Санкт-Петербург 1893, p. 1103–1104; СДЯ, vol. IV, p. 158.

¹⁴ И. Райнхарт, посвятивший специальное исследование лексике *Бесед*, особо *инюкостъ* не занимается, хотя статья Мареша об этом слове присутствует в его библиографии. Автор цитирует *инюкостъ* только в связи с теорией И. Хамма о поддельном происхождении КЛ – J. REINHART, *Methodisches zu den lexikalischen Bohemismen im Tschechisch-Kirchenslavischen am Beispiel der Homilien Gregors des Großen*, WSJ 26, 1980, p. 95.

Yuri Stoyanov (London)

MEDIEVAL CHRISTIAN DUALIST PERCEPTIONS AND CONCEPTIONS OF BIBLICAL PARADISE

Perceptions and conceptions of Biblical paradise in medieval Christian dualism (namely, Paulicianism, Bogomilism and related groups in Eastern Christendom and Catharism in Western Christendom), which led to some major revisionist readings and retellings of the canonical Eden narrative in Genesis 2–3, unlike other dualist doctrinal traditions have not been so far the subject of a systematic analysis. This is certainly to be regretted, since this problem offers the potential to explore an important and promising sphere in the study of medieval Christian dualist heresy, on one hand, and the development and transmutations of medieval notions, imagery and symbolism of paradise. In view of the insufficiently evolved state of research on this subject matter, the present article does not intend to advance a detailed discussion of the all medieval Christian dualist reinterpretations of traditional Paradise themes and narratives against the background of their respective treatment in Gnosticism and Manichaeism as well as early and medieval Christianity. Its main concern is to draw attention to some of the most prominent and symptomatic appropriations of traditional themes of Biblical paradise in medieval Christian dualism and dwell on the important but presently not always explicable problem of their theological and literary provenance. The significance of this specific problem is highlighted by the increasing amount of direct and indirect evidence of the role played by a number of early Jewish and Christian pseudepigraphic works dating from the late Second Temple era and late antiquity (preserved and circulated in various textual and language traditions in medieval Eastern Christendom) in the formation of medieval Christian dualist cosmogonic, cosmological, satanological, Christological and biblical history traditions.

Given the recent and ongoing historiographic controversies regarding the doctrinal nature and history of medieval dissident communities identified as ‘Cathar’, it will be necessary to briefly discuss the principal forms of medieval Christian dualism and their religio-historical provenance. In the wake of the extensive dissemination (via channels which included textual corpuses like the Nag Hammadi one) of varied Gnostic dualist and related teachings during late antiquity, traces

and actual individual or community transmitters of such traditions in early medieval Christendom become historically progressively difficult to detect and identify. However, what could be defined as proto-Gnostic, Gnostic-like, Gnosticizing, dualist and semi-dualist notions and elements stemming from such traditions were conserved in a number of pseudepigraphic works of early Jewish and Christian provenance which were circulated among diverse Christian milieux in late antiquity. Amid the theological and Christological controversies in the early medieval East Christian world, despite being censored and ostensibly forbidden by the evolving ecclesiastical elites, such pseudepigraphic texts were preserved and maintained their circulation in a variety of East Christian settings – whether in sectarian, heterodox, monastic or learned circles. In appropriate circumstances such notions and narratives in apocryphal works could trigger revivals of related attitudes through the simple borrowing of their themes or through creative exegeses spreading from these works to the canonical scriptures, with all the potential for the formulation of new heterodoxies and heresies.

The historical evidence of the beginnings and evolution of medieval Christian dualism is admittedly fragmentary and has attracted numerous scholarly controversies but after decades of text critical work on the relevant primary sources it can be concluded that its rise was signalled by the emergence of Paulicianism in the complex and tense religious world of early medieval Armenia. In the course of the centuries following the start of the process of its Christianization in the early fourth century Armenia had become the arena of the political and religious contest of the two great imperial rivals of late antiquity, the Christianized East Roman (Byzantine) and Sasanian Persian empires. There are some indications that with the introduction and progress of increasingly harsh anti-heretical (especially anti-Manichaeism) legislation in the Christian East Roman empire, Christian dissident groups, labelled heterodox and heretical by its institutionalized clerical elite, felt compelled to seek refuge in Armenian lands. In addition the rise and spread of Paulicianism needs to be considered against the background of the characteristic tensions and peculiarities in the early medieval religious climate in Armenian-speaking areas in the Caucasus and eastern Asia Minor. Due to the very fragmentary nature of evidence the early phases and fortunes of the Paulician movement are extremely obscure, making it very difficult to reconstruct their basic outlines.

There is sufficient evidence, however, that Paulicianism began to spread in Byzantine-ruled Anatolian areas early in its history and enjoyed some periods of toleration under the Byzantine iconoclastic emperors. In the following centuries the movement posed some serious problems for the Byzantine secular and ecclesiastical authorities, being predominantly approached and treated by the latter as a revival of Manichaeism – by that time accusations of Manichaeism in Byzantium were used not only against actual or alleged Christian heretics but also to stigmatize religious and political adversaries. Indeed Byzantine descriptions of Paulician

doctrines as “Manichaeism” and dualist have provoked intense and ongoing debates regarding the origins of Paulician teachings and religious observances.

Apart from asserting that the Paulicians adhered to emphatic iconoclasm and rejected the sacraments, prerogatives and hierarchy of the normative church, Byzantine polemical works consistently described the Paulicians as outright Manichaeans and attributed to them the radical dualist doctrine of two gods or principles, the evil creator of the present material world and the good God of the future world. The Paulicians are also described as professing Docetic Christology, according to which Christ’s incarnation was proclaimed illusory and the Virgin Mary was praised not as the mother of Christ but as the *heavenly Jerusalem*¹.

However, differing readings of references to the Paulicians in Armenian and Byzantine sources have led to conflicting conclusions as to whether they were originally dualist or embraced dualism later in their history². Assigning priority to the Armenian sources, Nina Garsoïan has strongly challenged the influential view that Paulicianism originated as a dualist heresy, presenting arguments in her wide-ranging reassessment of Paulician history and teachings that both the dualist and Docetic doctrines represent late developments in the Paulician movement, which occurred during its Byzantine period and on Byzantine soil³. However, this reappraisal of Paulician religious evolution has not succeeded in explaining convincingly the timing and cause of such posited Paulician doctrinal reorientation in Byzantium; indeed its proposal for a secondary dualist reformation within Paulicianism as well as its bridging of the sources for the heresy has itself met sustained and broad criticism⁴.

¹ The principal Byzantine sources on Paulicianism have been edited and collected in: *Les Sources grecques pour l'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure*, ed. C. ASTRUC, W. CONUS-WOLSKA, J. GOILLARD, P. LEMERLE, D. PAPACHRYSSANTHOU, J. PARAMELLE, TM 4, 1970, p. 1–227. A valuable selection of Byzantine sources for Paulician history and teachings have been translated, with commentaries, in: *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650 – c. 1450*, ed. J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, ed. coll. Y. STOYANOV, Manchester 1998, p. 57–114, 139–142, 166–175, 259–260. Generally, on the Byzantine sources for Paulicianism, cf. H. GRÉGOIRE, *Les Sources de l'histoire des Pauliciens*, BCLSM 22, 1936, p. 95–114; P.M. БАРТИКЯН, *Источники для изучения истории павликианского движения*, Ереван 1961, ch. 2, p. 55–102; N. GARSOÏAN, *The Paulician Heresy: A Study of the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire*, The Hague–Paris 1967, ch. 1; P. LEMERLE, *L'Histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques*, TM 5, 1973, p. 1–137.

² For a discussion of the posited references to and discussions of Paulicianism in the Armenian sources, cf. P.M. БАРТИКЯН, *op. cit.*, ch. 1; N. GARSOÏAN, *op. cit.*, ch. 2; *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, Appendix 2, *Armenian Sources and the Paulicians*, p. 292–293.

³ N. GARSOÏAN, *op. cit.*, with a proposed critical reconstruction of Paulician history, p. 112–151 (ch. 3), and of Paulician doctrine, p. 151–186 (ch. 4); EADEM, *Byzantine Heresy. A Reinterpretation*, DOP 25, 1971, p. 87–114; EADEM, *L'abjuration du moine Nil de Calabre*, Bsl 35, 1974, p. 12–27.

⁴ Cf.: P. LEMERLE, *op. cit.*, p. 12sq. and *passim*; L. BARNARD, *The Paulicians and Iconoclasm*, [in:] *Iconoclasm: Papers Given at the Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, March 1975*, ed. A. BRYER, J. HERRIN, Birmingham 1977, p. 75–83, esp. 81; I.P. COULIANU, *The Tree of Gnosis: Gnostic Mythology from Early Christianity to Modern Nihilism*, San Francisco 1992, p. 192–194; *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, Appendix 2, *Armenian Sources and the Paulicians*, p. 292–293.

Byzantine reports of Paulician teachings reiterate they professed dualism between the recognized creator-god and ruler of this world and the concealed god of the world to come (who could be seen as lord of heavens). These reports have triggered lengthy and persisting scholarly and theological debates have persisted the veracity of their allegations and whether such dualist teachings could have derived from Manichaeism, Marcionite or other dissenting Christian groups' influences⁵. It is also wholly, if not more plausible that the formulation of the Paulician dualist version of Christianity was not the consequence of an actual heretical chain of transmission of ideas but was developed independently through a spiritualist and allegorical reading of the New Testament in sixth-seventh century Armenian sectarian milieu, its dualist element being influenced directly or indirectly by the various dualist survivals still active on the religious scene of late antique and early medieval Armenia, ranging from Zoroastrian to Christian heterodox and possible Gnostic-related residues⁶.

Although it still abounds in major gaps and uncertainties, the history of the rise of the Paulician movement in Armenia, its expansion in Byzantine Anatolia and the re-settlement and migrations of Paulician communities in the Balkans and their later evolution there provides some very valuable evidence of the nature and dynamics of the development, expansion and suppression of religious dualist heterodoxy and heresy along the Caucasus – Anatolia – Balkan axis.

⁵ For arguments that Manichaeism was in many respects a direct ancestor of Paulicianism which experienced also some Marcionite influences, cf.: D. OBOLENSKY, *The Bogomils: A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge 1948, p. 44–47, followed by: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Богомилството*, София 1993, p. 83, 97, an. 57; for arguments that Paulician dualism may have been a development of Marcionite teachings, cf.: A. VON HARNACK, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott: eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der Katholischen Kirche*,² Leipzig 1924, p. 382–383 (with reservations); H. GRÉGOIRE, *op. cit.*; I. ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΙΟΥ, *Οι παυλικιανοί*, Αθήναι 1959, p. 153sq; M. LOOS, *Le Mouvement pauliciens à Byzance*, Bsl 25, 1964, p. 55–56; M. LOOS, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages*, Prague 1974, p. 34–35; for arguments for Gnostic influences on Paulician dualism, cf.: J.I. VON DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. I, *Geschichte der gnostisch-manichäischen Sekten im frühen Mittelalter*, Munich 1890 [repr. Darmstadt 1968], p. 2–3; H. SÖDERBERG, *La Religion des Cathares: études sur le gnosticisme de la basse antiquité et du moyen âge*, Uppsala 1949, p. 52sq; cf. the cautious approach to the problem of possible Manichaeism and/or Marcionite impact on Paulicianism in: S. RUNCIMAN, *The Medieval Manichee: A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge 1947, p. 46–59; cf. the views of I.P. COULIANU, *op. cit.*, p. 190–196, who, while treating Paulicianism as a 'popular Marcionism', argues that the Marcionite influence need not have been a direct historical one. Cf. also: P. LEMERLE, *op. cit.*, p. 132–135, for a discussion of the parallels and the important differences between Marcionism and Paulicianism, and an emphasis on Paulician reinstatement of evangelical Christianity and the Pauline tradition.

⁶ Cf. B. HAMILTON, *Historical Introduction*, [in:] *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 7–8; Y. STOYANOV, *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, London–New Haven 2000, p. 125–129; on fifth-century reports of trends and movements in Armenian Christianity perceived as Gnostic-related, cf. V.N. NERSESSIAN, *The Tondrakian Movement: Religious Movements in the Armenian Church from the Fourth to the Tenth Centuries*, London 1987, p. 79sq.

The evolution of medieval Christian dualism entered a new, crucial stage with the rise of the Bogomil heresy in the first half of the tenth century in the newly and to some extent re-Christianized central and eastern Balkans. Medieval Orthodox polemicists tended to apply to Bogomilism the heresiological cliché of “Manichaeism” or to define it as a combination of earlier heresies – such perceived combinations could involve admixtures of Manichaeism and Paulicianism, Paulicianism and Massalianism or else Manichaeism and Massalianism⁷ (condemned as heretical, Massalianism, with its characteristic anthropological dualism had followed a similar trajectory of diffusion from north-east Mesopotamia to Syria, Armenia and Asia Minor). Such clear-cut heresiological definitions of Bogomilism can be extremely misleading but sometimes have been adopted in earlier scholarship in which the direct influences of earlier Manichaeism, Marcionite or separate Gnostic traditions were also variously assumed to have their impact on the formation of Bogomil dualist teachings⁸. The most recent and evolving trends of research into the accelerated process of the formation of Slavo-Byzantine Orthodox theology, culture and learning in the late ninth and tenth centuries, as developed by the Ohrid and Preslav literary schools of the newly Christianized Bulgarian kingdom, however, have made available more material, and presented strong arguments suggesting that the conceptualization and elaboration of Bogomil theological dualism owes much to this diverse process. Significantly, not only were the scriptures translated in a language sufficiently close to the vernacular, but the wide-ranging translation and diffusion of ostensibly censored pseudepigraphic texts also took place during its initial phases⁹.

By the early eleventh century Bogomilism had penetrated Byzantine territories in Anatolia and was to spread further into peninsular Greece, the west-

⁷ Cf. for example: THEOPHYLACT LECAPENUS, *Epistula*, [in:] I. DUICHEV, *L'epistola sui Bogomili del patriarca constantinopolitano Teofilatto*, [in:] *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, Città del Vaticano 1964, p. 89–91; ANNA COMNENA, *Alexiad*, XV, 10, 3–4, ed. B. LEIB, Paris, 1945, III, p. 227sqq.; PSEUDO-PSSELLUS, *De daemonibus*, [in:] *Le 'De Daemonibus' du Pseudo-Psellus*, ed. P. GAUTIER, REB 38, 1980, p. 105–194.

⁸ See the summary of earlier and more recent approaches to the provenance of Bogomil dualism in: Y. STOYANOV, *op. cit.*, p. 161–166.

⁹ For earlier views about this process, cf., for example, Ъ. ИВАНОВ, *Богомилски книги и легенди*, София 1925; E. TURDEANU, *Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles*, RHR 138.1, 1950, p. 22–52; 138.2, p. 176–218; N. MINISSI, *La tradizione apocryfa e la origini del bogomilismo*, RS 3, 1954, p. 97–113; see the critical survey of more recent explorations of this phenomenon in: Y. STOYANOV, *op. cit.*, p. 260–287 *passim*; Y. STOYANOV, *Apocryphal Themes and Apocalyptic Traditions in Bogomil Dualist Theology and their Implications for the Study of Catharism*, PhD Diss., University of London 2000, p. 67–73, 213–236; see also the bibliography on the subject of the interrelations between Bogomilism and apocryphal literature in: A. ORLOV, *Selected Bibliography on the Transmission of the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in the Slavic Milieux*, [in:] IDEM, *Selected Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, Leiden 2009, p. 203–435 (418–423).

ern Balkans (particularly in Dalmatia and Bosnia). In the period of the crusades when the contacts and interchange between Eastern and Western Christendom greatly intensified, Bogomilism reportedly made missionary advances further to the west. While it is still impossible to establish a detailed picture of the interrelations between Bogomilism and the early Cathar communities in western Europe, a number of Western sources refer to a formative missionary and theological impact Eastern Christian dualists on early Catharism. The nature and extent of this impact (or even it existed at all) has remained the subject of vigorous and ongoing scholarly debate, which has acquired further topicality following some very recent studies, questioning the existence of a coherent dualist doctrinal system and organizational structures and hierarchy among groups labelled as 'Cathar' in Catholic polemical and historical sources¹⁰.

Original Bogomil dualism had a monarchian or moderate character which clearly contrasted with the mature Paulician radical dualist dogma of the two principles, the evil creator of this world and the good Lord of the world to come. The cumulative evidence of a number of primary sources indicates that by the last three decades of the twelfth century both Bogomil and the related Cathar dualism divided into two strands, a monarchian and a radical trend, which advanced different versions and narratives of Christian dualism (while the existence of intermediary forms of dualism or more monistically-inclined Bogomil groups and theologians should not be dismissed).

All versions of Bogomil and Cathar dualism had a strongly anti-cosmic, anti-somatic character. Significantly, in the accounts of both versions of Bogomil and Cathar dualism one may detect notions and narratives, variously related, for example, to apocryphal embellishments of the Genesis creation and flood stories, apocryphal and heretical satanologies and Christologies, etc., that cannot be discovered in the teachings of anti-ecclesiastical and heretical movements preceding the emergence of Bogomilism and Catharism but can be found in the various pseudepigraphic works that came to be translated and circulated in various Slavo-Byzantine contexts and milieus before and during the formation and evolution of Bogomil dualist theology¹¹. It was from such pseudepigraphic works like *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (2 Enoch)¹², *The Apocalypse*

¹⁰ In particular: M.G. PEGG, *The Corruption of Angels: the Great Inquisition of 1245–1246*, Princeton 2001; IDEM, *A Most Holy War: the Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom*, New York–Oxford 2008; R.I. MOORE, *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe*, London 2012.

¹¹ See the analysis of the evidence of primary sources, including critical surveys of existing studies touching on this problematic, in: Y. STOYANOV, *Apocryphal Themes and Apocalyptic Traditions...*, chs. 2, 3 and 4.

¹² The first edition of the apocalypse as a whole was prepared by A. I. Popov in 1880 (based on a late seventeenth-century Russian manuscript of the long recension), А.И. ПОПОВ, *Библиографические материалы собранные А.И. Поповым*, ЧИОИДР 3.9, 1880, p. 66–139, while in 1884 S. Novaković published for the first time a manuscript of the short recension: S. NOVAKOVIĆ, *Apokrif o Enohu*, Star 16,

of Abraham¹³ and *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch* (3 Baruch)¹⁴ that Bogomilism appropriated and developed some of its most important notions which later became influential in western Catharism such as its multi-heaven cosmology, crucial features of its diabolology, elements of its cosmogony and a number of eschatological traditions.

This brief introductory survey on the state of research on the types and provenance of pseudepigraphic works and the patterns of their impact on medieval Christian dualism were essential for providing the necessary religio-historical context for the discussion of the roots of its notions and narratives of biblical Paradise. Accounts of and polemics against moderate Christian dualism in medieval Eastern and Western Christendom generally focus on its tenet of the Devil (otherwise a secondary and inferior agency to God the Father) as a maker or architect

1884, p. 67–81. The subsequent discoveries of more manuscripts belonging to both recensions led to a continuous textual debate focused on the problem which one of two is closest to the original Slavonic translation of the apocalypse and occasionally, whether there exists a third intermediate version. For a bibliography of the editions, translations and studies of 2 Enoch, see A. ORLOV, *op. cit.*, p. 222–243.

¹³ Like 2 Enoch and *The Ladder of Jacob The Apocalypse of Abraham* is extant only in Slavonic manuscripts. The Slavonic version of *The Apocalypse of Abraham* has been preserved in a more or less full form in nine Russian manuscripts, the earliest of which date from the fourteenth century and was published in 1863 separately by: Н.С. ТИХОНРАВОВ, *Памятники отреченной русской литературы*, vol. I, Москва 1863, p. 32–53, and И.И. СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ, *Древние памятники русского письма и языка: общее повременное обозрение*, Санкт-Петербург 1861–1863, col. 648–665. Recent critical editions of the apocalypse were published separately by В. PHILONENKO-SAYAR, М. PHILONENKO, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham. Introduction, text slave, traduction et notes*, Paris 1981, and R. RUBINKIEWICZ, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave: Introduction, text critique, traduction et commentaire*, Lublin 1987. The recent important textual critical study of the apocalypse by A. Kulik includes an English translation of the text: A. KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic pseudepigrapha: toward the original of the Apocalypse of Abraham*, Atlanta 2004, p. 9–37. For a bibliography of the editions, translations and studies of *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, cf. A. ORLOV, *op. cit.*, p. 246–256.

¹⁴ The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) has been a subject of academic study for more than a century. In 1886 S. Novaković published the text of a Slavonic version of the apocalypse for the first time (from a fifteenth-century Serbian manuscript): S. NOVAKOVIĆ, *Otkrovenjje Varuhovo*, Star 18, 1886, p. 203–209, and in 1897 M.R. James presented an edition of the Greek text: M.R. JAMES, *The Apocalypse of Baruch*, [in:] *Apocrypha Anecdota II* (TS 5.1), ed. J. ROBINSON, Cambridge 1897, p. li–lxxi, 83–94. The subsequent discoveries and publications of more manuscripts of 3 Baruch led to a continuous textual debate focused on the problem of the relationship between the Greek and Slavonic versions and the Slavonic textual tradition. The study of 3 Baruch was greatly enhanced by the critical editions of the Greek version of the apocalypse by J.-C. PICARD, *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*, Leiden 1967, and its Slavonic version by: H. GAYLORD, *The Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch*, PhD Diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem 1983, which were followed by the major studies the apocalypse by D.C. HARLOW, *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*, Leiden 1996, and most recently: A. KULIK, *3 Baruch: Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch*, Berlin and New York 2010, which includes a very valuable new English translation of and commentary on the apocalypse, p. 89–386. For a bibliography of the editions, translations and studies of *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, cf. A. ORLOV, *op. cit.*, p. 278–284.

of the visible world and terrestrial creation¹⁵. Accordingly such accounts can emphasize the role of the Devil as a creator of paradise as in the case of the important source on eleventh-century Anatolian Bogomilism (and related groups), Euthymius of Peribleptos' *Epistola*¹⁶. The creation of Paradise and its position in the structure of the visible cosmos in such reported moderate dualist teachings is brought thus into the framework of a tradition of biblical exegesis in which, as in earlier Gnostic traditions, the Creator, the God of the Old Testament is identified as an inferior demiurge and reveals that above him there exists an invisible Father, against whom he raises a revolt in heaven.

The attribution of the creation of Paradise to this inferior biblical demiurge, represented as a secondary "satanic" power, is highlighted in the Bogomil apocryphon, *Interrogatio Iohannis* (the most detailed and significant internal source of medieval moderate Christian dualism)¹⁷ where it is generally synchronized with the other Creator's feats in Genesis 1–2. As with the other biblical acts of creation ascribed to the secondary "satanic" power in the Bogomil apocryphon, the fashioning of Paradise occurs in the wake of Satan's fall from heaven to the firmament following his rebellion against the Father. As in earlier Gnostic systems, *Interrogatio Iohannis* lays a special emphasis on its rendition of the Genesis Garden of Eden narrative and its theodicy, the Edenic fortunes of the first human couple, the identity of the Edenic serpent who tempted Eve to eat the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil and the nature of the Tree itself¹⁸. In its

¹⁵ See, for example, Presbyter Cosmas' tenth-century *Sermon Against the Heretics*, newly edited in: Ю. БЕГУНОВ, *Козма презвитер в славянских литературах*, София 1973, p. 305, 327, 331; MONETA OF CREMONA, *Adversus Catharos et Waldenses libri quinque*, ed. T.A. RICCHINI, Rome 1743, Book 1, *Preface*, p. 2sqq.

¹⁶ The text of Euthymius' *Epistola* is preserved in five manuscripts but only two contain the whole text. The letter is contained in *PG*, vol. CXXXI, col. 47–58, but is erroneously attributed to a later theologian, Euthymius Zigabenus (see an. 22 below). Another edition is to be found in: G. FICKER, *Die Phundagiagiten: Ein Beitrag zur Ketzergeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters*, Leipzig 1908, p. 3–86 (the reference to the belief he attributes to the Bogomils/Phundagiagites that the Devil is maker on paradise is on p. 33).

¹⁷ The apocryphon is extant only in Latin and divides into two main versions; the first version derives from a manuscript once in the archives of the Inquisition at Carcassonne but subsequently destroyed: it survives in two late manuscripts and one printed text which was published in: J. BENOIST, *Histoire des Albigeois et des Vaudois ou Barbets*, Paris 1691, vol. I, p. 283–296. Subsequent reprints included that of J.C. THILO, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, Leipzig 1832, vol. I, p. 884–896. The second version is represented solely by a manuscript preserved in the National Library of Vienna, apparently dating from the twelfth-thirteenth centuries. The Carcassonne version was reproduced alongside the Vienna version by: М. СОКОЛОВ, *Славянская книга Еноха праведнаго*, Москва 1910, p. 165–175; also by: Ё. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 73–87, R. REITZENSTEIN, *Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*, Leipzig–Berlin 1929, p. 297–311, and in the most recent critical edition of text, E. BOZÓKY, *Le Livre secret des cathares*, Paris 1980, p. 41–94.

¹⁸ On Gnostic approaches and reworkings of the Genesis Paradise narrative and related conceptualizations of the theme of Paradise, see, for example, R. VAN DEN BROEK, *The Shape of Edem According to*

reworking of the Genesis Paradise story and the fall of Adam and Eve *Interrogatio Iohannis* develops a variant of the tradition attested in earlier Gnostic systems regarding the Gnostic demiurge's (or his demonic archons') sexual encounter with or assault on Eve (or her "likeness"), which find parallels in Jewish rabbinic traditions concerning Eve's seduction by Samael/Satan (who could be identified or associated with the Edenic snake) and their progeny (Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer 22; Targum-Pseudo-Jonathan 5, 1–3)¹⁹. According to *Interrogatio Iohannis* Satan created paradise with the explicit purpose to seduce the first human couple to commit sin²⁰; he planted in the middle of it a bed of reeds and made the serpent²¹; he forbade Adam and Eve to eat the fruit of good and evil but having entered the serpent, allured Eve into sin²² (according to one of the glosses to the Vienna version, posing as a *beautiful youth*²³). Adam was also affected by Satan with a lust

Justin the Gnostic, VC 27, 1973, p. 35–45; M. TARDIEU, *Trois mythes gnostiques: Adam, Éros et les animaux d'Égypte dans un écrit de Nag Hammadi (II, 5)*, Paris 1974; P.S. ALEXANDER, *The Fall into Knowledge: The Garden of Eden/paradise in Gnostic Literature*, [in:] *A Walk in the Garden*, ed. P. MORRIS, D. SAWYER, Sheffield 1992, p. 91–104; J. MAGNE, *From Christianity to Gnosis and From Gnosis to Christianity: An Itinerary through the Texts to and from the Tree of Paradise*, Atlanta 1993 (Magne's thesis considers the reciprocal interpretation of the Emmaus and Paradise narrative as the key to the origins of Gnosticism and Christianity, offering a new chronology of these interpretations in the framework of Jewish-Gnostic-Christian interrelations; Magne argues that the paradise narrative in the Gnostic writings is the fundamental, central core around which and for which everything is organized, p. 73, and the Gnostic movement would have sprang directly... from the exegesis of the Paradise narrative revealed by the Emmaus narrative..., p. 59); T. RASIMUS, *Paradise Reconsidered in Gnostic Mythmaking: Rethinking Sethianism in Light of the Ophite Evidence*, Leiden 2009.

¹⁹ For Gnostic elaborations of the theme of Eve's seduction or attempted seduction by the demiurge, his oppressive archons or the chief archon in the Nag Hammadi tracts, see *The Apocryphon of John*, 24, 8–28; *The Apocalypse of Adam*, 66, 25 – 66, 10; *The Hypostasis of the Archons*, 89, 17–28; *On the Origin of the World*, 116, 5 – 117, 20; For a comparative survey of the theme of Eve's seduction in Gnostic (original and reported) and Jewish traditions, see G.A.G. STROUMSA, *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology*, Leiden 1984, p. 35–53. For further evidence concerning Gnostic and Gnostic-related teachings about Eve's seduction by the demiurge or his archons (or authorities), which maintained their currency among the schismatic Audians in the Holy Land, see H.-C. PUECH, *Fragments retrouvés de l'Apocalypse d'Allogéne*, [in:] IDEM, *En quête de la Gnose*, vol. I, *La Gnose et le temps et autres essais*, Paris 1978, p. 271–300.

²⁰ *Initiator autem peccati cum sua seductione ita fecit: plantavit paradisum et misit homines intus et precepit eis ne comederent ex eo – Interrogatio Iohannis* (Vienna version, 94–95), [in:] E. BOZÓKY, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

²¹ *Diabolus intravit in paradisum et plantavit arundem in medio paradisi et de sputo suo fecit serpentem et precepit ei in arundine manere et sic diabolus ascondebat sapientiam sue fraudis ut non viderent deceptionem suam – Interrogatio Iohannis* (Vienna version, 96–99), [in:] E. BOZÓKY, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

²² *Et intrabat et loquebatur ad eos dicens: De omni fructu qui est in paradiso, comedite, de fructu vero scientie boni et mali nolite comedere. Et iterum intravit dyabolus in serpentem nequam et seduxit angelum qui erat in forma mulieris et effudit super ea concupiscentiam peccatorum et fecit concupiscentiam suam cum Aeva in cauda Serpentis – Interrogatio Iohannis* (Carcassonne version, 93–99), [in:] E. BOZÓKY, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

²³ *Serpens non fuit ut serpens sed sicut homo. Fecit enim se sicut pulchrum adolescentem et preceptum diaboli introivit in paradisum per canam et decepit mulierem et fornicatus est cum ea cum cauda – Interrogatio Iohannis* (Vienna version, Gloss 7, 31–33), [in:] E. BOZÓKY, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

for intercourse with Eve and they begot together the ‘children of the devil and of the serpent’ and Satan’s reign, itself dependent on procreation, would last until the consummation of this age²⁴.

The Devil’s creation of Paradise, his seduction of Eve and infecting Adam with a *lust for debauchery* (leading to procreation) represents a crucial stage of his designs to imprison the divine substance in humanity in matter (at an earlier stage of the anthropogonic process he condemned the angels of the first and second heaven to suffer bodily imprisonment in mortal, respectively male and female, forms²⁵. By introducing (and enacting with Eve) *longing for sin* and *lust for debauchery* into Paradise, Satan fortifies humanity’s exile in matter. The relation of this “satanic” Eden’s relation to the creation and structure of the physical world is defined by its central role in this process of imprisoning the protoplasts in the flesh and magnifying humanity’s plight by subjecting it to the catastrophic (for its spiritual substance) chain of procreation.

The Paradise episode of Eve’s seduction by Satan is also briefly recounted in the very important twelfth-century polemical source on contemporaneous moderate dualist Bogomilism, Euthymius Zigabenus’ *Panoplia Dogmatica*²⁶. In Zigabenus’ account Adam and Eve were envisaged as being created in a kind of cooperation between Samael/Satanael and God (their bodies were moulded by the former but received God’s breath of life). Satanael (Samael) became jealous of them and started to plot against their descendants, thus making his first breach in his contract with God concerning the creation of man and the fortunes of his generations. Again through the medium of the serpent (into which he slipped) he deceived and seduced Eve and she begot from him twins, Cain and his sister Calomena, while Abel is born after her later human union with Adam²⁷. Elements of this Paradise narrative of Eve’s seduction by Satan and (on occasions) the ensuing Cainite line are recounted or alluded to in some of the standard Catholic polemical accounts of moderate Cathar dualism²⁸.

²⁴ *Et iterum effudit dyabolus in angelo qui erat in Adam, venenum suum et concupiscentiam que generat filios serpentis et filios dyaboli usque ad consummationem hujus seculi – Interrogatio Iohannis* (Carcassonne version, 101–104), [in:] E. BOZÓKY, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

²⁵ *Et precepit angelo secundi celi introire in corpus luti et tulit de eo et fecit alium corpus in forma mulieris precepitque angelo primi celi introire in illum. Angeli ploraverunt multum videntes super se formam mortalem esse in divisio formis – Interrogatio Iohannis* (Vienna version, 87–90), [in:] E. BOZÓKY, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

²⁶ EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, *Panoplia Dogmatica*, PG, vol. CXXX (cetera: EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS); the Bogomil section comprises col. 1289–1331; another version of the Bogomil section is also edited by G. FICKER in: G. FICKER, *op. cit.*, p. 89–111.

²⁷ EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, col. 1297.

²⁸ BONACURSUS, *Manifestatio haeresis catharorum quam fessit Bonacursus*, PL, vol. CCIV, col. 775–792(776); MONETA OF CREMONA, *op. cit.*, p. 145; GEORGIUS, *Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum hereticum*, [in:] *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ed. E. MARTÈNE, U. DURAND, vol. V, Paris 1717, col. 1705–1753 (1710–1711); SALVO BURCI, *Liber supra Stella*, ed. I. DA MILANO, *Il ‘Liber supra Stella’ del*

Apart from the earlier and already discussed Jewish and Gnostic traditions, the theme of Eve's seduction by an inferior demiurge, Satan (or Samael) in paradise is also present in 2 Enoch 31, 6 in which Satanael (to be transformed in Satan) begins to plot against Adam, enters paradise and seduces Eve²⁹. Unless this narrative represents itself a Bogomil interpolation, given the fact that 2 Enoch served as an important source for Bogomil teachings, this diabolical section in 2 Enoch certainly would have influenced or reinforced the Bogomil preoccupation with and elaboration of this Paradise theme. Furthermore, the association between the Devil, a tree in paradise (whether the tree of the knowledge of good and evil or some other tree) and the sin of Adam and Eve seen as related to lust or sexual union is present in the Slavonic version of 3 Baruch 4, 8 where Satanael plants in paradise the vine which is defined as the tree through which the serpent seduced Adam and Eve and was also the sinful desire that Satanael spread over them³⁰ (the Greek texts of 3 Baruch also identify the tree that deceived Adam with the vine but lack the theme of tree as a *sinful desire*).

A similar association occurs in *The Apocalypse of Abraham* 23, 5–12 where Abraham, after asking who was the one who seduced Eve and what was the fruit of the tree, is granted a vision of paradise in which he sees Adam entwined with Eve under a tree whose fruit has the appearance of a bunch of grapes, held and fed to the couple by a dragon with human hands and feet, identified with Azazel. Again, the tree that caused the Fall, the sexual union of Adam and Eve and the figure of God's adversary (in the case of this apocalypse, Azazel) are interrelated in Abraham's synthetic vision of the Garden of Eden³¹.

The association between paradise and its primordial tree(s) with the bodily/sexual human passions made explicit in *Interrogatio Iohannis* (and the moderate Christian dualism it represents)³² is thus largely shared in the Slavonic version of 3 Baruch and *The Apocalypse of Abraham* and was most likely formed under the impact of these pseudepigrapha. This association finds also parallels in earlier Gnostic traditions manifested, for example, in the Nag Hammadi tract, *Apocryphon of*

piacentino Salvo Burci contro i catari e altri correnti ereticali, Ae 19, 1945, p. 314. The interrelations between the representation of the association between the sexual union of Eve with Satan and Adam with the forbidden fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil is observed by: E. BOZÓKY, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

²⁹ 2 Enoch 31, 6 (Long version), MS Belgrade, National Library No 321, reproduced in: M. СОКОЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 31; Ё. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

³⁰ 3 Baruch 4, 8 (Slavonic version), MS Belgrade, National Library No 651, published in: Ё. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 196. For the variant readings of the passage in other Slavonic manuscripts of 3 Baruch, cf. H. GAYLORD, *op. cit.*, p. 46–47.

³¹ *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, 23, 5–12; text in: B. PHILONENKO-SAYAR, M. PHILONENKO, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

³² See, for example, the association between the forbidden tree and fornication in the moderate Cathar dualist teachings recounted in: *De heresy catharorum*, [in:] *La Hiérarchie cathare en Italie*, II, *De heresy catharorum in Lombardia*, ed. A. DONDAINE, AFP 19, 1949, p. 306–312 (310): *Et dicunt quod comestio ligni prohibiti fuit fornicatio...*

*John and Justin the Gnostic's Book of Baruch*³³. Another earlier Gnostic tradition which links Eve with the Tree of Knowledge (in the Nag Hammadi tract *The Origin of the World* while being sexually pursued by archons Eve hid herself into the Tree of Knowledge, leaving behind for them only an earthly resemblance of herself) finds a noteworthy resonance in one of the fifty articles of Patarene/"Manichaean" beliefs reportedly renounced by three "heretical" Bosnian noblemen before Cardinal Torquemada in 1461³⁴. According to article 12 of the list, the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil was envisaged as a woman and after Adam sinned with her, was expelled from Paradise – this belief could have been indeed ascribed to the Bosnian noblemen on the basis of inquisitorial records of earlier medieval dualist teachings³⁵ but do suggest that these teachings comprised a more detailed and Gnostic-like rewriting of the Genesis Paradise story than the extant evidence allows one to reconstruct. This is also confirmed by the reported Cathar teaching allegorizing the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil as a woman's womb in Georgius, *Disputatio inter Catholicum et Paterinum hereticum*³⁶ which becomes the target of a bitter polemical attack in this text, arguing that woman cannot be associated with Paradise, nor the tree in its midst with her womb.

This is also demonstrated by a gloss to the *Interrogatio Iohannis'* Paradise episode in the Vienna version which recounts in a slightly more elaborate detail the planting of Paradise, the type of trees planted, including the characteristic cosmographic detail that Satan surrounded it by a ring of fire and dwelling on its essentially evil nature³⁷. Some of the motifs of *Interrogatio Iohannis'* episode of Satan's planting of Paradise appear interrelated with similar themes which emerge in medieval Slavonic apocryphal texts of compilatory nature such as the cycle of *The Legend of the Wood of the Cross*, attributed to Gregory of Nazianzus³⁸, the erotapocritic work, *Razumnik*³⁹ and in the sixteenth-century South Slavonic cosmogonic text *On the Beginning of the World*⁴⁰. In the first two works Satanael/Samael is charged with

³³ Justin the Gnostic's *Book of Baruch* is reproduced in: HIPPOLYTUS, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, V, 26-27 (it is not certain whether the text he reproduces, presents the text fully or partially).

³⁴ These Patarene articles are refuted in: JUAN TORQUEMADA, *Symbolum pro informatione manichaeorum*, ed. N.L. MARTINEZ, V. PROANO, Burgos 1958. English translation and a useful commentary in J.V.A. FINE, *The Bosnian Church: A New Interpretation*, New York and London, 1975, p. 355–357 [repr. London 2007], p. 280–286. Attention to this article in the context of earlier and similar Gnostic beliefs was drawn by S. GERO, *The Seduction of Eve and the Trees of Paradise: A Note on a Gnostic Myth*, HTR 71, 1978, p. 299–301.

³⁵ As argued by J.V.A. FINE, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

³⁶ GEORGIUS, *op. cit.*

³⁷ *Interrogatio Iohannis* (Vienna version, Gloss 6, 23–30), ed. E. BOZÓKY, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

³⁸ Recent edition in A. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Текстологически наблюдения върху два апокрифа (Апокрифен цикъл за кръстното дърво приписван на Григорий Богослов и апокрифа за Адам и Ева)*, СЛ 11, 1982, p. 44–55.

³⁹ Editions of the text include Й. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 264–273.

⁴⁰ Published in: Й. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 322–323.

stealing seeds from Paradise and planting them on his own, was exposed and challenged by God to confront the tree he has stolen and planted and as a consequence he was blackened and expelled by the tree itself from Eden⁴¹. Apart from the theme of Satan planting a vine and introducing sinful passion in Paradise to lead Adam astray, the third apocryphal legend, *On the Beginning of the World*, offers further parallels to *Interrogatio Iohannis* in its account of Satanael's entry into paradise to deceive Adam and Eve and assuming the shape of a serpent with the head of a maiden⁴². The evolving study of the intertextual links between pseudepigrapha-based notions and narratives in Bogomilism and these particular cycles of apocryphal works, focused on cosmogony, cosmology and biblical history will certainly shed new light on the provenance and main features of the Paradise material shared and re-interpreted by these two streams of medieval appropriation and revisions of earlier pseudepigraphic works.

Descriptions of the creation of Paradise and rewriting of the Genesis story also occur in other pseudepigraphic texts circulated in the medieval Slavonic Orthodox world such as the Slavonic version of the *Life of Adam and Eve*, *The Sea of Tiberias* and the *Battle between Archangel Michael and Satanael* about which it has been continuously argued that some of their versions display traces of medieval dualist editorial interventions and interpolations⁴³. Some of the Paradise material in these apocryphal works possesses interesting cosmographic features but since it does not show manifest dualist elements or tendencies, it would be premature and risky to integrate this material into a discussion of the Paradise tradition in medieval Christian dualism⁴⁴. Again, the future study of the intertextual patterns between these texts and Bogomil adoptions of the shared pseudepigraphic heritage in medieval Byzantine and Orthodox Slavonic environments could yield interesting results in the sphere of the development of ideas about the cosmogra-

⁴¹ Texts respectively in А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 51; Ъ. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 260–261. On the place of this particular passage on Satanael and the Tree in Paradise in the manuscript tradition of *Razumnik*, see А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Erotarokrisesis. Съчинения от кратки въпроси и отговори в старобългарската литература*, София 2004, p. 251–253.

⁴² *On the Beginning of the World*, ed. Ъ. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 323; on these parallels between the Paradise material in *Interrogatio Iohannis* and *On the Beginning of the World*, cf. Ъ. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

⁴³ For a critical survey of the evidence for and state of debate of such dualist editorial interventions in these apocryphal works, see Y. СТОЯНОВ, *Apocryphal Themes and Apocalyptic Traditions...*, p. 114–191; in the case of the *Battle between Archangel Michael and Satanael*, the issue of dualist involvement in the text has been revisited by Г. МИНЧЕВ, *Един богомилски текст? Слово на св. Йоан Златоуст как Михаил победи Сатанаил*, Pbg 34.4, 2010, p. 17–46; G. MINCZEW, *John Chrysostom's Tale on How Michael Vanquished Satanael – a Bogomil text?*, SCer 1, 2011, p. 23–55.

⁴⁴ Significantly, although *Battle between Archangel Michael and Satanael* recounts God's creation of Paradise and attributes actual demiurgic acts to Satanael (he creates his own heavens, dark sun, moon and stars – a parallel satanic universe), these acts do not include the creation of an alternative paradise. On the dualist tendencies and type of cosmic dualism advanced in the apocryphon, see Y. СТОЯНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 120–122.

phy of Paradise in normative, heterodox and heretical medieval Eastern Orthodox milieus.

