

Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova (Sofia)

SOME ANTI-HERETIC FRAGMENTS IN THE 14TH CENTURY BULGARIAN CANON LAW MISCELLANIES

The most important anti-heretic document from the times of the Second Bulgarian Empire is Tsar Boril's Synodicon, compiled for the needs of the Synod against the Bogomils in Tărnovo in 1211¹. The very nature of the Synodicon as a work of Byzantine literature, created in relation to the events of 843 in order to keep alive the memory of the definitive victory of the Iconodules over the Iconoclasts, determines its character of a primordial source for the heresies. The *Zakonopravilo* of Saint Sava, or St. Sava's *Nomocanon*, established in 1219–1220, when the autocephalous Serbian archbishopric was constituted, and the Serbian translation of the Synodicon on the Sunday of Orthodoxy, proclaimed at the Synod of Žiža in 1221, also illustrate the strong presence of the anti-heretic theme on the South of the Slavs during the 13th century².

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

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

¹ Ив. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, Ив. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилев синодик. Издание и превод*, София 2010.

² Вл. МОШИН, *Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю православия. Анализ текстов*, ВВ 16, 1959, р. 317–394; ИДЕМ, *Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю православия. Тексты*, ВВ 17, 1960, р. 278–353; М. ПЕТРОВИЋ, *Законоправило или Номоканон светога Саве. Иловички препис 1262 године*. Фототипија, Горњи Милановац 1991; J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie. Édition et commentaire*, ТМ 2, 1967.

³ В.Н. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *Житие и жизнь преподобнаго отца нашего Теодосия*, СЧУНК 2 (20), 1904, р. 4–41.

or of private reading for the royal family – that the contemporary science possess from the reign of John Alexander (1331–1371). They are inscribed in the overall process of spiritual renewal and revival, known as the Second Golden Age of Bulgarian literature and culture, whose inspirer and patron is the Tsar himself. John Alexander is a unique Bulgarian ruler, for whom the greatest portion of images and written material has been preserved today¹. His reign has also the privilege of being the period best presented in matters of manuscripts, some of which after the Ottoman conquest make their way into Walachia, Moldova and the Russian lands. In the miscellanies of his epoch, despite their various content and purpose, one observes the repetition of one and the same texts, whose function is connected with the preservation of the true Orthodoxy and the regulation of the efforts for its dogmatic fundament. Some tendencies have been given priority: the encyclopedic one, maintained by the higher number of *erotapokriseis* in some miscellanies (in the Miscellany of hieromonk Laurentius from 1348, in particular²); the monastic and ascetic line, patronized by the strong support of the royal institution in favor of Bulgarian monasticism and his hesychast practices. The Canon law miscellanies enter in the scope of the 14th texts spread in the monastic milieu. So far, special attention has been paid to the various redactions of the confessional statement of the Creed and to the exposition of the Seventh Ecumenical Councils which are usually an obligatory part of the Slavonic nomocanon, or *Kormčaja Kniga*, but could be copied in other types of manuscripts as well (for instance, in the priest Philip's miscellany from 1345, in hieromonk Laurentius' miscellany from 1348, and others). However, they are not unique.

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

1. The manuscript № 76 from the Hludov's collection of the State Historical Museum in Moscow (onward Hlud. 76), copied in about 1330–1350, a bipartite codex with a Bulgarian and a Serbian part³. The first 90 folia contain features of the middle Bulgarian orthography with two signs of nasals, specific to the Tărnovo school. On the basis of paleographic criteria, A.A. Turilov identifies one of the scribes in the Bulgarian part with priest Philip's follower, who, together with his maitre, is the main scribe of the famous copy of Constantine Manasses' Chronicle in the priest Philip's miscellany from 1344–1345, manuscript № 38 in the Synoptic collection from the State Historical Museum in Moscow⁴. The Russian scholar

¹ Ив. БОЖИЛОВ, *Фамилията на Асеневици (1186–1460). Генеалогия и просопография*, ²София 1994, р. 163–164; Л. ЖИВКОВА, *Четвероевангелието на цар Иван Александър*, София 1980, р. 39.

² К. КУЕВ, *Иван Александровият сборник от 1348 г.*, София 1981, р. 27.

³ Е. БЕЛЯКОВА, *О составе Хлудовского номоканона (к истории сборника "Зинар")*, СЛ 37/38, 2007, р. 114–131; А. ПОПОВ, *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати библиотеки А. И. Хлудова*, Москва 1872, р. 200–201; С. НИКОЛОВА, М. ЙОВЧЕВА, Т. ПОПОВА, Л. ТАСЕВА, *Българското средновековно културно наследство в сбирката на Алексей Хлудов в Държавния исторически музей в Москва. Каталог*, София 1999, р. 82.

⁴ А.А. ТУРИЛОВ, *К истории тырновского "царского" скриптория XIV в.*, СЛ 33/34, 2005, р. 305–328.

notes preserved nowadays in 19 manuscripts where he was venerated as a Tsar)¹⁰. By presumed chronology, some of them step out from John Alexander's reign. In the matter of content as well, the analyzed miscellanies prove that his epoch did not engendered the appearance of the miscellany-prototype, but certainly increased the number of copies by enriching the primary compilation with supplementary works. Copying always signalizes actuality of the readings. The main textual corpus (the core of the miscellany) of all the given manuscripts is notable for its outlined anti-heretical direction, although the rest of the texts (the periphery of the miscellany) varies. The anti-heretic trends have their roots in the traditional self-identification of the Orthodoxy by denying every heresy, as well as in the concrete anti-heretical polemics in the Balkans during the 13th–14th centuries against the dualist doctrines (or the remains of them), and the Latins, to whom the strongest negative dispositions in the Byzantine and the Slavic society are especially addressed in the times of the Crusades. Other common reasons for keeping alive the anti-heretic tendency could be: the particular activity of 14th century heretic sects, such as the Adamites, the Barlaamites, and the Judaizers; the echo of the decisions of the Hagiorite assembly from 1344 against some Athonite and Thessalonian monks accused of having confessed to Bogomilism¹¹; the profound influence of the hesychasm with its specific striving for a pure knowledge of God as a way to Salvation; the impending Muslim danger over the Balkans and the pressing necessity of preserving the Orthodox identity by the combined efforts of the State and the Church¹².

The manuscript diffusion of identical anti-heretic texts in a series of copies testifies to the existence of a common prototype and arises from the question of what Greek correspondent the Slavonic reception is based upon. Let's focus on the chosen textual fragments¹³.

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

Under the following title *СѢТГО И ВЪСЕЛЕНСКАГО ВЪТОРАГО СЪБОРА* (variant in L и паку зри впадно се. СѢТГО И ВЪСЕЛЕНСКАГО ВЪТОРАГО СЪБОРА в сырнѣи недѣли. и в прочіи нѣлѣ сказаніе) begins: *Повелѣваемъ въсѣкомѣ хрѣтіанинѣ по сѣтѣи пѣсцѣ тѣхъ въса сѣморицѣ ѿ нѣла и паку до нѣла фоминѣ, миретіи члци да іадѣ мѣса, мниси же сырѣ и рибѣ* (in L added и ганца). и паку до срѣ .н. тницѣ въса тѣхъ сѣморицѣ. и паку дрѣгѣ сѣморицѣ до в'сѣ сѣтѣи по съшѣствіи сѣтѣо дхѣ такоужѣ іасти, и паку

¹⁰ Ив. БОЖИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

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

¹² G. PODSKALSKY, *Theologische literature des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865–1459*, München 2000, p. 124–143.