Significantly, recent studies of the paradise narrative in 3 Baruch 4 (especially the theme of the angelic planting of the Garden of Eden and its destruction by the waters of the Flood) have shed a new light on its dualist tendencies and potential which conditioned the interest of medieval dualist scribes in appropriating and reworking some of its elements. These recent trends of research have shown, for example, that whereas the number and list of planting angels and the type of planted trees in the Slavonic version of 3 Baruch 4 displays respectively continuity with rabbinic traditions and Philo⁴⁵, the very notion of the five trees in Paradise finds parallels not only in Philo but also in Gnostic and Manichaean traditions⁴⁶. The chronology and the above two main elements of the Paradise narrative in 3 Baruch 4 is also shared in the Qumran and Manichaean fragments of the *Book of Giants*⁴⁷ and the later related *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*⁴⁸. Another crucial element which, as persuasively argued by Orlov, is also shared by these two related streams of paradise material is the involvement of a fallen angelic being (or beings) in the planting of the Garden of Eden – respectively Samael (Satanael) in 3 Baruch and the fallen angels of the Enochic tradition, the Watchers in the *Book of Giants*⁴⁹. Paradise assumes thus a central locus in cosmic history and topography by becoming the primordial place where a superhuman being (or beings) raised the paradigmatic rebellion against the original heavenly order and divine authority.

The extant evidence (internal and external) of Eastern Christian medieval dualism is very scanty, focused principally on its theological, diabolical and docetic tenets and does not allow a proper reconstruction of its adoption and development of the Paradise tradition *vis-à-vis* the better attested moderate dualist Paradise narrative. The corresponding records of Western Christian (Cathar) radical dualism are more detailed and offer some indications that its appropriation and revisions of the Paradise tradition may have followed their distinct exegetical dynamics, which also had implications for the sphere of cosmography. The various Cathar versions of the radical dualist formula of two primordial

⁴⁵ D.C. HARLOW, *op. cit.*, p. 125–126, 198–208 *passim*; A. KULIK, *3 Baruch...*, p. 198–208 *passim*; A. KULIK, *Veritas Slavica: On the Value of Slavonic Evidence for the Early Apocalyptic Tradition*, ПИК 38, 2010, p. 1–65 (40–41).

⁴⁶ A. KULIK, *3 Baruch...*, p. 204–206; A. KULIK, *Veritas Slavica...*, p. 40–41.

⁴⁷ Cf. the texts in: W.B. HENNING, *The Book of the Giants*, BSOAS 11, 1943, p. 52–74; J. MILIK, M. BLACK, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrān Cave 4*, Oxford 1976, p. 317; L. STUCKENBRUCK, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary*, Tübingen 1997.

⁴⁸ Hebrew text and translation in: J. MILIK, M. BLACK, *op. cit.*, p. 321–328; on the shared paradise material in 3 Baruch 4, the Qumran and Manichaean fragments of the *Book of Giants* and *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, cf. A. ORLOV, *The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch and in the Book of Giants*, CBQ 65, 2003, p. 184–201.

⁴⁹ A. ORLOV, *op. cit.*; cf. J.C. REEVES, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony*, Cincinnati 1992, p. 95–96; L. STUCKENBRUCK, *op. cit.*, 114.

fundamental principles that were opposed from the very beginning naturally developed cosmogonies in which the God of Darkness was regarded as the creator of the four elements, the visible heaven, the moon, the stars and everything on earth, while the God of Light was the creator of everlasting, eternal things, four alternative elements of his own and another heaven, moon and stars⁵⁰. Such a cosmogony in which the two realms of light and darkness are coeval and totally separate could lead to a greater focus on the transcendent nature of any Paradise envisaged in the kingdom of Light and its “heavenly” connotations. This is indeed the case in the heavenly cosmography of Paradise advanced in the radical dualist anonymous “*Manichaeon*” *Treatise*, portions of which are reproduced in Durand of Huesca’s early thirteenth-century *Liber contra manicheos*⁵¹. In the sixth excerpt from the treatise the “new heaven and the new earth” of Isaiah 66, 22, 2 Peter 3, 13 and Revelation 21, 1 are recognized as the Paradise of the celestial kingdom in which are located the holy Jerusalem, the tree of life, river of life and the angelic court of the Father. Against the background of this heavenly cosmography of the Paradise in the kingdom of Light in this version of Cathar radical dualism, it would be worthwhile to recollect that generally in such Cathar radical dualist teachings Satan-Lucifer (seen on occasions as the son of an eternal evil god) initiates an attack on the heaven of the good God, causing the fall of the angels and the imprisonment of angelic souls in human bodies; in the teachings of the Albanenses of North Italy he can also be envisaged as sexually assaulting the celestial wife of the good God⁵² which could reflect Eve’s seduction by Samael/Satan in the Paradise narratives of medieval moderate Christian dualism⁵³.

Further study of the cosmography of the celestial Paradise and the sexual dimension of the evil principle’s onslaught on the “Good Creation” in medieval radical dualist teachings could establish whether such correlation between the Paradise narratives of the two principal currents of medieval dualism actually existed. Trends in medieval Christian dualism could also develop an interest in the cosmography and soteriological role of terrestrial paradise, as evinced by teachings of the second person in the hierarchy of the moderate dualist Cathar Church of Concorezzo in North Italy, Desiderius⁵⁴. Desiderius, whose doctri-

⁵⁰ Cf. for example, the system of Cathar absolute dualism recorded in: MONETA OF CREMONA, *op. cit.*, Book 1, Preface, p. 2–4.

⁵¹ Published by C. THOUZELLIER, *Un traité cathare inédit du début du XIII^e siècle d’après le Liber contra manicheos de Durand de Huesca*, Louvain 1961, p. 87–113.

⁵² The radical dualist teachings of the Albanenses are recorded in the treatise *Brevis summula contra herroses notatos hereticorum*, [in:] *La somme des autorités à l’usage des prédicateurs méridionaux au XIII^e siècle*, ed. C. DOUAIS, Paris 1896, p. 114–143.

⁵³ For a brief discussion of such a possible interrelation between the Albanenses’ and moderate dualist Paradise narratives, cf. Y. STOYANOV, *The Other God...*, p. 276–277.

⁵⁴ Desiderius’ teachings are recorded in: ANSELM OF ALESSANDRIA, *Tractatus de hereticis*, [in:] *La Hiérarchie cathare en Italie, II: Le “Tractatus de hereticis d’Anselme d’Alexandrie”*, ed. A. DONDAINE, AFP 19, 1949, p. 280–312 (311).

nal innovations eventually created a split in this Cathar church, attempted to formulate a more somatic version of Bogomil-Cathar Christology by asserting that Jesus assumed a body of 'the stuff of Adam'⁵⁵, a teaching which parted with traditional Bogomil-Cathar docetic doctrine that Christ never took an actual physical body, but did so only in appearance. Desiderius, moreover, manifested a very non-docetic concern with the whereabouts of the physical body of Jesus Christ, which, he claimed, was put in a terrestrial Paradise, where also resided Virgin Mary and John the Evangelist along with the souls of the righteous dead. According to Desiderius this righteous company will stay in the terrestrial Paradise until the Day of Judgement when Christ will put it again to rise and judge all good and evil⁵⁶.

It is obvious that Desiderius' teachings on terrestrial Paradise are in disagreement with the other extant medieval dualist renditions of the Paradise tradition but may reflect contemporaneous debates and opinions on the existence, nature and cosmography of Paradise in medieval Christendom. Medieval dualism did not develop in isolation from contemporaneous medieval intellectual currents and changing cultural trends, but interacted with them at varying degrees of intensity during its existence. Indeed recent studies have demonstrated the importance of high learning in Northern French⁵⁷ Italian⁵⁸ and Languedoc Catharism⁵⁹, demonstrating that the Cathars variously participated in the wider theological and educational trends of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries⁶⁰. Exploring to what extent speculations on Paradise (heavenly and terrestrial) may have played a role in these patterns of interaction between dualist heresy, literacy and contemporaneous intellectual pursuits of this period may prove another fruitful area for future exploration of medieval perspectives on Paradise.

The extant Paradise narratives in medieval moderate and radical Christian dualism and their cosmographic relevance certainly lack the complexities of earlier Gnostic representations and conceptualizations of the Paradise theme, with their cosmological, soteriological and eschatological dimensions and repercussions. But this may reflect the insufficiently explored evidence (internal and external) of the development of the Paradise narrative in medieval Christian

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 311.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 311–312.

⁵⁷ Cf. for example, P. BILLER, *Northern Cathars and Higher Learning*, [in:] *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy, and the Religious Life, Essays in Honour of G. Leff*, ed. P. BILLER, B. DOBSON, Woodbridge 1999, p. 25–52.

⁵⁸ L. PAOLINI, *Italian Catharism and Written Culture*, [in:] *Heresy and Literacy 1000–1530*, ed. P. BILLER, A. HUDSON, Cambridge 1994, p. 83–103.

⁵⁹ P. BILLER, *The Cathars of Languedoc and Written Materials*, [in:] *Heresy and Literacy...*, p. 61–82, esp. p. 80–82.

⁶⁰ See the summary of the evidence of and approaches to this phenomenon in: Y. STOYANOV, *The Other God...*, p. 261.

dualism. With the current level of research on the relevant primary sources on Eastern Christian dualism, it is difficult to establish as yet whether more material pertaining to Paradise in works which served as sources for a number of its teachings like 2 Enoch and 3 Baruch was adopted and re-interpreted in their narratives and theological and cosmological schemas. This may prove a useful area for a more systematic study, given the role of 2 Enoch in medieval Byzantine and Orthodox Slavonic speculations on Paradise, as evidenced by the textual interrelations between its long version and the Greek and Slavonic manuscripts of the anti-Catholic satirical tract *The Disputation of Panagiot and Azimit*⁶¹. Significantly, even before its medieval circulation in Byzantine and Orthodox Slavonic milieus the Paradise material in the original version of 2 Enoch had already served as a source for Manichaean dualist teachings concerning the heavenly paradise and the heavenly Tree of Life, as convincingly argued by J.C. Reeves⁶². Another area that would require future exploration in this context is whether the adoption of heavenly ascent notions from earlier pseudepigrapha into new dualist versions of visionary mysticism, as attested among some Bogomil and Cathar circles⁶³, included also re-interpretations of Paul's account of ascent to the third heaven and Paradise (2 Corinthians 12, 1–4)⁶⁴.

Further and more systematic investigation of the Paradise problematic in the sources for Eastern and Western Christian medieval dualism may thus prove fruitful in all these areas of study. It is hoped that this preliminary survey of medieval dualist conceptions of biblical Paradise shows also once more that, among other things, the doctrinal evidence for Bogomilism and Catharism is too complex and polyvalent to be defined or ignored *a priori* as representing medieval heresiological constructs drawing on earlier heresiological texts and stereotypes. Thus any future study aiming to argue, for example, that the various reported accounts of Cathar cosmogony, cosmology, satanology, Christology, soteriology,

⁶¹ For the Slavonic texts of *The Disputation of Panagiot and Azimit*, cf.: А.Н. ПОПОВ, *Историко-литературный обзор древнерусских полемических сочинений против латинян*, Москва 1875, p. 211–283; on the textual interrelations between the cosmographic Paradise material in the long version of 2 Enoch and *The Disputation of Panagiot and Azimit*, cf. М. СОКОЛОВ, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 136–144; A. VAILLANT, *Le Livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction français*, Paris 1952, p. XVI–XVII; F. ANDERSEN, *The Sun in 2 Enoch*, [in:] *L'église des deux Alliances: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*, ed. B. LOURIÉ, A. ORLOV, M. PETIT, Piscataway 2008, p. 1–38 *passim*.

⁶² J.C. REEVES, *Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library*, [in:] *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J.C. REEVES, Atlanta 1994, p. 184–191.

⁶³ Y. STOYANOV, *The Other God...*, p. 261–262; Y. STOYANOV, *Apocryphal Themes and Apocalyptic Traditions...*, p. 235.

⁶⁴ For a recent treatment of the Paradise theme in 2 Corinthians 12, 1–4 wider *New Testament*, pseudepigraphic and rabbinic frameworks, cf. G. MACASKILL, *Paradise in the New Testament*, [in:] *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*, ed. M. BOCKMUEHL, G.A.G. STROUMSA, Cambridge 2010, p. 67–71.

biblical history and eschatology are the end result of sets of discourses forged by their clerical adversaries and attributed to communities and individuals they intended to repress, need to base such arguments on solid and cautious text-critical analysis of the extant doctrinal evidence *in toto*. Without such analysis it would be impossible to establish a plausible textual chain of transmission for the respective narratives, imagery, symbolism, etc., in the sources for Bogomilism and Catharism and distinguish a textual layer that could represent a genuine “heretical” belief from one that reiterates inherited heresiological stereotypes. In the opinion of the present author such text-critical treatment of the primary sources to first establish the most plausible literary and theological provenance of the respective teachings attributed to medieval Christian dualist groups or individuals still remains indispensable to the study of medieval heresy and needs to precede the application of models and approaches drawn from contemporary anthropological and sociological theory to the source material.

In the case of the notions of Paradise in medieval Christian dualism such analysis could show that along with allegorical and inverted readings of the Genesis Eden narrative, other doctrinal concerns also may have played a role in medieval Christian dualist approaches to and revisions of the Paradise tradition.

Abstract. The article intends to draw attention to some of the most significant and telling appropriations of traditional themes of Biblical paradise in medieval Christian dualism (namely, Paulicianism, Bogomilism and related groups in Eastern Christendom and Catharism in Western Christendom) and initiate discussion on the important but presently not always explicable problem of their theological and literary provenance. The significance of this problematic is highlighted by the increasing amount of direct and indirect evidence of the role played by a number of early Jewish and Christian pseudepigraphic works in the formation of medieval Christian dualist cosmogonic, cosmological, satanological, Christological and biblical history traditions. The preliminary survey of medieval dualist conceptions of biblical Paradise shows also once more that the doctrinal evidence for Bogomilism and Catharism is too complex and polyvalent to be defined or ignored *apriori* as representing medieval heresiological constructs drawing on earlier heresiological texts and stereotypes. The material examined in the article shows that the text-critical treatment of the primary sources to first establish the most plausible literary and theological provenance of the respective teachings attributed to medieval Christian dualist groups or individuals still remains indispensable to the study of medieval heresy and needs to precede the application of models and approaches drawn from contemporary anthropological and sociological theory to the source material.

Yuri Stoyanov

Department of the Near and Middle East
Faculty of Languages and Cultures
School of Oriental and African Studies
University of London
Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square
London WC1H 0XG, United Kingdom
ys3@soas.sc.uk

Norbert Widok (Opole)

CHRISTIAN FAMILY AS DOMESTIC CHURCH IN THE WRITINGS OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

The family¹ has always been the place of the transmission of values, be it human, social, and religious. This statement refers also to the patristic period, i.e. to the first ages of Christianity². John Chrysostom († 407), the most famous preacher in the East, is an example of a bishop who exerted an important influence on the formation of family. In his homilies he instructed fathers and mothers about their pedagogical tasks, and spoke of religious upbringing of children, which was directly linked with the well being of Christian family. His comments on the letters of St. Paul, his favourite biblical author, brought out the significant inspirations and ideas concerning topics connected with family and raising children.

1. “Domestic Church” in the letters of St. Paul

In his letters sent to various Christian communities St. Paul employs the notion of the “Church” in relation to familial environment. In his Letter to the Romans, where he sends greetings to Priscilla and Aquilla, he adds the following words: *and my greetings to the church at their house* (Rom 16, 5). The word “Church,” according to the ecclesiological terminology of that epoch, stood for the community of the baptised who gathered for liturgical meetings. This Eucharistic gatherings took place at private homesteads. The ecclesiastical community met at a house of one of its members. St. Paul’s greetings informs that Priscilla and Aquilla had a house where the Roman community got together for prayers.

¹ The shorter, Polish version of this article was given in SacP 5, 2012, p. 25–29.

² See: T.A. SABATTINI, *La familia cristiana nell’ „Apologetico” di Tertulliano*, RSC 23, 1975, p. 51–66; M. FORLIN PATRUCCO, *Aspetti di vita familiare nel IV secolo negli scritti dei Padri Cappadoci*, [in:] *Etica sessuale e matrimonio nel cristianesimo delle origini*, ed. R. CANTALAMESSA, Milano 1976, p. 158–179; M. MEES, *Clemens von Alexandrien über Ehe und Familie*, Aug 17, 1977, p. 113–131; L. CIGNELLI, *La „Famiglia-modello” nella Chiesa patristica*, LAn 32, 1982, p. 155–190; M. TALBOT, *The Byzantine family and the monastery*, DOP 44, 1990, p. 119–130; A. SWOBODA, *Rodzina w pismach Ojców Apostolskich*, CT 72.4, 2002, p. 37–48; J.C. CAVADINI, *The sacramentality of marriage in the Fathers*, PE 17, 2008, p. 442–463; C. OSIEK, *What We Do and Don’t Know about Early Christian Families*, [in:] *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, ed. B. RAWSON, Oxford 2011, p. 198–213.

The married couple Priscilla and Aquilla is also mentioned in the first *Letter to Corinthians*, where St. Paul writes: *The churches of Asia send their greetings. Aquila and Prisca send their best wishes in the Lord, together with the church that meets in their house* (1Cor 16, 19). After anti-Jewish decrees of Claudius, Priscilla and Aquilla left Rome for Corinth, where they met the local community, and later together with Paul they travelled to Ephesus, where St. Paul wrote this letter. The statement about the fact that the local Church met at the house of Priscilla and Aquilla³ is essential for the topic of this article. As in the *Letter to the Romans*, here the words “home” and “Church” were put together again.

A similar content is contained also in the greetings closing the *Letter to the Colossians*, where its author puts down the following words: *Please give my greetings to the brothers at Laodicea and to Nympha and the church which meets in her house* (Col 4, 15). The message of this passage is very clear: at the house of Nympha in Laodicea Christians met for Eucharist. Here the two notions in question, “Church” and “house”, are linked again, which indicates the awareness that it was only the house of a trustworthy follower of Christ that could offer the place of gatherings for local ecclesiastic community.

The development of the situations described above was quite natural⁴. Cordiality and hospitality, and most of all love, as taught by Christ, were obvious reasons for opening the home for others for participation in Christian mysteries⁵. Nobody suggested to perform those mysteries in other buildings than private, because only such were accessible. It was only in Laodicea that in-between 360 and 370, that forbade in one of its canons (can. 58) to perform Eucharist at private houses⁶.

2. The notion of “domestic church” in St. John Chrysostom’s homilies

Commenting on St. Paul’s letters, especially on the formulas mentioned above, employing the terminology of St. Paul, Chrysostom created analogous references between the words “church” and “house” from the perspective of his time.

The primary text, in which Chrysostom emphatically juxtaposes these two concepts, is a passage from the homily on the *First Letter to Timothy*. He conveyed there the following instruction:

For the Church is, as it were, a small household, and as in a house there are children and wife and domestics, and the man has rule over them all; just so in the Church there are women, children, ser-

³ M. GÄRTNER, *Die Familienerziehung in der Alten Kirche*, Köln–Wien 1985, p. 11.

⁴ P. LAMPE, *Zur gesellschaftlichen und kirchlichen Funktionen der „Familie“ in neutestamentlichen Zeit*, Ref 31, 1982, p. 535–542; W. VOGLER, *Die Bedeutung der urchristlichen Hausgemeinden für die Ausbreitung des Evangeliums*, TLz 107, 1982, p. 785–794.

⁵ See more H.-J. KLAUCK, *Kościół domowy w okresie przedkonstantyńskim*, VP 5, 1985, p. 177–186.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 187.

vants. And if he that presides in the Church has partners in his power, so hath the man a partner, that is, his wife. [...] so there are in a family servants, and daughters...⁷

The content of this text presents similarities between ecclesiastic community and familial community. Both in the former and the latter there exists specific bond between their members. In both of them there is a leader responsible for any activities regulating their everyday life. Chrysostom as a presbyter and later a bishop knew the functioning of the Church. Therefore, he saw the same structure of administration in the life of a house and family. The function of a superior, i.e. of the one responsible for various undertakings of moral and religious nature, was given by him to the father of the family. His co-worker is his wife, with whom he should take care of their sons and daughters, and even servants.

One has to acknowledge that such position of father of the family was not a new discovery, since in the ages before Christ there existed an institution of father known as *pater familias*⁸. The Antiochian was fully aware of it. His merit consisted in bestowing new functions to the father flowing from baptism, therefore from the confession of faith in the Triune God. With this fact a wide range of additional responsibilities of religious character was connected. It is the father that is, according to Chrysostom, responsible for these. In this way he becomes a superior in the house similarly to a bishop in the local Church.

Similar thought were conveyed in his other commentary on St. Paul's letters, where family was directly named by him as the Church. His words are very suggestive:

Govern thy wife, and thus will the whole house be in harmony. Hear what Paul saith: *And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home.* If we thus regulate our own houses, we shall be also fit for the management of the Church. For indeed a house is a little Church. Thus it is possible for us by becoming good husbands and wives, to surpass all others.⁹

This passage shows that St. Paul became an important inspiration for Chrysostom's ideas concerning the religious life of the family. The burden of responsibility fell on the shoulders of the husband, whose one of the tasks, as he writes, is instruction of his wife. It is not, however, a one-sided activity. Husbands and wives are to sanctify each other, as he adds further in the text¹⁰. The role of father consists

⁷ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on 1 Timothy*, 10, 5 (trans. Ph. SCHAFF, [in:] NPNF, vol. XIII, p. 764).

⁸ See A. ŻUREK, *Od „paterfamilias” do „Pater noster”. Kontekst kulturowy pojęcia Boga jako „naszego Ojca” w literaturze patrystycznej*, SAC 15, 2001, p. 18–28; B. CZYŻEWSKI, *Paterfamilias i jego zadania według św. Jana Chryzostoma*, VP 29, 2009, p. 205–222.

⁹ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homily 20 on Ephesians*, 6 (trans. Ph. SCHAFF, [in:] NPNF, vol. XIII, p. 276).

¹⁰ More: V. KARRAS, *Male domination of women in the writings of Saint John Chrysostom*, GOTR 33, 1991, p. 131–139; C. BROU, *Le rôle des femmes dans l'Eglise de Constantinople d'après la correspondance de Jean Chrysostome*, [in:] SP 27, 1993, p. 150–154; D.C. FORD, *Women and Men in the Early Church: The Full Views of St. John Chrysostom*, South Canaan 1996; C.L. DE WET, *Wives and the „Hausetafeln” in John Chrysostom's „Homilia in Epistulam ad Ephesios 20”*, APB 21.2, 2010, p. 51–60.

in inspiring other members of the family to activity. In this way, the father becomes an administrator of the house. In such context there appeared his most important statement that the *family is a small Church*.

Therefore, one can speak of a macro-Church referring to the entire local community and a micro-Church which is the family and its house. By comparing these institutions Chrysostom arrived at a conclusion that the former is administered by a bishop while the latter by the father of the family¹¹. In other words, the father of the family performs the role of bishop, i.e. the one who gives instructions concerning religious truths and takes care of the morality of all the members of the family¹². It is important to emphasize that Chrysostom also included to the domestic Church servants who work in a given family. According to him all the inhabitants of the household should be taken care of by the father.

3. Episcopal functions of father in the “domestic Church”

The father of the family performs the function of bishop, when he organizes religious the life of his domestic community. His sanctifying activities can be presented as three tasks: he should take care of the reading of the Holy Scriptures, the practice of prayer, and the catechesis. Obviously, the father cannot perform liturgical activities connected with the Sacraments.

Undoubtedly, the first commentator of the Holy Scriptures in ecclesiastic community is the bishop. He is the one who watches over appropriate interpretation of the word of God making sure that it does not fall into theological errors and create heresy or schism. In homilies bishop comments on the word of God and thus he fulfils this task. Within the domestic church this function is performed by the father. He, after returning home from church, should – as taught by Chrysostom – set two tables: a table for food and a table for instruction. By this second one he should present what has been said with the words of the bishop. In this way his wife, children and even the servants will not be deprived of the instruction of the bishop, and the family home, due to such father’s attitude, will become the church¹³. This statement gives specific responsibilities to the father of the family concerning the Word of God received in liturgy. It should be transmitted in familial community at the so-called table of teaching. It was obvious that there was a table for meals while a table of teaching could be a place

¹¹ Some elements of this problem are given in paragraph *Ojciec rodziny w „Konstytucjach Apostolskich”* by J. ŻELAZNY in his book under title *Biskup Ojcem. Zarys eklezjologii syryjskiej na podstawie „Konstytucji Apostolskich”*, Kraków 2006, p. 103–144.

¹² See more: O. PASQUATO, *Pastorale familiare: testimonianza di Giovanni Crisostomo*, Sal 51, 1989, p. 3–46.

¹³ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on Genesis*, VI, 2 (*The Fathers of the Church*, trans. R.C. HILL, vol. LXXIV, Washington 1999).

where there was the Bible accessible to all. It could also stand for a particular time during the day devoted to reflection over Biblical texts. The table of teaching was then an extension of the pulpit. If the pulpit served as the place of instruction of the bishop, the table of teaching served for the father's meditation on the Bible. His task was to transmit to his wife, children and servants the conclusions flowing from the study of the Scriptures, being the food for the spirit. In this way, the household becomes a church within which salvation of the members of the familial circle was carried out. It was, therefore, the highest responsibility similar to the one of bishop.

Although the study and meditation on the Holy Scriptures is the father's task, in other homilies Chrysostom entrusts the role of upholding piety at home also to the wife. He adds:

And let the man, as soon as he has risen from his bed, seek after nothing else, but how he may do and say something whereby he may render his whole house more reverent. The woman again, let her be indeed a good housekeeper; but before attending to this, let her have another more needful care, that the whole household may work the works of Heaven.¹⁴

The wife should help her husband in performing such important task¹⁵. Chrysostom lays the stress on deeds, i.e. on implementing what was shown in homily and domestic reflection over the Bible. What is visible here is division of functions: the husband takes care of the meditation on the Word of God and the wife puts this into practice in domestic life¹⁶. *Theoria* and *praxis*, the two principles of the Eastern spirituality are revealed here. This practice is the wide opening of oneself to others by the deeds of mercy which should proceed from truly Christian family¹⁷.

Chrysostom does not confine his teaching to the reading of the Bible. He also writes of the good fruits of such practice. For he believes that *a word from the divine Scriptures, made to sound in the ear, doth more than fire soften the hardened soul, and renders it fit for all good things*¹⁸. According to him, holy texts possess the power to transform the spiritual sphere of listeners and to create attitudes open to any good.

Apart from reading and meditating on the Holy Scriptures another very important factor that shapes the spiritual aspect of the family is prayer. Chrysostom confronts participation in promiscuous feasts with feast accompanied by prayer:

¹⁴ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, LXXVII, 6 (trans. G. PREVOST, M.B. RIDDLE, [in:] NPNF, vol. X, p. 815).

¹⁵ J. JURKIEWICZ, *Mater familias według św. Jana Chryzostoma*, VP 29, 2009, p. 223–232; T. KRYNICKA, *Przymioty i zadania żony według Jana Chryzostoma*, VP 29, 2009, p. 113–122.

¹⁶ P. BROWN, *The Body and Societ: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York 1988, p. 311–312.

¹⁷ H. WÓJTOWICZ, *Zadania rodziny chrześcijańskiej w nauczaniu św. Jana Chryzostoma*, VP 5, 1985, p. 213–214.

¹⁸ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, II, 6 (trans. G. PREVOST, M.B. RIDDLE, [in:] NPNF, vol. X, p. 38).

But how then can one rejoice? Why, by saying hymns, making prayers, introducing psalms in the place of those low songs. Thus will Christ also be at our table, and will fill the whole feast with blessing, when you prayest, when you singest spiritual songs, [...]. So you will make the party a Church, by hymning, in the room of ill-timed shouts and cheers, the Master of all things.¹⁹

This statement sounds very radical. One has an impression that Chrysostom denies his listeners full participation in social meetings. In fact, the bishop brings them up to be able to participate in them in an appropriate manner. His criticism is directed against those feast which are the time of *those low songs* or *ill-timed shouts and cheers*. Instead of such behaviour leading to spiritual destruction he offers prayer of a very concrete form. He encourages the singing of hymns and psalms²⁰, i.e. to recitation of texts based on the Holy Scriptures. When introduced into domestic feasts, such elements will give praise to the Lord for all things and all the participants will be filled with blessing. In this way the house where the family enjoys feasts will become a Church. It is the father or the mother that perform here the role of inspiration.

Prayer is also the way of overcoming the difficulties of life. John the bishop persuades his listeners into believing that what is accessible to each man is

the assistance derived from persevering prayers. Thus, we are not ourselves [...] to strive alone, but also to invoke the help from above: and it will surely come and be present with us, and will aid us in our struggles, and make all easy.²¹

The Antiochian teaches about the meaning of prayers and its fruits, so necessary for everyday life. He adds, however, that these should be *persevering prayers*, being continuous activity of a Christian, and not only a practice in the moment of tragic occurrence. It is only incessant prayer and continuous invocation for help from heaven that turns out to be the firm support brining help in everyday tasks.

Chrysostom himself taught his listeners about the proper attitude at prayer:

Let us, I say, fall down before Him both in body and in mind, that He may raise us up when we are down; let us converse with all gentleness and meekness. And who is so wretched and miserable, one may say, as not to become gentle in prayer?²²

Both in his exterior port and spiritual attitude one has to exercise modesty, and gentleness, which testify to the humility of a believer. Regardless of the actual status of an individual, his ill fate or happiness, modesty should be a major virtue.

¹⁹ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, XXIV, 3 (trans. J.B. MORRIS, W.H. SIMCOX, G.B. STEVENS, [in:] *NPNF*, vol. XI, p. 921–922).

²⁰ S. LONGOSZ, *Śpiew w rodzinie środkiem wychowania w pedagogii św. Jana Chryzostoma*, RNR 1, 2009, p. 1–42.

²¹ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, XXIII, 4 (trans. G. PREVOST, M.B. RIDDLE, [in:] *NPNF*, vol. X, p. 288).

²² JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, LI, 6 (trans. G. PREVOST, M.B. RIDDLE, [in:] *NPNF*, vol. X, p. 564).

In family as domestic church, with the practice of reading the Holy Scriptures and praying, the members of the household will turn out to be faithful to Christian principles. According to Chrysostom it is the father as a religious guide that is supposed to watch over them. Commenting on the *Letter to the Romans*, regarding the houses which gave shelter to Christians in the times of St. Paul, the Antiochian referred also to familial communities of his day. For St. Paul was not in the habit of calling any houses Churches, save where there was much piety, and much fear of God deeply rooted in them²³. Chrysostom shared this conviction, and confirmed the principle that the house of Christians as domestic church should be penetrated by sublime religiosity and deep fear of God²⁴. This requirement is offered to Christians with detailed explanation of its realization.

The appropriate level of religiosity is connected with the transmission of catechetical teachings to the younger generation. The father of the family is responsible for the systematic upbringing of his children leading to the practice of the principles of Christian religion. John Chrysostom preaches with expertise that the father, by providing the boy these teachings, educates himself and proceeds in the good: he becomes better, if not for the love of virtue, then for the love of a child, because he does not want to aggravate him by bad example²⁵. The words come from a treatise *On Education of Children*, which is entirely devoted to pedagogical issues. It is mainly addressed to the father, although there are numerous references to the mother, who should be involved in the process of raising the children. Therefore, at the beginning of this statement there is the phrase *these teachings*, which closes various instructions directed to the father explaining the way he should take care of proper religious and social attitude of his children²⁶. Furthermore, the quoted passage contains a thought about constant pursuit of good and virtue. Virtue is often mentioned in St. John's homilies. It is understood by him as the integral fullness of perfection consisting of small elements of spiritual faculties, which is documented by a fragment of his homily:

²³ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, XXX, 3 (trans. J.B. MORRIS, W.H. SIMCOX, G.B. STEVENS, [in:] *NPNF*, vol. XI, p. 974).

²⁴ See more: A. BOBER, *Rodzina kościołem domowym według św. Jana Chryzostoma*, VP 5, 1985, p. 193–199; S. LONGOSZ, *Rodzina wczesnochrześcijańska Kościołem domowym*, RT.KUL 51, 10, 2004, p. 36–50; P. SZCZUR, *Problematyka społeczna w późnoantycznej Antiochii na podstawie nauczania homiletycznego Jana Chryzostoma*, Lublin 2008, p. 293–360; S. LONGOSZ, *Rodzina kościołem domowym w myśli Jana Chryzostoma*, VP 29, 2009, p. 281–312.

²⁵ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *On Education of Children*, 70.

²⁶ More about problems in these treatise see: TH. HALTON, *St. John Chrysostom on education*, CER 61, 1963, p. 163–175; A. UCIECHA, *Rodzina miejscem wychowania w traktacie pedagogicznym „O wychowaniu dzieci” św. Jana Chryzostoma*, ŚSHT 19/20, 1986/1987, p. 65–92; T. KOŁOSOWSKI, *Wychowanie religijno-moralne dzieci w rodzinie w świetle traktatu „O wychowaniu dzieci” św. Jana Chryzostoma*, Sem 17, 2001, p. 405–420; S. WASILEWSKI, *Metody wychowawcze św. Jana Chryzostoma*, VP 29, 2009, p. 433–445.

And why do I speak of the whole code. For even a part of it overlooked brings upon one great evils; as, for instance, almsgiving overlooked casts into hell them that have come short in it; and yet this is not the whole of virtue, but a part thereof. [...] Again, not to revile is a very small part of it [...]. Again, even continence itself is a part, [...]. I mean, that not only one of them overlooked shuts Heaven against us, but though it be done, yet not in due perfection and abundance, it produces the selfsame effect again.²⁷

The three examples of particular virtues (almsgiving, self-control, and abstinence from malediction) point to the connection of various spiritual behaviours or psychological attitudes which comprise perfection of the human person. The Antiochian presupposed the long way of gaining such perfection. However, he emphasised the necessity of *due perfection and abundance*. The perfection and the abundance are elements of general notion of virtue. The bishop wanted his listeners to show perfection of life and high degree of morality²⁸.

Apart from the care about moral image of the family Chrysostom also took care also of its faith. In the same homily he expressed important instruction concerning this issue:

Wherefore I entreat you let us use much diligence both to stand in the right faith, and to show forth an excellent life. For unless we add also a life suitable to our faith, we shall suffer the extremest punishment.²⁹

He puts together two aspect of the essence of Christianity, namely faith and morality. These two are factors of everyday Christian life that are dependent on each other and which one has to pursue ardently. Undoubtedly this task belonged to the father of the family who performed in family the function similar to the one of the bishop in the local Church.

* * *

The analyses of Chrysostom's chosen texts presented above, show the significance of Christian upbringing. They speak of religious upbringing of children, which is directly linked with the well being of the Christian family. Commenting on St. Paul's letters, he started propagating the idea of "domestic church," since it performs the role of a place where sanctification of human being occurs. The father of the family performs in such situation the tasks of a bishop, i.e. a guide in religious life. He should take care of the reading of the Holy Scriptures, the practice of prayer and catechetical teaching, which lead to proper level of faith and Christian morality. According to Chrysostom, systematic introduction of these religious

²⁷ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, LXIV, 4 (trans. G. PREVOST, M.B. RIDGLE, [in:] *NPNF*, vol. X, p. 377).

²⁸ O. PASQUATO, *La priorità dell' educazione morale in Giovanni Crisostomo*, [in:] *Crescita dell' uomo nella catechesi dei Padri*, ed. S. FELICI, Roma 1998, p. 5–35.

²⁹ JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, LXIV, 4 (trans. G. PREVOST, M.B. RIDGLE, [in:] *NPNF*, vol. X, p. 684).

practices in the family contributes to increase in piety among members, as well as social responsibility. The well formed family offers proper foundation for the transmission of religious tradition and significant link in social relations.

Translated by Waclaw Grzybowski

Abstract. John Chrysostom, the most famous preacher of the Eastern Empire, exerted an important influence on the formation of family. In his homilies he instructed fathers and mothers about their pedagogical tasks, and spoke of religious upbringing of children, which was directly linked with the well being of Christian family. Commenting on St. Paul's letters, he started propagating the idea of "domestic church," since it performs the role of a place where sanctification of human being occurs. The father of the family performs in such situation the tasks of a bishop, i.e. a guide in religious life. He should take care of the reading of the Holy Scriptures, the practice of prayer and catechetical teaching, which lead to proper level of faith and Christian morality. According to Chrysostom, systematic introduction of these religious practices in the family contributes to increase in piety among members, as well as social responsibility. The well formed family offers proper foundation for the transmission of religious tradition and significant link in social relations.

Norbert Widok

Katedra Historii Kościoła i Patrologii
Wydział Teologiczny
Uniwersytet Opoleński
ul. Drzymały 1a
45-342 Opole, Polska
nwidok@uni.opole.pl

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak (Łódź)

HYSTRIX IN GREEK

The Ancient Greek term ὑστρίξ presents diverse semantics and, to my best knowledge, it demonstrates seven different meanings:

I. (usually used in the plural) ‘swine bristle’. This meaning is undoubtedly original, as ὑστρίξ means ‘swine hair’ in the literal sense, cf. Gk. ὕς f. ‘pig’ and θρίξ, gen. sg. τριχός m. ‘hair’).

II. ‘swine leather whip, the cat, used as an instrument of punishment’.

III. ‘porcupine, *Hystrix cristata*’ as a Libyan animal.

IV. ‘hedgehog, *Erinaceus europaeus* L.’

V. ‘sea urchin (class *Echinoidea*)’.

VI. ‘badger, *Meles meles* L.’ (exclusively in the Ionic dialect).

VII. ‘an unclearly defined, animal’.

The available Ancient Greek dictionaries register only some of these meanings. The four-volume Ancient Greek-Polish dictionary has only two meanings: III and I (s.v. ὑστρίξ m. f. ‘jeżozwierz, jeżatka czubata, *Hystrix cristata* L.’; pl. ‘szczecina świnińska’), but registers also II (s.v. ὑστρίχις f. ‘bicz do chłostania niewolników’)¹. These same meanings are given by Oktawiusz Jurewicz². The authors of the Greek-Polish dictionaries generally follow the well-known *Greek-English Lexicon* LSJ, where the same three meanings (III, I, II) appear in the same order³. Only one meaning (III) is given in Dvorecký’s two-volume Ancient Greek-Russian dictionary⁴. The Greek-German lexica demonstrate a twofold meaning ‘hedgehog, porcupine / Igel, Stachelschwein’ (IV+III), as well as the sense ‘Stachelpeitsche’ (II) for the appellative ὑστρίχις⁵. In his *Vocabulario della lingua greca* Franco Montanari has two meanings (III ‘porcopino, istrice’; I ‘setole’), but he introduces the third meaning

¹ *Słownik grecko-polski*, ed. Z. ABRAMOWICZÓWNA, vol. IV, Warszawa 1965, p. 479.

² *Słownik grecko-polski*, ed. O. JUREWICZ, vol. II, Warszawa 2001, p. 458.

³ *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. H.G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, H.S. JONES, with a revised supplement, Oxford 1996, p. 1906.

⁴ *Древнегреческо-русский словарь*, ed. И.Х. ДВОРЕЦКИЙ, vol. II (М–Ω), Москва 1958, p. 1706, s.v. ὑστρίξ (‘porcupine / дикобраз, *Hystrix cristata*’).

⁵ See Menge-Güthling *Griechisch-deutsches und deutsch-griechisches Wörterbuch mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Etymologie*, vol. I, *Griechisch-deutsch*, ed. H. MENGE, Berlin-Schönberg 1913, p. 718 (‘Igel, Stachelschwein’); W. GEMOLL, *Griechisch-Deutsches Schul- und Handwörterbuch*, Wien-Leipzig 1908, p. 775, sv. ὑστρίξ (‘Stachelschwein’), ὑστρίχις (‘Stachelpeitsche’).

(II) in the next entry: ὑστριχίς – ‘frusta (per punire gli schiavi)’; *med.* ‘mallatia alla coda dei cavalli’⁶. Thus it is necessary to review anew the semantics of the Greek word ὑστριχίς.

Ad I. The etymological meaning ‘swine bristle’ (usually in the plural, ὑστριχες) seems to be attested securely in a comedy by Plato the Younger⁷. The comedy in question is not preserved, but the relevant fragment is quoted by Clement of Alexandria:

Τῶν γὰρ τετραπόδων οὐδὲν ἀποκτείνειν ἔδει
 ἡμᾶς τὸ λοιπὸν, πλὴν ὑῶν. τὰ γὰρ κρέα
 ἥδιστ’ ἔχουσι, κούδεν ἀφ’ ὑὸς γίγνεται
 πλὴν ὑστριχες καὶ πηλὸς ἡμῖν καὶ βοή⁸.

In his play *Feasts* Plato, the comedist, says truly suitable words:

Among the quadrupeds no animal has
 to be killed by us, except pigs, because pigs have
 very tasty meat, and alive pig gives us nothing
 other than bristle (ὑστριχες), dung and squeaking.

Ad II. The most certain attestation for the second meaning derives from the so-called *Liber Suda* (10th cent. A.D.)⁹: ὑστριχίς· ἐκ δέρματος μετ’ αὐτῶν τῶν τριχῶν μάστιξ [...] *Hystrix – whip made of leather together with the hair* [my translation – K.T.W.].

The whip made from pig’s leather and bristle was alternatively called ὑστριχίς in the Attic dialect.

Ad III. Herodotus¹⁰ and Claudius Aelian¹¹ speak clearly about the Libyan fauna, thus the meaning ‘crested porcupine, *Hystrix cristata* L.’ seems relatively certain. Herodotus mentions ὑστριχες in a long list of the exotic animals of Libya:

...καὶ βασσάρια καὶ ὕαιναί καὶ ὑστριχες καὶ κριοὶ ἄγριοι καὶ δίκτυες καὶ θῶες καὶ πάνθηρες καὶ βόρυνες καὶ κροκόδειλοι ὅσον τε τριπλήχες χερσαῖοι...¹²
 ...foxes, hyenas, porcupines, wild rams, the dictys, jackals, panthers, the borys, land crocodiles three cubits long...

⁶ F. MONTANARI, *Vocabulario della lingua greca*, Milano 2003, p. 2122.

⁷ PLATO, *Com.*, fr. 28, See *Supplementum comicum*, ed. J. DEMIAŃCZUK, Kraków 1912, p. 76–82.

⁸ CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, *Stromata*, VII, 6, [in:] IDEM, *Stromata Buch VII und VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae prophetae, Quis dives salvetur, Fragmenta*, ed. O. STÄHLIN, L. FRÜCHTEL, U. TREU, vol. II, Berlin 1970 (cetera: CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS) [= GCS, 17]. English translation of the passage by the author of the article.

⁹ *Suidae Lexicon*, Y, 692, rec. A. ADLER, vol. IV, Lipsiae 1935 [repr. 1971] (cetera: *Suda*), p. 684 (s.v. ὑστριχίς).

¹⁰ *Herodoti Historiae*, IV, 192, ed. H.B. ROSÉN, vol. I, Leipzig 1987 (cetera: HERODOTUS).

¹¹ AELIAN, *On the Characteristics of Animals*, XII, 26, trans. A.F. SCHOLFIELD, vol. III, London–Cambridge Mass. 1959 (cetera: AELIAN).