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

ѿ рождѣства хѣа до кръщеніа хѣа (in L до стѣи просвѣщеніи)¹⁴ такоже іасти¹⁵.
 и паки нѣла еже прѣмъсопѣнъ нѣ. въ наже трѣклатїи арміени поствѣ скврънныи
 свои по, дрѣклатомъ (sic!) арцивѣриоу. и тогда повелѣвае въсѣмъ хрѣтіанѣ іасти
 такоже въса тѣ седморицѣ, а не постити іакоже єдиномѣдрѣно съ еретики.
 нѣ и срѣ и пѣ іасти маса. а мнїси сырѣ и рывы, іакѣ и ѡны дрѣгыа сѣморицѣ
 ѣже рѣхомъ прѣжде. а проклатїи хансисанїе (in L and Hlud. 76 хансисаре) по
 и жрѣтвы творать тогда въ тѣ вса сѣморицѣ ѡсоу нѣкоемъ арцивѣрїоу,
 еже сѣтъ арміени. тѣмже сего ради не дѣнѣ нам' нї єдинъ днѣ постити. Кто ли
 не послѣшає сїхъ прѣданїи стѣи, нѣ инако начнеть мѣрѣствовати, анафема:~
 ѡ сырнѣи нѣли (in L without segmentation and the title keeps on и въса такоже
 сырнѣа нѣла іасти сыра и іаецъ повелѣ стѣи съворѣ). Въса такоже сырнѣа
 нѣла іасти сырѣ повелѣ стѣи съворѣ. въ срѣ же и пѣ тож седморицѣ пѣти побає
 литѣрїѣ прѣжѣсѣщеннѣа въ .ѡ. чѣ днѣ (in L въ врѣмѣ двѣаѣ часа побаєть пѣти
 часовы съ вѣрна)¹⁶. и потомъ іасти сыра и іаецъ, еретики ради антонїанскихъ (in
 L Яндонїаскїи designs a new paragraph) и савельанскїи (added in the marginal
 space of CHAI 1160, a probable auto correction of the scribe; in L and Hlud. 76
 in the principal text), иже съхранѣжть въса сїхъ седморицѣ не іасти ничѣсого.
 тѣмже повелѣ стѣи и великїи и въселенскїи съворѣ. да въса тѣ сѣморицѣ
 въсѣкѣ правослѣвныи безъ вѣсѣкого расѣжѣнїа іасти сыра и іаецъ и рывы. Юще
 же паче проклїнати трѣклатѣа еретики. прѣваго арїа и съ нимъ нествѣрїа,
 и савелїа. и ѡеѡра, и ѡеѡдѣта, хоулыа владослѣвца. и врагы стѣи троици,
 и расѣкателѣ. и іѡанна антихрїстова прѣдїтеча, и сънаслѣдника. маркиѡна же
 и зосимѣ и петрѣсїа, сї вѣсѣхъ проклїнати. єще же и .ѣ. єресеи и вса наставники
 и и оучителѣ. и ликопетра, и пѣла самосатѣа (in L самѣса), и македонїа. и євѣтїхѣвы
 єдиномѣрѣнники. въкѣпѣ ѣже и дїѣскора. и севириана (in L севрїани) и пѣла
 и оученики єго пѣликіаны (in L пѣлике), иже гѣршїи сѣтъ паче въсѣ еретики.
 іакоже и арміени. и дрѣгыа еретики кѣкѣвїи. О сїхъ въсѣхъ стѣи и прѣнїи
 и вѣгонѣснїи ѡцї наші, съворѣ въселенскѣа и великѣа сътворивше въ константїни
 (in Hlud. 76 констандинѣ) градѣ велицѣмъ, и въстѣочнїи градѣ. въ никїи же и въ
 єфесѣ, и въ халкидонѣ. въкѣпѣ же и съ правослѣвными и вѣгомѣдрѣными црїи
 на врѣмѣ на которагоже и црѣва. потѣ же и дрѣсїи съвори стѣи бываѣше по
 лѣтѣ, въ полѣтѣ црѣкѣи въ константїни градѣ. и въ вѣстѣочнїи црѣвахъ великѣихъ.
 въ лѣвдїкїи же и въ сардїи и въ гагрѣ (in Hlud. 76 гангрѣхъ). и въ антиѡхїи
 и въ кесарїи, и въ прочїи великїи црѣкѣа и градѣхъ. иже въсѣгда іаствѣаѣше
 ѡ правослѣвнїи. и ѡ исправлени іаствїннѣахъ вѣры, съпїсаша и прѣдаша нам'
 прѣданїа стѣа сї, възражаѣше въсѣкѣ ересеи и проклїнаѣше наставники ихъ,
 въсѣхъ иже єдиномѣдрѣствѣжть съ ними. и проганѣжше вѣкѣ пѣгоубныа

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

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, addition .єтї. днї.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, не побає пѣти лѣрїѣа. ниже прѣжѣсѣщеннѣа. нѣ въ .ѡ. чѣ по ѡпоущенїи вѣрна. въхѣдїи на трапѣзѣ.

и дшѣтлѣнныа, ѿ словеснаго стѣда хѣа. ѿже владословаще хѣлана наѣчиша. разсѣцающе и разѣлѣюще стѣж и безначалнѣа и единосѣщнѣа и животворашѣа троицѣ. ѿви же рѣша ѿ нѣ не исповѣдати истинно бѣж, прѣтѣа бѣж влѣцѣ нашѣ и прѣно дѣж мариа. къ сим же и ина многа развраченїа и хуѣлнїи на истиннѣа и стѣж и православнѣа вѣрѣ хѣж. тѣмже и мы, тако истиннїи посѣбеници и оучнїци стѣи аплѣ, единомѣдрѣно съ сими стѣими и вѣгѣносными ѿцѣи исповѣдаемь ѿже прѣдаша намъ стѣи аплї, истинно. ѿже потвѣрѣдиша и оукрѣпиша стѣи и вѣгѣноснїи ѿцѣи наши и прѣдаша на сїце въ православнѣи и истиннѣи вѣрѣ прѣвѣвати. и не прикасати сѣ ниже истѣзовати о трѣклѣтѣи и вѣгѣмрѣзѣкѣи еретикѣ. нѣ ѿвѣсати тѣѣ и странити сѣ ѿ нѣ и проклинати ѿ, тако наслѣбнїсы ѿгню вѣчномѣ и съжїтѣла дїаволовы. плѣнѣныа дїаволѣ, и гоубїтѣла дшѣтлѣнныа.