¹² HERODOTUS, IV, 192; trans. A.D. GODLEY, vol. II, *Books III and IV*, London–Cambridge Mass. 1957, p. 395. *Jeżatki ‘atherurus porcupine’* in the Polish translation of the passage (HERODOT, *Dzieje*, trans. S. HAMMER, ²Warszawa 1959, vol. I, p. 343).

Aelian's description of ὕστριξ, though obviously lacking scientific precision, refers to the porcupine:

ὄνυχων ἀκμαίς καὶ ὀδόντων διατομαῖς θαρροῦσικαὶ ἄρκτοι καὶ λύκοι καὶ πάρδοι καὶ λέοντες· τὴν δὲ ὕστριχα ἀκούω ταῦτα μὲν οὐκ ἔχειν, οὐ μὴν ὀπλων ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀμυντηρίων ἀπολελείφθαι ἐρήμην. τοῖς γοῦν ἐπιούσιν ἐπὶ λύμῃ τὰς ἄνωθεν τρίχας οἰονεῖ βέλη ἐκπέμπει, καὶ εὐστόχως βάλλει πολλάκις, τὰ νῶτα φρίζασα· καὶ ἐκεῖναί γε πηδῶσιν, ὥσπερ οὖν ἐκ τινοσ ἀφειμέναι νευράς.¹³

Strength of claws and sharpness of fangs make bears, wolves, leopards, and lions bold, whereas the porcupine, which (I am told) has not these advantages, none the less has not been left by Nature destitute of weapons wherewith to defend itself. For instance, against those who would attack it with intent to harm it discharges the hairs on the body, like javelins, and raising the bristles on its back, frequently makes a good shot. And these hairs leap forth as though sped from a bowstring.

In his different account on a similar subject the animals in question are called “Libyan” *expressis verbis* (Αἱ ὕστριχες αἱ Λιβυκαί¹⁴), thus there can be no doubt that the identification of Aelian's ὕστριχες as porcupines is correct.

Also Aristotle, referring to a work by Democritus of Abdera (fr. 150), seems to mean porcupines, as is to be seen in his text:

Δύνανται δ' ἀφίεσθαι οἱ ἀράχνην τὸ ἀράχνην εὐθύς γενόμενοι, οὐκ ἔσωθεν ὡς ὃν περίττωμα, καθάπερ φησὶ Δημόκριτος, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος οἷον φλοιόν, ἢ τὰ βάλλοντα ταῖς θριξίν, οἷον αἱ ὕστριχες.¹⁵

Spiders have the power of emitting their web as soon as they are born, not from within their bodies, as if it were an excrement, as Democritus says, but from the surface of their body, like the bark of a tree, or like the ejected spines of some animals, as the porcupine.¹⁶

The Polish translator Paweł Siwek has *jeże* (pl. ‘hedgehogs’) in his rendition of Aristotle's work¹⁷. However, Aristotle says that ὕστριχες belong to animals which *throw off their hair* (τὰ βάλλοντα ταῖς θριξίν), thus the passage refers to porcupines rather than to hedgehogs.

Ad IV. The fourth meaning (‘hedgehog, *Erinaceus europaeus* L.’), as well as the second one, can be safely established on the basis of the aforementioned entry in *Liber Suda*:

ὕστριξ· ἐκ δέρματος μετ' αὐτῶν τῶν τριχῶν μάλιστα. ὕστριχίδι μαστιγῶν Ἀριστοφάνης Βατράχους. ἢ ὕστριξ, ἀκανθόχοιρος, ἐχίνος χερσαῖος.¹⁸

¹³ AELIAN, I, 31, vol. I, London–Cambridge Mass. 1958, p. 49–51 (trans. A.F. SCHOLFIELD). *Jeżozwierz* ‘porcupine’ in the Polish translation of the passage (KLAUDIUSZ ELIAN, *O właściwościach zwierząt* (wybór), trans. A.M. KOMORNICKA, Warszawa 2005, p. 34).

¹⁴ AELIAN, XII, 26.

¹⁵ ARISTOTE, *Histoire des animaux*, IX, 39, ed. et trans. P. LOUIS (cetera: ARISTOTELES, HA), vol. III, Paris 1969.

¹⁶ *Aristotle's History of Animals in ten books*, trans. R. CRESSWELL, London 1883 (cetera: *Aristotle's History*), p. 260.

¹⁷ ARYSTOTELES, *Zoologia* (*Historia Animalium*), trans. P. SIWEK, Warszawa 1982, p. 414.

¹⁸ *Suda*, Y, 692, p. 684 (s.v. ὕστριξ).

Hystrix – a whip made of leather together with the hair. ‘Flogging with the whip’ – thus Aristophanes in his *Frogs*. Or *hystrix* – “prickly pig”, the earthen hedgehog.

The same meaning can be easily inferred from a list of synonyms for ‘hedgehog’ in *Liber Suda*:

Χοιρογρύλλιος· ὕστριξ, ἀκανθόχοιρος, τουτέστιν ἐχίνος χερσαῖος.¹⁹
*Choirogrullios*²⁰ – *hystrix*, „prickly pig”, that is the earthen hedgehog.

It should be emphasized that the meaning ‘hedgehog, *Erinaceus Europaeus* L.’ cannot be a late innovation of the Greek language (*Liber Suda* dates back to the 10th cent. A.D.), as it may be attested as early as in Aristotle’s times (4th cent. B.C.). The Greek scholar from Stagira, talking about animals which hibernate, gives the following information:

Τῶν δὲ ζῴοτόκων καὶ τετραπόδων φωλοῦσιν οἱ τε ὕστριχες καὶ αἱ ἄρκτοι.²¹
 Among viviparous quadrupeds the porcupines [sic!] and bears hibernate.

It is obvious that this passage cannot refer to porcupines, which live in the warm zone of the Mediterranean area and never have to hibernate. This fragment may describe only hedgehogs or alternatively badgers (see my discussion below, ad VI).

Another passage by Aristotle seems more problematic. The text runs as follows:

Καὶ ἡ ὕστριξ δὲ φολεῖ καὶ κύει ἴσας ἡμέρας, καὶ τὰλλα ὠσαύτως τῇ ἄρκτῳ. Κύουσιν δ’ ἄρκτον ἔργον ἐστὶ λαβεῖν.²²
 The female porcupine also hides away for the winter, and is pregnant for the same length of time, and otherwise does as the she-bear. It is no easy business to catch a bear when pregnant.

Aristotle informs us that the pregnancy of the female *hystrix* (ἡ ὕστριξ) lasts as long as the pregnancy of the she-bear (ca. 8–9 months). This feature cannot refer to the female hedgehog, which pregnancy is relatively short (slightly over 1

¹⁹ *Suda*, Ch, 598, vol. IV, p. 835 (s.v. χοιρογρύλλιος). Translation of the passages by the author of this article.

²⁰ Greek χοιρογρύλλιος seems to denote ‘east rock hyrax, *Procavia capensis syriacus* Schreber’, a medium-sized terrestrial animal, living in the Middle East and Africa. It has short ears and tail, resembling a guinea pig (*Cavia porcellus* L.). In antiquity the rock hyrax was compared with hedgehog, young hare and rabbit. See e.g. D. DUNCAN, *Urchin, coney, rock badger – genus hopping with the choiogrullios*, *Dandelion* 1, 2010, p. 1–4, <http://dandelionjournal.org/index.php/dandelion/article/viewFile/3/45> [25 X 2013].

²¹ ARISTOTELES, *HA*, VIII, 17 [600a]; *Aristotle’s History*, p. 215 (trans. R. CRESSWELL). *Jeze* (pl. ‘hedgehogs’) in the Polish translation of the text (ARYSTOTELES, *Zoologia...*, p. 340).

²² ARISTOTELES, *HA*, VI, 30 [579a], vol. II, Paris 1968; ARISTOTLE, *Historia Animalium*, trans. A.L. PECK, vol. II, London–Cambridge Mass. 1970 (cetera: ARISTOTLE), p. 339. Consistently, *samica jeza* (‘female hedgehog’) in the Polish translation of this passage also (ARYSTOTELES, *Zoologia...*, p. 275).

month²³). The female porcupine should be excluded for the same reason (ca. 2 to 3 and a half months)²⁴. On the other hand, Aristotle's description of the *hystrix* (both the hibernation and the long gestation) seem to square very well with habits of the badger.

It is worth emphasizing that at least at one place Aristotle distinguishes between earthen hedgehogs (οἱ χειρσαῖοι ἐχῖνοι) and the animals called ὕστριχες (discussed below)²⁵. In this place, ὕστριχες seem to refer to some maritime animals (see meaning V). However, meaning III 'porcupine' cannot be completely excluded.

Ad V. In the glossary written by Hesychius of Alexandria (5th or 6th cent. A.D.) we find the following gloss:

ὕστριξ: ζῶον ὀστρακώδερον, ἐνάλιον, βρώσιμον²⁶
Hystrix – a hard-shelled animal, maritime, edible.

The same meaning suggests itself in a passage by Aristotle in *Historia animalium*:

Τριχῶν γάρ τι εἶδος θετέον καὶ τὰς ἀκανθώδεις τρίχας, οἱ χειρσαῖοι ἔχουσιν ἐχῖνοι καὶ οἱ ὕστριχες· τριχὸς γὰρ χρεῖαν παρέχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ ποδῶν, ὥσπερ αἱ τῶν θαλαττίων.²⁷

Nevertheless, all animals which have hair are viviparous (and we must include here as a kind of hair the spiny hairs of hedgehogs and porcupines: these spines serve the purpose of hair, and not of feet as do spines of the sea-urchin).

Ad VI. The meaning 'badger, *Meles meles* L.' for ὕστριξ is not evidently attested in the ancient sources for one important reason. Namely, we know no certainly established Ancient Greek term for 'badger'²⁸. I believe, however, that there are

²³ L. SYKES, J. DURRANT, *The Natural Hedgehog*, London 2005, p. 25: *The gestation period is generally between 30 and 40 days*. The same statement is posited by M. BURTON, *Guide to the Mammals of Britain and Europe*, London 1985, p. 70 (*Gestation 30–40 days*). Differently L.J. DOBRORUKA, *Mammals*, Leicester 1998, p. 40, who says: *The gestation period is 5–6 weeks*.

²⁴ L.J. DOBRORUKA, *op. cit.*, p. 108, gives the following information regarding the porcupine: *No exact data are available on the duration of pregnancy: the shortest estimates are 65 days, the longest 112 days*. A similar approximation is given by M. BURTON, *op. cit.*, p. 214: *gestation 63–112 days*.

²⁵ ARISTOTELES, *HA*, I, 6 [490b], vol. I, Paris 1964.

²⁶ *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, post I. ALBERTUM rec. M. SCHMIDT, vol. IV, pars I, Ienae 1862 [repr. Amsterdam 1965], p. 221 (s.v. ὕστριξ). English translation by the author of the article, here and below.

²⁷ ARISTOTELES, *HA*, I, 6 [490b]; ARISTOTLE, vol. I, trans. A.L. PECK, London–Cambridge Mass. 1965, p. 33. *Ježe lądowe* and *ježe morskie* ('land hedgehogs' and 'sea hedgehogs') in ARYSTOTELES, *Zoologia...*, p. 18.

²⁸ As far as I know, the following Greek terms can be surmised to denote the 'European badger, *Meles meles* L.': 1. ἄρκος, diminutive ἀρκᾶλος; 2. ἄψος or ἄψος; 3. μελίνη; 4. πικτίς or πυκτίς; 5. τρόχος; 6. ὕστριξ. It should be emphasized that the first form ἄρκος m. 'badger' (< Proto-Greek *fárkos) was commonly contaminated with ἄρκτος m. or f. 'bear'. This opposition (ἄρκος 'badger' vs. ἄρκτος 'bear') was ignored by scholars also in modern times.

at least three premises, that allow us to suggest the meaning in question for Ancient Greek ὕστριξ.

Firstly, Modern Greeks from the Pontic area refer to the badger by means of the term ξυστρίγκι [pronounced: xistrígi] ('Dachs'), which evidently derives from *ὄξυ-ύστριξ²⁹. It follows that the term ὕστριξ could also denote the badger in antiquity, at least in the Ionic linguistic area (it is well known that the Modern Greek dialects of the Pontic area demonstrate features typical of Ionic, e.g. they preserve the long vowel η with the value [e]).

Secondly, the suggested semantics can be deduced from the Hesychian gloss:

ἀρκήλα · <τὸ > ζῶον. Κρήτες τὴν ὕστριχα³⁰

arkela – an animal; [thus] the Cretans [call] the badger (*hystrix*)

The meaning 'badger' is guaranteed by the Modern Greek (dial. Cretan) ἀρκαλος m. 'Cretan badger, *Melles meles* ssp. *arcalus*³¹ (= Hesychian ἀρκήλα), thus ὕστριξ in the Hesychian glossary can denote nothing other than 'badger'. The meaning 'porcupine' is completely excluded, for this animal did not (and does not) live in Crete. The remaining semantems IV ('hedgehog') and V ('maritime animal') are theoretically possible, but they, as well as 'porcupine', introduce semantic confusion and they explain nothing.

Thirdly, Eurasian badgers have their hair that is similar to swine bristle, from which brushes were and are made; thus the possible meaning 'having hair similar to pig's' (ὕσ-τριχες) squares very well with the earlier assumption that the Ionians called the badgers ὕστριχες³².

The suggested hypothesis (Ionic ὕστριξ denotes 'badger' and not 'porcupine'³³) remains in full agreement with the observed facts. The Hesychian gloss contains the word ἀρκήλα in the Ionic form containing the long vowel η (cf. Doric $\bar{\alpha}$, confirmed by the Modern Cretan form ἀρκαλος m. 'Cretan badger' and Carpathian ἀρκαλλος m. 'young of the wild animals, esp. of bear, lion or leopard'³⁴), as well as

²⁹ See N. ANDRIOTIS, *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten*, Wien 1974, p. 411, No. 4427 [= Schriften der Balkankommission. Linguistische Abteilung, 22].

³⁰ *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, A, 7275, rec. K. LATTE, vol. I, A–Δ, Hauniae 1953, p. 246 (s.v. ἀρκήλα).

³¹ N. ANDRIOTIS, *Lexikon...*, p. 153, No. 1164; G.P. SHIPP, *Modern Greek Evidence for the Ancient Greek Vocabulary*, Sydney 1979, p. 95.

³² E. KACZYŃSKA, K.T. WITCZAK, *Remarks on Some Doric Elements in the Modern Greek Dialects of Crete*, E 92(1), 2005, p. 113–114; IDEM, *Mustelidae in the Cretan Dialect of Modern Greek*, E 94, 2007, p. 298–302.

³³ The confusion of 'badger' and 'porcupine' in Modern Greek is also known. G.P. SHIPP, *op. cit.*, p. 96, gives the following comments to the Hesychian gloss in question: *This entry must be brought into a connexion with Cretan ἀρκαλος. It involves a confusion between the porcupine and the badger, for a parallel to which we need go no further than to ἀσβός, which in Macedonia is 'porcupine'. Hesych[ius] will then be citing the word in the corresponding Attic-Ionic form, presumably the name of another animal, then giving the Cretan meaning simply.*

³⁴ Metaph. 'a man crying out and making monotonous noise', cf. K. ΜΗΝΑΣ, *Λεξικό των ιδιωμάτων της Καραπάδου*, Κάρπαθος 2006, p. 152.

the glossema τὴν ὕστριχα with the Ionic semantics, which completely agrees with the Modern Cretan meaning ('badger').

What is more, at least two of Aristotle's texts are easier explained if one posits the suggested semantics 'badger' for the term ὕστριξ. The above-mentioned text by Aristotle is worth quoting once more:

Τῶν δὲ ζῳοτόκων καὶ τετραπόδων φωλοῦσιν οἱ τε ὕστριχες καὶ αἱ ἄρκτοι.³⁵
Among viviparous quadrupeds the porcupines and bears hibernate.

It is obvious that this passage cannot refer to porcupines, which live in the warm zone of the Mediterranean area and never have to hibernate. This fragment may only refer to hedgehogs or badgers.

As has been previously said, the crucial passage in the *History of Animals* was not understood properly:

Καὶ ἡ ὕστριξ δὲ φωλεῖ καὶ κύει ἴσας ἡμέρας, καὶ τὰλλα ὠσαύτως τῇ ἄρκτῳ. Κύουσιν δ' ἄρκτον ἔργον ἐστὶ λαβεῖν.³⁶
The female porcupine (ἡ ὕστριξ) also hides away for the winter, and is pregnant for the same length of time, and otherwise does as the she-bear. It is no easy business to catch a bear when pregnant.

Aristotle's information on the pregnancy of the female *hystrix* (ἡ ὕστριξ), which is said to last as long as the pregnancy of the she-bear, can denote neither 'porcupine' nor 'hedgehog', as it refers to the female badger, whose pregnancy may be restrained for some months due to the so-called delayed implantation³⁷. Most researchers agree that the duration of the badger's pregnancy varies between 7 months and 13–15 months³⁸. In other words, it can be compared with the duration of a bear's pregnancy (ca. 8–9 months).

In his works devoted to zoological topics Aristotle seems to confuse the two meanings 'porcupine' (most popular) and 'badger' (local use, probably in Ionia). Such a semantic dispersion is also observed in Modern Greek. The word ἀσβός generally means 'badger', but in some areas (in Macedonia) it denotes the porcupine.

VII. The semantics 'an unidentifiable, or unclearly defined, animal' must be assumed in those cases, where the context provides no additional information

³⁵ ARISTOTELES, *HA*, VIII, 17 [600a], vol. III; *Aristotle's History*, p. 215 (trans. R. CRESSWELL).

³⁶ ARISTOTELES, *HA*, VI, 30 [579a], vol. II; ARISTOTLE, trans. A.L. PECK, vol. II, p. 339.

³⁷ M. BURTON, *op. cit.*, p. 114. The author explains it as follows: *Mating usually in July but may occur February to October. Cubs born January to May. Does not mean gestation of 7 months as there is delayed implantation. Embryo is only implanted in wall of uterus 7–8 weeks before actual birth and then development proceeds normally.* L.J. DOBRORUKA, *op. cit.*, p. 74, says that *In some females latent pregnancy (i.e. temporarily suspended development of the embryo) has been observed, in others the development of the embryo proceeds without interruption. Gestation periods thus vary widely, between 7 and 15 months.*

³⁸ P. SUMIŃSKI, *Borsuk*, Warszawa 1989, p. 88: *Wszyscy autorzy są zgodni, że ciąża trwa nie krócej niż 7 miesięcy, a może trwać nawet 13–15 miesięcy.*

as to whether the term ὕστριξ refers to the porcupine (III), the hedgehog (IV), or the badger (VI). It is necessary to include here the following examples:

A fragment by Aeschylus, the famous Athenian writer from the 6th–5th cent. B.C., is reconstructed on the basis of the works of Aristophanes of Byzantium, the Greek grammarian, and Aelian. Modern editors give the following text:

ὦ φίλος, χέρας εὐμενής,
τέρψην δ' ἴκτισι κα[ι] νεβρο[ις]
ὕστριχων τ' ὀβριχισ[ι]
κοιμήσῃ δὲ τρίτος ξὺν
μητρὶ [καὶ π]ατρὶ τῶδε.³⁹

In the same place Aelian adds that the name in question was also used by the Athenian tragic poets:

τῶν δὲ ὕστριχων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων τὰ ἔκγονα ὄβρια καλεῖται· καὶ μέμνηται γε Εὐριπίδης ἐν Πελοπιδῶσι τοῦδὸνόματος καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ἄγαμέμνονι καὶ Δικτυουλοῖς.⁴⁰

Youngs of the *hystriches* and similar animals are called *obria*. And Euripides mentions this term in his *Peliades* [fr. 616 N], and Aeschylus in his *Agamemnon* [v. 143] and *Dictyulci* [fr. 48 N].

Callimachus of Cyrene, the prominent poet of the Alexandrian epoch (4th–3rd cent. B.C.), mentions in his hymn to Artemis the animal called ὕστριξ; the meaning is unclear:

καὶ κοίτην ἐλάφοιο καὶ ὕστριχος ...⁴¹
the lair of the stag and where the porcupine hath his burrow

In the Polish translation Wiktor Steffen gives the meaning *dzik*, 'boar', not confirmed by the lexical material of the Ancient, Medieval and Modern Greek⁴². Though the identification is wrong, it should be emphasized that any translation, including 'porcupine', 'hedgehog', 'badger', would be equally arbitrary.

Conclusions.

The standard dictionaries of the Ancient Greek language usually list three different meanings of the appellative ὕστριξ, namely: I. 'swine bristle', II. 'whip made

³⁹ AESCHYLUS, fr. 47a.

⁴⁰ AELIAN, VII, 47, vol. II, London–Cambridge Mass. 1959 (with my translation; in trans. of A.F. SCHOLFIELD: *And the young of porcupines and similar creatures are called ὄβρια*. It is hardly certain that the ὕστριχες denote 'porcupines' in this fragment).

⁴¹ *Callimachi Hymni et Epigrammata*, H, III, 96, rec. U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, Berolini 1882, p. 20. See also CALLIMACHO, *Inni. Chioma di Berenice*, trans. V. GIGANTE LANZARA, ³Milano 1993, p. 32. English translation: CALLIMACHUS, LYCOPHRON, ARATUS, trans. A.W. MAIR, G. R. MAIR, Cambridge Mass.–London 1989, p. 69.

⁴² *Antologia liryki aleksandryjskiej*, trans. W. STEFFEN, Wrocław 1951, p. 16 [= Biblioteka Narodowa, II, 64].

of swine leather and bristle', III. 'hard-shelled porcupine'. It is necessary to add as many as three or four new meanings (IV. 'hedgehog', V. 'sea urchin', VI. 'badger'; VII. 'an unclearly defined animal') to the previously established ones.

Abstract. Dictionaries of the Ancient Greek language distinguish only two or three different meanings of the Greek word ὑστρίξ. The present author analyses all the contexts and glosses where the word in question appears. On the basis of his own analysis he assumes that dictionaries of Ancient Greek should contain as many as seven different semantems: I. 'swine bristle', II. 'swine leather whip, the cat, used as an instrument of punishment', III. 'porcupine, *Hystrix cristata* L.', IV. 'hedgehog, *Erinaceus europaeus* L.', V. 'sea urchin', VI. 'badger, *Meles meles* L. '; VII. 'an unclearly defined animal'.

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak

Zakład Językoznawstwa i Indoeuropeistyki

Wydział Filologiczny

Uniwersytet Łódzki

ul. Lipowa 81, p. 408

90–568 Łódź, Polska

krzysztof.tomasz.witczak@gmail.com

ktw@uni.lodz.pl

Rafał Zarębski (Łódź)

POSSESSIVE ADJECTIVES FORMED FROM PERSONAL NAMES IN POLISH TRANSLATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Adjectives denoting possession are formed from bases which indicate the possessor of an object expressed by the modified noun, for instance *Jankowy rower*, *siostrzana miłość*. Analyses of word formation in contemporary Polish demonstrate that this type of adjectives is going out of use. In fact, it is the constructions with the genitive (like *rower Janka*) that are taking over the role of possessive adjectives in present-day Polish¹. It is common knowledge that the category of interest here was especially common in the Old Church Slavonic language, which is visible if we take a closer look at the monuments of the culture of Saint Cyril and Methodius². Moreover, Old Polish texts contain a high number of possessive adjectives (*Księgi Mojżeszowy, z Adamowa boku* – Sarospatak Bible). The phenomenon of possessive adjectives formed from proper names going out of use in the Polish language emerged between the 16th and 18th century and intensified from the middle of the 18th century onwards³.

Possessive adjectives derived from personal names, formed by means of the suffixes *-ow(y) < *-ovъ-jb, -in//-yn < *-inъ, -sk(i) < *-bškъ-jb* inherited into Polish from Proto-Slavic, unambiguously denoted possession. On the contrary, derivatives of common nouns formed with suffixes generally signalling possessiveness could at times have a divergent semantic interpretation, e.g. *lisi ogon* 'tail belonging to a fox' (possessive adjective), but *lisie spojrzenie* 'look characteristic of a fox' (adjective denoting similarity)⁴.

The word formation of possessive adjectives has been described exhaustively⁵. Adjectives formed from personal names at one point constituted such sizeable semantically homogenous groups of words that Krystyna Kleszczowa decided not to

¹ R. GRZEGORCZYKOWA, *Zarys słowotwórstwa polskiego*, Warszawa 1984, p. 68.

² Compare the frequent use of possessive adjectives formed from personal names in the *Psalterium Sinaiticum*, e.g. *avraaml'ъ, aronovъ, zaxarijinъ* (cf. T. FRIEDELÓWNA, *Biblijna onomastyka w staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskim Psalterzu synajskim*, AUNC.FP 40(246), 1993, p. 3–25 (17–19).

³ S. SZLIFERSZTEJNOWA, *Przymiotniki dzierzawcze w języku polskim*, Wrocław 1960, p. 40–41.

⁴ Z. KLEMENSIEWICZ, T. LEHR-SPEŁAWIŃSKI, S. URBAŃCZYK, *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*, Warszawa 1981, p. 226–234.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 226–236; S. SZLIFERSZTEJNOWA, *op. cit.*

analyse them in her monograph on word formation of adjectival derivatives in Old Polish⁶. It is essential for the evolution of the Polish system of word formation that the group of derivatives discussed here has almost gone out of use⁷.

In the course of the work on anthroponymy in the Polish translations of the *New Testament*⁸ it turned out that possessive adjectives formed from proper names were not merely a broad category in Middle Polish translations, but also that their usage in particular texts depended on some factors which determine the linguistic shape of the translations. The factors in question are extralinguistic, such as the basis of the translation (Greek original or Latin *Vulgate*), the selection of methods and techniques of translation and the attitude to the tradition of translation⁹. Even a cursory look at the possessive adjectives points to the conclusion that the usage of this type of adjectives in translated texts may be conditioned by stylistic factors. Furthermore, whether or not to use a deanthroponymic possessive adjective was determined by purely linguistic factors; it depended on the phonetic shape of the anthroponym or its morphological structure. Considering all the circumstances that can affect the use of possessive adjectives derived from anthroponyms in the translations of the *New Testament* mentioned above, this type of derivatives should clearly be analysed linguistically.

The aim of this article is to take a closer look at possessive adjectives formed from personal names in the Polish translations of the *New Testament*¹⁰. We will focus on the old translations, i.e. those stemming from the 16th and 17th century, while keeping track of the latest, contemporary ones at the same time. The latter, for the most part, are in accordance with the developmental trends of contemporary Polish with reference to the category of adjectives in question. However, even these texts contain some possessive adjectives. This phenomenon is to be linked with

the rule of respect for linguistic custom, the tradition of the biblical Polish language, which causes the persistence of many invariant linguistic formulae in contemporary translations [...] and the stability of the biblical vocabulary¹¹

as well as the invariability of some already archaic grammatical forms.

The study shows that the word formation structure of the forms under analysis is of paramount importance, but so are the factors which determine the linguistic shape and the use of the derivatives examined. What is of interest to us is the role of the extralinguistic factors mentioned above in the process of using

⁶ K. KLESZCZOWA, *Staropolskie derywaty przymiotnikowe i ich perspektywiczna ewolucja*, Katowice 2003, p. 62–63, p. 75–79.

⁷ Possessive adjectives formed from personal names are still quite robust in the modern dialects.

⁸ R. ZARĘBSKI, *Słownik nazw osobowych w polskich przekładach Nowego Testamentu*, Łódź 2005; IDEM, *Nazwy osobowe w polskich przekładach Nowego Testamentu*, Łódź 2006.

⁹ D. BIEŃKOWSKA, *Polski styl biblijny*, Łódź 2002, p. 24–33.

¹⁰ Cf. *Sources*, an. 12.

¹¹ D. BIEŃKOWSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

possessive adjectives where the basic texts (Greek original or Latin *Vulgate*) display the substantival form of the name. We are thus touching upon the issue of choosing linguistic means of expression in a text; at the same time we are encroaching on the field of stylistics. We will try to show what impact using or not using possessive adjectives has on the stylistic layer of the translations excerpted.

Fifteen full and eleven incomplete translations of the *New Testament* into Polish have been examined. Among the former there are Middle Polish texts¹² dating

¹² Cf. Sources in the list below:

B *Biblia to jest Księgi starego i Nowego Przymierza* [Księgi Nowego Przymierza Kto pospolicie Nowym Testamentem zową z wielką pracą y pilnym poprawieniem z Greckiego na Polski język przetłumaczone], trans. S. BUDNY, Nieśwież 1571–1572, ed. H. ROTHE, F. SCHOLZ, repr. Paderborn–München–Wien–Zürich 1994 [= *Biblia Slavica*. 2nd Series: Polnische Bibeln] (viz *Biblia nieświejska* or *Nieśwież/Budny Bible*).

Br *Ewangelia według Świętego Mateusza*, trans. R. BRANDSTAETTER, Warszawa 1986; *Ewangelia według Świętego Marka*, trans. IDEM, Warszawa 1980; *Ewangelia według Świętego Łukasza*, trans. IDEM, Warszawa 1982; *Pisma Świętego Jana Ewangelisty. Ewangelia. Listy. Apokalipsa*, trans. IDEM, Warszawa 1978; *Święty Łukasz Ewangelista, Dzieje Apostolskie*, trans. IDEM, Warszawa 1984.

Brz *Biblia święta, to jest księgi Starego i Nowego Zakonu właśnie z żydowskiego, greckiego i łacińskiego nowo na język polski z pilnością i wiernie wyłożone...*, Brześć Litewski 1563 (viz *Biblia brzeska* or *Brześć Bible*).

BT *Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych*, ed. coll. (on the initiative of the Benedictines of Tyniec), ⁴Poznań 1996, (¹1965), (viz *Biblia Tysiąclecia*).

Cz *Nowy Testament, to jest wszystkie pisma Nowego Przymierza z greckiego języka na rzecz polską wiernie i szczerze przełożone...*, trans. M. CZECHOWIC, Raków 1577.

D *Nowy Testament. Nowy przekład z języka greckiego na współczesny język polski*, Brytyjskie i Zagraniczne Towarzystwo Biblijne, Warszawa 1991.

Db *Pismo święte Nowego Testamentu. Wstęp, nowy przekład z Wulgaty. Komentarz*, trans. E. DĄBROWSKI, ⁷Poznań–Warszawa–Lublin 1958 and *Ewangelie i Dzieje Apostolskie, Wstęp. Nowy przekład z Wulgaty. Komentarz*, trans. IDEM, Poznań–Warszawa–Lublin 1953 (¹1947).

Dn *Dobra Nowina według Mateusza i Marka*, trans. W. WITWICKI, Warszawa 1958.

E *Ewangelia św. Mateusza. Przekład ekumeniczny*, Warszawa 1997; *Ewangelia św. Marka. Przekład ekumeniczny*, Warszawa 1997; *Ewangelia według św. Łukasza. Przekład ekumeniczny na język współczesny*, Warszawa 2000; *Pismo święte Nowego Testamentu i Psalmi. Przekład ekumeniczny z języków oryginalnych*, Towarzystwo Biblijne w Polsce, Warszawa 2001.

G *Biblia święta, to jest księgi Starego i Nowego Przymierza z żydowskiego i greckiego języka na polski pilnie i wiernie przetłumaczone*, Gdańsk 1632 (viz *Biblia gdańska* or *Gdańsk Bible*).

H *Harmonia ewangeliczna (15th/16th century)*, [in:] S. VRTEL-WIERCZYŃSKI, *Wybór tekstów staropolskich*, Warszawa 1969.

I *Grecko-polski Nowy Testament. Wydanie interlinearne z kodami gramatycznymi*, trans. R. POPOWSKI, M. WOJCIECHOWSKI, Warszawa 1993.

K *Pismo Święte Nowego Testamentu*, trans. S. KOWALSKI, Warszawa 1978 (¹1957).

L *Biblia to jest księgi Starego i Nowego zakonu na polski język z pilnością według łacińskiej Biblii, od Kościoła krześcijańskiego powszechnie przyjętej, nowo wyłożona...*, Kraków 1561, (viz *Biblia Leopoldy* or *Leopoldita Bible*).

M *Apokalipsa*, trans. Cz. MIŁOSZ Cz. MIŁOSZ, Kraków 1998; *Ewangelia według Marka, Apokalipsa*, trans. IDEM, Lublin 1989.

Mu *Nowy Testament zupełny. Z greckiego języka na polski przełożony i wykładem krótkim objaśniony...*, trans. S. MURZYŃSKI, ed. J. SEKLUCJAN, Królewiec Pruski 1553.

P *Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych ze wstępami i komen-*

back to 16th century (*Mu, Sz, L, Brz, B, Cz, W*), 17th century (*G*) and newer ones, from the 20th century (*BT, P, Pr, K, D, I, E*). The incomplete ones are mostly contemporary translations (*Db, Dn, Br, M*), but they also include old ones from the 15th and 16th century (*H, Zb*). The translations excerpted differ not only with respect to the chronological order, but also the basis of translation. *Mu, Brz, B, Cz, G, BT, Dn, P, Pr, K, Br, M, D, I, E* were translated from the original languages, whereas *H, Zb, Sz, L, W, Db* are based on the *Vulgate*. Furthermore, the texts display divergent methods of translation. Some of them represent loose translations (*L*), while others follow the original extremely closely (*verbum de verbo*) (*B, W*). There are also philological (*BT*), interlinear (*I*), ecumenical (*E*) and artistic (*M, Br*) translations, as well as ones representing the technique of dynamic equivalence (formal equivalence) (*D*). Such an extensive and varied collection of translations of a single text (in this case, the *New Testament*) allows for a complete and objective philological look not only at the *New Testament* names, but also at the possessive adjectives formed from anthroponymic bases.

As has been mentioned, possessiveness in older Polish was often expressed by means of possessive adjectives. In the 15th–17th century *New Testament* translations excerpted there are a great many adjectives formed from personal names. Numerous adjectives formed from masculine anthroponyms with the suffix *-ow(y)* occur. If they appear in the form of nom. sg. in old texts (15th–17th century), they follow the short inflection; in the oblique cases they inflect according to the pronominal declension.

The following forms are only attested with the short inflection¹³: *Addow* (< *Addi*), *Apollow* (< *Apollo*), *Barnabaszow* (< *Barnabasz*), *Elmadanow* (< *Elmadan*), *Jonas(z)ow* (< *Jonasz*), *Jonow* (< *Jona*), *Jazonow* (< *Jazon*), *Jeseow* (< *Jesse*), *Jesow* (< *Jese*), *Joseow* (< *Jose*), *Jonamow* (< *Jonam*), *Joramow* (< *Joram*), *Jowiszow* (< *Jowisz*), *Judaszow* (< *Judasz*), *Kajfaszow//Kajafaszow* (< *Kajfasz//Kajafasz*), *Kastorow* (< *Kastor*), *Kefasow* (< *Kefas*), *Lamechow* (< *Lamech*), *Matatyjaszow* (< *Matatyjasz*), *Melchijow* (< *Melchi*), *Molochow* (< *Moloch*), *Naggow//Naggeow* (< *Nag(g)e*), *Neryjow* (< *Neri*), *Pirrow* (< *Pirr*), *Publijuszow//Poplijow* (< *Publijusz*), *Salow//Saleow* (< *Sala*), *Semejow* (< *Semej*), *Ste-*

tarzami, trans. M. PETER (ST), M. WOLNIEWICZ (NT), vol. III, ²Poznań 1987 (¹1974–1975) (viz *Biblia poznańska* or *Poznań Bible*).

Pr *Biblia to jest Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu. Nowy przekład z języków hebrajskiego i greckiego opracowany przez Komisję przekładu Pisma Świętego*, Warszawa 1975.

Sz *Nowy Testament polskim językiem wyłożony według doświadczonego łacińskiego tekstu od Kościoła krześcijańskiego przyjętego...*, ed. M. SZARFFENBERG, Kraków 1556.

W *Nowy Testament w przekładzie ks. dr. Jakuba Wujka z roku 1593*, trans. J. WUJEK, ed. W. SMEREKA, Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, Kraków 1966.

Zb *Apokalipsa Św. Jana w przekładzie Tomasza ze Zbrudzewa (1555)*, ed. I. KWILECKA, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk 1976.

¹³ All examples transcribed.

fanow (< *Stefan*), *Tymeuszow*// *Tymeow* (< *Tymeusz*)¹⁴. Conversely, the following derivatives only followed the long inflection: *Aaronowy* (< *Aaron*), *Abelowy*// *Ablowy* (< *Abel*), *Abijaszowy*// *Abijowy* (< *Abijasz*), *Aleksandrowy* (< *Aleksander*), *Appijuszowy*// *Appijowy* (< *Appijusz*), *Arstobulowy* (< *Arystobul*), *Arystobulusowy* (< *Arystobulus*), *Arystobulosowy* (< *Arystobulos*), *Asserowy* (< *Asser*), *Barachijaszowy* (< *Barachijasz*), *Barachijowy* (< *Barachija*), *Benijaminowy* (< *Benijamin*), *Bosorowy* (< *Bosor*), *Eberowy* (< *Eber*), *Elijaszowy* (< *Elijasz*), *Ezajaszowy* (< *Ezajasz*), *Feliksowy* (< *Feliks*), *Festusowy*// *Festowy* (< *Festus*), *Gadowy* (< *Gad*), *Gamalijelowy* (< *Gamalijel*), *Herodowy* (< *Herod*), *Isacharowy* (< *Isachar*), *Izajaszowy* (< *Izajasz*), *Izraelowy* (< *Izrael*), *Jesajowy* (< *Jesaj*), *Jobowy* (< *Job*), *Jonanowy* (< *Jonan*), *Josesowy* (< *Joses*), *Kainanowy* (< *Kain*), *Kefasowy* (< *Kefas*), *Kisowy* (< *Kis*), *Kleofasowy* (< *Kleofas*), *Koreowy* (< *Kore*), *Manassesowy* (< *Manasses*), *Melchisedechowy* (< *Melchisedech*), *Narcysowy*// *Narkissowy* (< *Narcys*), *Neftalimowy* (< *Neftali*), *Pilatowy* (< *Pilat*), *Rubenowy* (< *Ruben*), *Rufowy* (< *Ruf*), *Salaowy* (< *Sala*), *Salomonowy* (< *Salomonowy*), *Saulowy* (< *Saul*), *Szczepanowy* (< *Szczepan*), *Tytusowy* (< *Tytus*), *Tytowy* (< *Tyt*), *Uriaszowy* (< *Uriasz*), *Zabulonowy* (< *Zabulon*).

The rest of deanthroponymic adjectival forms use both the short and the long inflection: *Abrahamow*, -y (< *Abraham*), *Adamow*, -y (< *Adam*), *Aminadabow*, -y (< *Aminadab*), *Alfeuszow*, -y// *Alfeow* (< *Alfeusz*), *Amosow*, -y (< *Amos*), *Andrzejow*, -y (< *Andrzej*), *Apollosow*, -y (< *Apollos*), *Aramow*, -y (< *Aram*), *Arfaksadow*, -y// *Arfakadowy* (< *Arfaksad*), *Boozow*, -y (< *Booz*), *Dawidow*, -y (< *Dawid*), *Elijakimow*, -y (< *Elijakim*), *Elijezerow*, -y (< *Elijezer*), *Enochow*, -y (< *Enoch*), *Enosow*, -y (< *Enos*), *Esromow*, -y (< *Esrom*), *Falegow*, -y// *Falekowy* (< *Faklek*), *Faresow*, -y (< *Fares*), *Heberow*, -y (< *Heber*), *Herow*, -y (< *Her*), *Izaakow*, -y (< *Izaak*), *Jakobow*, -y (< *Jakub*), *Janow*, -y (< *Jan*), *Jaretow*// *Jaredow*, -y (< *Jaret*), *Jezusow*, -y (< *Jezus*), *Johanow*, -y (< *Johan*), *Jorymow*, -y (< *Jorym*), *Jozefow*, -y (< *Jozef*), *Judow*, -y (< *Juda*), *Kosamow*, -y (< *Kosam*), *Lewijow*, -y (< *Lewi*), *Maatow*, -y (< *Maat*), *Mahatow*, -y (< *Mahat*), *Malelelow*, -y (< *Maleleel*), *Matatyjow*, -y (< *Matatyja*), *Matatow*, -y (< *Matat*), *Matusalow*, -y (< *Matusala*), *Melchow*, -y (< *Melcha*), *Meleow*, -y (< *Melea*), *Mennow*, -y (< *Menna*), *Mojżeszow*, -y (< *Mojżesz*), *Na(a)s(s)onow*, -y (< *Na(a)s(s)on*), *Nachorow*, -y (< *Nachor*), *Natanow*, -y (< *Natan*), *Naumow*, -y (< *Naum*), *Obedow*, -y (< *Obed*), *Onezyforow*, -y (< *Onezyfor*), *Pawłow*, -y (< *Paweł*), *Piotrow*, -y (< *Piotr*), *Ragawow*, -y (< *Ragaw*), *Ragamow*, -y (< *Ragam*), *Resow*, -y (< *Resa*), *Salatyjelow*, -y (< *Salatyjel*), *Salmonow*, -y (< *Salmon*), *Saruchow*, -y (< *Saruch*), *Semow*, -y (< *Sem*), *Setow*, -y (< *Set*), *Symeonow*, -y (< *Symeon*), *Szymonow*, -y (< *Szymon*), *Zacharyjaszow*, -y (< *Zacharyjasz*), *Zebedeuszow*, -y// *Zebedeow* (< *Zebedeusz*), *Zorobabelow*, -y (< *Zorobabel*).

The origin of the suffix *-ow* is connected with the forms of the gen. pl. of the Proto-Slavic *u*-stem declension. Adjectival derivatives in *-ow* were formed from masculine nouns and mostly denoted possession. They functioned as predicative attributes, which certainly contributed to their popularity in older Polish¹⁵. As can be seen from the material quoted above, they constituted a broad

¹⁴ The exact location cf. R. ZARĘBSKI, *Słownik...*

¹⁵ J. ŁOŚ, *Gramatyka polska*, pars 2, *Słowotwórstwo*, Lwów–Warszawa–Kraków 1925, p. 23; S. SZLIFERSZTEJNOWA, *op. cit.*, p. 85–89.

category in the Old Polish and Middle Polish translations of the *New Testament*. In contemporary translations, genitival forms are used in place of adjectives functioning as attributes, which, as has already been said, is in accordance with the evolutionary trends of Polish. A simple comparison of a text from the 16th century (*W*) with a translation from the 20th century (*BT*) clearly shows that possessive adjectives disappear, giving way to genitival forms, e.g. *żona Uriaszowa* – *żona Uriasza* (Mt 1, 6), *do śmierci Herodowej* – *do śmierci Heroda* (Mt 2, 15), *córka Fanuelowa* – *córka Fanuela* (Lc 2, 36)¹⁶. It is evident that the scale of this phenomenon is considerable. In the texts which form the basis of the translation (Greek original or Latin *Vulgate*), genitival forms occur where the older translations had possessive adjectives. That the translators of these texts used adjectival derivatives indicates the high degree to which the base antroponyms were morphologically adapted to Polish.

Thanks to the processes of adaptation, names of foreign origin entered various declensional types of Polish¹⁷. Among the examples mentioned there are derivatives formed from masculine personal names which belong to different declensions: masculine non-palatal, e.g. *Elmadan* > *Elmadanow*, *Gad* > *Gadowy*, *Feliks* > *Feliksowy*, *Obed* > *Obedow*, *Tyt* > *Tytowy*; masculine palatal, e.g. *Judasz* > *Judaszow*, *Mojżesz* > *Mojżeszow(y)*; feminine vocalic, e.g. *Abija* > *Abijowy*, *Juda* > *Judow(y)*, *Matusala* > *Matusalow(y)* and pronominal-adjectival, e.g. *Addi* > *Addow*, *Jese* > *Jesow*, *Neri* > *Neryjow*, *Melchi* > *Melchijow*. It must be pointed out that some adjectives in the material analysed occur in a number of variant forms, which is connected with the various methods of morphological adaptation of some names, e.g. *Abelowy*// *Ablowy*, *Abiaszowy*// *Abiowy*, *Alfeuszow*, -y// *Alfeow*, *Kajfaszow*// *Kajafaszow*, *Naggow*// *Naggeow*, *Publiuszow*// *Popliow*, *Salow*// *Saleow*, *Tymeuszow*// *Tymeow*, *Appiuszowy*// *Appiowy*, *Fetusowy*// *Festowy*, *Narcysowy*// *Narkissowy*, *Falegow*, -y// *Falekowy*, *Arfaksadow*, -y// *Arfakadowy*, *Jaretow*// *Jaredow*, -y, *Zebedeuszow*, -y// *Zebedeowy*.

Forms with the suffix *-in* are also found among possessive adjectives excerpted from the Polish translations of the *New Testament*. They are not as numerous as the derivatives in *-ow*; what is more, their occurrence (only in the short inflection) is limited to the older texts. As few as 9 masculine and 2 feminine names form adjectives in *-in*. From masculine antroponyms are formed: *Joannin* (< *Jan*) *Mu*, *Janin* (< *Janna*) *Mu*, *Judzin* (< *Juda*) *Cz*, *Kefin* (< *Kefa*) *Cz*, *W*, *Melchin* (< *Melcha*) *Mu*, *Salin* (< *Sala*) *Mu*, *Semein* (< *Semea*) *Mu*, *Stefanin* (< *Stefana*) *Brz*, *Cz*, *Tarzyn* (< *Tara*) *Mu*, whereas derivatives such as *Herodyjadzin* (< *Herodyjada*) *Mu*, *Sarzyn* (< *Sara*) *Mu*, *Cz* are derived from feminine names. The distribution of adjectives in *-in* is the following: *Mu* (8 forms), *Cz* (3), *Brz* (1), *W* (1). It is worth noting that the presence of

¹⁶ E. BREZA, *Odmiana nazw własnych w Nowym Testamencie Biblii Wujka i Biblii Tysiąclecia*, [in:] *Biblia a kultura Europy*, ed. M. KAMIŃSKA, E. MAŁEK, vol. I, Łódź 1992, p. 152–159 (154).

¹⁷ M. MAŁEK, *Imiona chrześcijańskie w średniowiecznej Polsce*, Kraków 1994; R. ZARĘBSKI, *Nazwy osobowe...*, p. 108–147.

adjectives formed with *-in* only in these translations proves that there are strong philological ties among them, in particular between *Mu*, *Cz* and *Brz*¹⁸.

Derivatives in *-in* were formed solely from nouns ending in *-a*¹⁹. Therefore, their presence in the old translations was determined by the various methods of morphological adaptation of foreign names. This phenomenon may be illustrated by the following example. The Greek name 'Κηφᾶς' (Lat. *Cephas*) in the translations analysed is characterized by a broad array of variant shapes, e.g. *Cefas*, *Kefas*, *Kefasz*, *Kifas*// *Kiefa*, *Kefa*, *Kifa*. If the name was adapted as consonant-final in a given translation, the possessive adjective was formed with *-ow*, in accordance with the morphological rules of distribution. On the other hand, variants with a word-final vowel took the suffix *-in*.

In the material examined, a few adjectival forms with possessive meaning are formed with the suffix *-sk*²⁰, e.g. *judzki* (< *Juda*), *zabuloński* (< *Zabulon*), *neftalimski* (< *Neftalim*). Their presence was limited almost exclusively to old translations. In some contemporary translations the adjective *judzki* appears (*Db*, *Dn*, *Pr*, *D*).

The register of all possessive adjectives formed from proper personal names in the Polish translations of the *New Testament* is as depicted above. Forms in *-ow* constitute the majority of the analysed examples. This is mainly due to the fact that the dominant part of the *New Testament* names were adapted into the Polish masculine declension. Adjectives in *-ow* were formed precisely from nouns that belonged to the non-palatal and palatal masculine paradigms. The use of adjectival derivatives in old translations results not only from the linguistic reasons which determined the huge popularity of the adjectival possessive attribute in 15th–18th century Polish. It also indicates the high linguistic consciousness of the translators²¹. This is reflected in the stylistic shape of the excerpted texts, because it shows how the authors attempted to make their translations more consistent with the language of their times instead of blindly following the authority of the base text.

As regards the usage of possessive adjectives in the 20th-century translations of the *New Testament*, it has already been said above that they occur fairly infrequently. There are only 7 recorded forms in *-ow(y)* in *BT*: *Mojżeszowy* (used 8 times), *Janowy* (7), *Chrystusowy* (2), *Dawidowy* (2), *Jakubowy* (2), *Salomonowy* (1), *Szymonowy* (1). A similar situation is to be found in other contemporary translations. Moreover, if one compares the use of possessive adjectives in *BT* (first published in 1965) and the ecumenical translation (*E*) from 2001, the difference in the use of relational adjectives is noticeable, in spite of the short lapse of time between the two translations. Where *BT* uses an adjectival derivative, the authors of *E* use genitival

¹⁸ More general linguistic and stylistic research also confirms this.

¹⁹ J. ŁOŚ, *op. cit.*, p. 36; S. SZLIFERSZTEJNOWA, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

²⁰ J. ŁOŚ, *op. cit.*, p. 84–85; S. SZLIFERSZTEJNOWA, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

²¹ In her study of the onomastics of the *Psalterium Sinaiticum*, T. Friedełówna considers the use of possessive adjectives formed from personal names an indication of the authors' derivational inventiveness (cf. T. FRIEDELÓWNA, *op. cit.*, p. 24).

structures, e.g. *potomstwo Abrahamowe BT / Abrahama E* (Hebr 2, 16), *w krążganku (...) Salomonowym BT / Salomona E* (Act 3, 11), *w prawie Mojżeszowym, prawa Mojżeszowego BT / Mojżesza E* (Lc 2, 22; Io 7, 23; Act 13, 39; 28, 23), *chrzest Janowy BT / Jana E* (Mc 11, 30; Lc 7, 29; 20, 4; Io 5, 36), *Jakubowy BT / Jakuba E* (Mc 5, 37), *potomstwo Dawidowe BT / Dawida E* (Io 7, 42), *Szymonowego BT / Szymona E* (Mc 1, 16), *Ducha Chrystusowego BT / Chrystusa E* (Rom 8, 9), *córka Syjońska BT / Syjonu E* (Mt 21, 5)²². However, that the possessive adjectival attribute goes out of use may depend not only on the linguistic factors reflected in the developmental trends of Polish, but also on extralinguistic factors. The point is that the text is modernised so as to make its language close to the reality of contemporary Polish. At the same time, the translators of the latest versions of the *New Testament* use archaic adjectival forms to show their respect for the traditional biblical style, within which the forms in question were not anything peculiar²³. The presence of possessive adjectives in the 20th-century *Db* translation, more noticeable than in the other contemporary translations of the *New Testament*, must be ascribed precisely to the continuation of the Polish biblical style. It is especially visible in the ways of expressing family relations, e.g. *Maria Józefowa (P, Br)*, *Maria Jakubowa (P, Br)*, *Juda// Judasz Jakubowy (Pr)*, *Jakub Alfeuszowy (Pr)*.

As regards the stylistic value of adjectival possessive derivatives and their impact on the stylistic development of the *New Testament* translations under analysis, it is important to note the hesitation of certain translators, inferrable from various commentaries or marginal glosses. Namely, alternant forms of some anthroponyms are found in a few Middle Polish translations. Two types of translators' hesitation can be noted. The more frequent one consists in the presence of an adjectival derivative in the main text and the base name of this derivative in the margin²⁴, e.g.: *Abrahamow// *Abraham* (Lc 3, 34), *Addow// *Addi* (Lc 3, 28), *Aminadabow// *Aminadab* (Lc 3, 33), *Amosow// *Amos* (Lc 3, 25), *Arfaksatow// *Arfaksat* (Lc 3, 36), *Aramow// *Aram* (Lc 3, 33), *Boozow// *Booz* (Lc 3, 32), *Dawidow// *Dawid* (Lc 3, 31), *Enosow// *Enos* (Lc 3, 38), *Esromow// *Esrom* (Lc 3, 33), *Falekow// *Falek* (Lc 3,35), *Faresow// *Fares* (Lc 3, 33), *Herow// *Her* (Lc 3, 28), *Helijakimow// Helijakim* (Lc 3, 30), *Heberow// Heber* (Lc 3, 35), *Helijezerow// Helijezer* (Lc 3, 29), *Helmadamow// Helmadam* (Lc 3, 28), *Izaakow// Izaak* (Lc 3, 34), *Janin// *Janna* (Lc 3, 24), *Jaretow// *Jaret* (Lc 3, 37), *Jesow// *Jeso* (Lc 3, 29), *Jonamow// *Jonam* (Lc 3, 30), *Joramow// *Joram* (Lc 3, 29), *Jozefow// *Jozef* (Lc 3, 23; 3, 24; 3, 26; 3, 30), *Judow// *Juda* (Lc 3, 26; 3, 30), *Kainanow// *Kainan* (Lc 3, 36; 3, 37), *Kosamow// *Kosam* (Lc 3, 28), *Lamechow// *Lamech* (Lc 3, 36), *Malelelow// *Malelel* (Lc 3, 37), *Matattjaszow// *Matattjasz* (Lc 3, 25), *Matuzalow// *Matuzala* (Lc 3, 37), *Melchin// *Melchi* (Lc 3, 28), *Meleow// *Melea* (Lc 3, 31),

²² The opposite situation – a gen. sg. form in *BT* versus a possessive adjective in *E*, e.g. *Dawida BT / z miasta Dawidowego E* (Lc 2, 4), *Cezara BT / z domu cesarskiego E* (Phil 4, 22) – appears occasionally.

²³ D. BIEŃKOWSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 30–41.

²⁴ Forms excerpted from marginal glosses are preceded with the sign *.

Menamow// **Menam* (Lc 3, 31), *Natanow*// **Natan* (Lc 3, 31), *Naggow*// **Nagge* (Lc 3, 25), *Nachorow*// **Nachor* (Lc 3, 34), *Naassonow*// **Naasson* (Lc 3, 32), *Naumow*// **Naum* (Lc 3, 25), *Obedow*// **Obed* (Lc 3, 32), *Pawłowy*// **Paweł* (1 Cor 16, 21), *Resyjow*// **Resyja* (Lc 3, 27), *Ragawow*// **Ragaw* (Lc 3, 35), *Semow*// **Sem* (Lc 3, 36), *Semein*// **Semej* (Lc 3, 26), *Symeonow*// *Symeon* (Lc 3, 30), *Setow*// **Set* (Lc 3, 38), *Saruchow*// **Saruch* (Lc 3, 35), *Tarzyn*// **Tarra* (Lc 3, 34), *Zorobabelow*// **Zorobabel* (Lc 3, 27), *W*: *Barachijaszowego* (G. m. sg.)// **Barachijasz* (Mt 23, 35). The second one, found more rarely, is the opposite situation – a name in the nom. sg. or (less frequently) in an oblique case is used in the main text, whereas a possessive adjective formed from it is noted in the margin, e.g. *Mu*: *Andrzej*// **Andrzejow* (Io 1, 44), *Helijasz*// **Helijaszowy* (Rom 11, 2), *Jozef*// **Jozefow* (Act 7, 14), *W*: *Bosor*// **Bozorow* (2Pe 2, 15).

The material depicted above was only found in two 16th-century translations. Numerous marginal glosses were used by the translator of the *Mu* text, based on the Greek original and its translation (*W*), whose base was the *Vulgate*²⁵. The translators' hesitation which can be observed here testifies not only to their philological training, but also to a high linguistic consciousness, which leaves its mark on the stylistic layer of the translation. The forms which got marginalised in the old texts provide a valuable source for understanding the philological techniques of the former Biblicalists. They show the process of looking for a compromise between the linguistic layer of the basis of the translation and the language of the translation itself.

The analysis of possessive adjectives in old and contemporary Polish translations of the *New Testament* leads to a number of conclusions of a linguistic and stylistic nature. It is worth repeating once again that Old Polish and Middle Polish translations abound in possessive derivatives, which was in accordance with the spirit of the Polish of those times. That adjectival attributes go out of use in the newer versions of the *New Testament* is a sign of the processes that are taking place in contemporary Polish.

It is instructive to analyse the category under discussion in a wider Slavic context. 15th-17th century Polish continued the state attested in the translations of the Biblical books into Old Church Slavonic. This can be demonstrated by even a cursory look at the lexicographical material. A wide range of examples belonging to the category of interest can be found there²⁶, e.g. *аврамовъ*//*авраамовъ*//*авраимль*, *адовъ*, *аполоновъ*, *аполлосовъ*//*аполосовъ*, *елмодановъ*, *еслимовъ*//*еслимль*, *еноховъ*, *иродидинъ*, *монсеровъ*//*мосеровъ*, *хрестосовъ*//*христосовъ*. The chief dis-

²⁵ Among the Polish linguists and biblical scholars the philological training of the translators of *Mu* and *W* is widely known and valued (cf. M. Kossowska, *Biblia w języku polskim*, vol. I-II, Poznań 1968–1969).

²⁶ Examples from: *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*, ed. J. Kurz, Z. Hauptová, vol. I-IV, Praha 1958–1997 as well as *Indeks a tergo do materiálův do slovníka I. I. Srezniewskiego*, ed. A. Obrębska-Jabłońska et al., Warszawa 1968.

crepancies between the Old Church Slavonic and Old Polish translations concern the use of different suffixes, e.g. *МЕЛЕАНЪНОВЪ* – *Melein*, *СТЕФАНИНОВЪ*//*СТЕФАНОВЪ* – *Stefanin*. That being said, disparities of this kind also exist among the particular Old and Middle Polish translations, e.g. *Semeiow*//*Semein*, *Stefanow*//*Stefanin*.

The use of deanthroponymic possessive adjectives influences the stylistic layer of the analysed texts, as it may evoke changes in the set of names used in particular texts²⁷. If we take a closer look at possessive adjectives in the corpus of 20th-century translations, we can notice how various methods of translation clash. On the one hand, using archaic derivatives may be a sign of deep respect for the tradition of translation; but if used too often, they show that the translator is enslaved by this tradition, as it is the case in *Db*. On the other hand, the non-use of adjectival possessive attributes testifies to the commendable process of modernization of the biblical language; however, it may turn out incompatible with the stylistic habits of the reader. Once again, translating biblical texts proves to be a challenging task: it is difficult to reach a compromise that would satisfy theologians, biblists, linguists and the remaining recipients.

Abstract: The study focused on possessive adjectives derived by means of the suffixes *-ow(y)*, *-in*, *-sk-* formed from proper personal names in old and contemporary translations of the *New Testament*. Adjectival derivatives have been excerpted from 15 full and 6 incomplete translations of the *New Testament*, which date back to the 16th, 17th and 20th century. These translations differ in methods of translation (loose and word-for-word; philological, interlinear, ecumenical, dynamic and artistic) and its basis (Greek original or Latin *Vulgate*). The comparative analysis of old and contemporary translations shows that possessive adjectives, though used frequently in former times, are now going out of use and the substantival genitival attribute is taking their place. This phenomenon is reflected in processes linked with the development of the Polish language. Moreover, tracking the use of the type of adjectives analysed can be used to distinguish various methods of translation. The use of possessive adjectives in contemporary texts suggests respect for the tradition of translation, whereas the failure to use them – the modernization of Polish.

Rafał Zarębski

Katedra Historii Języka Polskiego
Wydział Filologiczny
Uniwersytet Łódzki
al. Kościuszki 65
90–514 Łódź, Polska
rafzar@interia.pl

²⁷ Cf. O. ODELAIN, R. SEGUINEAU, *Dictionnaire des noms propres de la Bible*, Paris 1978.

Bogusław Andrzej Baczyński (Tarnów)
Małgorzata Baczyńska (Thessaloniki)

To Anna – A Wife and Mother

THE TESTAMENT DONATION OF KNYAZ FEDOR SANGUSZKO FOR THE MONASTERY OF ST. PAUL OF XEROPOTAMOU ON THE HOLY MOUNT ATHOS (9TH NOVEMBER 1547)

The aim of this article is to present several comments on the subject of the original Volhynian testament donation for the monastery of St. Paul of Xeropotamou on the Holy Mount Athos. The benefactor was knyaz Fedor Andreevič Sanguszko (Sanguškovič), marshall of the Volhynia, starosta of Volodymyr and Vinnytsia, who throughout his hard-working life gathered a great fortune in Volhynia¹, gaining royal recognition and high social status², and at the end of his life distributed his wealth, taking care to ensure financial security for his wife and children, as well as to provide for his body and soul after his death.

The Sanguszkos (initially also Sanguškoviče) were one of the twenty aristocratic Lithuanian families, which controlled thirty percent of the Grand Duchy's lands. The remaining area was owned by nineteen thousand minor boyars. The military review drawn up in 1528 gives a clear picture of the aristocratic dominance during the early years of knyaz Fedor's activity. The Sanguszko family was placed only at the 12th position, fielding 170 knights, from the 2720 farms they owned³. The first known document in which the financial matters of the Sanguszkos are present (in the person of knyaz Fedor's ancestor, father of Alexander, the progenitor of the Kamień Košyrski and Nesuchoeże branches of the family and Michał, the progenitor of the Kovel line) is the act of delimitation of his property Frol from

¹ A. JABŁONOWSKI, *Ziemia wołyńska w połowie XVI wieku (Monografia)*, [in:] *Rewizya zamków ziemi wołyńskiej w połowie XVI wieku*, ed. IDEM, Warszawa 1877, p. XCIV–XCV [= *Zródła dziejowe*, 6].

² *Ibidem*, p. XXV–XXVI: *According to the review of 1545, we have found the names of the chief Volodymyr notables of this period. From knyaz families: Sanguszkos, of Kovel and Košyr, from among the knyazes, and of whom Fedor Andreevič was the local starosta and the marshall of all of Volhynia; the Wiszniowiecki family – Alexander, the lease holder (dzierzawca) of Żečyca; the Czartoryski family; and the minor families, such as Porycki, Kurcewicz, Koziaka and Jerhowicki (or Rohowicki) of Horuv and Rużyn* (transl. M. Zytka).

³ *Пераніс войска Вялікага княства Літоўскага 1528 г.*, Мінск 2003; J. ОСИМАЊСКИ, *Historia Litwy*, Wrocław 1979, p. 106; Т. КЕМРА, *Dzieje rodu Ostrogskich*, Toruń 2003, p. 44.

Ostroh⁴, issued on the eve of the feast of Luke the Evangelist, on 17th of October 1423. The document is known from a transumpt of Władysław III from 1444, where it is mentioned. Further preserved documents from 15th and 16th centuries allow the recreation of the economic situation of the family and its ties to the royal court⁵.

On the 25th of September 1539, in Cracow, king Sigismund I confirmed for knyaz Fedor Andreevič Sanguszko, the marshall of Volhynia, the purchase of the village Chlapotyňa from knyaz Andrej Czetwertyński, and of the village Stawka from the Stawecki nobles⁶, and it is the last document related to transactions of knyaz Fedor. Afterwards, on 12th of April 1545, he appeared on the king's demand at the military review at the Volodymyr castle. Two and a half years later, on 9th of November 1547, he ordered his last will and testament to be written down. The original text in Ruthenian⁷ was published in Lviv in 1890 by Bronisław Gorczak⁸, the custodian of the Archive of Sanguszko Princes in Sławuta.

The testator entrusted his soul and body to God, the Mother of God and All Saints, and instructed to be buried in the Kiev Pečersk Lavra, with his ancestors. He entrusted the care for his wife and children to the Lithuanian magnates, Jan Hlebowicz (the voivode of Vilnius and Chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania), Mikołaj Radziwiłł the Black (marshall of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania), Ivan Hornostaj (the court marshall), Konstanty Vasyl Ostrogski (the voivode of Troki), brothers and relatives (among them to his nephews, Aleksander and Jan Fedorovič Czartoryski). He instructed his wife and children to donate in his name (listed in the will) the monastic foundations, among those – in the key passage that is of interest to us – to the Xeropotamou monastery of St. Paul on Mt. Athos⁹. It was to receive annually the sum of 600 Lithuanian groschen (*grosze*)¹⁰.

Such donation, although common among the Lithuanian-Ruthenian princes and nobility¹¹, who at that time were predominantly members of the Orthodox Church, is a phenomenon. The generous endowment of the Pečersk monastery, or of the Orthodox cathedrals in Vilnius and Brest are not surprising, nor are the donations to the monasteries and churches on the Sanguszko ancestral lands, nor even the large sum that the testator left for finishing the construction of the monastery of St. Nicholas in Mielce, which he founded (just as his relative, Michał

⁴ B. GORCZAK, *Katalog pergaminów znajdujących się w Archiwum X.X. Sanguszków w Sławucie*, 61, Sławuta 1912, p. 32–33 (cetera: B. GORCZAK, *Katalog pergaminów*).

⁵ B. GORCZAK, *Katalog pergaminów...*, 89, p. 46–47; 91, p. 47–48; 104, p. 53–54; 159 and 160, p. 77; 179 and 180, p. 85–86; 202, p. 95–96.

⁶ B. GORCZAK, *Katalog pergaminów...*, 202, p. 95–96.

⁷ A. JABŁONOWSKI, *Przedmowa*, [in:] *Rewizya zamków...*, p. III.

⁸ *L. cit.*

⁹ B. GORCZAK, *Archiwum...*, p. 564.

¹⁰ 1 Lithuanian groschen (Lith. *grašis*, Rus. *groš*) = 1,25 of Polish groschen (Pol. *grosz*) (ca. 2,5 g); cf. J.A. SZWAGRZYK, *Pieniądz na ziemiach polskich X–XX w.*, Wrocław 1973.

¹¹ On the subject of Old Polish wills cf. B. POPIOŁEK, *Woli mojej ostatniej Testament ten... Testamenty staropolskie jako źródło do historii mentalności XVII i XVIII wieku*, Kraków 2009, *passim*, esp. p. 13–30.

Bohusz Bohowitynowicz, did)¹². What is astonishing is the attention devoted to the monastery of St. Paul¹³, located so far away from the ancestral Volhynia. It was, similarly to other monasteries on Mt. Athos, for two centuries under the patronage of Serbian rulers, and within their sphere of interest, which found its apogee in the capture of the peninsula by Stephen Dušan in 1345. This patronage was not eliminated by the peninsula's subsequent recapture by the Byzantine Empire. As it is known, donations to Mt. Athos, based on similar activities of the Byzantine emperors, became with time a typical example of the Serbian rulers' piety, both in the Nemanjić family as well as later, which is important in the context of the will discussed here, their heirs, in time only titular, the Branković family. Similarly, many of the Danubian princes were benefactors of monasteries, among them that of St. Paul of Xeropotamou, which did not change after the fall of Byzantium and under Turkish rule.

The key, as we think, to solving the mystery of the will donation, is the person of Hanna (Ganna – in the original will), the wife of knyaz Fedor Andreevič. She was most likely the daughter of the titular despot of Serbia during 1496–1502, John (Jovan) Branković¹⁴, who passed away on 10th of December 1502. From this it would follow that Anna's birth should be dated to before 1502. The title of despot John Branković received from Vladislav II, the king of Hungary. He was the last Serbian ruler from the Branković family, and a continuator of the traditional patronage of the Serbian rulers over monasteries, including the one of St. Paul of Xeropotamou on the Holy Mount Athos. In 1505 he was created a saint, under the name of Despot John. Let us add, that the mother of Hanna/Anna, Jelena Jakšić¹⁵, called „Helena despotissa” came from a similarly noble family. Anna had four siblings – sisters: Milica, married to the Voivode of Wallachia, Neago-e Basarab; Maria, married to Ferdinand Frangepan; Helena, married to prince

¹² Cf. e.g. the testament of Ivan Hornostaj with quite similar list of monasteries and churches (including Vilnius, Kiev, Lutsk, Brest', but also Židičín, Zimne, Volodymyr Volynsky) – Н. СЛЕЖ, *Сям'я Івана Гарнастая, падскарбія ВКЛ*, БГЗ 38, 2012, p. 34–36.

¹³ On the subject of this monastery see e.g.: S. BINON, *Les origines légendaires et l'histoire de Xéropotamou et de Saint-Paul de l'Athos*, Louvain 1942; M. SKOWRONEK, *Przyczynek do historii biblioteki klasztoru Świętego Pawła na Górze Athos*, [in:] *Święta Góra Athos w kulturze Europy, Europa w kulturze Athosu*, ed. M. KUCZYŃSKA, Gniezno 2009, p. 222–230.

¹⁴ Such filiation was proposed by T. WASILEWSKI, *Przyczynki źródłowe do stosunków Polski ze Słowiańszczyzną południową w wiekach XIII–XVI*, SŻ 8, 1963, p. 120–123. It was, one should add, questioned more recently. It is possible that Hanna was the daughter of Helena Jakšić from her second marriage, with Ivaniš Berislavić (I. CZAMAŃSKA, *Wiśniowieccy. Monografia rodu*, Poznań 2007, p. 42; Z. ANUSIK, *O księżętach Wiśniowieckich i czasach, w których żyli. Suplement do monografii rodu*, PNH 8.2, 2009, p. 163–165) and was born after 1502. In the context of the matter discussed here it does not make much difference, since either way she was brought up in an environment in which the ties with Mt. Athos were strong.

¹⁵ T. WASILEWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 120–123. It is worth noting that she had ties to Mt. Athos as well. Cf. K. MITROVIĆ, *Povelja despotice Jelene Jakšić manastiru Hilandaru*, CCA 7, 2008, p. 195–203.

of Moldavia, Peter IV Rareș; and Magdalena (Maria Magdalena), from ca. 1538 the second wife of knyaz Iwan Wiśniowiecki (d. 1542)¹⁶. Anna's paternal grandparents were: Stefan Branković, called the Blind, the transitory despot of Serbia during 1458–1459 and also a benefactor of the monasteries on Mt. Athos, and Angelina Arianites. Hanna, we may presume, fully felt herself to be a continuator of the great traditions of her Balkan ancestors. After Fedor Andreevič's death she married once more, to the starosta of Krzemieniec (Kremenec), Mikołaj Zbaraski. She died in 1579. She had six children from her marriage with knyaz Sanguszko: Dymitr (Dmitri), Andrzej (Andrej), Roman, Jarosław, Fiodor (Fedor) and Magdalena (Maria Magdalena)¹⁷. The date of Fedor and Anna's wedding remains unknown. However, because their oldest son Dymitr was born ca. 1530, the marriage should also be dated to this period. It needs to be emphasized that in the *Archiwum ksiąg Sanguszków w Sławucie*, over ten documents from the 1549–1570 period are listed, showing legal disputes surrounding the assets left by Fedor, in which Anna Despotissa is one of the parties, often admonished by the king, against her children from the first marriage¹⁸. Although the above documents show the knyaginya's activity, preserved and documented only under her name from the second marriage¹⁹, with the exception of the will of Fedor Sanguszko, they do simultaneously present her character. Anna appears to have been a strong personality²⁰, occasionally acting with disregard for the interests even of her own children. The death of her two sons, in tragic circumstances and at a relatively young age, certainly did not bring her any joy. Dymitr (1530–1554) in particular went down in history, due to the consequences of forcing Elżbieta (Halszka) of Ostrog to marriage (1553). This deed caused infamy and necessitated fleeing abroad. Dymitr's life ended soon afterwards, in Jaroměř, where he was killed by Marcin Zborowski²¹.

¹⁶ W. DWORZACZEK, *Genealogia*, Warszawa 1959, vol. II, *Tablice*, tabl. 87, 88, 176. On the subject of Ivan Wiśniowiecki see I. CZAMAŃSKA, *op. cit.*, s. 37sq; Z. ANUSIK, *op. cit.*, p. 156sq. Magdalena, similarly to Hanna, may have been a daughter of Jelena Jaksić from her second marriage. It may be useful to mention that Anna Glińska, Jelena Jaksić's sister, was grandmother of Ivan IV the Terrible.

¹⁷ M. MACHYNIA, *Sanguszko Fiodor*, [in:] *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (cetera: *PSB*), vol. XXXIV, p. 480–482, where older suppositions regarding Anna's origins can be found; J. HAWRYLUK, *Księżęta Sanguszkowie na wołyńskich i podlaskich włościach*, HBH, 2007, fasc. 5(93), p. 29.

¹⁸ *Archiwum Ksiąg Sanguszków w Sławucie*, documents dated: 19 V 1549 (vol. VI, LVIII, p. 93–94); 5 XI 1552 (vol. VI, XC, p. 130); 7 XI 1552 (vol. VI, XCI, p. 131); 7 XI 1552 (vol. VI, XCII p. 131–132); 12 XI 1552 (vol. VI, XCIII, p. 132–133); 6 III 1553 (vol. VI, XCVI, p. 136–137); 6 III 1553 (vol. VI, XCVII, p. 137–138); 10 III 1553 (vol. VI, XCVIII, p. 138–139); 9 V 1554 (vol. VI, CXVII, p. 218); 3 III 1557 (vol. VI, CXIX, p. 219); 23 I 1562 (vol. VI, CXXII, p. 222); 23 I 1562 (vol. VI, CXXIII p. 223); 1 XI 1570 (vol. VI, XLVIII, p. 68–69).

¹⁹ T. WASILEWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 120–123.

²⁰ W. ŁOZIŃSKI, *Prawem i lewem. Obyczaje na Czerwonej Rusi w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku*, ed. J. TAZ-BIR, Warszawa 2005.

²¹ On the subject of the marriage of Dymitr and Halszka and the tragic end of her life cf.: S. ZAGÓRSKA, *Halszka z Ostroga. Między faktami a mitami*, Warszawa 2006, p. 30sq. See also M. MACHYNIA, *Sanguszko (Sanguszkowicz) Dymitr*, [in:] *PSB*, vol. XXXIV, p. 471–473.

The will donation of Fedor Sanguszko to the Holy Mount Athos, originating from Volhynia, which at that time was still a part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is, according to our knowledge, the first of its kind. We do not, however, know whether this part of the will was fulfilled, and whether the donation was used. Our attempts at obtaining such information did not bring results²².

Regarding the matter of using Fedor Andreevič Sanguszko's foundation, it would be tempting to postulate that the money from the donation was used to fund the frescoes in the chapel of St. George, in the monastery of St. Paul, in 1555²³. It is, however, impossible to say whether they were created by Theophanis Strelitzas known as Theophanes of Crete, himself – the artist who gave the Cretan, spiritualised school of iconography its classical form – or his sons, who were taught icon writing by their father. This school, much like its predecessor, known as Macedonian school, is considered to be more realistic, it does not use *podlinniki* that may be found in Rus. Athos would have been the next stop for the painter who, prior to the arrival on the Holy Mountain with his two son from Heraklion, already adorned with frescoes the monastery of St. Nicholas Anapafsas in Meteora, among which he created the Transfiguration and the Denial of St. Peter. In 1535 he adorned Monastery of Lavra, and in 1545 with his son painted the interior of the Stavronikita monastery, where in 1546 he created the famous Icon of Christ the Pantokrator. Afterwards he did not leave the Holy Mountain until 1558 or early 1559; shortly prior to his death he returned to Crete, where he passed away²⁴. In the present state of knowledge, to verify our assumptions seems, alas, beyond our reach.

Translated by Michał Zytka

Bogusław Andrzej Baczyński
Małgorzata Baczyńska
ul. Romanowicza 38 B/2
33–100 Tarnów, Polska
baczyn@op.pl

²² Thanks to the kindness of Fadon Chatziantoniou we were able to contact father Nikodimos Agi-opavlidis, who is responsible for the matters of historical heritage in the monastery of St. Paul of Xeropotamou (24th of April 2013). It turned out, however, that there is no knowledge of the donation at the monastery, and the documents confirming it have most likely not survived, despite the fact that the monastery's library contains 494 manuscripts and approximately 12 500 books (I. TAVLAKIS, *Monastery of Agios Pavlos*, <http://www.macedonian-heritage.gr/Athos/Monastery/Agios%20Pavlos.html>).

²³ I. TAVLAKIS, *Monastery of Agios Pavlos: The monastery has 12 chapels, of which the most important one is that of St. George, with Cretan school frescoes from 1555*. The justification for our proposal we intend to present elsewhere.

²⁴ On the subject of Theophanes and his works see, i.a.: M. CHATZIDAKIS, *Recherches sur le peintre Theophane, le Cretois*, DOP 23/24, 1969/1970, p. 309–352; M. Χατζηδάκης, *Ο κρητικός ζωγράφος Θεοφάνης. Η τελευταία φάση της τέχνης του στις οιχογραφίες της Ιεράς Μονής Σταυρονικήτα*, Mount Athos 1986.

1. Во имя святых, живоначальных и неразделимых Троица, Отца и Сына и святого Духа, аминь. Я раб Божии, князь Федор Янъдреевич Сонкѣвшковича чиню сию дѣловнищѣ в доброй памяти и в целом розвѣмѣ. Наипервей дѣшѣ мою и тело мое грешное полежаю милостивомѣ Богѣ и пречистои Его Матери и всимъ святымъ его, а тело мое маетъ быти положено в Печерскомѣ монастыри, в Святое Пречистое в Києве с предки мои. 2. Я при томъ прошѣ и полежаю в опеку жонѣ и дети мои Его Милости, панѣ Янѣ Юревичѣ Глебовича, воеводе Виленскомѣ, канцлерѣ великого князѣства Литовского, а Его Милости, панѣ Миколаю Радивилѣ, маршалкѣ земѣтскомѣ великого князѣства Литовского; а Его Милости, панѣ Иванѣ Горностаю, маршалкѣ дворномѣ, а брати мои, кровнымъ моимъ, Его Милости князю Василию Костентиновичѣ Шетрозкомѣ, воеводичѣ Троцкомѣ, а сестренцомъ моимъ, князю Александрѣ и князю Иванѣ Федоровичомъ Чорторыскимъ. 3. Я по дѣши мое жона и дети мои мають дати на вечныи сороковецѣ: до монастыра святое Пречистое Печерского в Києве пѣтдесѣт коп грошей Литовскихѣхъ, а на церковъ соборнѣю святого Софѣа, Премѣдрости Божии в Києве десѣт коп грошей, а на монастыръ святого Николы Пвстынского двадцѣть коп грошей, а на два монастыри святого Михаила Выдвѣицького, а на святого Михаила золотоверхого десѣт коп грошей, а на церковъ соборнѣю святое Пречистое в мѣсте Виленскомъ десѣт коп грошей, а на монастыръ святое Троицы в мѣсте Виленскомъ десѣт коп грошей, а на монастыръ Свѣспальскѣи десѣт коп грошей, а на церковъ соборнѣю святого Николы в Берестѣи десѣт коп грошей, а на церковъ соборнѣю святое Пречистое в Володимѣри десѣт коп грошей, а на монастыръ святое Пречистое в Зѣанѣ десѣт коп грошей, а на церковъ соборнѣю святого Ивана Богѣслова в замкѣ, в Лвцкѣ, десѣт коп грошей, а на монастыръ святого Николы в Жидичинѣ десѣт коп грошей, а на монастыръ святого Спаса в Володимѣри двадцѣть коп грошей, а на монастыръ святого Михаила в Володимѣри пѣт коп грошей, а до церкви святого Федора в Володимѣри пѣть копѣ грошей, а до церкви святыхъ правѣдныхъ Иовакима и Янны в замѣкѣ, в Володимѣри, пѣт коп грошей, а на монастыръ святого Николы в Блаженѣкѣ двѣ копѣ грошей, а на церковъ соборнѣю святого тридневного Воскресѣния Христова в Несѣхожахъ десѣт коп грошей, а до монастыра святое Пречистое в Загоровѣ десѣт коп грошей, а на монастыръ святого Николы в Мѣльцохъ десѣт коп грошей. Я къ томѣ по церквамъ в мѣсте Володимѣрскомѣ и по всимъ церквамъ, которые сѣть по всимъ именамъ моимъ, на тѣе ма быт дано две копѣ грошей. 5. Я при томъ теж, што если шѣцѣль до шѣраза намѣстныхъ иконы Успенѣа святое Пречистое в Печерскомѣ монастыри в Києве на шкованѣ ланцѣхъ мои золотыи, в которомъ двѣстѣ золотыхъ черленыхъ, тотъ ланцѣхъ там на то ма быти шѣдан и тымъ ланцѣхомъ тотѣ шѣразъ ма быт шкован. Я што сѣ тѣкнетъ монастыра святого Николы в Мѣльцохъ, в недобѣдовани церкви мѣрѣ и в недостаткѣ святостѣи, шѣразовѣ, книгъ и ризъ и иншихъ потребъ церковныхъ, тоѣ все водѣмъ потреби жона и дети мои зо всихъ именѣи моихъ къ той церкви мають справит. 6. Я при томъ я видѣчи доброе, а цнотливое захованѣ жоны своѣи къ себѣ, княгинѣи Ганны Деспотовны, записѣю еи, жонѣ своѣи,

всѣхъ имененъ монахъ, што ихъ колвекъ есть ѡтчизныхъ, выслѣженыхъ и кѣпленыхъ, третью часть на вѣчность: **Мает** она тѣю третью часть держати и вживати воде воли своее, она бѣдетъ она тѣю третью часть продати и замѣнати и на церковѣ ѡтписати и по своемъ животѣ кому хочет, томъ изъ ласьки своеи она записати, а дѣти мои и некоторые крѣвныи, близкии мои не мають ее с тое третее части рѣшати. **7.** Къ томъ тежъ записью еи, жонѣ своеи, княгини Ганнѣ Дѣспотовни шестьсотъ коп грошей Литовскихъ и сто гривенъ сребра роуленого ис позлотою на вѣчность, на имѣни своемъ Поворскѣ. Я которыи попелъ жона моя, княгиня Ганна Деспотовна, казала за свои гроши палити, в тотъ попелъ не мають сѣ дѣти мои встѣпати, але она продавши и на свои пожитокъ маетъ шѣрнѣти. Я при томъ тежъ записью дочце своеи, княжне Федорѣ, абы еи зо всѣхъ троухъ частей имѣненъ монахъ вѣна тисѣча коп грошей Литовскихъ выдана была, а дочце моеи меншеи, княжне Марине, на всѣхъ троухъ частехъ имѣненъ монахъ записью тисѣчъ коп грошей Литовскихъ, а сребро мое все ѡтписью дочце моеи, княжне Федорѣ, полѣмиски и тарели, кѣбеки и лыжки серебряныи, шаты, двѣ шѣбы ѡдамашковыхъ чирвоныхъ, кѣницами подбитыхъ, а шѣвъ ѡксамитнѣю, чорнѣю, кѣницами подбитѣю, а сѣкню чирвоною, ѡдамашковѣю, запоны и коберцы, штѣки ѡдамашковые, не краеные, тѣе княжне Федорѣ мають быти. **8.** Я сынъ моеи, князю Дмитрию, ѡтписью шѣвъ соболу, ѡдамашкою крита, аведѣти гнѣдыи, зѣроа сребренаа на кон, ѡзда, поперсины, похвы, саблѣ сребромъ ѡправенаа, што ѡтъ Угриновского, кофтан ѡдамашковыи, чирвоныи, з ыншими шатами князю Дмитрию, а зѣроа, бѣхтеры, панцыри, тое сынъ мой, князь Дмитрей, посполъ изъ сынами моиими, братѣю своею, княземъ Яндрѣемъ, княземъ Романомъ, княземъ Ярославомъ на ровныи части маетъ поделити. Я привила, или листы на вси имена мои, тѣе в заховани в жоны моеи, княгини Ганны и в сына моего, князя Дмитрея мають быти, нижли еслибы сѣ сынове мои межки собою поделали, а кому з нихъ которые сѣ имена зостанѣт, на тѣе имена мають они привила и листы себе побрати. **9.** Къ томъ тежъ наливки мои серебряныи, меншии и дванадцѣ тареленъ серебряныхъ, старыхъ до монастыра Мелецкого на потребы церковныи, на крестъ, на келехи, на кадилицы и на иншии потребы церковныи мають даны быти, а до церкви соборное в замкѣ, в Несвѣжежахъ, триднѣвного Воскресѣна Христова два полѣмиски серебряныхъ мають даны быти. Што тежъ если до монастыра свѣтого Павла, которыи есть в свѣтой Горѣ, надалѣ в кождынъ рокъ по десѣти коп грошей, тѣю десѣти коп грошей абы жона и дѣти мои на тотъ монастыръ давали. Я што предковѣ мои и я надали на монастыръ свѣтого Николы в Мелцохъ село Головево, село Комарово, село Сыново, село Ковали, два дворы: Песочно и Задыбы с пашнами и з млынами, тое вѣчне и непорѣшне къ томъ монастырѣ записью, того жона и дѣти мои и некоторые потомки мои не мають ѡтнимати. **10.** Я што тежъ предковѣ мои, ѡтецъ мой и а, надали на церковѣ соборнѣю Воскресѣна Христова в Несвѣжежахъ село Дороготѣши, тое село ѡтъ тое церкви не маетъ быти ѡтдалено. И на иншии церкви по всимъ именамъ моимъ, што бѣдетъ еце за предковъ монахъ и я надалъ, якъ люди, такъ земли бортное, полъ и сеножатенъ

и иншихъ рѣхомыхъ речен, тые вси речи, якъ ѡт монастырѣ Мелецкогѣ, так и ѡт иншихъ церкви надана моего, абы ничего не порѣшено. 11. Я што сѣ дотычетъ долговъ моихъ, коимъ есмь виненъ: Архимандритѣ Менскомъ, Софронію триста золотыхъ черленыхъ, а Якимъ Голатинскомъ пятдесятъ коп грошей Литовскихъ, а двомъ дочкамъ Яндриаса Янчинскогѣ по двадцати коп грошей Литовскихъ, а Гневомъ Грицковичъ Ставецкомъ двадцатъ коп грошей Литовскихъ, а двомъ дѣвкамъ Томиловнамъ полчетвертадесатъ коп грошей Литовскихъ, тыи долги жѣна и дѣти мои зо всихъ трѣхъ частей моихъ, абы заплатили, абы того ничего на мои дѣши не залегло. 12. Я то я записью подъ клятвою свѣатыхъ ѡтецъ триста и ѡсемь на десѣт, иже въ Никеи. Къ которомъжъ тѣстаментамъ для твердости, я свою печатъ приложити казалъ. Я при томъ были: Сго Милость ѡтецъ Генадии, владыка Володимирскіи и Берестейскіи, а сестра моя, пани Богъшова Боговитиновича, подскарбина земская, пани Федора Яндреевна, а панъ Тихонъ Киселъ, а панъ Петръ Калвсовскіи. Гдѣжъ Ихъ Милость за жаданемъ моимъ и свои печати приложили къ семъ моимъ тѣстаментамъ. Писанъ въ Володимери подъ леты Божего Нарожена а̄. ф̄. м̄. ѓ̄. Месеца ноябра ѡ. денъ, индикта ѓ̄.