If we start from the text in L, where the title about the Cheese fare week is not a separate unity, it is obvious that the Second Ecumenical Council (the First from Constantinople, 381) was perceived as a canonical frame. In its 1st and 7th rules, the Council pronounced accusations against the actual heresies during the whole 4th century, namely the Macedonians (denying the divinity of the Holy Spirit, or Pneumatomachians), Sabellians, Eunomians, Markelians, Appolinarists, and others. These are Trinitarian Christological heresies, arisen from the non-orthodox view about the Holy Spirit. By their ideology they are close to the Arianism, condemned as early as on the First Ecumenical Council convened in Nicaea in 325. But the subsequent matter does not justify directly this frame because it consists explicitly of bylaws against the non-orthodox fasting. The text controverts the three-time-damned Armenians and their arajavor fast (a preliminary fast from the pre-Lenten penitential cycle, held during the week between the Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee and the Sunday of the Prodigal Son, as the text says *нѣла еже прѣ макопѣнѣж*). None of the holy councils of the Church has ever mentioned the arajavor fast, but its complicated and differently explained nature is well enough documented by Byzantine sources¹⁷. In our text, however, this fast is taught as closely connected with the Orthodox dogma of fasting; likewise it is quoted in the Lenten Triodion and the Typikon, without any references to the legendary narratives about the heretic Sergius and his dog, which the arajavor fast was named after. In contrast to the Armenians and other monophysite sects, such as the Jacobites, Copts, and Nestorians, during the week of the arajavor fast, orthodox Christians do not fast on Wednesday and Friday on pain of anathema (according to other prescriptions during the whole week the fasting should be broken, as the Slavonic text indicates: *сего ради не дѣитъ намъ нѣ единъ дѣнь постити*). The reason for the Armenian fast to be mentioned in a textual sequence for the Cheese-fare week

¹⁷ A. SHARF, *Byzantine Orthodoxy and the Preliminary fast⁹ of the Armenians*, [in:] BYZANTION. ΑΦΙΕΡΩΜΑ ΣΤΟΝ ΑΝΔΡΕΑ Ν. ΣΤΡΑΤΟ, vol. II, ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΙΑ, ΑΘΙΝΑΙ 1986, p. 649–670.

might be seen in the common permission for the use of dairy products. Besides the Armenians, the Slavonic text emphasizes the so-called $\chi\alpha\eta\sigma\eta\varsigma\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\iota\epsilon$, $\chi\alpha\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma\alpha\rho\epsilon$. As early as the first half of the 11th century, the Byzantine writer Demetrius, metropolitan bishop of Cyzicus in Asia Minor, wrote against them and other Armenian sects of Jacobites and Melhiti who venerated the death on the cross more than Jesus himself¹⁸. Fragments of his work constitute the 41st chapter of the St. Sava's nomocanon, followed by the famous 42nd chapter against the Bogomils, called Babuni. In this shape, they were set within the whole corpus of the earliest copy from Ilovica, dating from 1262.¹⁹ Demetrius of Cyzicus compared those heresies to the Eutychian one, pointing out the common practice of eating meat during the Cheese-fare week. Thus, the micro textual insertion about the Cheese-fare week in the given fragment is a focus on the subject of the breaking of orthodox fasts and the ways to differentiate from the heretics by the established practices during the pre-Lenten period. As it is well known, after the Cheese fare Sunday the 40 days of Lent begins. The inserted list of heresiarchs confirms again that the core of the anti-heretical polemics is the Trinitarian Monophysite heresies and those of the Quartodecimans, who deviate from Orthodoxy by the way of celebrating Pasha, some of them similar to the Jews²⁰. Indeed, the Second Ecumenical Council proclaimed accusations against the mentioned heresies. The list of the heresiarchs, condemned mostly prior to and on the Fourth Ecumenical council, traditionally starts with Arius, Nestorius and other famous monophysites, but one can likewise see outlined the name of Paul from Samosata and that of Lucopetros. Historically speaking, in those personalities one alludes both to monophysites and to dualist heresies, especially to the most popular one, Paulinism. For instance, Lucopetros was declared a teacher of the heretic Sergius, who was thought to have established the arajavor fast according to the legendary background; at the same time, Lucopetros was mentioned as a leader of the Bogomils–Phundagiagitae from the Byzantine theme Opsikion in northwestern Anatolia, Asia Minor during the first half of the 11th century, as stated by Euthymius of the Periblepton (or of Akmonia) in his famous 11th-century Epistle based entirely on authentic contemporary data²¹. The dualistic line is straightened on a nominative level by the use of the term $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\kappa\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\rho\iota\kappa\iota$, regularly keeping one and the same shape in all three copies and

¹⁸ PG, vol. 127, col. 879–885.

¹⁹ The Ilovica Kormčaja represents a 398 leaves parchment codex, copied by deacon Bogdan in Ilovica, the siege of Zeta metropolis, on Bishop Neophyte's order. Today, the manuscript is kept in the Library of Zagreb. It was reproduced in 1991; see М. Петровић, *op. cit.*, p. 2056–206a.

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

²¹ G. FICKER, *Die Phundagiagiten. Ein Beitrag zur Sektengeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters*. Leipzig, 1908, p. 165, 211–219; M. ANGOLD, *Church and Society under Comneni 1081–1261*. Cambridge, 1995, p. 467; J. GOUILLARD, *L'hérésie dans l'Empire byzantin jusqu'au XII s.*, TM 1, 1965, p. 299–324; A. SHARF, *op. cit.*, p. 669–670.

associated with the name of the Manichean leader Kuvrick (Kubrick), or Mani²². One can presume the influence of 12th-century anti-heretic Byzantine discourse, when, together with the standard Trinitarian accusations, dualistic ones supplemented the vivid polemics, treating the Armenians as Manichaeans or Paulicians, because Paulinism flourished among the Armenian diasporas in Byzantium, in particular. Besides the accusations in Monophysite heresy and dualism, with regards to the Armenians, Byzantine literature from the epoch of the Crusades offers examples of having made associations between them and the Latins. Therefore, the Armenians were metaphorically called *the third colony of the Latins*, because of the similarities between the two denominations in dogmatic matters, against which the Orthodox Church had always fought, such as the use of unleavened Eucharistic bread (asymes) and pure wine in the Holy Communion. Anti-Armenian propaganda increased after the conquest of Thessalonica by the Normans in 1185.²³

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

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

Повѣдаемъ же и злѣа вѣрѣи и лжкѣа иже безквасное дрѣжжѣе и слѣжжѣе мрѣтво. сирѣѣ ѣакоже, фрѣзи (the same in L and Hlud. 76) и ѣни прочіи такоѣи. иже неистинна ѣе жрѣтва и бескрѣвнаа. и неѣ истинно (in L and Hlud. 76 неистинно) вѣѣображеніе ѣхѣ еже исповѣдѣжѣтъ, нѣж мрѣтва вѣѣображѣжѣтъ сѣна бѣжїа. вѣсѣкое безквасное и безсѣльное мрѣтво ѣе. ѣакоже и ѣни творѣа. и ѣноже бладословѣа злѣишее, еже глаѣ хѣлаше (in L and Hlud. 76 ниже бладословїе злѣишее глаѣтъ хѣлаше). ѣако сѣын дѣхѣ ѣѣ ѣца и ѣѣ сѣна исхѣди и раболѣпно сѣтѣо дѣа глаѣше и проповѣдажѣше. и ѣна мнѣга бѣомрѣзска ѣаже ѣматѣ. иже не вѣсхѣтѣшѣа покоритѣа сѣмоу сѣворѣ и зченїю сѣынѣ ѣѣѣ (end in L)²⁵, ихѣже послѣди сѣвра вѣ кѣонстантїни градѣ сѣаа и правѣнаа ѣѣѣра црѣца, сѣ сѣомѣтѣ свой правослаѣный црѣмѣтѣ мнѣхаилѣ. и сѣтѣѣми великыми ѣѣѣ по ѣѣѣрѣзѣ великый и прѣѣѣый сѣворѣ вѣсѣленскый, паѣы сѣтворѣше и сѣставѣлѣше, правослаѣвнѣа вѣрѣи оѣтѣврѣдишѣ

²² А. ТОГОМАНОВА, *За една парономазия в Бориловия синодик*, [in:] *Гловеса прѣчюднаа*, vol. XV, *Юбилеен сборник в чест на проф. И. Буюклиев*, София 2012, p. 36-42.