Reprinted from editio princeps: Archiwum książąt Sanguszków w Sławucie, vol. IV, ed. B. Gorczak, 1535–1547, Lwów 1890, p. 562–565, with internal divisions introduced in the present edition (abbreviations and sigla as resolved by B. Gorczak).
Original MS in: Archiwum Narodowe w Krakowie, Oddział I - Zamek Wawel, Archiwum Sanguszków, ASŁS ang. Per 242 (size 541 x 450 mm).

Testament of knyaz Fedor Andreevič Sanguszko(vič)

1. In the name of the Holy and indivisible Trinity that is the beginning of life, Father, and Son and the Holy Spirit, amen. I, a servant of God, knyaz Fedor Andreevič Sonkguškovič hereby write this last will and testament, with good memory and whole¹ mind. First and foremost I entrust my soul and my sinful body to the merciful God and His Most Pure Mother and to all of His saints, and thus my body is to be laid in the Pečersk monastery, at the Holy Most Pure² in Kiev, next to my ancestors. 2. At the same time I ask and entrust the care of my wife and my children to His Grace, lord Jan Jurevič Glebovič³, voivode of Vilnius, chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, to His Grace lord Mikolaj Radiwil⁴, land marshall of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, to His Grace Ivan Gornostaj⁵, marshall of the court, to my brothers, my relatives, His Grace knyaz Vasil Kostentinovič Ostrozki⁶,

¹ I.e. 'clear, lucid, sane'.

² *Svjata(ja) Prečista(ja)*, i.e. the Mother of God. The Pečersk Lavra in Kiev was supported already by the knyaz's father, Andrej Aleksandrovič Sanguszko(vič), who was eventually laid to rest there.

³ Jan Jurevič Hlebowicz (Glebovič) – son of the Smolensk voivode, Jerzy Hlebowicz. He owed his career to queen Bona; he was the chief opponent of the Radziwil family in Lithuania. He was the voivode of Vitebsk since 1528, of Polotsk since 1532, of Vilnius since 1542, and Grand Chancellor of Lithuania since 1546; a first-rate diplomat, he was frequently an envoy to Moscow. He died in 1549.

⁴ Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwil (Radivil) called Czarny (the Black) – creator of the family's might, land marshall of Lithuania since 1544, Grand Marshall of Lithuania and Grand Chancellor of Lithuania since 1550, voivode of Vilnius since 1551. Received a ducal title from the emperor in 1547; supporter and propagator of Calvinism and Arianism (antitrinitarianism) in the Republic. An opponent of a closer union of Lithuania with the Crown, his influence on the king diminished near the end of his life. Died in 1565.

⁵ Ivan Ostafijevič Hornostaj (Gornostaj) – from a Kievian noble family, *hospodarski* (court) marshall since 1529 and simultaneously, from 1530, land treasurer; since 1538 an administrator of the Troki voivodeship, since 1549 of Vilnius voivodeship, he became a voivode of Nowogródek (Navharudak) in 1551. Trusted by both Sigismunds, an able administrator. Died in 1558.

⁶ Konstanty Vasyl (Konstantinovič) Ostrogski – starosta of Volodymyr (Volynsky) and marshall of Volhynia since 1550, voivode of Kiev since 1559, one of the mightier Lithuanian lords during the second half of 16th century. Protector of the Orthodox Christianity in the Republic, founder (ca. 1580) of the Ostroh Academy and a printing press (where, among others, the so-called Ostroh Bible was published); an opponent of the Union of Brest. Loyal towards Sigismund II Augustus, maintained good relations with Jan Zamoyski, exerted considerable influence on Polish politics since the Union of Lublin. Died in 1608.

Fedor Sanguszko has always been related to the Ostrogscy knyazes, as his mother, Maria, came from that family; she was the daughter of Ivan, sister of Konstanty Ivanovič and an aunt of Konstanty Vasyl. Fedor's father administered the Ostrogski estate during 1500–1507. Fedor himself took part in fighting the Tartars, under the command of Konstanty Ivanovič Ostrogski in 1527, and in 1537 under the command of Ilia (Elias) Ostrogski, who was Konstanty Vasyl's half-brother. After Ilia's death, Fedor became one of the commissioners overseeing the division of his estate between his daughter Elizabeth (Halszka) and Konstanty Vasyl.

voivodits⁷ of Troki, to my nephews, knyaz Aleksander and knyaz Ivan Fedorovič Čortoryski⁸. 3. And for my soul, my wife and children are to donate for eternal *sorokoust'*⁹; for the Pečersk monastery of the Holy Most Pure in Kiev, 50 threescore Lithuanian groschen¹⁰, and for the cathedral church of Saint Sophia, of Divine Wisdom in Kiev¹¹ – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen¹², and for the Saint Nicholas Pustynnyi Monastery¹³ – 20 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the two monasteries, Saint Michael Vydubič'ki Monastery¹⁴ and Saint Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery¹⁵ – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the cathedral church of the Holy Most Pure¹⁶ in the city of Vilnius – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the monastery of Holy Trinity¹⁷ in the city of Vilnius – 10 threescore Lithu-

⁷ Voivodits (Pol. *województwo*, Lat. *palatinida*) 'son of a voivode'; Konstanty Vasył Ostrogski was a son of Konstanty Ivanovič, the Grand Hetman of Lithuania, castellan of Vilnius, voivode of Troki. While the title of voivodits did not officially guarantee that he would take over the voivodship after his father, it was nonetheless a common practice, and the voivode families constituted the most important group of the Polish and Lithuanian-Ruthenian aristocracy.

⁸ Aleksander Fedorovič and Ivan Fedorovič Czartoryscy – the sons of Fedor (Fiodor) Michałovič Czartoryski and a daughter (name unknown) of Andrej Aleksandrovič Sanguszko(vič), the sister of Fedor. Andrej Sanguszko and Fedor Czartoryski were involved in lengthy litigations over incomes from the Lutsk *starostwo* (1523, 1525–1526, 1530). Aleksander Fedorovič was an able commander, fighting the Tartars during Sigismund I's reign, since 1542 no longer in active duty. He was the *starosta* of Volodymyr since 1554, and from 1566 he was the first voivode of the newly created Volhynian voivodeship. He died in 1571. Ivan Fedorovič, married to Anna Zaslavska (Zasławska), died in 1566/1567, he was the ancestor of both of the main lines of the Czartoryski family, i.e. Korets (*korecka*) and Klevan (*klewańska*) lines.

⁹ *Sorokoust'* – Pol. *Czterdzieścina*, Bel. *Саракавіны*, a prayer or a common reading of the Psalter for the soul of the deceased, held for forty days after death.

¹⁰ 50 threescore Lithuanian groschen – i.e. 3000 Lith. gr. [50 x 60; threescore (Pol./Ruth. sing. *kopa*, pl. *kopy*) being conventional amount in transactions]. Cf. an. 10 in our article above.

¹¹ Saint Sophia's (Holy Wisdom) Cathedral of Kiev – one of the oldest and the most important temples of the Kievan Rus, a burial place of the Kievan great princes. Dated to the 11th century (1017 or 1037), rebuilt multiple times, during the mid-16th century in considerable disrepair.

¹² Here and below: 600 Lith. gr.

¹³ Saint Nicholas Pustynnyi Monastery – one of the oldest monasteries of Kiev, founded perhaps by knyaz Mstislav Vladimirovič in 1113, built on the slope of the hill near Dneper. From 17th cent. known also as the Little Nicholas Monastery or Slupskiy ('of the Pillar').

¹⁴ Saint Michael Vydubits'ki (*Видубицький*) Monastery – monastery located on the shore of the river Dneper, founded by the Vsevolod Jaroslavič, the grand duke of Kiev, later associated with duke Vladimir Monomakh and his family; one of the centres of intellectual life in Kiev during mediaeval times.

¹⁵ Saint Michael's Golden-Domed (*Золотоверхий*) Monastery – the first temple in this place in Kiev, associated previously with the family of Duke Sviatopolk II Izjaslavič, was destroyed by Tartars in 1240; the worship was renewed in 1496, and the temple was considerably expanded and decorated throughout the 16th century.

¹⁶ The Cathedral of Vilnius – built on the orders of the Grand Duke Algirdas (Algirdas) in 1346–1348, in the still non-Christian Lithuania. After its dome collapsed in 1506, the cathedral church in Vilnius was rebuilt, with royal permission, by Konstanty Ivanovič Ostrogski, brother of Fedor Andreevič's mother.

¹⁷ Monastery of Holy Trinity in Vilnius – the first wooden temple was constructed thanks to the initiative of the wife of the Grand Duke Algirdas (Algirdas), Julianna of Tver (the mother of Vladislas II

anian groschen, and for the monastery in Suprasl¹⁸ – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the cathedral church of Saint Nicholas in Berest¹⁹ – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the cathedral church of the Holy Most Pure in Volodymer²⁰ – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, 4. and for the Monastery of the Holy Most Pure in Zemne²¹ – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the cathedral church of Saint John the Theologian in the castle in Luck²² – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the monastery of Saint Nicholas in Židičín²³ – 10 threescore

Jagiełło) during the mid-14th century; subsequently, a monastery was created there. The right to build a brick wall in place of the wooden one was granted with a royal privilege of Sigismund I to Konstanty Ivanovič Ostrogski, father of Konstanty Vasył and uncle of Fedor Sanguszko, after the battle of Orša in 1514.

¹⁸ Suprasl (Pol. Supraśl) – city in Podlasie in Poland, in the vicinity of the Knyszyn Forest, since 1501 the location of the developed over time monastery of the Annunciation and Saint John the Theologian, founded by the Nowogródek (Navharudak) voivode Aleksander Chodkiewicz with the permission royal permission of Alexander I and Sigismund I, and of the patriarch of Constantinople Joachim I. Centre of book copying, and the place where the *Codex Suprasliensis* was discovered.

¹⁹ Brest (Berest'e, Pol. Brześć Litewski, Brześć nad Bugiem) – Belarusian city upon the river Bug, close to the present Polish border, of historical importance as the seat of a *starostwo*, and subsequently a voivodeship, and the place of many congresses and meetings of the Commonwealth's *sejm*. The castle and *starostwo* of Brest was bought from the widow of Aleksander Januszowicz by the father of Fedor, knyaz Andrej Aleksandrovič Sanguszko(vič) in 1508.

Church of Saint Nicholas – originally gothic, from 14th century. The place of signing of the Union of Brest in 1596.

²⁰ Volodymyr Volynsky (Pol. Włodzimierz Wołyński, Ruth. Володимир Волинський), the capital of one of the dukes from the Rurik dynasty, and one of the political centres of Volhynia. The estates of Sanguszko family were in large part located near Volodymyr, and the family itself had strong ties with that city, which can be attested by the number of times it is mentioned in this will. Andrej Aleksandrovič Sanguszko was a *starosta* of Volodymyr since 1507/1508.

The cathedral church of the Holy Most Pure in Volodymyr (or rather of the Assumption), founded by prince Mstislav Izjaslavič in the middle of the 12th cent., remained the most important church of the city, almost untouched during the Tartar attacks in the 13th and 14th cent. The burial place of the princes of Volhynia.

²¹ Zimne/Zymne (Ukr. Зимне, Pol. also *Zimno*) – a village upon the river Luh (Pol. Ług), 5 km to the south of the Volodymyr Volynsky. The Assumption Monastery at the Holy Mountain in Zimne (Ukr. Зимненський Свято-Успенський Святогорський монастир) and the cathedral with the churches of the Holy Trinity, St. Julianna and St. Barlaam, is perhaps the oldest monastery complex in Volhynia. In 1495 a new, brick cathedral church was founded by Fiodor Michalovič Czartoryski. The place of burial of the Czartoryski, Czetwertyński, Kozieka and other families.

²² Lutsk (Pol. Łuck) – one of the *sejm* cities of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the seat of the *starosta* of Lutsk; this function was performed by the Sanguszko and Czartoryski families during the 16th century (i.a. since 1522 by Fiodor Michalovič Czartoryski, since 1542 by Andrzej Sanguszko(vič) Koszyrski).

The church of Saint John the Theologian – the Orthodox cathedral of Lutsk, built within the upper castle, was a family temple of the Jaroslavič branch of the Rurikids with the status of the cathedral since at least the late 13th cent.

²³ Židičín (Pol. Żydyczyn, Ukr. Жидичин) – a village in Ukraine (Kivercivskyi Rajon) upon the Styr river, to the north of Lutsk, with a monastery built at the latest at the beginning of the 13th century, destroyed by the Tartars in 1496, subsequently rebuilt and provided with considerable land dona-

Lithuanian groschen, and for the monastery of the Holy Saviour in Volodimer²⁴ – 20 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the monastery of Saint Michael in Volodimer²⁵ – 5 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the church of Saint Theodore in Volodimer²⁶ – 5 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the church of the Holy Pious Joachim and Anna in the castle in Volodimer²⁷ – 5 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the monastery of Saint Nicholas in Błażenik²⁸ – 2 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the cathedral church of the Holy Resurrection of Christ in Nesuchoże²⁹ – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the monastery of the Holy Most Pure in Zagorov³⁰ – 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and for the monastery of Saint Nicholas in Mielce³¹ – 10 threescore Lithuanian gro-

tions by Styr. The monastery of Saint Nicholas in Židičín was linked since 1507 (i.e. Sigismund I's donation) with the Ostrogski family (it was Konstanty Iwanovič, the father of Konstanty Vasyl and uncle (mother's brother) of Fedor Sanguszko who received it at that time, along with the rights to patronage).

²⁴ The Holy Saviour, i.e. Christ as *Salvator, Spas*. The village Janowiec was legally attached to the monastery. Cf. an. 20.

²⁵ The monastery of Saint Michael in Volodymyr – the first mention of the temple comes from 13th century; it still existed in 1621, and subsequently declined. The privileges and rights associated with the monastery were equally divided between Andrej Aleksandrovič (Fedor's father) and Andrej Michaiłovič Sanguszko.

²⁶ The church of Saint Theodore in Volodymyr – one of the minor churches in Volodymyr Volynsky, in decline at the time, fell into ruin by the end of 17th century.

²⁷ The church of the Holy Pious Joachim and Anna in the castle of Volodymyr – the church mentioned in *Ipatievskaja letopis'* (1291), fell into ruin most likely by the end of 16th century. It should not be mistaken with a later Catholic church of the same name.

²⁸ The village Błażenik (Błażeniki), located north of the Volodymyr Volynsky, half way to Turijnsk (Pol. Turzysk), belonged to the Sołtan family since donation by king Alexander until mid-16th century, and to Mikołaj Łysakowski in the latter half of that century. It is unclear whether the monastery of Saint Nicholas in Błażenik is the same as the monastery in the nearby Turupin (Turobin, Turobyn).

²⁹ Nesuchoże (Pol. Niesuchoże, now Ukr. Воля) – eponymous hereditary estate for the Sanguszko family line, located among the Volodymyr estates upon river Turia (Kovel rajon of modern Ukraine), which belonged to the family, along with Grabow and Košyr, since the time of the family's progenitors, i.e. Fiodor Olgierdovič and his son, Sanguszko Fedkovič. In 1502, after it was divided between Andrej Aleksandrovič (Fedor's father) and Andrzej Michałovič Sanguszko, it belonged to Andrej Aleksandrovič, and subsequently constituted the main part of Fedor Andreevič's estate. The Orthodox church of the Holy Resurrection of Christ, located on the castle grounds, similarly to the family's manor house, did not survive. After the Second World War Nesuchoże itself was divided into four separate villages. Further details concerning the church cf. below.

³⁰ Zagorov (Pol. Ruth. Zahorów, Ukr. Загорів) – two villages (Old Zagorov and New Zagorov), the seat of the Zahorowski family, with a monastery that existed there since the mediaeval period; the monastery was built in wood and requiring outlays. Less than three years after Fedor Sanguszko's death, his daughter Fedora married Piotr Zahorowski, and together they finalised the foundation, in 1567–1570 considerably expanding the monastery and donating lands to it. The monastery subsequently became a famed centre for icon writing and copying books.

³¹ This religious complex is among the most closely connected with the Sanguszko family. Mielce (Ukr. Мильці), located near Nesuchoże, were the subject of dispute of knyaz Andrej Aleksandrovič

schen. And in addition, for the churches in the city of Volodimer and for all of the churches on all my lands, 2 threescore Lithuanian groschen [each] should be given. 5. Also in addition to this, [as] I had promised to [give] for the icon of the Dormition of the Mother of God in the Pečersk monastery of the Holy Most Pure in Kiev my golden chain for decoration, in which is 200 red zlotys, this chain is to be given for this purpose, and with this chain this icon is to be fitted. As for the monastery of Saint Nicholas in Mielce, unfinished church wall and insufficient [number of] holy things, icons, books, clothes and other items needed in the church, all of this my wife and my children, taking from all of my possessions, are to provide for this church. 6. And in addition to this I, seeing the good and virtuous conduct of my wife, knyaginya Ganna Despotovna, towards me, I leave her, my wife, a third part of all of my lands, however many of them there might be: inherited from my father, received for service and purchased, for eternity. She is to administer and use this third part according to her will, she is free to sell, trade or donate to the church this third part, and after the end of her life she may leave it to whomever she wills, and my children and some of my relatives, my close ones, are forbidden from ousting her from that third part. 7. In addition I also leave to her, my wife, knyaginya Ganna Despotovna, 600 threescore Lithuanian groschen and 100 grivna of gilded silver for perpetuity, in my estate in Povorsk³². And the ash, which my wife, knyaginya Ganna Despotovna ordered to be made at her own expense³³, to this ash my children should make no claim, but she, having sold it, is to use it for her own benefit. In addition I will that my daughter, knyazna Fedora³⁴, should receive from all three parts of my estate a dowry of 1000 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and to my younger daughter, knyazna Marina³⁵, from all three parts of my estate I leave 1000 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and all my silvers I leave to my daughter, knyazna Fedora: serving plates and plates, silver mugs and spoons, clothes, two damask *šuby*³⁶ red, trimmed with marten fur, and velvet *šuba*,

(Nesuchoeże branch) with knyaz Vasyl Michałovič (Kovel' branch). The latter eventually conceded the monastery to Fedor Andreevič in 1533 according to the so-called Mielce settlement (*ugoda mielecka*), in return for other religious buildings and villages. The church of St. Nicholas was founded by Fedor Sanguszko on 23rd of May 1542. Hanna Despotissa was buried there in 1579.

³² Povorsk (Pol. also Powórsk, Poworsko) – settlement located half way between Kovel' and Manevyči, at the beginning of 16th century Konstanty Iwanovič Ostrogski. It should not be confused with Porsk – parts of this settlement, located further to the south, belonged to Fedor Sanguszko thanks to a royal donation made in 1536.

³³ Burning of ash for sale to merchants (mainly Jewish) from different parts of the Commonwealth brought considerable income to the Sanguszko family.

³⁴ Fedora – in 1550 r. married Piotr Bohdanovič Zahorowski; she received in dowry from her mother Podłożce and Porsk, which triggered a conflict between Hanna and Fedora on one side, and the latter's brother, Dymitr. She died in 1575. Buried in Mielce.

³⁵ Maryna (Maria) – she died young, buried in Mielce.

³⁶ *Šuba* (Pol. *szuba*) – a form of an outer garment, long, lined with fur, usually costly and made of expensive materials.

black, trimmed with marten fur and red, damask dress, window curtains and carpets, bolts of damask cloth, not cut – these are to belong to knyazna Fedora. **8.** And to my son, knyaz Dmitri³⁷, I leave the sable *šuba*, covered in damask, the bay steed, silver armour for the horse, bridle, breastplates, sheathes, the silver fitted³⁸ sabre from Ugrinovski³⁹, the red, damask caftan along with other garments [I leave] to knyaz Dmitri, and the armours, bechters, coats of mail – my son, knyaz Dmitri, together with my sons, his brothers, knyaz Andrej⁴⁰, knyaz Roman⁴¹ and knyaz Jaroslav⁴², are to split into equal shares. And the privileges and all of the papers [relating to] all my lands are to be kept by my wife, knyagina Ganna and my son, knyaz Dmitri, and should my sons share between themselves, then to whomever of them the estates would go, they are to take the privileges and papers [relevant for] these estates. **9.** In addition to this my silver vessels, the smaller ones and 12 silver plates, the old ones, are to be donated to the monastery in Mielce for the needs of the church: for the cross, chalices, incense burners and other church instruments, and for the cathedral church at the castle, in Nesuchoeże, dedicated to the Resurrection of Christ – two silver serving plates are to be donated. Regarding what I donated to the monastery of Saint Paul, which is on the Holy Mountain, annually 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen, these 10 threescore Lithuanian groschen let my wife and my children donate for this monastery. And regarding what my ancestors and I donated to the monastery of Saint Nicholas in Mielce: Solovevo⁴³ village, Ko-

³⁷ Dymitr Sanguszko (Sanguszkovič) – the eldest son of Fedor and Hanna, brought up at the royal court, for bravery in fighting the Tartars made *starosta* of Žitomer (Żytomierz) in 1548, subsequently of Kaniów (Kaniv) and Čerkasy. After his father's death and the second marriage of Hanna (with Mikołaj knyaz Zbaraski), he remained with her in a bitter dispute, into which the royal court became involved. The main participant, along with Konstanty Vasyl Ostrogski, of the raid on Ostrog, aimed at kidnapping and marrying to him Elżbieta (Halszka, Elisabeth) of Ostrog, the daughter of Ilia Ostrogski, an heiress to the estate and remaining under king's protection (1553). Sentenced *in absentia*, in an atmosphere of an international scandal, to infamy and death, he fled to Bohemia where he was captured and killed (1554).

³⁸ I.e. with a silver handgrip.

³⁹ Stanisław Uhrynowski – a royal courtier and owner of his family estate Uhrynów, tenant of Kołodno.

⁴⁰ Andrej (Andrzej) Sanguszko – died young, buried in the church in Mielce.

⁴¹ Roman Sanguszko – brought up at the royal court, he fought in expeditions against Muscovy, under the command of Mikołaj Radziwiłł (Radivil) Rudy (the Red) and Konstanty Vasyl Ostrogski, later a commander himself. *Starosta* of Žitomer (Żytomierz) since 1557, the first voivode of the newly created Bratslav voivodeship (1566). He contributed to making the decision to join the Bratslav voivodeship and considerable parts of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the Crown in connection to the Union of Lublin. Court Hetman of Lithuania since 1569. He died in 1571, buried in the church in Mielce.

⁴² Jaroslav Sanguszko – participant of the Livonian war of 1562, Lithuanian delegate for the Sejm, murdered in 1564 in Jareviče near Lutsk.

⁴³ Solovevo or Solovi (Pol. Solowiewo) – a village half way between Mielce and Nesuchoeże. In the 1570s it still belonged, like the surrounding estates, to Roman, the son of knyaz Fedor.

marovo⁴⁴ village, Synovo⁴⁵ village, Kovale⁴⁶ village, two manor houses: Pesočno⁴⁷ and Zadyby⁴⁸, along with the arable fields and mills, for eternity and permanently I leave to this monastery, and this may not be taken back by my wife nor my children nor any of my descendants. **10.** And what my ancestors, my father and I donated to the cathedral church of the Resurrection of Christ in Nesuchoeże: Dorogotieši⁴⁹ village, this village may not be taken back from this church. And what was donated to other churches on all of my lands, what happened in the times of my ancestors and what I donated, both men and lands with apiaries, and shores, and meadows with hay, and moveable other things, all these things, both [given] to the monastery in Mielce, as well as other churches that were endowed by me, may nothing be taken from them. **11.** Regarding my debts, [here are] those that I owe to: to archimandrite of Mensk Sophronius⁵⁰ – 300 red zlotys, and to Jakim Goljatynskij⁵¹ – 50 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and to [the] two daughters of Andrijas Jančynski⁵² 20 threescore Lithuanian groschen each, and to Gnevoš Griškovič Stawecki⁵³ – 20 threescore Lithuanian groschen, and to the two Tomiło⁵⁴ girls 35 threescore Lithuanian groschen to be equally split [between them]. These debts may my wife and children pay off from all three of my parts [of estate], so that none

⁴⁴ Komarovo – a village between Synovo and Nesuchoeże.

⁴⁵ Synovo or Synove – a village in the Nesuchoeże estates, north-west of Mielce, on the far shore of the lake bearing the same name. It belonged to Fedor's father, knyaz Andrej Aleksandrovič, since the division of the family estates in 1502.

⁴⁶ Kovale – a village in the vicinity of Mielce.

⁴⁷ Pesočno (Pol. Piaseczno) – a village to the south west of Povorsko.

⁴⁸ Zadyby – a village purchased by Fedor Sanguszko from Lewek Zadybski and his nephews (Hrycko, Juchno, Siemaszko) in 1536–1538. So-called Puszcza Zadybska (Zadyby Forest) was an important, also from economical perspective, part of knyaz Fedor's estate.

⁴⁹ Dorohotieši or Dorotyšče – a village south of Nesuchoeże, by the road to Kovel'. In 1570s it belonged to Roman Sanguszko.

⁵⁰ Sophronius (Sofronij) – he was an archimandrite of the Ascension monastery in Minsk during 1540s, after his predecessor, Vassian Šyška, left for the Pechersk Lavra (1541/42), and before the position was taken by Joseph, archimandrite from at least 1552. He vigorously defended the monastery from the attempts to retake the previously donated estates, which is attested also by other (aside from this one) documents from this period.

⁵¹ Jakim Goljatynskij – if identical with Daniło Jackovič Holatyński (as B. Gorczak assumed), he would be the owner of Holatyn (Golatyn, or Zvinogrod); the Holatyński family is said to be deprived of their premises by knyaz Fedor Sanguszko himself, who as contemporary source has it, treated them as slaves and married their sisters with peasants (illustration of the Volhynian castles, 1545).

⁵² Andrzej (Andrijas Ivanovič) Janczyński – owner of the village and estates Kruchiniče, which, together with his brothers Tychna and Jan partially mortgaged and partially sold to Fedor Sanguszko in 1535, which was in part confirmed in 1536 by king Sigismund I. Subsequently in the Lokači (Łokacze) estates of knyaz Roman Sanguszko.

⁵³ Gniewosz Griszkowicz (Hnevoš Hriškovič) Stawecki(-Šyškinnič) – together with his brother Ivan he sold to Fedor Sanguszko Stawek, the village on the river Turia belonging to his family, in 1538 (this was confirmed by Sigismund I in 1539 and 1541). It remained in the Nesuchoeże estates since.

⁵⁴ Tomiło (*Tomilówne*) sisters – unidentified.

of this may hang on my soul. **12.** And this I sign under the oath on the 318 holy fathers, who were at Nicaea⁵⁵. To this will and testament, for permanence, I ordered my seal to be attached. This was witnessed by: His Grace father Gennadius⁵⁶, the bishop of Volodimer and Bereste and my sister, Bogušova Bogovitinovič, the wife of district treasurer, lady Fedora Andreevna⁵⁷, and sir Tichno Kisel⁵⁸ and sir Piotr Kałusovskij⁵⁹. Here also Their Graces on my request attached their seals to this testament of mine. Written in Volodimer, from the birth of Christ 1547, on the ninth day of the month of November, 6 indiction.

*Translated by Michał Zytka and Zofia Brzozowska
Annotated by Andrzej Kompa*

⁵⁵ Nicaea – sc. at the ecumenical council of 325 A.D.

⁵⁶ Gennadius (Gennadij, Henadej) – bishop of Volodymyr and Bereste (Brest') between 1536–1547.

⁵⁷ Fedora Andreevna (Fedja, known as 'Pani Bohušova') – died in 1557, the wife of Bogusz Michał Bohowitynowicz (Bohovitynovič), who died in 1530 and was the land treasurer of Lithuania. He came from a Volhynian boyar family and was a leading diplomat, political writer and an able administrator during Sigismund I's times. His wife survived him by many years, and was respected among the Lithuanian-Ruthenian and Polish nobility. Already a widow at the time, she married off her daughters to members of Polish noble families.

⁵⁸ Tichno (Tychno) Kiesel – Volodymyr judge, often witnessed the documents produced by the Nesuchoeże line of the Sanguszko family.

⁵⁹ Piotr Kałusowski – a Lithuanian courtier, often witnessed the documents produced by the Nesuchoeże line of the Sanguszko family.

BOOK REVIEWS

ГЕОРГИЈЕ СФРАНЦЕС, Хроника. Паџ Византијског царства [GEORGE SPHRANTZES, *Chronicle. The Fall of the Byzantine Empire*]. Превео и приредио МЛАДЕН СТАНКОВИЋ, Предањске студије, Београд 2011, pp. 304.

The presented publication includes the edition and translation of a chronicle by George Sphrantzes into the modern Serbian language. The chronicle is one of the most important historiographical sources for the late Byzantine Empire period. The author of the translation and the extensive scholarly commentary is Mladen Stanković – a Serbian legal historian, the author of, among others, the biography of the Empress Helena Dragaš, the mother of the last Byzantine emperor, Constantine XI Palaiologos¹.

The work by George Sphrantzes was included in this paper in its short edition, containing an account of the events of 1413–1477 (the so-called *Chronicon Minus*). The basis for the edition and translation was the publication: GEORGIOS SPHRANTZES, *Memorii 1401–1477*, ed. V. GRECU, București 1966 [= *Scriptores Byzantini*, 5]. While working on the text, the author of the translation also used two other editions of the source: the classic edition of J.-P. Migne, included in volume 156 of *Patrologia Graeca* (col. 1023–1080, Paris 1886) and a newer one, prepared by Riccardo Maisano within the series of *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* (vol. 29, Rome 1990).

The original Greek text of the source and its Serbian translation (p. 33–216) are presented in parallel, with an extensive scholarly commentary including, among others, the attempt to identify all the people and places found in the text of the chronicle, the possible exact dates of events, explanations of potentially un-

clear terms, as well as additional historical information allowing for a more complete reception of the work.

The text of the source is preceded by the editor's introduction (p. 7–32), presenting the figure of George Sphrantzes and his work. Here we can find the information about the most important facts about the Byzantine author. A lot of attention was devoted to the description of the source and the textological dependence between his short wording, *Chronicon Minus*, widely recognized as the primary variant of the chronicle, and, at the same time, an authentic work of George Sphrantzes, and the so-called *Chronicon Maius* – a later historiographic compilation attributed to Sphrantzes, covering the period 1258–1478, which was created most probably in the second half of the 16th century by Macarius Melissenos (Melissourgos), Metropolitan of Monemvasia. Moreover, all manuscripts known to the author containing the text of *Chronicon Minus* and its modern editions and translations into modern European languages were discussed.

The publication also contains a number of annexes. Without any doubt, the most important of these is the Serbian translation of a fragment of *Chronicon Maius* (p. 217–264) by Macarius Melissenos (Melissourgos), containing a comprehensive account of the siege of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks, covering the period from 2nd April to 29th May, 1453 (fragments of Book III, 3–13). The text of the source includes a commentary.

In the final part of the book the publisher included a list of 15th-century Byzantine emperors, Turkish sultans, despots of Morea and the rulers of Serbia, along with the dates of their reigns, a list of the patriarchs of Con-

¹ М.М. СТАНКОВИЋ, *Последња византијска царица. Прича о српској принцези која је шест деценија седела на константинопољском престолу и била мајка двојице последњих источних царева*, Београд 2010, pp. 238.

stantinople and the popes from the same period, a map of the Peloponnese and Constantinople from the 15th century as well as an index of proper names and names of the places which appear in the text.

The goal of the publisher is to address the presented publication to a wide group of recipients. However, it should be noted that in-

cluding the full text of the *Chronicle* by George Sphrantzes in the original Greek, with translation into a modern European language, is an invaluable help for Byzantine historians who specialize in the later period of the history of the East Roman empire.

Zofia Brzozowska (Łódź)

ЯРОСЛАВ Н. ЩАПОВ, *Византийская «Эклога законов» в русской письменной традиции. Исследование, издание текстов и комментарий*, Издательство Олега Абышко, Санкт-Петербург 2011, pp. 240.

The presented book is most likely the last, published postmortem, publication of Jaroslav N. Ščapov (1928–2011). He was a Russian historian and a distinguished specialist in the research of the spiritual culture of Rus' during the 9th to 14th centuries. The book is the result of several years of the author's academic interests, focused on the issue of old-Russian law as well as its relationship with Byzantine jurisprudence. It is worth noting that already in the 1970s Jaroslav N. Ščapov published two extensive academic monographs devoted to the legislation of Russian princes in the 11th to 14th centuries. The aim of these so-called *ustavs* was to establish the legal frames for the functioning of Church organization in Rus'¹. The issue of reception of the Byzantine ecclesiastical law collections (*Nomocanons*) in the East Slavic context was discussed in the monograph *Византийское и южнославянское правовое наследие на Руси в XI–XIII вв. (Byzantine and South Slavic Legal Heritage in Rus' in the 11th–13th centuries)*².

The purpose of the publication is to familiarise the reader with the old-Russian translation of the *Ecloga* – a Byzantine legal code with

a strictly secular nature, promulgated – according to the *Introduction* in the work of Jaroslav N. Ščapov – by Leo III and his son Constantine V in 726 or 741³. The *Ecloga* is widely considered to be the first, after Justinian's *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, mediaeval collection of East Roman law⁴.

Taking into account the amount of source material and the specific nature of the existing research on the *Ecloga*, the author of the book rightly excluded from the scope of his work the so-called *Law for Judging People* (*Законъ съдъный людьмь*) – the oldest Slavic collection of secular court law, based on the provisions of

³ J. VAŠICA, *Metodějův překlad nomokanonu*, Sla 24, 1955, p. 16; J. MEYENDORFF, *Teologia bizantyjska. Historia i doktryna*, trans. J. PROKORUK, Warszawa 1984, p. 107; Г. ЛИТАВРИН, *Политическая теория в Византии с середины VII до начала XIII в.*, [in:] *Культура Византии. Вторая половина VII–XII в.*, ed. З. УДАЛЬЦОВА, Г. ЛИТАВРИН, Москва 1989, p. 66; И. МЕДВЕДЕВ, *Развитие правовой науки*, [in:] *ibidem*, p. 216; К. МАКСИМОВИЧ, *Byzantine Law in Old Slavonic Translations and the Nomocanon of Methodius*, Bsl 65, 2007, p. 10; Т. СЛАВОВА, *Юридическа литература*, [in:] *История на българската средновековна литература*, ed. А. МИЛТЕНОВА, София 2008, p. 201; J.-C. СНЕУНЕТ, *Administracja cesarska*, [in:] *Świat Bizancjum*, vol. II, *Cesarstwo bizantyńskie 641–1204*, ed. IDEM, trans. А. ГРАВОЊ, Kraków 2011, p. 161.

⁴ И. МЕДВЕДЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

¹ Я.Н. ЩАПОВ, *Княжеские уставы и церковь в Древней Руси XI–XIV вв.*, Москва 1972, pp. 340; IDEM, *Древнерусские княжеские уставы XI–XV вв.*, Москва 1976, pp. 240.

² IDEM, *Византийское и южнославянское правовое наследие на Руси в XI–XIII вв.*, Москва 1978, pp. 291.

the *Ecloga*, composed perhaps as early as the 9th century⁵. The focus is on the history of translations of the Byzantine law collection into the Old Church Slavonic language, with a particular emphasis on their reception in the context of Old Russian culture. It is worth noting that the Old Church Slavonic translation of the *Ecloga*, prepared probably in the middle of the 10th century in Bulgaria⁶, has been preserved until now in Old Russian manuscripts,⁷ originating from the 14th to 17th centuries. This attests to the considerable popularity of this collection in Rus'. The excerpts from the *Ecloga* (taken from both the full Slavonic translation and the *Law for Judging People*) were included in the Old Russian law collections. Along with *Nomocanon* and *Procheiron*, they were included in 13th century the *Book of the Helmsman* (Юрмичая книга)⁸. They can also be found on pages of the so-called *Books of Law* (Книги законные) from the same period⁹ and of the *Measure of Justice* (Мѣрило праведноу) – a collection of legal texts written in North-East Russia in the second half of the 13th century¹⁰, preserved, among others, in the manuscript from the third quarter of the 14th century, now kept in the Russian State Library (РГБ, ф. 304, № 15)¹¹.

The main part of the presented publication is the first academic edition of the text of the full Old Church Slavonic translation of

the *Ecloga* (p. 13–58). Jaroslav N. Ščapov based it on one manuscript, which he considered the most representative. He thoroughly analyzed the text and compared the studied manuscript with other Old Russian copies of the *Ecloga*, taking into account both the retained copies of *Measure of Justice* and the *Book of the Helmsman*. All lexical differences and variations of text that he noticed and which occurred in the studied manuscripts are listed in the footnotes under the main text. The edition of the text includes an extensive comment by Jaroslav N. Ščapov (p. 59–186), which provides, among others, an explanation of the provisions included in the *Ecloga*, additional historical information as well as a comparison of the terminology used in Old Church Slavonic translation with the expressions found in the original Greek text.

The next part of the book is an edited text of an abbreviated variant of the Old Church Slavonic translation of the *Ecloga* (p. 187–192), found in the Old Russian copies of *Measure of Justice* and the *Book of the Helmsman*. This text and the full translation of the *Ecloga* were published in accordance with the same rules. It also includes an extensive scholarly commentary (p. 193–195).

The final part of the book includes additional materials: critical editions of fragments of the *Ecloga*, found in the Old Russian *Book of the Helmsman* (p. 196–204) and critical editions of the fragments of the *Ecloga*, found in the Old Russian collection of legal texts, the so-called *Books of Law* (p. 205–209). At the end of the book there is an edition of a Serbian legal text collection from the 17th century, preceded by a reliable introduction. The source is entitled *Judgment of Tsar Leo and Constantine* (Судъ Цра Лео и Константина) and includes references to the *Ecloga* (p. 210–230). The outline may be used as an interesting material for researching not only the impact of Byzantine legal tradition on Old Russian jurisprudence, but also the interpenetration of cultures in the area of *Slavia Orthodoxa*.

It is also worth noting the fact that the author and the publisher made every effort to put emphasis on archive and library signatures of all the manuscripts that were analyzed or only mentioned in the book. This will allow re-

⁵ J. VAŠICA, *op. cit.*, p. 17; F. DVORNIK, *Byzantine Political Ideas on Kievian Russia*, DOP 9/10, 1956, p. 77; J. VAŠICA, *K otázce původu Zakona sudného ljudem*, Sla 30, 1961, p. 1–2; IDEM, *Literární památky epochy Velkomoravské 863–885*, Praha 1966, p. 73; K. МАКСИМОВИЧ, *op. cit.*, p. 10; Т. СЛАВОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

⁶ F. DVORNIK, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

⁷ К. МАКСИМОВИЧ, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁸ F. DVORNIK, *op. cit.*, p. 78; H. KOWALSKA, *Kultura staroruska XI–XVI w. Tradycja i zmiana*, Kraków 1998, p. 117, 153–154.

⁹ К. МАКСИМОВИЧ, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

¹⁰ H. KOWALSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 153–154; К. МАКСИМОВИЧ, *op. cit.*, p. 10; Т. СЛАВОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

¹¹ Г. ВЗДОРНОВ, *Искусство книги в Древней Руси. Рукописная книга Северо-Восточной Руси XII – начала XV вв.*, Москва 1980, p. 20.

searches of Old Russian law to have easy access to manuscripts that include the Old Church Slavonic translation of the *Ecloga*.

As a weak point of the reviewed publication one may consider the fact that the publisher did not use a specialized font for editing texts in the Old Church Slavonic language that would make it possible to indicate all the spelling features of the Old Russian texts. It is also a pity that the author also did not have time to prepare a translation of the text of the Old Church Slavonic *Ecloga* into one of the modern languages (e.g. modern Russian). This would have significantly broadened the group of recipients of

the publication and allowed its use in work with students. In its current form, however, the presented publication is very valuable for mediaevalist historians and paleoslavists, introducing to the academic community an almost unknown source – the full Old Church Slavonic translation of the Byzantine *Ecloga* (so far only the original Greek text of the *Ecloga* has been published and translated into modern languages)¹².

¹² E.g. *Ecloga. Das Gesetzbuch Leons III und Konstantinos V*, ed. L. BURGMANN, Frankfurt-am-Main 1983, pp. 282 [= FBR, 10].

MICHAŁ STACHURA, *Wrogowie porządku publicznego. Studium agresji językowej w Kodeksie Teodozjusza, Nowelach Postteodozjańskich i Konstytucjach Sirmondiańskich [Enemies of the Public Order. The Study of Language Aggression in the Theodosius Code, Post-Theodosian Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions]*, Towarzystwo Wydawnicze „Historia Iagellonica”, Kraków 2010, pp. 262.

Michał Stachura, the historian from Cracov working in the Department of the History of Byzantium at the Institute of History of the Jagiellonian University, has recently published a series of important papers, each of which is to a great extent based on the analysis of the *Theodosius Code*. He has been particularly interested in the terminology characteristic of statutes included in the Code just mentioned and pertaining to the unorthodox, Christian population of the Roman Empire. One of the goals he set himself was to uncover ideological components inherent in statutes dealing with heretics and determining their legal position¹. The work under review em-

bodies a new method developed by the author with a view to studying imperial constitutions directed not only against heretics but against

W poszukiwaniu istoty przestępstwa innowierców – studia nad terminologią ustaw wymierzonych w niekatolików (364–450/455) [In search of the essence of the crime committed by religious dissenters – studies of terminology used in statutes directed against non-Catholics 364–450/455], [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności. Studia źródłoznawcze*, vol. V, ed. T. DERDA, E. WIPSZYCKA, Kraków 2004, p. 219–269; *Eunomian rights to draw testaments in the legislation of 389–399*, ZSSR.KA 92, 2006, p. 45–62; *Stadt und Peripherie in der Häretikerpolitik der frühbyzantinischen Kaiser (ca. 325 bis 455)*, P 1, 2006, p. 133–152; *Kritik der superstitio und Affirmation der Orthodoxie in den Gesetzen des Codex Theodosianus*, [in:] *Studies on Late Roman History*, ed. E. DĄBROWA, Kraków 2007, p. 33–61 [= Ele, 12]; *Pogańska ofiara i heretyckie nabożeństwo w ujęciu praw Kodeksu Teodozjusza* [Pagan sacrifices and religious ceremonies held by heretics in the Theodosian Code], [in:] *SKaz*, vol. VI, ed. B. IWASZKIEWICZ-WRONIKOWSKA, D. PRÓCHNIAK, Lublin 2008, p. 179–192.