²³ M. ANGOLD, *op. cit.*, p. 510.

²⁴ Х. МИКЛАС, Л. ТАСЕВА, М. ЙОВЧЕВА, *Берлински сборник*, Sofia-Wien 2006, p. 56; Патриарх Евтимий, *Съчинения*, praefatio К. ЯНАКИЕВ, София 1990, p. 62.

²⁵ At this point, the text is interrupted purposely and continues with a sequence of canonical rules, mostly intended for monks: *Брѣи на ловѣ нехѣдди или пѣы хранѣа...* After them, the text reverts to folio 161b.

и прѣдашж. ѿгнавшє и проклавшє въса сѣмѣдръныхъ ѳретики, и посты ихъ и исповѣданіе. мы же послѣстѣвѣюще прѣданіе стѣи ѿцъ и оученіе и. исповѣдѣ стѣа и живоначална и єдиносѣижа трѣцж. равнославно ѿца и сѣа и стѣо дѣа. ѿца безначална. и сѣа събезначална. и дѣа стѣо равносѣина. ѿца нероужена. и сѣа роужена, и дѣа стѣо исходаща ѿ ѿца. и на сѣѣ прѣбываща. єдина сѣла. єдино съчетаніе, и єдино поклоненіе. стѣа трѣцж. и тако глади на іако ѿ ѿца исходаща дѣа стѣо, и на сѣѣ прѣбываща. а иже сице не мѣдръствѣвѣши, нѣ инако по своему сѣмѣдръному разсѣмоу глаши. таковыи, анафема, анафема, анафема:~ (in L, added at the end Иже неповиновеетъ сѣ написаныхъ ни послѣшаеть прѣданиюмы сѣ написанныи ѿ стѣи аплѣ. и єгносныи и прѣобныи ѿцъ. нѣ инако начне ходити и жити кроми сѣ написанныи правн. анафема).

Following the description of CHAI 1160, this textual insertion formally belongs to the group of collected texts entitled *ω сырѣи нѣли*, which covers a wide range of fragments, including penitential rules²⁶, but in L, this sequence is not separated as an autonomous entity. The canons break the homogeneous structure in blocks of, generally speaking, *non-penitential* texts. The given state of L copy allows the presumption that the doctrinal reglementations are components of one unity and that their segmentation might be conceived as a result of a latter transformation. This statement is supported the fact that the fragment is not particularly titled. It is framed by readings about orthodox fasts and ends with a triple anathema against the *the very abominable faith* of the so called *фржси*. As I consider this term a key-word, the analysis should start from here.

Фржси (in other copies *фрлси*, *фрѣзи*) is used one more time in all sources, again in close connection with the fourth Orthodox fasts – of Christmas, Paschal, of the Holy Apostles and of the Theotokos – situated in positional proximity with the above mentioned text without a special title. Given its position and contents, this fragment falls into the same rubric. Here it is: *Сѣо во ради дръзнѣвшє написахѣ. да не винѣ нѣци и зѣвѣрѣтше, іако хотатъ постити сѣ. и свойми начинанми своѣ посты и зѣставы начне творити которыиже іако єретици творѣ. не дръжѣще прѣданіа стѣи аплѣ и стѣи єгносныи ѿцъ. иже єгда достоитъ поститиѣ, тогда не постатъ сѣ. и єгда лѣпо є не постити сѣ. тогда постатъ сѣ. ѿ православна и истинна вѣры далѣ ѿстожше. и сквернѣжа вѣрѣ своѣ развращенѣ дръжѣще. и стѣа трѣцж ѿца и сѣа и стѣо дѣа, нечисто и неисправлено исповѣдѣюще. іако фржси и армени проклѣтии. и ини прочи таковѣи, иже не прилажѣтъ сѣ къ истинному православію. иже и великаго поста прѣвѣла нѣла мѣса іаджше. и єгда аще кто хоше. ихъ же проклаша стѣи събори и ѿлжчиша, прѣповѣныи и єгносныи ѿцъ наши (in L и хѣи подражателѣ) < CHAI 1160: f. 86a; L: ff. 163a-b; Hlud. 76: ff. 46a-46b.*

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

²⁶ Архивски номоканон, р. 13.

ἐνταῦθα λεγομένους Φρύγας, that is to say, to a heretic sect from the region of Phrygia in the central part of Asia Minor, unified by the founder Montanus and his disciples the Montanists (Phrygians), who preached the ideas of: dissolving marriages; disrespect to the Eucharist and its replacement with a Satanic sacrifice; the faith in the Paraclete (the Consoler, or the Holy Spirit), whose name was also appropriated to the leader of the sect. This heresy was brought in light of the seventh rule of the Second Ecumenical council and the eighth rule of the Local council from Laodicea, about 343.²⁷ Epiphanius of Cyprus (†403), in his Panarion (*Adversus haereses* from 374–377), fragments from which took place in the St. Sava's Nomocanon, treated the mentioned heretics from the Second Ecumenical council as Montanists: **ФРИГИ** ѿ **МОНДАНА** соуѣтъ, **ФРИГИ** **МОН'ДАНИТЫ**, **КАТАФРИГАСТЕ**²⁸. But in the same primordial Slavonic source, the whole 51st chapter was dedicated to **ФРАНЪЗЪХЪ** и **Ѡ** **ПРОЧИХЪ** **ЛАТИНЪХЪ** (in the text, one can read the explanation **ФРАНЗИ** **ИЖЕ** **ГЕР'МАНИ** **НАРИЦАЕТЬ** **СЕ**). Among the numerous condemnations against the Latins, or Germans, one lists the following: consumption of meat during the first week of the Lent; the ignorance of and the disrespect to the Cheese-fare week: **НИ** **ЗЪНАЮТЬ** **ЧТО** **ЕСТЬ** **СЫРНАА** **НѢЛЕ**; the irregular observation of the Lenten fast, which, among different representatives of this denomination, varies from six, through eight, to ten weeks, and so on. Hence, identical or similar accusations could be addressed to different heretic denominations, to compare: **1.** According to the interpretations of the eighth canon of the Second Ecumenical council, the Eunomians, Sabellians and **ФРОУГЫ**²⁹ were called *Wednesday people*, because they used meat in Wednesday, but fasted on Saturday; **2.** According to the Demetrius of Cyzicus' testimonies, Jacobites, Melhiti and **ХАНСИЗА'НІЕ**, **ХАНСИЗАРЕ** **ВЪ** **СЪТЪНИ** **ВЕЛИКЫИ** **ПЪ** **ВЪ** **СЪБОТЪ** **И** **ВЪ** **НѢЛЮ** **МЛАКО** **И** **СИРЬ** **И** **ГАНЦА** **ГАДЕТЬ**. **ѠПРОКЪСНИ** **СЛОУЖЕ**. **ВЪ** **ВИНО** **ВОДЫ** **НЕ** **ВЪЛИВАЮТЬ**³⁰; **3.** On the other hand, fasting on Saturday, the use of azymes, and the heaviest possible deviation – the dogma about the proceeding of the Holy Spirit not only from the Father but also from the Son, the Filioque, – were obligatory arguments in the Byzantine anti-Latin polemics and therefore in its Slavonic adoption. Taking into consideration the content of the fragment in all three copies, testifying the use of the examined term, it seems plausible to refer **ФРЪЖСИ** to Latins and to bind the text with the anti-Latin account, which, naturally, could not be emblematic for the canonical determinations of the Second Ecumenical council, but could be engendered by the nominative association between similarly sounding names. The fact that L, in one of its marginal notes on folio 78b, explicitly explained the term by the following: **ИТАЛИ** **НАРИЧАТ** **СА** **ФРЪЖСИ** gives grounds

²⁷ *Правилата на Св. православна църква*, р. 418–419; *Правилата на Св. православна църква с тълкуванията им*, ed. et trans. Ст. ЦАНКОВ, И. СТЕФАНОВ, П. ЦАНЕВ, София 1913, р. 789–790.

²⁸ Quoted according to the Bucharest Kormčaja from the same filiations, manuscript № 285 from the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, f. 285b.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, f. 61a.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 153b.

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

Since the establishment of Charlemagne's Empire as Imperium Francorum, the whole Western world has been referred to as the Empire of Franks, from the Greek φράγκοι. Since 1204, the Latins and the crusaders were referred to in this way. Nikon of the Black Mountain (1025 – 1100/1110) left some significant details about that in his *Taktikon*, as the author himself witnessed of the conquest of Antioch by the warriors from the First Crusade. In the 38th chapter of his work, he spoke about τὸ ἔθνος τῶν φραγγῶν ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς Γερμανοὶ λεγόμενον³¹. According to him, they shared the same anti-heretical views with the Macedonians, Nestorians and, in particular, the Arians. The form **фрѣзи** was testified in Tsar John Asen's inscription from 1230 in Tărnovo's church "St 40th martyrs"; **фрѣгы** could be read in St. Hilarion of Almopia's Prolog Life³². The forms **фрѣгы**, **фрѣзи**, **фрѣжъскыѣ** were attested in the St. Petka from Tărnovo's Life, written by Patriarch Euthymius. They corresponded to the described historical events during Tsar John Asen II's reign and designated the Latins, or the Franks, the habitants of the Latin Empire on the Balkans created after the Fourth Crusade, existing from 1204 to 1262. Despite the non-exhaustiveness of the given examples and their possible multiplication, one can conclude that the term circulated as a topical nomination in the literature of the Second Bulgarian Empire all over the 13th and 14th centuries.