¹ See among others: *Pojęcie „heretycy w ustawodawstwie Konstantyna Wielkiego i jego następców* [The Concept „Heretics” in the Legislation of Constantine the Great and that of his Successors], *Histor* 30, 2000, p. 19–52; *Zur Motivation der Häretikererfolgung im Spiegel von Gesetztestexten der Theodosianischen Dynastie*, [in:] *Freedom and Its Limits in the Ancient World. Proceedings of a Colloquium Held at the Jagiellonian University*, ed. D. BRODKA, J. JANIK, S. SPRAWSKI, Kraków 2003, p. 249–262;

all groups of Roman society who may be said to have fallen victim to the offensive and insulting language used in the imperial law. Stachura is of the opinion that it was verbal aggression, coupled with undisguised contempt, which was used for denoting those whom Roman emperors regarded as enemies of the public order.

In the first part of his book the author defined the subject of his study – the language of invective, the term which he explains needs to be understood as *involving all means of expression used for creating such a language, deeply embedded in the ancient tradition of producing utterances of this kind*². Stachura traces back this tradition to the Greek rhetoric of classical period which saw the emergence of two genres – called *psogos* and *koinos topos* – whose distinguishing mark was verbal attack. In late antiquity language aggression began to thrive again following the spread of panegyrics (praiseworthy qualities of one person being “enhanced” by comparison with character flaws of the other) and the outburst of religious controversies (fueled by theological disputes within the Church and the state’s growing hostility towards pagans and Jews). Stachura argues that abusive language was a tool used for expressing the idea of the emperor striving to protect his subjects, to ensure state security, and to uphold doctrinal correctness in matters of religion. “The brutality” of the language apparent in imperial statutes dealt with here was a dark side of the very same propaganda which made emperors exhibit their *clementia*. Except for the analysis of fully preserved documents offering examples of the invective language in its complete form, the author also examined partially preserved constitutions containing only single offensive words or phrases.

The case made in the second part of the work is that there is clearly a pattern to be detected in both the arrangement of the invective language in the imperial legislation and in the function it was supposed to exercise. It is for this reason that for the elucidation of the structure of the abusive language, the author relies

on 10 examples derived from the *Theodosius Code* and *post-Theodosian Novels*. Since the latter are well-preserved, Stachura has been able to grasp key characteristics of the language of invective (repetitions, metaphors, enumerations etc.), isolating the main social circles considered hostile to the public order: 1) heretics and religious dissenters, 2) the dishonest – corrupted officials, and 3) various criminals committing such crimes as mugging, theft, or kidnappings. In the task of carrying out a rhetorical analysis of the statutes, the author usually begins by reciting at length their original versions and then turns to commenting on their content. The next step he takes consists in analyzing particular words which he organizes according to various criteria.

He isolates terms which, on his interpretation, were designed to denote the relation of hostility between the Roman community and its enemies; motives which informed the latter’s conduct; the nature of all acts hostile to the Roman order; and the wrong or erroneous religious stance.

Goals pursued by the author in the second part of his book left him with the necessity of carrying out an essentially philological analysis. And it is the study of language that allowed him to isolate – in the third and concluding part of the book – various classes of enemies (according to charges laid against them) and build their hierarchical portrait.

The first category of enemies involves those who committed a crime of sacrilege. The last term was usually taken to indicate non-compliance with imperial laws or simply disregard for imperial authority, which could manifest itself in a destruction or desecration of the Emperor’s effigies (also by counterfeiting imperial coins), or in a tax evasion. Stachura emphasizes the fact that the Roman authorities were not as much concerned about the protection of the legal order as they were about the protection of the law itself which was granted a special immunity and was surrounded by an aura of sanctity embedded in the sacrosanct character of the imperial power itself (p. 184).

Enemies of the state made up the second category of those who brought upon themselves the language of invective. In the first place this group included barbarians. They were re-

² ...obejmując tym pojęciem wszelkie środki wyrazu służące do stworzenia inwektywy, zakorzenione w antycznej tradycji tworzenia tego typu deprecjujących wypowiedzi – p. 29.

garded as invaders and robbers impelled by cruelty which in the Greco-Roman tradition was thought of as destroying the ancient value *humanitas*. It is interesting to note that – as opposed to a variety of ancient texts – there are no other charges laid against barbarians in the documents examined by the author. The image of the barbarian to be created on the basis of those documents is not so much a traditional one as it is reduced to the very essence of this tradition. The barbarian is a dangerous invader, actuated only by cruelty which remains so foreign to the Greco-Roman tradition. It is also the so-called internal enemies that were ranked among enemies of the state. That group consisted of usurpers and criminals who had a record of assault and mugging. The imperial legislation allows one to combine the latter crime with desertion. It also assists the notion that some areas of the Roman Empire were stricken with banditry.

Enemies of the state also included enemies of the Orthodox Church which was supported by the state machinery. And it is, of course, heretics and – to a lesser degree – Jews and pagans that were ranked among this group. However, under the imperial law it was only heretics that counted as criminals; where pagans were concerned, it took making an offering to a pagan deity to commit a crime. One did not commit a crime simply by being a pagan. Judaism was considered a deviation from the true religion. Nevertheless, it enjoyed a relative tolerance which Roman emperors were inclined to display for quite a long time. The invective language was thus applied to all three groups, with laws directed against heretics, however, standing out by its impetuosity. The very term *hereticus*, says M. Stachura, was regarded as an invective.

Corrupted officials were also condemned as enemies of the Roman order. They failed to protect it, even though it was the task they were called upon to perform. Imperial legislation charged palace officials and provincial governors with all sorts of abuses, ascribing them vile motives. Palace officials were accused of exceeding their public service remit and of abusing power while acting as tax collectors. Audacity, avarice, or obstinate refusal to obey the Emperor's orders were among the invectives with which they were referred to. The terms were also supposed to reveal their base motives.

Provincial governors were often charged with negligence of duty in administering justice (they are blamed for failing to dispense justice impartially, or for denying the right of appeal). Their contemptible conduct was motivated by greed, laziness, (characterized by different terms), audacity (*audacia*), insolence (*insolentia*), and madness (*furor*). Officials that came under the authority of a governor were accused of making decisions that violated existing laws, or of using their position as governor's agents for deriving illegal profits. Stachura has created a long list of offenses committed by different officials, stressing the fact, however, that some of their abuses – for example, corruption – need to be treated as purely theoretical. In all probability, this corruption was hypothetical only and should not be assumed to have existed in reality. Referring to it was a way of demonstrating the imperial power and its commitment to *never surrender control over the administrative apparatus* (p. 69).

The fifth category of enemies consisted of those whose offences, although punishable, were not regarded as stemming directly from the hostility towards either the state or the Church. Witchcraft, grave looting, homosexuality, adultery, incest, abduction of women (especially abduction of consecrated virgins), and the use of violence (especially taking possession of a disputed area by the use of force, while the area still remained the subject of a legal tussle) were among the heaviest crimes to be found in this group. Perpetrators of such acts were usually charged with audacity (*audacia*).

Approaching the problem from a purely statistical angle, it is heretics that were considered to be the worst enemies of the Roman order. The invective language, in its most extensive form, was leveled against them. Those who were found guilty of a variety of violent offences such as robbery and assault, grave looting, adultery, pimping, sorcery, abduction of women ranked second in this category. The third group of enemies was composed of officials who abused their power.

Raising both legal and historical issues *Enemies of Roman Order* is as much a book on the history of Roman law as it is on the history of Roman society and Roman administration in late antiquity. Stachura has succeeded in

demonstrating to how great an extent imperial legislation regulated social and religious norms in the epoch under consideration. He has thrown into relief the fact that emperors took it as one of their most important goals to make both their subjects and their administrative apparatus abide by the existing law. Specifying words and terms which were meant to convey an offensive and disdainful meaning, he has compiled a dictionary of invective, indicating expressions and terms which can actually be looked at as an ideological justification for penal sanctions to be applied against members of social groups mentioned in the above. He has offered a hierarchy of Roman society – seen from the perspective of the emperors – with Orthodox Christians on top of it and heretics at the bottom. *If we take a closer look at the hierarchy, then we shall see that it is not the state but the Church that was regarded as the key value which deserved protection in the first place*³.

It is not only historians of Roman law, Roman society, and Roman administration, but also classical philologists and experts on the history of religion that are likely to find the analysis of the language of imperial constitutions carried out in the book under review interesting. Stachura clarified the meaning of many terms, devoting a separate chapter to those which identified all sorts of religious errors. His focus was

³ *Jeśli przyjrzymy się naszej hierarchii, szczególnie chronioną wartością okazuje się nie państwo, lecz wspierany przezeń Kościół i jego prawowierność* – p. 206.

not only on elucidating the difference in their meaning – sometimes very subtle – but also on revealing their origin. In pursuing his analyses, he often drew on the Greek philosophy of classical period and the Laws of the Twelve Tables.

Stachura has provided the reader with an original dissertation which offers much insight into many aspects of Roman history in late antiquity. Although his book deserves praise and is an important scholarly achievement, the author could sometimes be more accurate in presenting his ideas. He, for example, appears to be too casual in applying quotation marks to words such as enemy/enemies or invective/invective language. The overuse of quotation marks often leaves the reader in a quandary over the way in which a given word or phrase is to be understood. And since the exact meaning of some key terms is of crucial importance for the line of reasoning presented in the book, the reader should be left with no doubt as to how to understand them.

I am convinced that the work of Stachura is going to serve as an important point of reference for all students of Roman history, especially those who are interested in different aspects of social order of the Roman Empire (Roman administration, the authorities' response to social disturbances etc). Offering some information upon normative sources of late antiquity, it is also likely to attract the attention of those scholars for whom the *Theodosius Code* remains the main *instrumentum studiorum*.

Translated by Artur MękarSKI
Paweł Filipczak (Łódź)

Świat rzymski w V wieku [Le monde romain au v^e siècle], red. RAFAŁ KOSIŃSKI i KAMILA TWARDOWSKA, Towarzystwo Wydawnicze „Historia Jagellonica”, Kraków 2010, pp. 464.

Le monde romain au v^e siècle est une synthèse d'un siècle dans l'histoire de l'Empire romain tardif, l'image panoramique de l'État et de la société de cette époque, la première présentation de Rome du v^e siècle de ce type en langue polonaise. Dans un seul volume on a abordé

différents aspects de la civilisation romaine traditive, complexes et divergeants – le fait incontestable et digne d'être mentionné.

La première partie du livre, consacrée à l'histoire politique, comprend des chapitres suivants : *Rzymski Zachód w latach 395–493*

[*L'Occident romain de 395 à 493*] (dont l'auteur est Marcin Pawlak, p. 22–77), *Rzymski Wschód w latach 395–518* [*L'Orient romain de 395 à 518*] (Kamilla Twardowska, p. 79–128) et *Królestwa barbarzyńskie w V wieku* [*Les royaumes barbares au V^e siècle*] (Dawid Zołoteńki, p. 129–208). La deuxième partie, qui présente les structures de l'État romain, comprend cinq chapitres : *Organizacja Cesarstwa Rzymskiego w V stuleciu : cesarz – armia – prawo* [*L'Organisation de l'Empire romain au V^e siècle : l'empereur – l'armée – le droit*] (Jacek Wiewiorowski, p. 211–275), *Społeczeństwo w Cesarstwie Rzymskim V wieku* [*La société de l'Empire romain au V^e siècle*], divisé encore en deux parties : *Struktura społeczna* [*La structure sociale*] (Rafał Kosiński, p. 278–297) et *Rodzina* [*La famille*] (Marcin Pawlak, p. 297–328). Suivent encore les chapitres suivants : *Gospodarka Cesarstwa Rzymskiego w V wieku* [*L'économie sous l'Empire romain au V^e siècle*] (Krzysztof Broda, p. 329–364), *Religie cesarstwa rzymskiego w V stuleciu* [*Les religions de l'Empire romain au V^e siècle*] (Rafał Kosiński, p. 365–417) et *Edukacja i kultura w V wieku* [*L'Éducation et la culture au V^e siècle*] (Elżbieta Szabat, p. 417–444).

Les auteurs de l'ouvrage analysé abordent des questions scientifiques majeures, souvent discutables, en rectifiant ou désavouant des théories reconnues dans la conscience historique et présentant les interprétations les plus récentes – en voici quelques-unes.

Le limes rhénan a été franchi par les tribus des Vandales, des Suèves et des Alains probablement en 405 et non à la fin de 406, ce qui a été reconnu jusqu'à présent. C'était un événement qui avait des conséquences d'une grande portée. Les Romains n'étaient plus capables d'expulser des barbares installés sur le territoire de l'empire. Les invasions venues de l'autre côté du Rhin ont provoqué entre 406 et 413 plusieurs problèmes intérieurs, comme, p.ex. la séparation définitive de Rome des vastes territoires de la Gaule et de l'Espagne, ce qui a rendu impossible la levée de contributions des terrains perdus et en conséquence la crise financière. L'affaiblissement de l'armée et la perte de capacité défensive de l'État ainsi que le déclenchement des guerres civiles et des usurpations – tous ces faits ont eu, selon l'auteur de cette

partie de l'ouvrage *Le monde romain au V^e siècle* (p. 27–35) des conséquences catastrophiques sur le fonctionnement de l'Occident romain et ont réellement provoqué son déclin.

Le passage de Constantin III de la Bretagne à la Gaule, traité habituellement comme une évacuation de l'île par les troupes romaines, a eu en réalité le caractère d'intervention militaire de l'usurpateur voulant prendre le pouvoir sur le continent européen (p. 192–193). Le commandant germanique Odoakre proclamé roi, l'assassinat du vrai gouverneur de l'Italie, le patricien romain Orestes et la privation du pouvoir de son fils, l'empereur Romulus Augustulus – tous ces événements remontant à 476, indiquent la date symbolique de la chute de l'Empire d'Occident. Par contre, l'événement le plus souvent présenté dans les manuels, qui a eu lieu en 476 – le renvoi des insignes impériaux à Constantinople – ne s'est passé que quatre ans plus tard (p. 72–74).

L'invasion des tribus germaniques n'a pas fini par le dépeuplement des villes et villages et n'a pas provoqué d'importants ravages dans l'économie de l'empire occidental. Le caractère illusoire du dépeuplement est un effet de la crise de la colonisation de type *villa*, se caractérisant par la diminution de la surface habitable de pièces, le partage de pièces, la démolition de bâtiments, etc. Le dépeuplement et la crise économique ne touchent l'Occident qu'entre les années 30 et 50 du VI^e siècle comme suite des épidémies et des guerres avec les Goths. En ce qui concerne le V^e siècle, on peut parler seulement d'un certain *fléchissement de la conjoncture démographique*¹ et, très visible au milieu du V^e siècle, des restrictions au commerce entre l'Italie et l'Afrique dominée par les Vandales (p. 356–360).

L'essor économique de l'Orient était possible grâce aux facteurs qui manquaient en Occident: l'existence de grandes métropoles et le stationnement de nombreuses troupes, la structure diversifiée de propriété foncière, le développement du commerce en dehors de régions (sur-

¹ *Przed rokiem 541 możemy najwyżej mówić o pewnym pogorszeniu koniunktury demograficznej* – p. 357.

tout le long de la ligne l'Égypte – Constantinople) et les conditions climatiques favorables. La stagnation de l'activité économique n'apparaît dans certaines provinces orientales que dans les années 40 du VI^e siècle en conséquence des épidémies et du fléchissement démographique (p. 361–363). Les auteurs du *Monde romain* portent leur attention sur le fait que l'Orient est menacé d'une façon permanente par les barbares – le phénomène le plus souvent associé à la partie occidentale de l'empire, neutralisé de façon diplomatique ou militaire grâce au contenu du trésor plus riche que celui de l'Occident (p. 82–83, 92–96, 102–106, 117–120).

En ce qui concerne le régime politique, on peut parler d'une *théocratie avec des éléments de césaropapisme*² plutôt que du césaropapisme au sens propre du terme ; en Orient les souverains ont été traités comme de vrais chefs de l'Église et en même temps leurs protecteurs et la coopération entre l'État et l'Église était modèle. En Occident la chute de la puissance impériale a pesé sur la propagation d'une nouvelle conception du pouvoir, basé sur la domination du pouvoir épiscopal sur impérial (p. 213–215).

Les moines chrétiens protégeaient la population rurale contre des abus des fonctionnaires ou propriétaires fonciers – c'était pourtant un phénomène plutôt exceptionnel, bien que, il n'y a pas longtemps, présenté dans la hagiographie comme universel (p. 295). La virginité et le célibat, comme valeurs supérieures – parfois plus appréciées que le mariage traditionnel, quoique dans certains milieux chrétiens il en était autrement – étaient une nouveauté introduite par le christiannisme dans les relations sociales. Cependant le célibat, malgré l'opinion parfois rencontrée, n'a pas été introduit par la décision prise par le synode d'Elvire (vers 306) mais a trouvé ses origines dans la tradition se formant en Occident au cours des IV^e et V^e siècles (p. 324).

Il y a seulement quelques opinions exprimées par les auteurs du *Monde romain* qui ont un caractère polémique. Les émeutes survenues à Constantinople en 491 ont été, selon

moi, provoquées par le mécontentement réel³ et non prétendu de la population face à la décision du préfet de la capitale (p. 117). Dans les grandes villes de l'Orient – malgré l'opinion présentée dans le livre (p. 355) – fleurissait la production artisanale diversifiée, le gagne-pain d'une grande majorité de la population (les cas d'Antioche et de Beyrouth en sont les meilleurs exemples)⁴. Le rôle de l'école fondée à Constantinople en 425 augmentait systématiquement mais la question si on peut la classer au rang de l'université est discutée depuis longtemps par nombreux scientifiques dont certains, contrairement à l'opinion de l'auteur de cette partie du *Monde romain* (p. 432–433), abondent dans le sens de la réponse affirmative⁵.

Dans le texte on peut remarquer de petites imprécisions concernant les faits et la langue. La révolte de Marcien en 479 a été déjà étouffée le deuxième jour et non le troisième par Illus, exerçant la fonction de *magister officiorum*⁶ et non celle de *magister militum praesentalis* (p. 110).

³ Cf. P. FILIPCZAK, *Julian, prefekt Konstantynopola [Julien, préfet de Constantinople]*, [in:] *Hortus historiae. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci profesora Józefa Wolskiego w setną rocznicę urodzin [Hortus historiae. Le livre d'or en hommage du professeur Józef Wolski à l'occasion du centenaire de sa naissance]*, ed. E. DĄBROWA, M. DZIELSKA, M. SALAMON, S. SPRAWSKI, Kraków 2010, p. 670–671.

⁴ Cf. p.ex. W. CERAN, *Rzemieślnicy i kupcy w Antiochii i ich ranga społeczna (II połowa IV w.) [Les artisans et les marchands à Antioche et leur rang social (seconde moitié du IV^e siècle)]*, Wrocław–Kraków 1969, p. 41–83 et L.J. HALL, *Roman Beirut: Beirut in Late Antiquity*, London–New York 2004, p. 22–27.

⁵ Cf. p.ex. A. KOMPA, *Edukacja w Konstantynopolu [L'Éducation à Constantinople]*, [in:] *Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym. Miasto i ludzie w okresie wczesnobizantyjskim [Constantinople – la Nouvelle Rome. La ville et la population du début de l'époque byzantine]*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, Warszawa 2011, p. 624–626, voir p. 625, an. 244 (voir un large choix d'oeuvres antérieures).

⁶ Cf. M.J. LESZKA, *Kilka uwag na temat Illusa Izauryjczyka w latach 479–484 [Quelques remarques sur le destin d'Illus d'Isaurie de 479 à 484]*, M 62, 2007, p. 99–101.

² ... *śluszniej jest mówić o rysie teokratycznym i elementach cesaropapizmu* – p. 214.

Le Monde romain au V^e siècle est un livre qui présente de solides connaissances, adressé au grand public. Il n'y a pas de doute que les lecteurs soient attirés par le discours d'une grande clarté et la construction transparente et explicite. Ce volume devrait tomber en mains des participants aux séminaires concernant l'époque de l'antiquité tardive pour leur servir d'un outil fondamental de travail et les chercheurs y trouveront une bonne référence dans leurs recherches scientifiques.

Ce qui constitue une qualité primordiale du *Monde romain au V^e siècle* est une approche holistique et une vision récente du siècle qui

a marqué un tournant dans l'histoire de Rome et encore en dehors de ce siècle. Le cours de l'histoire politique qui commence conventionnellement en 395 finit au milieu du VI^e siècle, la description des structures étatiques, sociales et religieuses commence parfois à la charnière du III^e siècle et du IV^e siècle – ce qui est profitable pour le lecteur, qui, en un seul volume, peut prendre connaissance de presque toute l'époque de dominat.

*Traduction par Anna Sobczak-Zajda
Paweł Filipczak (Łódź)*

АНАТОЛИЙ А. ТУРИЛОВ, *Slavia Cyrillomethodiana: Источниковедение истории и культуры южных славян и Древней Руси. Межславянские культурные связи эпохи средневековья*, „Знак“, Москва 2010, pp. 488.

АНАТОЛИЙ А. ТУРИЛОВ, *От Кирилла Философа до Константина Костенецкого и Василия Софьянина. История и культура славян IX–XVII вв.*, „Индрик“, Москва 2011, pp. 448.

АНАТОЛИЙ А. ТУРИЛОВ, *Межславянские культурные связи эпохи средневековья и источниковедение истории и культуры славян. Этюды и характеристики*, „Знак“, Москва 2012, pp. 808.

During the years 2010–2012, the two Moscow publishing houses *Znak* and *Indrik* released the greater part of the oeuvre of the eminent Russian historian and Slavist, specializing in the history of the Church and the culture of South and East Slavs, palaeography, epigraphy, codicology and older Slavic literatures – Anatolii Arkadyevič Turilov. This output – collected in three thick volumes – comprises studies on a broad range of topics¹, reflecting the author's varied interests.

The first of the three books, entitled *Slavia Cyrillomethodiana: Источниковедение истории и культуры южных славян и Древней*

ных книг, хранящихся в СССР, ed. А.А. Турилов, Москва 1986; *Дополнения к „Предварительному списку славяно-русских рукописных книг XV в., хранящихся в СССР (М., 1986)“*, ed. А.А. Турилов, Н.А. Охотина, Москва 1993; *Каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг XV века, хранящихся в Российском государственном архиве древних актов*, ed. А.А. Турилов, Москва 2000; А.А. Турилов, *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР. XI–XIII вв.*, pars 1, *Исправления и уточнения*, АИУОН.С 5, 1997/1998, p. 469–503; *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в России, странах СНГ и Балтии: XIV век*, ed. А.А. Турилов, Москва 2002.

¹ Part of them arose during the work on manuscript catalogues, cf.: *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР XI–XIII вв.*, ed. С.О. Шмидт, Москва 1984; *Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописных книг XV в., хранящихся в СССР (для Сводного каталога славяно-русских рукопис-*

Руси. Межславянские культурные связи эпохи средневековья (Москва 2010, pp. 488), contains eighteen previously published articles spanning the years 1982–2009, grouped into four thematically consistent sections. All the papers are devoted to the medieval history of the culture of the Orthodox Slavic countries, heavily influenced by the legacy of the Apostles of the Slavs – the brothers Saints Cyril and Methodius – and their disciples.

In lieu of a usual foreword, the first part, entitled *Древнейшие межславянские культурные связи и судьбы кирилло-мефодиевского наследия в национально-региональных традициях* (p. 7–114) starts with a survey text reviewing the medieval Russian literary culture of the 11th–16th centuries, therefore including its Great Russian and Little Russian (Ukrainian/Belarusian) variants, analysed on the basis of original texts on general Christian topics and their translations in a broader Slavic context (*Slavia Cyrillomethodiana* and *Slavia Orthodoxa*). The second article continues the first one in a way, dealing with the history of Glagolitic and Cyrillic monuments of Old Church Slavonic literature uncovered principally through the intensive exploration of monastery archives on Mount Athos, in Macedonia, Palestine and Sinai², forming the so-called OCS canon ('старославянский канон' in the Russian nomenclature) as well as – what is perhaps more important – the slightly later ones, hailing from the medieval national and religious traditions of the Slavic countries. An undeniable advantage of this particular study is no doubt the fact that the author does not impose on himself any geographical limits, thoroughly discussing the whole Slavic area (East, West and South, although the last

of the three understandably gets the most attention); neither does he restrict the study to any particular text types. In the next four articles of the first part Turilov concentrates on the following points: 1. the peculiarities of the Russian-South Slavic cultural contacts and the resulting role of the literary tradition of Muscovite Rus' (15th–16th century) in the dissemination of the texts from the period of the 1st Tsardom (885–970); 2. an attempt to reconstruct the oldest Slavic corpus of hymnographic texts in the Old Russian tradition (based on material from the Menaia); 3. remarks on the manifestation of the literary heritage of Cyril and Methodius' disciples (Constantine of Preslav and Clement of Ohrid) in the Slavic Breviary (Требник), based on the manuscripts and old prints of the Bulgarian and Serbian recension; 4. the connections between medieval Serbian literature from the Nemanjić period with the oeuvre of the Holy Brothers and the reception of some of their works on Serbian ground.

In the article opening the second chapter (*История и культура Болгарии IX–X вв.*, p. 115–178), Turilov discusses the formation of the Bulgarian variant of the Menologion (in comparison with Russian and Serbian manuscripts), pointing to certain forgotten (as he himself remarks in the title of the paper) dates from the ecclesiastical and political history of the 1st Bulgarian Tsardom. The subsequent two texts constitute a meticulous analysis of an individual source text – *Сказание инока Христодула (Сказание о железном кресте, селтера: Сказание...)*. The first article focuses on the attempt to illuminate the origin of the text, whereas in the second one the *Сказание...* serves as a means to reveal the image of the Bulgarian society at the close of the 9th century.

The third part – under the heading *Культурные связи Руси с южными славянами в XII–XIII вв.: „первое восточнославянское влияние“* (p. 179–232) – encompasses only two texts, devoted to the following topics: 1. Old Russian literary texts (as e.g. *Послание брату-столпнику с надписанием „Илариона*

² For details cf.: А. А. Турилов, *Судьба древнейших славянских литературных памятников в средневековых национально-региональных традициях*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Slavia Cyrillomethodiana: Источниковедение истории и культуры южных славян и Древней Руси. Межславянские культурные связи эпохи средневековья*, Москва 2010, p. 18–38 (esp. 19).

митрополита Киевского“ в заглавии, Сочинения Кирилла Туровского, „Предисловие покаянию“, „Слово от Апостола“, „Пчела“, Житие Андрея Юродивого or Пандекты Никона Черногорца) in South Slavic manuscripts (Serbian and Bulgarian; we may note that the author does not confine himself to the period specified in the title of the section, since he also covers the 14th century in his analysis, even taking into account later facts as well); 2. the 12th century Novgorodian text „Поучение Моисея“ in South Slavic codices that reflect Russian-South Slavic cultural bonds (it is worth mentioning that the theoretical considerations are illustrated with material excerpted from the source texts).

The fourth chapter, „Второе южнославянское влияние“ и русская книжная культура XIV–XV вв. (p. 233–438) is the lengthiest section in this volume. It is introduced by a text studying the influence exerted by South Slavic literature on the nonmaterial culture of Rus' (the emergence of a vast number of new texts in the East Slavic lands, the creation of new copies of old manuscripts in accordance with the orthographic standards functioning in Rus' at the time, the impact of Middle Bulgarian spelling conventions on native orthography, etc.), accompanied – as usual in Turilov's writings – by an ample bibliography of studies devoted to this vital subject, counting over thirty pages. The following paper deals with the problem of the Serbian component in the so called “second South Slavic influence” on the East, correcting and supplementing views prevalent in the literature on the subject. The third article is a close study of Memnon's *Tetraevangelion*³, aimed at determining the time and place of its composition. The next publication depicts the roughly 150 year long history of the Verse Prologue (*Стишний пролог*) and its transformations. The further studies are devoted to the following issues: 1. the periodization of the literary connections between Rus' and the South Slavic lands in the 15th and early

16th century based on a selection of source texts (being the earliest of Turilov's works reprinted here, it is supplemented by an additional commentary by the author⁴); 2. the literary connections between the South Slavic area and Muscovite Rus' as well as the Orthodox parts of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; 3. the phenomenon of the Slavo-Moldovan manuscript tradition of the 15th–16th centuries.

The volume under discussion is enhanced with the highly valuable information on the time and place of the original publication of the collected articles, detailed notes on the widely used source material, as well as an index of geographical and personal names connected with the cited secondary literature and original texts.

The second of the publications under review is entitled *От Кирилла Философа до Константина Костенецкого и Василия Софьянина. История и культура славян IX–XVII вв.* (Москва 2011, pp. 448). It is, like the previous volume, a collection of articles (numbering twenty-one in total, and likewise reprinted⁵) divided into four parts.

In the initial section, labelled *Кирилло-мефодиевская проблематика. Творчество учеников Кирилла и Мефодия. Болгария в IX–X вв.* (p. 9–125) we find publications discussing the most distant past of Christian Slavdom. The first paper comments on the reception of the Sermon (*Slovo*) *О похвале святей Богородице Кирилла Философа* (cetera: *Slovo*) in the East and South Slavic manuscript tradition of the 15th–17th centuries. Although the authorship of the *Slovo*, first attested in a 15th century manuscript⁶, can scarcely be

⁴ Cf. p. 361–362.

⁵ Information on the original time and place of publication is given on p. 428–431.

⁶ The manuscript bears the bookplate of the State Historical Museum (ГИМ), Муз. 1779; cf. A.A. Турилов, *К истории великоморавского наследия в литературах южных и восточных славян*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *От Кирилла Философа до Константина Костенецкого и Василия Софьянина. История и культура славян IX–XVII вв.*, Москва 2011, p. 11sq[qq].

³ Manuscript housed at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, the collection of P.N. Dobrotov (archbishop Paul), №26 (basic collection 11.9.7).

attributed to Cyril himself, the work is – as noted by Turilov – closely tied with the Great Moravian literary heritage⁷. This publication is indubitably a solid application of textual criticism to the source (supplemented with an additional commentary to this particular edition, as the article was first published in 1985⁸), since the author studies the text based on a number of manuscripts. It is noteworthy that the text of the *Slovo* itself (according to the aforesaid 15th-century manuscript) is also included, with preserved punctuation and abbreviations (p. 31–35). The next paper furnishes a historiographical discussion on the Slavic Menologion and the position of the commemoration of the Holy Brothers within it. In the third piece in this volume, Turilov focuses on the epigraphic and palaeographic issues pertaining to the inscription on the icon of Clement, bishop of Rome. Subsequently, he turns to two source texts: 1. the work *Учение, им же ведати человеку числа всех лет*, written in 1136 by Kirik the Novgorodian, representing the variety of calendar/mathematical texts popular within the *Slavia Orthodoxa* at the time; 2. *Сказание...*, also discussed in some publications contained in the 2010 volume⁹ – this time, Turilov addresses issues connected with the cycle on the miracles of Great martyr George (including the authorship and date of composition) as well as the geography of the miracles themselves.

The second chapter – *Судьбы глаголицы в средневековой письменности южных и западных славян* (p. 127–157) – opens with an article on the traces of Glagolitic in the Menologion forming part of the Ohrid Apostle (12th century). The next two texts investigate a previously unknown copy of the Glagolitic Service to Sts. Cyril and Methodius¹⁰ (the publication includes a critical edition of the text) and discusses the problems connected to at-

tributing hands to particular authors (as exemplified by a selection of Croatian Glagolitic manuscripts).

The third part of the volume – *Культурные связи восточных и южных славян в XIV–XVII вв.* (p. 159–307) – begins with an article corresponding to a monograph by A.I. Sobolevskij¹¹, devoted to the corpus of 14th–15th century South Slavic translations in Rus', quite diverse as regards genre and subject matter. The next study explores the dating of twelve 14th–16th century icons from Pskov based on the linguistic and palaeographic features of the inscriptions found on them. Subsequently, the author addresses the following issues: 1. the history of the Ukrainian-Bulgarian connections concerning the ornamentation of 16th-century manuscript books (in the present publication, the text was expanded so as to include the analysis of one of the manuscripts in question, the Čerepiš Gospel); 2. a multi-angled study on the anonymous stories of the 1558 mission to Ivan the Terrible from Mount Athos, concerning the miraculous icons (and other relics) of Hilandar Monastery (the paper is supplemented by an edition of the source text); 3. a close textual study of the Karlovac manuscript of Konstantin Kostenečki's treatise *О письменах*.

The fourth and last part of the volume, entitled *Археография. Кодикология* (p. 309–431), contains seven articles. The first one deals with the fragmentary Slavic palimpsests from the collections of A.I. Chludov, with special emphasis on the Glagolitic palimpsest¹². The next one studies fragments of parchment manuscripts in a codex from A.S. Uvarov's collection in the State Historical Museum¹³. In the four subsequent texts, the author focuses

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 11.

⁸ Cf. an. 5.

⁹ Cf. above.

¹⁰ The Moscow fragments of the St. Thomas Breviary (Святотомашевский бревиар).

¹¹ А.И. СОБОЛЕВСКИЙ, *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV–XVII вв. (Библиографические материалы)*, Санкт Петербург 1903 (reprint Leipzig 1989). Turilov's article first appeared in print on the 110th anniversary of the publication of this monograph.

¹² Хлудов, № 117, housed at the State Historical Museum (ГИМ).

¹³ Уваровское собрание ГИМ, № 1176–4^о.

on the Serbian manuscript tradition, analysing in detail the following points: 1. the origin and date of the composition of two codices: the Mileševko Panegyric¹⁴ and the Homiliarium of Mihanović¹⁵; 2. fragments of certain Serbian manuscript books from the late 13th and 14th centuries; 3. 14th- and 15th-century documents; 4. Serbian cryptography of the 15th and 16th centuries. The volume closes with a study devoted to the collection of manuscripts found in 1868 in Bulgaria and Macedonia by the Russian scholar A.F. Gilferding.

Along with the articles and the information on their original place of publication, the book also features an index of reference numbers used in the work on the manuscripts, indicating the place of their storage, as well as a list of abbreviations (referring to institutions, collections, editions etc.).

The third and newest (as well as most voluminous) book presented here is a collection of forty three articles by A.A. Turilov (again – like in the two previously discussed volumes – arranged by topic into four chapters), published under the title *Межславянские культурные связи эпохи средневековья и источниковедение истории и культуры славян. Этюды и характеристики* (Москва 2012, pp. 808). The papers contained in this volume are likewise known to the scholarly community from other publications.

The first section of the book, *Судьбы кирилло-мефодиевского наследия в национально-региональных традициях и древнейшие межславянские культурные связи* (p. 9–235) is strongly reminiscent of the corresponding part of the volume *Slavia Cyrillomethodiana...* – not only in view of the almost unchanged title (cf. above), but also the content, since as many as seven of the twelve articles published there are also to be found in the present volume¹⁶.

Another one was published a year before in the volume *От Кирилла Философа...*¹⁷ The remaining four publications included in this section are: 1. a close textual study on the *Proglas of Constantine the Philosopher*, including a meticulous palaeographic analysis; 2. the services for St. Methodius¹⁸ (supplemented by an edition of the text); 3. Clement of Ohrid's canon for the Dormition of the Mother of God¹⁹ (likewise with an edition of the text²⁰); 4. an overview of the history of Slavic literature in the western parts of the 1st Bulgarian Tsardom from the 10th to the first half of the 13th century.

The second part, again entitled identically as in the volume *Slavia Cyrillomethodiana...*, i.e. *Культурные связи Руси с южными славянами*

*дения над южнославянской рукописной и старопечатной традицией); Две забытые даты болгарской церковно-политической истории IX в. (К вопросу формирования болгарского варианта церковного месняцеслова в эпоху Первого царства); Судьба древнейших славянских литературных памятников в средневековых национально-региональных традициях; Роль сербской традиции в сохранении древнейших памятников славянской литературы; Древнерусская культура в контексте средневековых славянских (на материале книжности); Болгарские литературные памятники эпохи Первого царства в книжности Московской Руси XV–XVI вв. (заметки к оценке явления); К уточнению объема и состава древнейшего славянского оригинального гимнографического корпуса в древнерусской традиции (на материале минейных служб), [in:] А.А. Турилов, *Slavia Cyrillomethodiana...*, p. 85–102; 117–146; 18–38; 103–114; 9–17; 39–64; 65–84.*

¹⁷ *К истории великоморавского наследия в литературах южных и восточных славян (Слово „О похвале Богородице Кирилла Философа“ в рукописной традиции Кирилла Философа...*, [in:] А.А. Турилов, *От Кирилла Философа...*, p. 11–44.

¹⁸ According to the manuscript ГИМ, Хлуд. 156; the article is co-authored by L.V. Moškova.

¹⁹ The article is co-authored by L.V. Moškova.

²⁰ According to the manuscripts ГИМ, Хлуд. 156 as well as ГИМ, Хлуд. 166 (the missing troparion).

¹⁴ Montenegro, Cetinje Monastery, № 50.

¹⁵ Croatia, Zagreb, Archives of the Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences (HAZU), III, с 19.

¹⁶ *К определению объема творческого наследия учеников Кирилла и Мефодия в составе славянского Треника (Предварительные наблю-*

в XII–XIII вв.: „первое восточнославянское влияние“ (p. 237–303), consists of three papers, two of which were included in the volume published two years earlier²¹. The third text (coming second in the book) investigates what the author refers to as “new” and “forgotten” facts related to the mutual literary influence between Rus’ and the South Slavic area in the relevant period. The article cites source material excerpted from 11 works.

The third chapter, *Книжность и книжная культура Болгарии и Сербии в XIII – начале XVII в.* (p. 305–516), is the lengthiest one, covering sixteen texts in total. Five of them concentrate on Bulgarian authors, literary works and scriptoria connected with Tarnovo, while the remaining eleven (three of which were published in 2011 r. in the volume *От Кирилла Философа...*²²) explore the question of the role of Serbia in the formation of the medieval culture on the Balkans. They include publications on the accomplishments of particular illustrious personae (as e.g. St. Sava) as well as comprehensive studies on diverse source material – ranging from texts from the archives of St. Panteleimon’s Monastery on Mount Athos (we may note that the critical analyses are accompanied by editions of the texts

themselves²³), through fragments of Serbian liturgical books²⁴, early Slavic epigrams by the Byzantine physician Nicholas Callicles, glosses from the *Vita of Despot Stefan (Lazarević)* by Konstantin Kostenečki, up to a codex containing the *Bulgarian Apocryphal Chronicle*²⁵.

The final fourth part, entitled *„Второе южнославянское влияние“ и русская культура XIV–XVI вв.* (p. 517–755), features twelve articles, of which only three are absent from the previously reviewed volumes²⁶. These address the following issues: 1. the Bulgarian sources (more precisely, the vitae of John of Rila and Petka-Paraskeva) for the Russian Chronograph; 2. certain oriental motifs in the East and South Slavic literatures of the 15th–16th centuries; 3. the literary sources of the iconography of St. Paraskeva in the collection of the Tretyakov State Gallery.

²³ А.е. Греч. 1187, к. 6 об. – 7.

²⁴ Cf. а.е. РГБ, собр. В. И. Григоровича (ф. 87), № 11.3/М. 1693.3); ГИМ, Хлуд. № 164.

²⁵ The so-called Kičevo Miscellany (Кичевский сборник).

²⁶ The other nine publications are: *Восточнославянская книжная культура конца XIV–XV в. и „второе южнославянское влияние“; К вопросу о периодизации русско-южнославянских литературных связей XV – начала XVI в.; К вопросу о сербском компоненте во „втором южнославянском влиянии“; О времени и месте создания пергаменного Евангелия „Мемнона-книгописца“; К истории Стишиного пролога на Руси в XIV–XV вв.; Критерии определения славяно-молдавских рукописей XV–XVI вв.; Южнославянские памятники в литературе и книжности Литовской и Московской Руси XV – первой половины XVI в.: парадоксы истории и географии культурных связей, [in:] А.А. Турилов, *Slavia Cyrillomethodiana...*, p. 235–282; 350–364; 283–303; 304–339; 340–349; 410–438; 365–409; Южнославянские переводы XIV–XV вв. и корпус переводных текстов на Руси (к 110-летию выхода в свет труда А.И. Соболевского); Рассказы о чудотворных иконах монастыря Хиландарь в русской записи XVI в., [in:] А.А. Турилов, *От Кирилла Философа...*, p. 161–200; 237–288.*

²¹ *Памятники древнерусской литературы и письменности у южных славян в XII–XIV вв. (проблемы и перспективы изучения); „Почтение Моисея“ и сборник игумена Спиридона (новгородский памятник XII в. в контексте русско-южнославянских связей, [in:] А.А. Турилов, *Slavia Cyrillomethodiana...*, p. 181–209; 210–232.*

²² *Милешевский Панегирик и Томиларий Михановича – к датировке и происхождению двух древнейших сербских списков Торжественника общего; К отождествлению частей некоторых фрагментированных сербских рукописей конца XIII–XIV вв.; Заметки о сербских грамотах XIV–XV вв., написанных книжным письмом: проблемы писцов, подлинности и датировки актов (из предварительных наблюдений); [in:] А.А. Турилов, *От Кирилла Философа...*, p. 331–344; 345–380; 381–404.*

Just like in the case of the previous volumes, this one also contains information on the original place of publication of the respective articles, detailed notes on the used source material and an index of names.

We may conclude this short survey of A.A. Turilov's publications by asserting that the three volumes under review no doubt confirm the author's outstanding impact on the complex field of Orthodox Slavic medieval culture. They are indisputably a splendid source of information for specialists in many disciplines, especially historians and Slavists interested in palaeography. The decision to republish

the vast majority of Turilov's works (spanning decades' worth of research) in three new volumes will make it significantly more convenient for readers interested in his papers to access them, as the effort of tracking down difficult-to-find publications in search of the particular articles is spared. At the same time, the fact that half of the third volume comprises articles already published in the two preceding ones (and therefore at most two years earlier) does strike one as slightly odd.

Translated by Marek Majer
Agata Kawecka (Łódź)

БОРИВОЈЕ МАРИНКОВИЋ, *Заборањени братственици по перу* [Forgotten Brothers of Writing], Службени Гласник, Београд 2011, pp. 359.

Many monographs were written on the subject of Serbian writers in the South Slavic academic literature, both historical and literary-historical. Majority of these texts are focused on the life and works of the most prominent writers coming from *gens Rasciana*. There is no lack of biographies of Dositej Obradović (1739–1811)¹, Jovan Rajić (1726–1801)², Zaharija Orfelin (1726–1785)³, Pavle Julinac (1731–1785)⁴. As a result of this research, however, the picture of the eighteenth-century Serbian literature is rather fragmented. The panorama of the artistic life of the Serbs includes also other artists, who are usually overlooked or marginalized in monographic studies of Serbian literature.

An attempt to fill this gap in the academic literature was made by Borivoje Marinković (1930–2012) in a work titled *Заборањени*

братственици по перу. The author was a professor at the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Novi Sad for many years. From the beginning of his academic career he was investigating early modern Serbian literature and culture, with particular emphasis on the eighteenth century. Among his greatest works we can find: *Дневник Јустина Михаиловића, Доситеј у говору и твору*. This Balkan researcher was also an editor of the works of Serbian thinkers from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, particularly of Dositej Obradović⁵ and Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787–1864)⁶. Additionally, all editions of his works were enriched with a detailed scholarly commentary. We should not also omit a highly useful five-volume bibliography concerning early modern printed Cyrillic, which was published in the years 1988–1992⁷. The work

¹ Ј. ДЕРЕТИЋ, *Поетика Доситеја Обрадовића*, Београд 1974.

² Д. РУВАРАЦ, *Архимандрит Јован Рајић 1726–1801*, Сремски Карловци 1901.

³ Т. ОСТОЈИЋ, *Захарије Орфелин. Живот и рад му*, Београд 1923.

⁴ Р. РАДОЈЧИЋ, *Павла Јулинца „Кратки увод у историју порекла славено-српског народа“*, Београд 1929.

⁵ Д. ОБРАДОВИЋ, *Сабрана дела*, vol. III, Београд 1961.

⁶ В. С. КАРАЦИЋ, *О српској народној поезији*, Београд 1964.

⁷ Б. МАРИНКОВИЋ, *Библиографија о нашем ћириличком штампарству, штампаријама и књигама XV, XVI и XVII столећа*, Београд 1988–1992.

Заборањени братственици по перу is one of the last book of this Serbian researcher.

The study of B. Marinković consists of two parts. In the first one (*Есеји о мање познатим писцима XVIII столећа*, p. 7–204), the author introduces some silhouettes of forgotten Serbian writers from the eighteenth century. On pages from 207 to 350 (*Списи о песнику Јовану Авакумовићу у српској грађанској поезији*), Marinković includes the second part, devoted *in extenso* to the life and work of Jovan Avakumović (1748–1810). The final parts of the Serbian researcher's work are the afterword (*Поговор*, p. 351–355) and bibliography. At this point it should also be noted that some of the articles included in the reviewed book have already been published in academic journals. This fact, however, is always recorded by the publication's author published.

One of the longest of essays was devoted to Jovan Muškatirović (1743–1809), who played a very important role in the promotion of *Aufklärung* of Serbs in the Habsburg Monarchy. B. Marinković draws the attention to the perception of this historical figure by both his contemporaries as well as by researchers of the South Slavic Enlightenment.

A lot of space in *Заборањени братственици по перу* the author dedicated to Emanuel Janković (1758–1791). The focus of attention by Marinković on Janković should not be a surprise to anyone, as the historian of Serbian literature from Novi Sad wrote many works devoted to the author of *Трговци*. Additionally, B. Marinković is also the author of the biography of E. Janković⁸. In the essay titled *Девет фрагмената о Емануилу Јанковићу*, Marinković shows the figure of Janković in nice facets. He pays special attention to his social and artistic activities. Some of the events from the eighteenth-century writer's life, however, were mentioned only in passing; the reader may find more information on this subject in the artist's biography.

The last "forgotten" of the Serbian literature from this period, to whom South Slavic

historian dedicate an entire essay, is Aleksije Vezilić (1753–1792). The text, however, is somewhat different the previous articles, as Marinković was more focused on the impact Vezilić had on other artists of the time than on his biography.

Beyond the above-mentioned figures, the part of the work entitled *Есеји о мање познатим писцима XVIII столећа*, other important people from the eighteenth-century Serbian culture are mentioned, such as Silvester Popović (1700–?), Pavle Nenadović (1703–1768), Mihailo Maksimović (?–1819), etc.

The second part of the work, *Заборањени братственици по перу*, is fully dedicated to Jovan Avakumović. We can distinguish seven sections that relate to life, work and contribution that this artist made to the creation of the Serbian bourgeois and secular poetry. It is this part of Marinković's work that is without a doubt the most innovative and valuable, as Marinković is the first author to comprehensively discuss the figure of the author of the work entitled *Трагом нових података о Јовану Авакумовићу* that considerably expands our *terra historica* for new contexts. Essays dedicated to Avakumović are chiefly based on source materials that have not been previously published; because of this, numerous excerpts of eighteenth-century, unpublished works can be found here.

Borivoje Marinković undertook a difficult task. The effect of long-term work on reviewing the collection of essays is impressive. The South Slavic researcher delivered to a reader a complete, systematised and extremely well considered compendium of knowledge about the little-known, forgotten, Serbian artists and filled a long-standing gap in the historic and Slavic literature. Undoubtedly, the work called *Заборањени братственици по перу* is a position that every scholar sharing interest in the history and cultural changes in the Balkans in the early modern period should have.

Piotr Kręzel (Łódź)

⁸ ИДЕМ, *Емануил Јанковић*, Београд 2007.

***Z dejín slovensko-srbských vzťahov [Aus der Geschichte der serbisch-slowakisch Beziehungen]*, ed. MIROSLAV DANIŠ, Vydavateľstvo STIMUL, Bratislava 2012, pp. 198 [= Acta historica Posoniensia, 19].**

In der Frühen Neuzeit zeichnete sich die serbische Gesellschaft durch eine starke Migration aus. Diese betrifft ganz besonders die an der Donau liegenden Regionen. Oft war die Umsetzung von Teilen der Bevölkerung eine Auswirkung bzw. Folge von Maßnahmen der Armee und beruhte auf dem Krieg zwischen Österreich und dem Osmanischen Reich in dieser Region. Die erste Migrationswelle in Gebiete der Stephanskronen (und in die der heutigen slowakischen Gebiete) kam schon um die Wende des XV. zum XVI. Jahrhunderts an¹. Die von Serben am stärksten besiedelten Plätze in Ostmitteleuropa waren solche Orte wie Szentendre, Buda und Komárno.

Das Zusammentreffen zweier Ereignisse – die vor 500 Jahren erfolgte Gründung der ersten serbisch-orthodoxen Gemeinde auf slowakischem Gebiet (in Komárno), aber auch das 90-jährige Jubiläum der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität in Bratislava, lieferten den slowakischen und serbischen Forschern eine sehr gute Begründung, um am 4. November 2011 in Bratislava eine wissenschaftliche Konferenz zu veranstalten, die den serbisch-slowakischen in Lauf der Zeiten gewidmet war. Es nahmen daran Vertreter der Universität Novi Sad und der Comenius-Universität (Bratislava) teil.

Die vorliegende Publikation mit dem Titel *Z dejín slovensko-srbských vzťahov [Aus der Geschichte der serbisch-slowakisch Beziehungen]* ist

also ein Ergebnis dieses Treffens in Bratislava. Der Band erschien in der Serie Acta historica Posoniensia, 19. Er besteht aus vierzehn Artikeln. Der Text wurde chronologisch angeordnet, die Reihenfolge entspricht dem Ablauf der Konferenz.

Der Band Buch beginnt mit dem Artikel (p. 11–14) von Petar Rokai an, in der der Autor die Brauchbarkeit der Zipser Chronik (*Szepesszombati Krónika, Chronicon de Georgenberg*) für die Erforschung der mittelalterlichen Geschichte Serbiens bespricht. Der Autor widmet besonders viel Platz dem Zeitabschnitt der Regierung vom Stefan Lazarević (1377–1427).

Im Verlauf der Konferenz wurde viel Platz dem Zeitalter der Frühen Neuzeit gewidmet, besonders dem XVIII. Jahrhundert. Die zu diesem Teil gehörenden Artikel gelten insbesondere der Bildung. Miroslav Dudok beschreibt in der Arbeit unter dem Titel: *Slováci na srbskom gymnázium v Sremskych Karlovciach* (p. 15–22), das Leben der Slowakischen Studenten in dem Ort Sremski Karlovci. Ein sehr interessanter Text ist auch der Text des Serbischen Historikers Vladan Gavrilović, der die Motivation beschreibt, die für die südslawischen Studenten ausschlaggebend bei der Wahl der Evangelischen Mittelschulen im XVI-II. Jh. war. Er richtet die Aufmerksamkeit stark auf die religiösen und politischen Probleme. Zur Textgruppe, die der Bildung gewidmet sind, kann man auch den Artikel von Đorđe Đurić unter dem Titel *Jan Tomka Saski u kontekstu evropskih uticaja na srpsku istoriografiju u XVIII veku* (p. 23–33) zählen. In diesem Artikel wird ausführlich der Einfluss der slowakischen Humanisten auf die Formung der neuzeitlichen serbischen Geschichte um die Wende des XVI-II. zum XIX. Jh. beschrieben. An dieser Stelle sollte man auch den Text erwähnen, der den Serbisch-Slowakischen Beziehungen gewidmet ist und von Samuel Jovanković stammt (p. 143–154). Der Autor vergleicht die Geschich-

¹ Über dieses Thema haben schon mehrere Autoren gehandelt: J. РАДОНИ, *Прилози за историју Срба у Угарској у XVI, XVII и XVIII веку*, Нови Сад 1909; В. СТОЈАНЧЕВИЋ, *Пресек кроз историју српских сеоба од XIV до почетка XVIII века*, ЗМСИ 41, 1990, p. 21–22; Љ. ЦЕРОВИЋ, *Срби у Словачкој*, Београд 1999; М. СВИРЧЕВИЋ, *Миграције у Србији XVIII века и установе патријархалног друштва*, ГЕИ. САНУ 52, 2004, p. 314.

tsbücher in den Schulen im Hinblick auf ihre serbischen Elemente.

Die nächste große Artikelgruppe in diesem Werk wurde ganz den intellektuellen Beziehungen zwischen den Serben und Slowaken im XIX. Jh. gewidmet. Der Leser sollte besonders seine Aufmerksamkeit auf den Text von Dejan Mikavica richten, dem Inhaber des Lehrstuhls für Geschichte an der Universität in Novi Sad (p. 69–75). Er beschreibt die Rechte und die politische Lage des slowakischen Volkes gemäß der national bestimmten Ideologie von Svetozar Miletić (1826–1901). Der Serbische Historiker richtet sein Interesse vor allem auf die politischen Faktoren, die zu einer solchen Wahrnehmung der Slowaken durch einen der größten nationalen Ideologen Serbiens führten. Der Autor versucht auch, das Problem der Multiethnizität im Kontext der Habsburgermonarchie aufzuzeigen.

Ebenfalls sehr interessant sind die Texte der Geisteswissenschaftler aus Bratislava zum Thema der serbischen Anwesenheit auf slowakischem Boden. Nennenswert ist an dieser Stelle auch die Arbeit von Michala Mračka (p. 47–56), über die Benennung der Straßen in der Hauptstadt der Slowakei, die sehr an die Gestalten und Ereignisse aus der Geschichte der Serben anspielen. Die Autorin schrieb ihre Arbeit auf der Basis eines sehr umfangreichen sprachwissenschaftlichen Materials. Alica Ku-

lihová hingegen befasste sich mit dem Problem der Übersetzung der Arbeiten von Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787–1864). Sie analysierte verschiedene Arbeiten des serbischen Wissenschaftlers. Der Text enthält viele Zitate, die ihre Thesen reich illustrieren (p. 57–68).

Das Buch *Z dejín slovensko-srbských vzťahov* beinhaltet auch biographische Skizzen zweier serbischen und slowakischer Forscher. Die erste dieser Skizzen, verfasst von Nebojša Kuzmanović, befasst sich mit dem Leben und Schaffen von Risto Kovijanić (1895–1990), die zweite hingegen von Miroslav Daniš beschreibt die diplomatische Tätigkeit von Josef Belaj (1911–2005) in Jugoslawien (p. 122–133).

Darüber hinaus sollte auch beachtet werden, dass am Schluss des Buches auch einige Rezensionen verschiedener Bücher zu finden sind.

Das vorliegende Buch *Z dejín slovensko-srbských vzťahov* wird mit Sicherheit unser Wissen im Bereich der serbischen und slowakischen Beziehungen bereichern. Dieses Buch ist trotz seiner vielen Autoren sehr übersichtlich. Es ist nicht nur für Spezialisten der Geschichte der Balkanhalbinsel und Ostmitteleuropas empfehlenswert, sondern auch für Geisteswissenschaftler, die sich für die Beziehungen zwischen den slawischen Völkern interessieren.

Piotr Krężel (Łódź)

MONIKA OŻÓG, *Inter duas potestas. Polityka religijna Teoderyka Wielkiego [The Religious Policy of Theoderic the Great]*, Wydawnictwo WAM, Kraków 2012, pp. 314.

The figure of Theoderic the Great, king of the Ostrogoths, ruler of a state which had its territorial core in Italy, the cradle of the Roman state, has long been fascinating scholars. The result of this interest is a large number of works devoted to various aspects of his life, as well as the history of the state he ruled. Not all aspects of his rule, however, became a focus of a thorough study. Theoderic's religious policy can be count-

ed among those, and it is that subject to which this work is devoted. It was written by Monika Ożóg, an academic teacher of the Institute of History of the University of Opole, her Ph.D. being *Kościół starożytny wobec świątyń oraz posągów bóstw [Attitudes of the Ancient Church towards temples and statues of deities]*, Kraków 2009, pp. 220.

Theoderic the Great and the Ostrogoths he ruled were, from a religious viewpoint, Ar-

ians. By Constantinople and Rome – the titular *potestas*, not mentioned by name – they were regarded as heretics. The Polish Scholar offers us an opportunity to examine how this heretical ruler was shaping the relationship with his Catholic subjects and, in particular, with the bishops of Rome. I think it is in this way that the position of the bishop of the Eternal City towards the Gothic ruler should be defined, hence I have some doubt as to the adequacy of the first part of the book's title to the nature of relations between Theoderic and the Roman Shepherd. The other major relations with the Byzantine Emperors are also examined; it is worth recalling that it was probably on the initiative of one of them – Zeno – that Theoderic arrived on the Apennine Peninsula, taking over the power from Odoacer.

The primary source for the Author of the book discussed here is the *Book of the Bishops of Rome (Liber Pontificalis)*. This work, created relatively soon after the time of Theoderic, forms not only the most important source of information (enriched, of course, by other texts, of both Latin and Greek provenance), but also the basis for the development of the structure of the book. The text is divided into nine chapters, seven of which are delimited by the pontificates of the bishops of Rome, who held the dignity at the time when Italy was under Theoderic's rule. They were Felix III, 483–492 (chapter II, p. 53–70), Gelasius, 492–496 (chapter III, p. 71–77), Anastasius II, 496–498 (chapter IV, p. 79–81), Symmachus, 498–514 (chapter V, p. 83–135), Hormisdas, 514–523 (chapter VI, p. 137–178), John I, 523–526 (chapter VII, p. 179–189) and Felix IV, 526–530 (chapter VIII, p. 191–193). The aforementioned chapters are complemented by: chapter I, *The Arian Church of the Goths* (p. 31–52), chapter IX, *Religious matters in the Edict of Theoderic* (p. 195–231), an *Introduction* (p. 7–29), *Conclusions* (p. 233–237), a summary in English (p. 239–243), a list of abbreviations (p. 245–248), bibliography (p. 249–289) and indexes of people (p. 292–299), places and geographical names (p. 301–304) and quoted primary sources (p. 305–314). In the chap-

ters based on the *Liber Pontificalis*, the Author analyses passages on specific popes in the context of their relations with Theoderic. Information taken from this source is juxtaposed with others, such as *Excerpta Valesiana*, *Varia* of Casiodorus and *Getica* of Jordanes.

In the first chapter, Monika Ozóg presents Arianism in its Gothic version, defining it as a “national” religion. In chapter IX she takes on the issues of the religious themes in the *Edict of Theoderic* in the context of the authorship of this text (Theoderic the Great or Theoderic II, king of the Visigoths). The Scholar found new arguments in favour of associating the *Edict* with Theoderic the Great.

The structure adopted has its advantages: among them, potentially greater ease in capturing a specific issue in a particular historical context; however, as was rightly observed by the Author herself, this solution also has its disadvantages, the most serious of which is the relatively frequent repetition of information. Despite the emphasis on the information from *Liber Pontificalis*, Monika Ozóg does not lose sight of other sources, which she confronts with her main source. The bibliography includes many important titles, although it might also be worth reaching for several other works, such as: an article by Jonathan Shepard¹, devoted to such matters as Theoderic's stay in Constantinople (his education and attitude to Roman culture); and two monographs focused on the reign of Anastasius², important not only for understanding the relations between that Emperor with Theoderic and the bishops of Rome, but also for explaining the nature of the formal relations between Ravenna and Constantinople. It is also worth

¹ J. SHEPARD, *Manners maketh Romans? Young barbarians at the emperor's court*, [in:] *Byzantine Style, Religion and Civilization. In Honour of Sir Steven Runciman*, ed. E. JEFFREYS, Cambridge 2006, p. 135–158.

² F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, Cambridge 2006; M. MEIER, *Anastasios I. Die Entstehung des Byzantinischen Reiches*, Stuttgart 2009.

referring to the classic work of A.A. Vasiliev on the reign of Justin I³.

On the pages of her book the Author presents Theoderic as a capable player who skilfully managed religious matters. She points out that the ruler had to deal with important issues such as the Laurentian Schism, which was tearing apart the Church in Rome, or the Acacian schism, which determined the nature of relations between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople. It is significant that Theoderic was able to use both schisms for his own purposes.

³ A.A. VASILIEV, *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great*, Cambridge 1950.

The Scholar points out that for the majority of his rule, Theoderic managed to preserve stable, peaceful relations between the Arians and the Catholics. Only during the final years of his rule did Theoderic take steps against the latter group, as a consequence of the anti-Arian policy of Emperor Justin I. This step however should not obscure the thirty years during which the king of the Goths earned the reputation of a ruler who could bring about religious peace in his country.

*Translated by Michal Zytka
Miroslaw J. Leszka (Łódź)*

VLADIMÍR VAVŘÍNEK, *Cyril a Metoděj mezi Konstantinopolí a Římem* [Cyril and Methodius between Constantinople and Rome], Vyšehrad 2013, pp. 375.

The book discussed here was written by Vladimír Vavřínek, an outstanding Czech Slavist and Byzantinologist¹, a scholar who for many years now has worked on the so-called Cyril-Methodius question, and is a renowned expert in the field. The book is, it seems, something of a summary of the many years of research performed by its author and an attempt at sharing his conclusions – on the subject of the activity of the “Solun [Thessalonican] Brothers” that was so important in the history of mediaeval Europe – with a wider audience (hence its popular science character).

V. Vavřínek begins the tale about the life and activity of Constantine and Methodius from the moment of the arrival of the messengers of the prince of Great Moravia to Constantinople – which became a pretext for

presenting the capital of the Byzantine Empire (*Příchod Moravanů do Konstantinopole* [The arrival of the Moravians to Constantinople], p. 7–18), and subsequently of the main aspects of the history of Byzantium, with an added emphasis on religious matters, from 4th century until the time of the arrival of the Moravian envoys. This part of the work is entitled *Byzanc* [Byzantium] – p. 19–49. In the following section (*Soluňští bratři před odchodem z Byzance* [Solun Brothers prior to departure from Byzantium], p. 50–88), the Author examines the fortunes of Methodius and Constantine up to the point when they were designated by the emperor Michael III and the patriarch Photius to undertake missionary activity in the Great Moravian state.

The subsequent part of the book (... *rudis adhuc christianitas gentis Maravensium*, p. 89–115) was devoted to the beginnings of the Great Moravian state, with an emphasis on the presence of Christianity (prior to the arrival of the Solun Brothers) among the local populace. It is a starting point for characterising the activity of Constantine and Methodius in the Great Moravian state during Rostislav's reign in the following part (*U Rostislava*

¹ He authored many works, among them: *La révolte d'Aristonikos*, Praha 1957; *Staroslověnské životy Konstantina a Metoděje*, Praha 1963; *Církevní misie v dějinách Velké Moravy*, Praha 1963; *Dějiny Byzance*, Praha 1992, 1994 (co-author); *Encyklopedie Byzance*, Praha 2011 (in cooperation with P. BALCÁREK).

[*In the state of Rostislav*], p. 116–148). It is also here that the reasons for their departure from Great Moravia and the fortunes of their journey to Rome are described. It also presents a sketch of the relations between the papacy and Constantinople, drawing particular attention to the influence exerted on said relations by the rivalry over the Bulgarian church. The following part of the book (*U prahů apoštolských* [At the papal see], p. 149–192) pertains to the stay of the Solun Brothers in Rome. The author describes here: the welcoming of Constantine and Methodius by pope Hadrian II; the death of Constantine; the circumstances of the elevation of Methodius to the dignity of archbishop, and finally the events that led to the return of the Bulgarian church into the Constantinopolitan area of influence. In the part entitled: *Metoděj – arcibiskup svatě cirkve moravské* [Methodius – archbishop of the holy Moravian church] (p. 193–268), V. Vavřínek presents the activity of Methodius after his return to the Great Moravian state, ruled at this time by Svatopluk. The Author's argument focuses on the various aspects of church life in the Great Moravian state; on the relations between Methodius and Svatopluk, papacy, German clergy, Byzantium, as well as on the translation activity of the archbishop. In the following part of the book (*Slovan-ské písemnictví na Velké Moravě* [Slavic literature in Great Moravia], p. 269–304), V. Vavřínek characterised Slavic literature associated with the Solun Brothers and their students, focusing his attention on the *Life of Constantine* and the *Life of Methodius*. The following fragment, *Poslední léta moravské cirkve* [The final years of the Moravian church] (p. 305–322), concerns the fortunes of the Church in the Great Moravian state from the year 885 until its end;

the subsequent one, *Cyrlometodějské dědictví* [Cyrillo-Methodian legacy] (p. 323–350), is in turn devoted to the reception of the Slavic liturgy and literature in the Premyslid Czech state, in Bulgaria and in Rus.

The work is supplemented by: acknowledgements (351–252), selected bibliography (354–358)², indices (359–375). The book is neatly published, richly illustrated and supplied with maps. The graphic design is guaranteed to attract a reader's attention, and is an excellent addition to the interesting, clearly presented and standing on a high professional level and reflecting the modern state of the knowledge content. This is certainly a book that can be read for gain with pleasure by both an „ordinary” reader as well as a scholar already versed in the themes it discusses. One can only regret that such works are relatively rarely written by great scholars, such as Vladimír Vavřínek.

Translated by Michal Zytka
Miroslaw J. Leszka (Łódź)

² I am aware that the bibliography is a selection, however it would be worthwhile, in my opinion, to expand it at least by the work of L. SIMEONOVA, *Diplomacy of the Letter and the Cross: Photios, Bulgaria and the Papacy 860s–880s*, Amsterdam 1998 (very important for the study of relations between Constantinople and Rome at the time of Photius' patriarchate, with an expanded look at Bulgarian matters). I will use the occasion to add a correction – the full title of Tadeusz WASILEWSKI's work listed in the bibliography: *Bizancjum i Słowianie w IX wieku. Studia z dziejów stosunków politycznych i kulturalnych*, and it was published in 1972, and not in 1970 (p. 358).

AULUS GELLIUS, *Noctes atticae* 2.24. *De vetere parsimonia; deque antiquis legibus sumptuariis* / AULUS GELLIUSZ, *Noce attyckie, 2.24. O dawnej oszczędności i o starożytnych ustawach dotyczących wydatków*, ed. et trans. ALDONA RITA JUREWICZ, MARIA PIECHOCKA-KŁOS, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, Poznań 2012, pp. 48 [=Fontes Historiae Antiquae. Zeszyty Źródłowe do Dziejów Społeczeństw Antycznych, 25].

In 2012 University of Adam Mickiewicz Press published the translation of the passage of Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* titled *Noctes Atticae 2,24. De vetere parsimonia; Deque antiquis legibus sumptuariis*. The book has been published as an issue XXV of the bilingual series known as *Fontes Historiae Antiquae*. The translation and commentary have been prepared by Aldona Rita Jurewicz and Maria Piechocka-Kłos. The authors attempted to introduce to Polish readers an interesting and important work which presents the customs and opinions of the Romans on luxurious life as well as the legal and administrative methods of resolving this significant social problem. The work consists of three parts. In the first one the authors described Aulus Gellius himself and his work. The second part contains the bilingual edition of Gellius' text. The Polish translation is correct and comprehensible, but it is possible to find minor editorial errors. Another slight mistake is inserting into the Polish translation the nickname "divine" for Tiberius which cannot be found in the original text (p. 21). In the third part (the most interesting one) the authors comment on particular *leges* which were included by Gellius in his *Noctes Atticae*. The commentary contains a short introduction explaining the reasons for issuing sumptuary laws in Rome. Afterwards the authors described particular laws in chronological order from the times of early

Republic until the establishment of the Principate. The book ends with brief conclusions. It is worth emphasizing that the authors equipped their book with an elaborate and expanded set of footnotes. They made ample use of the sizeable international literature of the subject. It detracts, however, from the quality of the book that the authors omitted the articles of Polish authors, including Anna Pikulska-Radomska¹ or Janusz Sondel². This omission may not be treated, however, as a discrediting one. The issues presented in the reviewed book have never been fully described in Poland in an academic manner. The authors filled that gap and it is important to say that their work will facilitate further studies of the subject that are undertaken by both the Roman law scholars as well as historians and classicists. The large number of commented laws once again shows that the efficiency of sumptuary laws was low and they were generally disobeyed by the Roman citizens.

Konrad Tadajczyk (Łódź)

¹ A. PIKULSKA-RADOMSKA, *Ustawowa regulacja obyczajów w prawie rzymskim. Wykład habilitacyjny*, *Slur* 37, 1999, p. 213–219.

² J. SONDEL, *Les "leges sumptuariae" considérées comme l'expression des conditions sociales et économiques de la Rome antique*, *AIC* 6, 1973, p. 101–124.

LUIGI SANTAGATI, *Storia dei Bizantini di Sicilia*, Edizioni Lussografica Caltanissetta, Caltanissetta 2012, pp. 421.

Many years ago A. Guillou wrote in his work about Byzantine Sicily: *Nessuna ricerca approfondita è stata condotta sinora sulla Sicilia bizantina da parte degli studiosi di storia del mondo bizantino*¹. Since that time the research on the Byzantine era of the island has moved on a lot. Among the books dedicated to its history there is that written by Luigi Santagati.

The monograph has been divided into four major parts dealing with sources and current state of research (book I, *Introduzione ad una storia dei Bizantini di Sicilia*, p. 13–45), Sicily's history in late antiquity and early Byzantine era (book II, *Tra la Sicilia romana e bizantina (440–535)*, p. 49–125), life and culture of the Byzantines in Sicily (book III, *Vita e civiltà dei Bizantini di Sicilia (535–827)*, p. 129–198), and finally the struggle against the Arabs (book IV, *L'invasione araba e la resistenza bizantina, 827–1061*, p. 199–352).

The chapters in each part have been devoted to particular problems. And thus two chapters of part one (*Lo stato dell'arte*, p. 15–23; *Le fonti della conoscenza storica e geografica*, p. 25–45) present the state of research on Byzantine Sicily, as well as the sources on which the research is based. Santagati has also pointed out the difficulties of the examination into the history of Byzantium due, among other things, to the destruction of imperial archives commenced by participants of the 4th crusade and finished by Turks (p. 51).

Part II, dedicated to political history of the island contains the chapters which discuss its history at the end of the West Roman Empire (*Fine di un impero*, p. 49–54), barbarian raids and recapturing of the island by Justinian the Great (*Dai Vandali agli Ostrogoti ed ai Bizantini*, p. 55–75), finally the Byzantine rule (*La Sicilia tra il VI e l'VIII secolo*, p. 77–113; *La Sicilia tra l'VIII ed il IX secolo*, p. 115–125). While dis-

cussing the history of the island during Justinian's war with the Goths, the author has devoted much space to the attack of Totila, reconstructing the route of the Gothic army and the list of conquered Sicilian towns. He has emphasized the scale of destruction – *quello che non distrussero i Vandali lo distrussero i Goti* (p. 72). Much attention has been paid to emperor Constans' stay on the island, mutinies of Mezesius Sergius, first Arabic invasions, organization of the Church in Sicily and its civil administration.

In part III the author discusses the problems of Sicilian culture and economy under Byzantine rule. The first chapter (*Gli insediamenti abitativi tra il V e l'VIII secolo*, p. 129–154) has been devoted to the reconstruction of the settlement network on the island, based on written and archeological sources. Chapter Two (*La Sicilia bizantina*, p. 155–198) discusses various aspects of civilization and culture, such as architecture, communication routes, administration, courts, religion, agriculture, language, trade, medicine, everyday life, literature and poetry.

The author pays much attention to the problem of settlement on the island, precisely reconstructing the network of towns, villages and fortresses which used to exist from the beginning of 5th century. To do that he has referred to the antic works by Cicero, Strabo and Ptolemy and early medieval ones by Stephan of Byzantium, Procopius of Caesarea, Leo of Ostia, Constantine Porphyrogenetus, as well as by an anonymous author from Ravenna and another anonymous of *Descriptio orbis Romani*. Santagati has also reconstructed the network of communication routes, ways and bridges, inherited from antic Rome. The remaining chapters of Part Two are much more general in nature. Particular problems are presented in relatively short, 2–4 pages long notes. Some of the author's remarks are certainly worth to be mentioned. Describing the economy of the island he has noted that Arabic influence on the development of the island's agriculture is overrated (p. 169). While discussing the problem of the language he agrees with the opinion

¹ A. GUILLOU, *La Sicilia Bizantina. Un bilancio delle ricerche attuali*, ASSi 4, 1975/1976, p. 45 [= A. GUILLOU, *La Sicile byzantine. Etat de recherches*, BF 5, 1977, p. 95].

of Biaggio Pace that the Greek culture in Sicily was limited to educated people and clergy (p. 181). Presenting prominent Sicilians he emphasizes that on the island there were good conditions for education, particularly that which prepared to ecclesiastic career (p. 190).

In the six chapters of part IV (*L'invasione araba e la prima linea di resistenza*, p. 199–225; *La seconda linea di resistenza*, p. 227–244; *Lo sgrelolamento della Sicilia bizantina*, p. 245–269; *La caduta di Siracusa*, p. 271–286; *L'inizio delle fine*, p. 287–317; *La caduta delle ultime roccaforti siciliane*, p. 319–140) the author discusses the advancement of Arabic invasion and Byzantine resistance. The author has devoted much room to different versions of sources concerning the rebellion of Euphemius, which had been a kind of “invitation” for invasion (p. 201–205). He subsequently tries to reconstruct the route of the Arab forces and their conquests. Much attention has been dedicated to Italy being threatened by the Saracens from Sicily and the changes in settlement caused directly or indirectly by the invaders. The last chapter is devoted to Byzantine attempts to return to the island (*Tra Arabi e Normanni*, p. 341–351) – the expeditions of Orestes, Leo Opos and George Maniakes.

The monograph is supplemented by numerous appendices with the information about religious settlements, Sicilian saints, *stratēgoi*, Byzantine measures and weights, bridges and fortifications. The author has found room for a translation of the letter from patriarch Photius to Leo, archbishop of Calabria. Using the book is facilitated by personal and geographical indices and maps.

The work has been based upon a vast, although much incomplete base of sources and even more incomplete literature on the subject. The author cites almost exclusively the works of Italian authors, or these non-Italian ones whose works have been translated into Italian. He has particular esteem to Michele Amari – he wants to see his own monograph as *sorta di modesto preambulo* to Amari's monumental *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia* (p. 22). It is difficult to underrate the role of Amari – the eminent historian and Arabist, whom we owe (among others) the translation of Arabic

sources about Sicily – in examining the island's history, geography and economy. Still, Amari's work was written in mid-19th century (the fact that Santagati cites a contemporary edition of that is of secondary importance) and since then a lot has been written, of which Santagati should be aware. I cannot understand why the footnotes and bibliography lack the works of the authors of whose contribution in the development of the knowledge of Sicily's history the author himself writes in the first chapter of Part One (such as Vera von Falkenhausen, André Guillou, Marius Canard, Alexandr A. Vasiliev, Ewald Kislinger and many others). Similarly, the author has not reached for some important works of his Italian fellow-scholars, to mention P. Corsi, B. Bavant, L. Bernabò Brea, O. Bertolini, G.P. Bognetti and many others. By the way, for some reasons some works cited in the footnotes have not found themselves in the bibliography.

Not all of the sources discussed in the same chapter (p. 28–42) have been effectively used. It is a mistake to refer to Amari (leaving completely aside the sources, even when they are mentioned in the main text – see p. 106, 124) when discussing Arab invasions on the island. Similarly, Gregory of Tours has been through Biaggio Pace (p. 141). L. Santagati likes quoting the Italian translations of Greek or Arab sources. Although it is acceptable, albeit with longer – sometimes a few pages long – quotations it would probably be better to move them to annexes. The problem is that the aforementioned sources have not been subject to any critical analysis – they serve solely as an illustration. As a result the reader must himself make interpretation, e.g. of the letter of monk Theodosius relating the siege of Syracuse by the Arabs (p. 274–282), sources describing the attempts to help the besieged city (p. 284–286), relating the downfall of Taormina (p. 308–309) or defeat of the Byzantines at Rometta (p. 327–330). The problem lies in the fact that such an analysis would have to be done on the original text.

The author is certainly more interested in the era after 827, which is pointed out by the disproportion between the parts about the political history of the island under Byz-

antine rule (fewer than 50 pages) and the big chapter of over 150 pages, devoted the struggle against the Arab invasion (827–967). For some reasons unknown to me, that first part is very superficial, which leads to many simplifications, to mention just a few.

The thesis that from 535 until 1860 (i.e. for 1325 years!) the island was separated from the rest of Italy (*si andò staccando dal resto d'Italia* – p. 75) is quite surprising. In fact Sicily was one of the two major Byzantine centres in the West, and after the downfall of the Exarchate of Ravenna it remained the only one. The territory of southern Italy was subordinated to the *strategos* of Sicily and during the greatest territorial expansion of the Theme of Sicily also part of Calabria and the territories of Otranto, Gaeta and Naples². If we talk of separation then, it was that separating Sicily and southern Italy from its northern part.

It is not certain if the whole of Sicily found itself under the Vandal occupation (p. 58–59). F.M. Clover suggests that they made use of the difficult situation of Odoacer to force a tribute from the province upon which they had not had real control³. F. Giunta has presented a different views on the Vandal rule over Sicily. He himself, by interpreting the testimony of Victor of Vita and Procopius, comes to a conclusion that it was the control rather than the rule⁴.

One needs to be really careful in the assessment of the attitudes of the inhabitants of Byzantine provinces in the Middle East to the Arab invaders. It is certainly not true that

they perceived the Arab rule to be so much better than the Byzantine one to give their support or welcome the invaders (p. 83–84, 121). Although at that time the Arabs were fairly tolerant, as far as religious affairs were concerned, we must remember that in the 7th century it was economy rather than religion that motivated them. To support his thesis, Santagati cites only one source – an Arab chronicler al-Baladhuri. A historian should not put so much trust in a testimony of just one side, completely leaving aside all sources of the other. And for example in the Syrian sources the Muslim invasion was interpreted as the punishment of God.

It is not certain if the first Arab raid on Syria took place in 652 (p. 84). I myself would not exclude some local *razzia* to obtain spoils, but we must also consider the doubts by many scholars. The information in *Liber pontificalis* must raise doubts, as we read there that *profectus est Siciliam* [i.e. Olimpius – T.W.] *adversus gentem Saracenorum qui ibidem habitabant*⁵. The Arabs certainly did not live in Sicily in 652! Theophanes dates the raid to the year 6155 (= 662/663)⁶, but at the same time he refers to the 22nd year of Constans' rule (=664) and the 8th year of rule of Mu'awija.⁷ Al-Baladhuri's testimony speaks most loudly against dating the invasion to 652. According to him,

⁵ *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Romae*, ed. L. DUCHESNE, vol. I, Paris 1955 (cetera: LP), p. 338.

⁶ *Theophanis Chronographia*, AM 6155, rec. C. de BOOR, vol. I, Lipsiae 1883 (cetera: THEOPHANES), p. 348. It is interesting that in Theophanes there is no information about the invasion after Constans death, which D. MOTTA (*Politica dinastica e tensioni sociali nella Sicilia bizantina: da Costante II a Costantino IV*, Man 1.2, 1998, p. 676) explains by political grounds.

⁷ According to A. STRATOS (*The Exarch Olympius and the supposed Arab Invasion of Sicily in A.D. 652*, JÖB 25, 1976, p. 69) the eighth year of Mu'awija fell in Theophanes on the year 664, although the Syrian administrator became a caliph as late as in 661. Still, Theophanes does not mention another caliph after 656 (when a war between Ali and Mu'awija).

² T. WOLIŃSKA, *Sycylia w polityce bizantyńskiej w VI–IX w.* [*Sicily in the Byzantine Policy, 4th–9th Century*], Łódź 2005, p. 58, an. 177–180.

³ F.M. CLOVER, *A Game of Bluff: The Fate of Sicily after A.D., 476*, Hi 48.2, 1999, p. 238. E. KISLINGER (*Zwischen Vandalen, Goten und Bizantinern: Sizilien im 5. und frühen 6. Jahrhundert*, [in:] BSC, vol. II, ed. A. RÓZYCKA-BRYZEK, M. SALAMON, Kraków 1994, p. 41) is of similar opinion. According to him the Vandals might only have few posts on the island.

⁴ F. GIUNTA, *Gensericus e la Sicilia*, Kōk 2, 1956, p. 104–142 (partic. 117–118).

the first assault on the island took place during the Caliphate of Mu'awija (661–680)⁸. It is on that ground (among others) that A. Stratos has questioned the previous datation. The scholar has concluded that the first Arab invasion took place most likely on the turn of 669/670 (i.e. after the death of Constans), and Theophanes must have mistaken Sicily for Cilicia⁹. Olimpius explained his expedition to Sicily by the invasion, but for the rebellious exarch it may have been just a comfortable excuse. In the opinion of Andreas Stratos, Olimpius had planned his Sicilian adventure to capture the island for just himself, not to fight the invaders¹⁰. It should also be emphasized that contrary to what Santagati thinks (p. 86), Olimpius never reached Sicily – Andreas Stratos says the epidemics had killed him already in Italy.

The author cannot decisively say who actually created the theme of Sicily. At first we read that it was *probabilmente* or even *quasi sicuramente* the idea of Constans II (p. 86–87), later however (p. 107–108) he attributes it to Justinian II. In fact, the date of introducing the thematic reform in Sicily is controversial. A. Stratos is a proponent of the thesis that it should be attributed to Constans rather than to Justinian¹¹, but it is

more likely that the emperor's stay at Syracuse only commenced the evolution that eventually led to the formation of theme. Many scholars point to Justinian II as the author of that reform and they date it to the end of 7th century, between 692 and 695¹². Similarly, E. Eickhoff believes that the theme of Sicily was created by Justinian II,

writing that Constans failed in organizing defence of the province, whereas founding a theme was a permanent value.

¹² Among others: F. BURGARELLA, *Bisanzio in Sicilia e nell'Italia meridionale: I riflessi politici*, [in:] *Storia d'Italia*, ed. G. GALASSO, vol. III, *Il mezzogiorno dai Bizantini a Federico II*, Torino 1983, p. 196–197; R.M. CARRA-BONACASA, *Testimonianze bizantine nell'Sicilia Occidentale: situazione degli studi e prospettive di ricerca*, [in:] *Géographie historique du monde méditerranéen*, ed. H. AHRWEILER, Paris 1988, p. 47; L. CRACCO RUGGINI, *Tra la Sicilia e Bruzzi: patrimoni, potere politico e assetto amministrativo nell'eta di Gregorio Magno*, [in:] *Miscellanea di studi storici*, vol. II, Genova 1982, p. 67; A. GUILLOU, *La Sicilia bizantina*, [in:] *Messina. Il ritorno della memoria*, Palermo 1994, p. 25–26; IDEM, *Géographie administrative et géographie humaine de la Sicile byzantine (VI^e–IX^e s.)*, [in:] *Philadelphie et autres études*, ed. H. AHRWEILER, Paris 1984, p. 135 (and other works by this author); M.I. FINLEY, *A History of Sicily. Ancient Sicily to the Arab Conquest*, London 1968, p. 186; J. FERLUGA, *L'Italia Bizantina dalla caduta dell'esarcato di Ravenna alla metà del secolo IX*, [in:] *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'Alto Medioevo*, vol. I, Spoleto 1988, p. 179; IDEM, *L'esarcato*, [in:] *Storia di Ravenna*, vol. II.1, *Dall'eta bizantina all'eta ottoniana. Territorio, economia e società*, ed. A. CARILE, Ravenna 1991, p. 370; V. LAURENT, *Les sceaux byzantins du Médailleur du Vatican*, Città del Vaticano 1962, p. 121; N. OIKONOMIDIS, *Une liste arabe des stratèges byzantines du VI^e siècle et les origines du thème de Sicile*, [in:] IDEM, *Documents et recherches sur l'institutions de Byzance (VII–XV siècle)*, London 1976, VII, p. 127–130; A. PERTUSI, *Il „thema“ di Calabria: sua formazione, lotte per la sopravvivenza, società e clero di fronte a Bisanzio e Roma*, [in:] IDEM, *Scritti sulla Calabria greca medievale*, Soveria Mannelli 1994, p. 51 (*un po' prima del'700* and others whom I mention in my monograph about Byzantine Sicily

⁸ 'AHMAD 'IBN YAHYÀ 'AL-BALADURI, *Conquisti de [varii] paesi*, trans. M. AMARI, [in:] *Biblioteca arabo-sicula*, ed. M. AMARI, vol. I, Torino–Roma 1982, p. 268.

⁹ A. STRATOS, *Byzance au VII^e siècle*, vol. II, trans. A. LAMBERT, Lausanne 1985, p. 218–220; IDEM, *Exarch Olimpius...*, p. 70. E. KISLINGER (*Regionalgeschichte als Quellenproblem. Die Chronik von Monembasia und das sizilianische Demenna. Eine historisch-topographische Studie*, Wien 2001, p. 120–121) conforms to this datation.

¹⁰ A. STRATOS, *Exarch Olimpius...*, p. 73. Similarly K.P. CHRISTOU, *Byzanz und die Langobarden. Von der Ansiedlung in Pannonien bis zur endgültigen Anerkennung (500–680)*, Athenai 1991, p. 201.

¹¹ A. STRATOS, *Expédition de l'empereur Constantin III surnommé Constant en Italie*, [in:] *Bisanzio e l'Italia. Raccolta di studi in memoria di Agostino Pertusi*, Milano 1982, p. 356; IDEM, *Byzance...*, p. 240; IDEM, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, vol. IV, Amsterdam 1980, p. 58–59, 143. The author (*Expédition...*, p. 357) contradicts himself

but he locates the event at the beginning of 8th century, i.e. during the second reign of the emperor (705–711)¹³. This opinion is shared by W. Enßlin, H. Ahrweiler, S. Borsari and others¹⁴. Also H. Gelzer shows the 8th century as the beginning of the theme¹⁵. B. Pace goes even further and pushes the forming of the theme to mid-8th century¹⁶. In the Byzantine sources the post of strategos of Sicily was first mentioned in relation to the events of 718¹⁷ and the first certain strategos was Sergius, the same who in 717 rebelled against the emperor¹⁸. Still, before him the post had probably been taken by Theodor, who at the times of pope Constantine was sent to Ravenna (709/710) by Justinian II to punish its inhabitants for the acts of hostility during

– T. WOLIŃSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 52–72 and partic. 56, an. 155–166).

¹³ E. EICKHOFF, *Seekrieg und Seepolitik zwischen Islam und Abendland. Das Mittelalter unter byzantinischer und arabischer Hegemonie (650–1040)*, Berlin 1966, p. 96.

¹⁴ A. AHRWEILER, *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VII^e–XV^e siècles*, Paris 1966, p. 48; P. BORSARI, *L'Amministrazione del tema di Sicilia*, RSI 66, 1954, p. 138; W. ENSSLIN, *Zur Verwaltung Siciliens vom Ende des Weströmischen Reiches bis zum Beginn der Themenverfassung*, [in:] *Atti dello VIII Congresso Internazionale di Studi Bizantini*, Roma 1953, p. 364 [= SBN 7, 1953]. W.E. KÆGI (*Byzantine Military Unrest 471–843. An Interpretation*, Amsterdam 1981, p. 227–228) lists it among the themes that existed at the beginning of 8th century.

¹⁵ H. GELZER, *Die Genesis der Byzantinischen Themenverfassung*, Amsterdam 1966, p. 28.

¹⁶ B. PACE, *I Barbari ed i Bizantini in Sicilia*, ASS 36, 1911, p. 6.

¹⁷ THEOPHANES, AM 6210, p. 398; NIKEPHOROS PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, *Short History*, 55, ed. et trans. C. MANGO, Washington 1990, p. 124.

¹⁸ G. AGNELLO, *Palermo bizantina*, Amsterdam 1969, p. 7; V. LAURENT, *Une source peu étudiée de l'histoire de la Sicile au Haut Moyen Age: La sigillographie byzantine*, [in:] *Byzantino-sicula*, vol. I, Palermo 1966, p. 37.

his first reign¹⁹ and who welcomed the pope in Sicily while on the way to Constantinople²⁰. It is possible, though, that Sicily had had a strategos even earlier and that it had been a man named Theophylact, who later became the exarch of Ravenna²¹. V. Laurent has discovered and published that official's seal, which he dates to the end of 7th century. As Theophylact became the exarch in 701, he must have been the island's strategos about the year 700. A new research by M. Nicianian and V. Prigent²², which is known to Santagati (p. 108), shows yet another person – a certain Salventius, who could have occupied the post from ca. 685. The above data let me share the opinion of these scholars who see the founder of the theme of Sicily in Justinian II and leads me to the conclusion that it must have been founded at the end of 7th century.

There is no hard evidence that Constantine IV landed in Sicily after his father's death (p. 88), which version is present in some eastern sources. According to Theophanes and others the young emperor personally set off with a huge fleet to avenge the death of his father and suppress the mutiny²³. It was there that he

¹⁹ *Mittens Justinianus imperator Theodorum patricium et primi exercitus Siciliae cum classe, Ravenna civitatem coepit* (LP, p. 389). AGNELLO (*Liber pontificalis ecclesiae ravennatis*, 137, ed. O. HOLDER-EGGER, [in:] *MGH.SRLI*, vol. I, Hannoverae 1878, p. 367) named him *monostrategos*.

²⁰ LP, p. 390. The pope was travelling through Naples where he was greeted by John Rizocopus, *patricius et exarchus*, and then went to Sicily, greeted by Theodor, already a *patricius* and *strategos* of the island.

²¹ *Cubicularius, patricius et exarchus Italiae* (LP, p. 383). He was the exarch in 701–705. The seal of Theophylact, *cubicularius* and *strategos* of Sicily was published by V. LAURENT (*Sceaux byzantins...* p. 120–121).

²² M. NICHANIAN, V. PRIGENT, *Le stratèges de Sicile. De la naissance du thème au règne de Léon V*, REB 61, 2003, p. 97–141.

²³ THEOPHANES, AM 6160, p. 352. Besides him Constantine's expedition was described by Agapius, George the Monk, Leo Grammaticus, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Manasses, Michael the Syr-

would have captured the usurper, sentenced him to death, along with his father's murderers and returned to Constantinople. Western sources, including *Liber pontificalis* and Paul the Deacon, are silent about Constantine IV's expedition to the island. In the light of their relations, that were the western troops that had set off against Mezesius, they arrived in Syracuse and killed Mezesius himself and many of his supporters and their bodies, along with Mezesius' head were shipped to Constantinople²⁴. A. Stratos, although ready to admit that

ian, Joel (we know from him that Constantine was nicknamed *pogonatus* when he returned with the beard from the Sicilian expedition – GIOELE, *Chronographia compendiaris*, ed. et trans. F. IADEVAIA, Messina 1979 p. 101). Information about the expedition can be found in eastern chronicles – *Dionisius reconstituted*, *Chronicon ad a. 1234* and in some western ones (Otto of Freising, Dandolo, Martinus, Ekkehard). Information about participation of the emperor can be found neither in patriarch Nicephorus, nor in most western sources. It is not totally unlikely in the light of an obscure note in *Continuatio Isidoriana: Constans apud Syracusam audiens seditione suorum occisum patrem cum classe qua potuit, palatium petiit et tronum gloriose triumphando concendit* (*Continuatio Isidoriana Byzantia-Arabica et Hispana*, cap. 26, ed. Th. MOMMSEN, Th. NÖLDEKE, [in:] *MGH.AA*, vol. XI, Berolini 1894, p. 345). John the Deacon at first informs of suppression of the mutiny by western troops and sending Mezesius' head (GIOVANNI DIACONO, *Istoria Veneticorum*, I, 36, ed. L.A. BERTO, Bologna 1999, s. 82) to write later on that it was the emperor who punished him (I, 39, p. 84). Many contemporary historians accept the information of Constantine IV's expedition. Cf. W. HAHN, *Mezesius in peccato suo interit*, *JÖB*, 29, 1980, p. 62; W.E. KÆGI, *op. cit.*, p. 166. J.F. HALDON (*Byzantine Praetorians. Institutional and Social Survey of the Opsikion and Tagmata c. 580–900*, Bonn 1984, p. 472) on the one hand doubts in Constantine's visit in Sicily, on the other he writes of the emperor's expedition with the *Opsikion* troops (*ibidem*, p. 195).

²⁴ Pauli *Historia Langobardorum*, V, 12, ed. E. BETHMANN, G. WAITZ, [in:] *MGH.SRLI*,

the mutiny was suppressed by western troops, believes that Constantine may indeed have visited Sicily²⁵. He emphasizes that the exarch of Ravenna would not command the forces out of his own area without special imperial consent, that he had no power on Sicily and that it was only the emperor himself that could have the rebels executed because of their high ranks. In my opinion these arguments may not be decisive. The emperor, informed of what was going on on the island and of the participant of the rebellion could issue the appropriate orders on paper. The fact that they such an order has not been preserved is not surprising. In addition to this, Stratos is inconsequent, as he maintains somewhere else that in 713 strategos Theodor commanded both the forces of the theme of Sicily and of the exarchate of Ravenna, in the absence of the exarch²⁶. In 668–669 the situation could have been just the opposite.

It seems more important why so many eastern sources keep telling about Constantine's expedition to the west. In spite of them, we may not ignore the opinion of E.W. Brooks, who has questioned the possibility of personal participation of the young emperor in the expedition²⁷. His arguments must be taken seriously: a) had the emperor personally arrived in Sicily, Mezesius' head would not have needed to be sent to Constantinople; b) the author of the *Life of Adeodatus* in *Liber pontificalis* wrote it soon after the described events and could not have been unaware of the emperor's arrival along with his fleet; c) Constantine IV could not leave the capital city, neither during the mutiny of Saborius,

vol. I, Hannoverae 1878; *LP*, p. 346. *Reginonis ablati Prumiensis Chronicon cum continuatione Treverensi*, a. 576–604, ed. F. KÜRZE, [in:] *MGH.SRG*, vol. L, Hannoverae 1890, p. 30; *Ptolomei Lucensis Historia ecclesiastica*, XII, 21, ed. L.A. MURATORI, [in:] *RIS*, vol. XI, Mediolani 1727, col. 942.

²⁵ A. STRATOS, *Byzantium, in the Seventh Century*, vol. V, Amsterdam 1980, p. 10–13.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 19.

²⁷ For details cf. E.W. BROOKS, *The Sicilian Expedition of Constantine IV*, *BZ* 17, 1908, p. 455–459. D. MOTTA (*Politica dinastica e tensioni sociali nella Sicilia bizantina: da Costante II a Costantino IV*, *Man* 1.2, 1998, p. 671) is of similar opinion.

the ally of the Arabs (668), nor later when he commanded the defence against Yazid's attack (669). In Brook's opinion when the fleet set off from Constantinople, the mutiny on the island had already been suppressed. In fact, the testimony of the western sources seems to be decisive here. It is difficult to imagine that chroniclers would fail to notice the presence of another East Roman emperor after Constans in Sicily.

It is not true that the wife and two sons of Constans II *lo raggiunsero solo alcuni anni dopo a Siracusa* (p. 86). The eastern sources tell of the ruler's plans to move his family to the West, which however would have been prevented by the people of Constantinople. It is not unlikely that such plans may have existed. Although there is no evidence to support that, we can imagine that following Maurice's example, also Constans may have thought of giving the West to a son of his. This, besides the natural longing for the family, could explain the plan of bringing the younger sons to the West. It may not have concerned his eldest son, who had been entrusted the government at Constantinople. This way or the other, those plans were never accomplished.

The objection from the popes against iconoclasm was not the sole reason for the decision to confiscate the income from papal estates in Sicily, Calabria and Illyricum (p. 100). More important was to obtain the means for the struggles against the Arab invasion – let us remain that it was just during the reign of Leo III that the most dangerous siege of Constantinople took place.

Scholars have not been able to determine which of the rulers: Constans II or his son Constantine IV was nicknamed *pogonatus* (bearded). The author of the foreword to the Greek version of *Hypomnesticum Theodorii*²⁸ calls Constans like this. Many other scholars maintain that it is him, not Constantine IV that should be named this way²⁹, but there is no general

²⁸ R. DEVRESSE, *Le texte grec de l'Hypomnesticum de Théodore Spoudée*, AB 53, 1935, p. 66.

²⁹ E.W. BROOKS, *Who was Constantine Pogonatus*, BZ 17, 1908, p. 460–462; P. CHARANIS, *Some Remarks relating to the History of Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century*, [in:] *Byzance. Hommage à A. Stratos*, vol. I, Athenes 1986, p. 60; A. STRATOS, *Byzance...*, p. 38.

consent about it³⁰. L. Santagati thinks that both could have been called like that (p. 86–88), which indeed cannot be excluded.

Some of the author's theses have not been sufficiently proven. I would like to know, for example, who exactly thinks that it was the Church of Sicily that contributed to Constans' murder in 668 (p. 87), where is the source informing of the Byzantine attack against the Muslims in Africa in 688–689 (p. 97) or what evidence proves that the Sicilians adhered closer to the Church *di origine latina* than *di origine greca* (p. 121).

Interesting is the author's opinion that the failure in Sicily meant the total failure of the passive system of defence, developed in the empire along with the thematic system, and that no conclusions were drawn from that defeat (p. 225). It should be regretted that this thought has not been further developed. Another interesting supposition is that that the reason why Sergios did not proclaim emperor himself was that as an eunuch he could not pretend to the throne, but due to the lack of sources we can only guess.

Similarly lacking evidence is the opinion of the misfortunes that Constans' stay at Syracuse would bring to the Sicilians (p. 88). The issue, however, is more complicated. Not negating the fiscal pressure, we may not forget of its advantages, as well. The emperor's stay at Syracuse certainly contributed to its development, as it became an imperial seat (*sedes imperii*)³¹. It is not accidental that the pretences of the Church of Syracuse appeared just at that time³². Constans'

³⁰ R. MAISANO, *La spedizione italiana dell'imperatore Costante II*, SG 28, 1975, p. 143.

³¹ The emperor would encourage his companions to build mansions in the city *in eis aulis sibi aedificare et possessiones atque bona acquirere* (*Chronicon anonymum ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens*, part I, CXXXVII, CXXXIX, ed. I.-B. CHABOT, Lovanii 1937 [CSCO 109, ser. 3, Scriptorum Syri 14], p. 220, 223). A similar statement can be found in Dionysius, according to whom the emperor encouraged to buying estates to provide means for the living (*Dionysius reconstituted*, 113, [in:] *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles*, ed. A. PALMER, Liverpool 1993, p. 187).

³² The first time in *Vita Zosimi* from the end of 7th cent. (bishop of Syracuse 654–662). The leg-

reforms gave a decisive impulse to the militarization of the island and introducing the thematic system on it.

L. Santagati likes digressions, sometimes interesting, but not always justified by the subject he writes about (information about literary texts devoted to Belisarius, p. 55, a vast part concerning the Lombard invasion in northern Italy, p. 77–79, or the description of Rome by Al-Idrisi, p. 251–253). These passages could have been removed in favour of expanding

end can also be found in *Vita P. Marciiani, Vita P. Pancratii* and *Encomium* of St. Martian.

the parts more important to the main subject of the book.

What I have above should not discourage the reader to reach for the book by Luigi Santagati. It is certainly an interesting attempt to make the reader acquainted with a fairly unknown history of Sicily at the times when it was a part of the East Roman Empire. I am particularly enthusiastic about the authors careful reconstruction of human settlement on the island and I am glad to recommend it to the readers.

Teresa Wolińska (Łódź)

БИСТРА НИКОЛОВА, *Монашество, манастири и манастирски живот в средновековна България* [*Monasticism, Monasteries and Monasterial Life in Medieval Bulgaria*], vol. I, *Манастирите* [*Monasteries*], vol. II, *Монасите* [*Monks*], Алфаграф, София 2010, pp. 861.

The topic of monasticism in medieval Bulgaria has attracted unceasing interest of scholars for some time now. Numerous separate studies have touched upon almost all aspect of that movement. It is surprising that we had to wait until the beginning of the 21st century for its monograph. The reason for that might lie in the peculiarity of the source material, which does not present a coherent picture of the history of Bulgarian monasticism. To complain about the small number of preserved sources would be an exaggeration, but in comparison to source materials on Byzantine or Serbian monasticism there are some easily recognizable and scholarly troublesome deficiencies: not one of the medieval Bulgarian *typica* has been preserved (existence of one – John of Rila Testament – is still a matter of debate), only a small number of donative documents survived, while majority of monasterial manuscripts have been lost.

The matter of monasticism in medieval Bulgaria is a complex and vast area of study. The author's monograph consists of a staggering 850 pages, although, as she remarked

at the beginning of her work (p. 8), she has not presented a fully exhaustive analysis of the subject but only her subjective overview of it. The volume of the work is partly affected by the author's methodology. She has devoted a lot of space to a detailed description of the discovered by archeologists monasterial locations and she has included a number of side subjects.

The first volume focuses on monasteries, their architecture, material conditions of monastic life and on selected issues that archeological discoveries have brought to daylight. It is composed chronologically, with consecutive chapters relating to: monasteries from the 9th until the beginning of the 11th century, from the period of Byzantine reign and the Second Bulgarian Tsardom. Because of the peculiarity of the subject and the problem of dating such sights a whole separate chapter has been devoted to the presentation of materials on rock monasteries. It is clear that the author's interest focuses on the earliest period of Bulgarian monasticism, since the first chapter takes half of the volume.

Materials are presented in a systematic fashion. Each monastery is meticulously described and the author presents the layout and size of chambers (if such information is included in published archeological data), information about inscriptions, graffiti, equipment and paintings.

The main theme of the first chapter (p. 13–269) are the criteria for identification of monasteries among the remains of buildings. Bistra Nikolova rejects many such identifications on the basis of topographic analysis. The author describes a set of features characterising a cenobitic monastery – enclosed space, within which one can find the church, the cells and the refectory. The properly monasterial functionality of those places is preserved as long as they are directly connected. In a distance there may be utility and storage facilities, scriptoria or workshops. Nikolova contests the idea that objects such as The Great Basilica in Pliska, Pod Zăbuite, Avradaka, Tuzlalăka and Patlejna in Preslav should be recognised as monasteries. Even if her arguments are too unorthodox to be commonly accepted, the very fact that they were raised may have positive effects. It is difficult not to agree with the author when she claims that in numerous publications of archeological discoveries on medieval Bulgarian monasticism the conclusions are formulated in an arbitrary manner.

The passage in which the author states that she does not believe that some of the bigger and better equipped living quarters belonged in fact to hegumen (p. 108–113) is a very valuable observation. Bistra Nikolova claims, that no distinction should be made in Bulgarian monasteries of 9th–11th centuries as to the quarters of the superiors, because they usually lived in ordinary cells, which were hardly different from the rest. The author's considerations lead, however, to a somewhat paradoxical situation, because she devotes the most space (p. 111–113) to the question of supposed hegumen cells in the Tuzlalăka and Pod Zăbuite complexes, which, according to herself, cannot be classified as monasteries.

For the same reason it might be surprising for the reader to find considerations about the number of monks living in the complexes in

Preslav, the monasterial character of which has been put into question (p. 85–99). Moreover, the information concerning the diet of the Bulgarian monks is based on data collected from those places (p. 145–146). Some of the analyses presented by the author, then, do not lead anywhere because the analysed objects are not monasteries. The long passage on ceramic icons (p. 161–182) is a clear example of that. The author begins with considerations on the importance of icons in the world of Eastern Christianity, then describes the process of production and stylisation. Having noted that, analogously to Byzantium, monasteries could own ceramic workshops, she presents an opinion that this was not the case with Bulgarian monasteries.

In chapter two (p. 270–343), which focuses on monasteries on Bulgarian lands during Byzantine reign (11th–12th century), the author presents very interesting ideas about the monastery in Rila and its earliest history (p. 274–285). Taking the *Anonymous life of St. John of Rila* to be the most reliable source, she concludes, contrary to information provided by Euthymius of Tărnovo, that John has not set up any monastery and that the beginnings of the monastery in Rila should be dated for the beginning of the 11th century. That line of thought is continued on p. 626–628, 791–814. As a result of such an arrangement of the contents some of the conclusions are repeated three times. It could have been avoided if the book contained unambiguous annotations referring the reader to other parts of the work devoted to the relevant ideas. Frequent repetition of “as mentioned before” or general references to previous chapters are not very useful for finding scattered information. Unfortunately, the book does not contain an index of proper names.

In the second chapter the author also describes monasteries connected to the figure of Prochorus of Pčinja, Gabriel of Lesnovo, Joachim of Osogovo, St. George monastery near Skopje, Theotokos Eleusa monastery in Strumica, Theotokos monastery near Tetovo and the Bačkovo Monastery.

Chapter three (p. 344–404) is devoted to rock monasteries. The author enumer-

ates and describes them in geographical order and draws interesting conclusions from the collected data. More rock monasteries were built around important centres of spiritual life but geology remained the most important determinant for localisation. And so during the lifetime of Boris-Michael and his successors the terrain that was best suited for the creation of rock monasteries was located near Pliska, Preslav and Dorostolon and near Tărnovo and Červen in the Second Bulgarian Tsardom. Bistra Nikolova tries to identify some of the mentioned congregations as cenobias or lauras.

In the last chapter of this volume (p. 405–536) we can find an overview of monasteries created in the Second Bulgarian Tsardom. There is a separate discussion part for the capital monasteries (p. 405–456), one for the provincial ones (p. 457–492), one for those from Bulgarian-Byzantine border (p. 492–515) and one for those from the Black Sea coast (p. 515–536).

Volume two – *Монаси [Monks]* – is built thematically, it contains of the chapter *Българският средновековен монах и неговият манастир [Bulgarian medieval monk and his monastery]*. The author in the first sub-chapter (*Монашеският институт [Monasticism as an institution]* p. 539–545) refers briefly to the different forms of monastic life (anachoretism, cenobitism, idiorhythmia) and circumstances in which they appeared. In that strangely superficial overview there appeared some imprecisions.

Bistra Nikolova considers Pachomius to be a co-creator of the first lauras, which is an opinion not to be found in the academic literature (p. 541). Her opinion that cenobitic monasteries were different from lauras in that they required strict obedience towards the hegumen (expressed elsewhere, p. 629–630) is unsubstantiated. In fact it was a requirement present in both types of congregations¹.

In the next sub-chapter – *Раждането на манастира [The birth of a monastery]*,

p. 545–549) – we can find a short overview of matters connected with the creation of monasteries – who started them, why, what determined the choice for localisation of the congregation. Majority of the considerations presented here have been developed either in chapter one or in the following sub-chapters.

On the following pages of the book, the author deals with motivations of people who chose to join a monastery, analyses the ethnic and social background of soon-to-be monks, their previous occupations, tonsuring ceremony and taking the habit and the habit itself (*Мотивация [Motivation]*, p. 550–572; *Преди манастира [Before the monastery]*, p. 573–595; *Постригването на монах/монахиня. Монашеско облекло [Tonsuring. Monk's clothing]*, p. 596–616). She devotes a lot of space to rulers, members of the ruling house and aristocracy. The major part of the sub-chapter focuses on the identity of tsar Peter and Peter Černorizec. The author rejects the hypothesis that these are one and the same person, the only argument in favour of such claim she does not contest, is the sameness of names of these saints (p. 578–582). Fragments devoted to tsar Peter can be also found in different parts of the book (p. 562–563, 826–843).

Next sub-chapter – *Изборът на манастир [The choosing of the monastery]*, p. 616–741 – consists of six loosely connected parts: typology of monastic life and monasterial congregations, number of monks in the monastery, the monastery and its surroundings, conditions of monasterial life, economic status of monks and monasteries, legal status, monastic liturgy. The author states here that in assessing the number of monks living in a given monastery it is a more reliable practice to consider the size of the church rather than the number and size of the cells (p. 85–99, 643–646). That claim is entirely unconvincing. Arguments against adopting such approach are presented by the author herself on page 646. Some inconsistencies can be found in the part on economy. On page 676 the author declares that she is going to list the types of estates, which were the main sources of

¹ Cf. A.-M. TALBOT, A.P. KAZHDAN, *Lavra*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. II, p. 1190.

income for the monastery, but she then enumerates both real and movable properties (*Основна собственост, тази от която идват главните приходи на манастирите, била недвижимата собственост [...] и движимата собственост*). On page 686 of the book Bistra Nikolova quotes Dimităr Angelov's opinion on the duties of the rural folk towards monasteries and in the footnote on page 392 she mentions an opposing view of Genoveva Cankova-Petkova. Because of the way that B. Nikolova puts them, however, both of these opinions are compatible. That sub-chapter shows most clearly the contrast between the studiously written parts of the book in which the author presents scrupulous analyses supported by in-depth reflection and long studies and the fragments written in a cursory and somewhat hasty manner.

In the following sub-chapters the author analyses the subject of the monks' participation in the intellectual life of medieval Bulgaria. In doing so she focuses on monasterial schools (p. 741–751) and monastic literature (p. 751–761). Trying to define the term "monastic literature" Bistra Nikolova poses three questions: which pieces does the monk transcribe and translate, what does he read and what does the monasterial collection of manuscripts contain. In her conclusions the author emphasises the ambiguity of distinction between the monastic and non-monastic literature.

In the subsequent parts of the book we can find information about the regulations in monks' life (p. 768–783), cults of saints which developed in monasteries (p. 783–846) and monasterial ktitors and donors (p. 846–854). It seems that the basis for the source in the first of the chapters mentioned here is incomplete. The author included *Sermon against the heretics* by Cosmas the Presbyter, *Poenae monasteriales* from the Berlin Codex, penitentials published by Vatroslav Jagić². It lacks for instance *Rule for*

hermits or relevant parts from *Pseudo-Zonaras Nomocanon*. Bistra Nikolova has presented a very interesting methodology in working with the collected material: she compared binding norms with models presented in hagiographic works and she supplemented her conclusions with an analysis of a collection of quotations from marginal notes made by Bulgarian monks. It is all the more unfortunate that the author omitted such important sources.

The book is finished with a laconic ending (p. 855–858) followed by an index of abbreviations (p. 859–861).

Lastly a few remarks on some major editorial errors. I would not mention numerous misspelling had they not appeared in the Church Slavonic quotations (p. 620, 679, 792), titles of books and names in bibliography (p. 270, 271, 291, 305, 388 [note 172, name Vălov written as Vălčev, wrong title], 587, 639, 770, 771, 819, 850, etc.) which can be a problem for those willing to independently analyse the material and identify the quoted texts. There are many problems with the bibliography. The author makes a mistake even when quoting the title of her own article in the footnote 214 on page 616 where she writes: *Названията на монаси и манастири в старобългарската книжнина*, instead of: *Монаси и манастири в средновековната българска терминология*. The maps and illustrations are of low quality and some of the plans are illegible (p. 36, 79–81, 377, 443 etc.).

The book has a number of merits of which I mentioned only a few. It also has a number of shortcomings most of which I took the liberty to remark on. Extensive source base, the vastness of the discussed material, original and inspiring interpretations and observations of the author make this book a must-read for all those interested in spiritual culture of medieval Bulgaria and the whole of Byzantine Commonwealth.

Jan Mikołaj Wolski (Łódź)

² V. JAGIĆ, *Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko južnoslovenskih rukopisa*, Star 6, 1874, p. 131–133.

SHAUN TOUGHER, *The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society*, Routledge: Abingdon–New York 2008, pp. XII, 244 [= Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies].

The reviewed book focuses primarily on the perceptions of eunuchs throughout the period of Byzantine Empire, with fragments devoted to eunuchs in other time periods serving to put the subject matter in context.

The book consists of a preface, a list of abbreviations, a map, an introduction, fifteen black-and-white plates, eight chapters and a conclusion, as well as two appendices, a bibliography and an index. The work is very well referenced and deeply engages with modern scholarship, such as the works of K.M. Ringrose¹; the comprehensive bibliography will certainly be helpful to all interested in studying the subject. It may be noted here that no major new works on the subject of eunuchs have been published since 2008; shorter texts include S. Tougher's article on the eunuchs' perspective on men², S.R. Holman's article on Meletius the Monk's sources for his *De natura hominis*³, and several articles by G. Sidéris⁴. A section partially devoted to perceptions and representations of eunuchs may be found in M. Hatzaki's 2009 work⁵. One may find several more general

works discussing the subject of gender, such as the latest publication of J. Herrin's collected essays on women in Byzantium⁶ (including three previously unpublished texts), or the collected volume *Questions of Gender in Byzantine Society*⁷.

It may also be of interest to the reader that a conference volume is being planned to follow *The Gender of Authority: Celibate and Childless Men in Power. Ruling Bishops and Ruling Eunuchs* conference that took place in August (28th to 30th) 2013 in Zurich.

In the introduction (p. 1–6), the author notes a surge of interest in eunuchs in popular culture in recent years, and discussed possible reasons for said interest. The introduction also includes an outline of the work and the geographical and chronological boundaries within which the subject matter is discussed.

The first chapter: *The eunuch in history. From antiquity to the twenty-first century* (p. 7–13) serves as a broader introduction to the subject, outlining the history of eunuchs across the world (including Persia, China and India, as well as Western Europe), the roles eunuchs performed in their respective societies, as well as some of the reasons for castration. It also includes a discussion of eunuchs in modern world, with particular reference to the Indian hijras. The chapter provides a wider context for the following discussion, elegantly outlining the majority of themes explored in the book.

Chapter two: *Approaching eunuchs. Attitudes, studies and problems* (p. 14–25) examines the attitudes towards eunuchs displayed by historians, both ancient and modern, noting the often hos-

¹ Most notably K.M. RINGROSE, *The Perfect Servant: Eunuchs and the Social Construction of Gender in Byzantium*, Chicago 2003.

² S. TOUGHER, *Cherchez l'homme! Byzantine men: a eunuch perspective*, [in:] *The Byzantine World*, ed. P. STEPHENSON, Abingdon–New York–London 2010, p. 83–91.

³ S.R. HOLMAN, *On Phoenix and Eunuchs: Sources for Meletius the Monk's Anatomy of Gender?*, *J ECS* 16, 2008, p. 79–101.

⁴ G. SIDÉRIS, *Eunuques, Castration et Transidentité à Byzance*, [in:] *Les Assises Du Corps Transformé Regards Croisés Sure Le Genre*, ed. J. MATEAU, M. REYNIER, F. VIALLA, Bordeaux 2010, p. 63–94; IDEM, *Les eunuques de Byzance (IV^e–XII^e siècle): de la société de cour à la société urbaine*, [in:] *Dynamiques sociales au Moyen Âge en occident et en Orient*, ed. E. MALAMUT, Aix-en-Provence 2010, p. 89–116.

⁵ M. HATZAKI, *Beauty and the Male Body in Byzantium*, New York 2009, p. 86–115.

⁶ J. HERRIN, *Unrivalled Influence: Women and Empire in Byzantium*, Princeton 2013.

⁷ *Questions of Gender in Byzantine Society*, ed. B. NEIL, L. GARLAND, Farnham 2013. The volume includes an essay devoted to eunuchs: S. TOUGHER, *Bearding Byzantium: Masculinity, Eunuchs and the Byzantine Life Course*, p. 153–166.

tile treatment of eunuchs by the primary source authors, and attempts to trace the origins of this hostility. At the same time it provides an overview of modern literature discussing the subject of eunuchs – in general, as well as in respective societies. Subsequently, the author outlines the main problems encountered by a scholar dealing with the subject – such as biases of the earlier authors, or difficulty in successfully identifying eunuchs in the sources (both written and visual). Pointing out and analysing the methodological problems inherent in studying the subject of eunuchs is of great merit here, as it helps to inform the reader of the nuances and difficulties inherent to studying the subject.

Chapter three: *Castration* (p. 26–35) deals with the procedure itself. The author notes that it can be studied in its own right, separately from its importance for the subject of eunuchs. The wide variety of reasons for castration is discussed first; an overview of the possible variants and methods of castration follows (this includes accidents). Subsequently, the physiological and social effects of castration are discussed.

Chapter four: *The court eunuchs of the later Roman Empire* (p. 36–53) deals with the subject of eunuchs serving in the imperial administration during late antiquity, examining, among others, the reasons for the rise to power of the court eunuchs, the functions in which they served, and the positions, honours and titles they could hold. The final, and longest, part of this chapter discusses the reasons for which eunuchs were employed by the emperors; the commentary here is both insightful and compelling, and goes a long way to answering this question.

Chapter five: *Transformations. Byzantine court eunuchs, seventh to eleventh centuries A.D.* (p. 54–67) examines the evolution that the position of a court eunuch underwent during discussed period. As the state was changing, so did the roles, responsibilities and titles available to the eunuchs. Ethnic origins and social ties that the court eunuchs are also discussed here, as well as the matter of castration of Roman citizens (a deeply controversial issue at the time). Perhaps one of the most interesting aspects of

this chapter is the discussion of the links between native, Byzantine eunuchs and the prominent families, which may have helped in integrating such eunuchs into the society.

Chapter six: *Eunuchs and religion* (p. 68–95) discusses the roles eunuchs played in the religious *milieu*, as well as attitudes toward eunuchs performing religious roles. Following a commentary about views on religiously motivated self-castration, an overview of eunuchs serving in priestly and monastic roles is provided. Subsequently, the links between important court eunuchs and religion are explored in some detail. Of particular interest here might be the intriguing observation on the portrayals of eunuchs and angels, in that they may have had an impact on one another – as both angels and eunuchs were perceived as genderless and, according to some authors, pure.

Chapter seven: *Images and identities of eunuchs* (p. 96–118) discusses the changing views on eunuchs from late Roman times, when these were strongly negative, ascribing to eunuchs all possible vices and presenting them as neither men nor women (and inferior to either), throughout the Byzantine history. In this chapter the author engages with some of the earlier theses concerning portrayal of eunuchs, posited by K.M. Ringrose, pointing out problems with interpreting sources such as hagiographies and presence of literary tropes leading to distorted images. Lack of self-presentation of eunuchs and „outsider” views of Muslims and Western Christians are also discussed.

Chapter eight: *The twilight of the Byzantine eunuch* (p. 119–127) discusses the presence of eunuchs in the later Byzantine empire – their decline under the Komnenoi dynasty and a possible resurgence under the Angeloi. The author argues that one possible cause of the decline in number and influence of eunuchs may be linked to the change of power structure in the imperial government (an increased reliance on imperial family members).

The conclusion (p. 128–130) reiterates the importance of adopting a broad, comparative approach for the studies concerning eunuchs, and underlines the role of eunuchs as a part of

the Byzantine society which held highly mixed views of them. Of the two appendices, the first one provides a list of the Byzantine emperors; it is the second one (pp. 133–171) that deserves a separate mention, as it provides the reader with a compact yet informative prosopography of 229 Byzantine and late Roman eunuchs.

The book is not an attempt at a definitive study of eunuchs in the Byzantine empire, as the author himself admits, but instead it serves to provide a general framework for the study of eunuchs during this period – and it is clear that this goal was fulfilled. The reader will find

in the work numerous insightful observations and conclusions, as well as an invaluable assistance for further study of Byzantine eunuchs. The book should also prove to be of considerable interest to those interested in studying perceptions of gender and gender roles, in both historical and modern context. The clear structure and style make the work easy to read and accessible, for both a scholar and layman alike.

Michał Zytka (Cardiff)

ABBREVIATIONS

AA.ASH	Acta antiqua, Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
AANL	Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei
AB	Analecta Bollandiana
Ae	Aevum. Rassegna di scienze storiche, linguistiche e filologiche
AFP	Archivum fratrum praedicatorum
AH.ASH	Acta historica, Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
AIC	Archivum Iuridicum Cracoviense
AIUON.S	Annali dell'Istituto universitario Orientale di Napoli, Slavistica
An	Antiquity. A Quarterly Review of World Archaeology
AnzSP	Anzeiger für slavische Philologie
AoB	Annals of Botany
APB	Acta Patristica et Byzantina
APH	Acta Poloniae Historica
Ar.ASS	Archeion. Archivio di Storia della Scienza
Ara	Arabica
AS	Ancient Society
ASI	Archivio storico Italiano
ASS	Archivio storico siciliano
ASSi	Archivio Storico Siracusano
ATe	Ars Textrina: the Art of Weaving
Ath	Athenaeum
Aug	Augustinianum. Periodicum semestre Intituti Patristici Augustinianum, Pontificia Universitas Lateranensis
AUNC.FP	Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. Filologia Polska
Balc	Balcanica. Annual of the Institute for Balkan Studies
BCLSMF	Bulletin de la Classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques, Académie royale de Belgique
BF	Byzantinische Forschungen. Internationale Zeitschrift für Byzantinistik
BHM	Bulletin of the History of Medicine
BL	Byzantina Lodziensia
BP	Balcanica Posnaniensia
BSC	Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia
Bsl	Byzantinoslavica. Revue internationale des études byzantines
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
BZ	Byzantinische Zeitschrift
CBQ	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly

CCM	Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, X ^e –XII ^e siècles
CER	Catholic Educational Review
CFHB	Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae
CGS	Chinese Geographical Science
CNI	Cultura Neolatina
CP	Classical Philology
CQ	Classical Quarterly
CSCO	<i>Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium</i>
CT	Collectanea Theologica
Dand	Dandelion. Postgraduate arts journal & research network
DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers
E	Eos. Commentarii Societatis Philologiae Polonorum
Ele	Electrum. Studia z historii starożytnej
Elp	Elpis. Czasopismo Teologiczne Katedry Teologii Prawosławnej Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku
EO	Échos d'Orient
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
FBR	Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte
FGHB	Fontes graeci historiae bulgaricae / Грътски извори за българската история
GCS	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte</i>
GOTR	The Greek Orthodox Theological Review
H	Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie
He	Hesperia. The <i>Journal</i> of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens
Hi	Historia. Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte
Histor	Historyka
HTR	The Harvard Theological Review
JAF	Journal of American Folklore
JAMS	Journal of the American Musicological Society
JECS	Journal of Early Christian Studies
JÖB	Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik
JRAI	The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institutue
K	Klio. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte
KH	Kwartalnik Historyczny
Kök	Kökalos. Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto di Storia Antica dell'Università di Palermo
KWo	Klinische Wochenschrift
LAn	Liber Annus
M	Meander

Man	Mediterraneo antico
MBAH	Münstersche Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte
MGH.AA	<i>Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores antiquissimi</i>
MGH.SRG	<i>Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae historicis separatim editi</i>
MGH.SRLI	<i>Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX</i>
MHB	Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica
MJ	Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch
MNGB	Mitteilungen der Naturforschenden Gesellschaften beider Basel
MPH	<i>Monumenta Poloniae Historica</i>
MS	Mediaeval Studies, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
NPFC	<i>Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of Christian Church</i>
NRMI	Nuova Rivista Musicale Italiana
OCP	Orientalia Christiana Periodica
ODB	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> , ed. A. Kazhdan et al., New York–Oxford 1991
Osi	Osiris
P	Palamedes: A Journal of Ancient History
Pbg	Palaeobulgarica/Старобългаристика
PE	Pro Ecclesia
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca</i> , ed. J.-P. Migne Paris 1857–1866
PL	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina</i> , ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1844–1880
PNH	Przegląd Nauk Historycznych
PPC	Petits Propos Culinaires
PRMA	Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> , ed. T. KLAUSER, Stuttgart 1950–
RE	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, Stuttgart 1894–1978
REB	Revue des études byzantines
Ref	Reformatio
RES	Revue des études slaves
Rhet	Rhetorica. A Journal of the History of Rhetoric
RHR	Revue de l'histoire des religions
RIS	<i>Rerum italicarum scriptores</i> , ed. L.A. Muratori, Milano 1723–1751; Città di Castello–Bologna, 1900–
RLit	Russian Literature
RNR	Roczniki Nauk o Rodzinie

Rom	Romania. Revue consacrée à l'étude des langues et des littératures romanes
RS	Ricerche slavistiche
RSC	Rivista di studi classici
RSI	Rivista Storica Italiana
RT.KUL	Roczniki Teologiczne Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego
SBN	Studi bizantini e neoellenici
SA	Slavia Antiqua
SAC	Studia Antiquitatis Christianae
SacP	Sacrum et Profanum
Sae	Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte
Sal	Salesianum
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SCer	Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Center for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-Eastern Europe
Sem	Seminare. Poszukiwania naukowe
SG	Siculorum Gymnasium. Rassegna semestrale della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Catania
SGa	Slavica Gandensia
SHi	Slavica Hierosolymitana
Slur	Studia Iuridica. Wydział Prawa i Administracji Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego
SKaz	<i>Sympozyja kazimierskie poświęcone kulturze świata późnego antyku i wczesnego chrześcijaństwa</i> , red. B. Iwaszkiewicz-Wronikowska, D. Próchniak, Lublin 1998–
Sla	Slavia
SMat	Salvatoris Mater. Kwartalnik Mariologiczny
SP	<i>Studia patristica</i>
ŚSHT	Śląskie Studia Historyczno-Teologiczne
SSp	Die Slawischen Sprachen
Star	Starine, na sviet izdaje Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb
SŻ	Studia Źródłoznawcze. Commentationes
T	Traditio: Studies in Ancient and Medieval Thought, History, and Religion
Tlz	Theologische Literaturzeitung. Monatsschrift für das gesamte Gebiet der Theologie und Religionswissenschaft
TM	Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines
TS	Theological Studies

VC	Vigiliae christianaе: A Review of Early Christian Life and Language
VP	Vox Patrum. Antyk Chrześcijański
WK	Waffen- und Kostümkunde
WSJ	Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch
ZNUJ	Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik
ZSSR.KA	Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung
ZW	Zeszyty Wiejskie
ΕΕΒΣ	Ἐλετηρική Ἐταιρεία Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν
БВе	Богословский Вестник
БГЗ	Беларускі істарычны Зборнік
БЕ	Български език
ГЕИ.САНУ	Гласник Етнографског Института САНУ
ГИБИ	Гръцки извори за българската история
ГСУ.ИФФ	Годишник на Софийския Университет. Историко-Филологически факултет
ВПСТГУ.Ф	Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета, III, Филология
ЕЛ	Език и литература
ЗМСИ	Зборник Матице Српске за Историју
ЗРВИ	Зборник Радова Византолошког Института
ИК	История и Книжнина
ИОРЯС	Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности [Императорской/Российской Академии Наук]
Исто	Историја / Journal of History
КМЕ	Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия, vol. I–IV, София 1985–2003.
КУИ	Киевские университетские известия
НБН	Над Бугом і Нарвою. Український часопис Підляшся
ПК	Полата књигописнаи / Polata Knigopisnaja. A Journal Devoted to the Study of Early Slavic Books, Texts and Literature
ПКЖИФ	Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор
ПКШ	Преславска книжовна школа
СЛ	Старобългарска литература
Слав	Славяноведение
СПВЛ	Сборник памятников византийской литературы
ССАрх	Стари српски архив

ТКШ	<i>Търновска книжовна школа</i>
ТОДЛ	Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы Института русской литературы Академии наук СССР
ФЗ	Филологические записки, Воронеж
ЧИОИДР	Чтения в Императорском обществе истории и древностей российских при Московском университете

The full list of abbreviations may be found at:
ceraneum.uni.lodz.pl/s-ceranea/wykaz-skrotow

GUIDELINES FOR THE AUTHORS

A. 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 sebaste 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. ДАВРОВА, 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. СПЕЕК, [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.	IDEM/IDEM/EADEM	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</i> /		
<i>ibidem</i>	<i>recognovit</i>]		
	[rec.:] [here: <i>recensio</i>]		

References to the Bible are also used in typical Latin abbreviations.

Gn Ex Lv Nm Dt Ios Idc Rt 1Sam 2Sam 1Reg 2Reg 1Par 2Par Esd Ne Tb Idt Est Job
Ps Prv Eccle Ct Sap Eccli Is Ier Lam Bar Ez Dn Os Il Am Abd Ion Mich Nah Hab
Soph Ag Zach Mal 1Mac 2Mac

Mt Mc Lc Io Act Rom 1Cor 2Cor Gal Eph Phil Col 1Thess 2Thess 1Tim 2Tim Tit
Philm Heb Iac 1Pe 2Pe 1Io 2Io 3Io Ids Apc

Greek and Latin terms are either given in 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 Garomond Premier Pro is recommended, for early Slavonic – Cyrillica Bulgarian 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 Śródziemnego 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).

Wydane przez Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego
Wydanie I. W.06443.13.0.C

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego
90-131 Łódź, ul. Lindleya 8
www.wydawnictwo.uni.lodz.pl
e-mail: ksiegarnia@uni.lodz.pl
tel. (42) 665 58 63, faks (42) 665 58 62

Druk i oprawa: Quick Druk