The published fragment from CHAI 1160 targets the unleavened bread used by the Latins and the Filioque. In this purpose, the fragment lies upon the Council from 843, convened in Constantinople, on which, thanks to the Empress widow Theodora (842–867), regent of his son Michael, the logothete Theoktistos and other supporters of the regent council, the veneration of the holy icons was definitely restored³³. On the 11th of March, 843, *on the first Sunday of Lent*, the Iconodules proclaimed publicly their victory and legitimized the renewal of the canonical dispositions from the Seventh Ecumenical council (the Second Nicean), held in 786–787. The council of 843 was its natural prolongation in the fight between Iconoclasts and Iconodules, having given the most actual dogmatic definition of

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

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

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

the Orthodox faith, and therefore, having turned into a basic ideological cushion for the anti-heretic theme, as the latter was given shape only and solely in opposition to the Orthodoxy, which means that, by use of antinomy, the broadest Orthodox perception defined the heretic as someone who merely was not an Orthodox³⁴. In this way, the incompatible, at first sight, titles of the Bulgarian miscellanies found an internal logical order and organization. Obviously, it is to presume that the Slavonic text lies upon a concrete Greek prototype of compilative character, over which the rich centuries-long Byzantine anti-Latin controversy left its mark by using fundamental subjects and ideas. The strong anti-Latin propaganda had characterized the Byzantine society since the 12th century. All researchers having dealt with this period are unanimous that in the reign of the Komnenos dynasty, one observed an unprecedented wave of hostility against the Latins' errors, which turned into *religious hysteria and popular antipathy*³⁵. The period of the 11th – to the beginning of the 13th centuries gave birth to the Lists of Latins' false beliefs, a very popular literary genre in Byzantine literature with a probable influence on the Slavonic tradition (see, for instance, the reference to the 30^y errors of the Latins in the Berlin miscellany: *а на латинѣхъ искладиваетъ .л̄. вынь злыхъ*)³⁶. The anti-Latin theme gained official status on the Balkans in and through St. Sava's Nomocanon. Thus, the anti-Latin issue was also typical for the epoch of the spread of the examined miscellanies.

In the context of what has been said so far, it is scarcely surprising that the anti-heretic theme continues in the rubric *От правилъ събора Антиохинскаго* (CIAI 1160: f. 88b; Hlud. 76: f. 48b; L: f. 31a), in which there were two anathemas striving against the communication with Jews, Armenians, Jacobites, Muslims, and Paulicians (the latest endowed with the gloss *иже сѣтъ прѣчїи такоуїи, иже сѣтъ патерїни и бѣгомїли*)³⁷. Although in all the copies the fragments about the Cheese fare week indicated an unchangeable number of ̄̄̄̄ (65) heresies, subjected to anathema, that is namely in the rubric *От правилъ събора Антиохинскаго*, where the explicit nomination of the Bogomils, unique in the overall miscellany scope, took place. In previous publications, I have already argued in favor of its translated character from a yet unknown Greek correspondent. I allowed myself, as well, to stress the fact that the source Cotelarius' Nomocanon pointed out as Greek (also known as Pseudo-Zonaras' nomocanon), could not have been the immediate source for the Slavonic translation³⁸, but might have been of the same manuscript

³⁴ J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon...*, p. 182.

³⁵ P. MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993, p. 368; M. GALLAGHER, *Church Law and Church Order in Rome and Byzantium. A Comparative Study*, Birmingham 2002 [= BOM, 8], p. 173.

³⁶ X. МИКЛАС, Л. ТАСЕВА, М. ЙОВЧЕВА, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

³⁷ М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, М. РАЙКОВА, *Богомитите в църковноюрдическите текстове и па-метници*, СЛ 39/40, 2008, p. 197–219.

³⁸ М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 259–410.

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

1. Chapter 43rd: **СѢТѢО И ВЪСЄЛЕНСКАГО ВТОРАГО СЪБОРА**, which contained only one canon with the incipit **Ѡ ПУРГАНЪ ѠЗЫКЪ ПРІИДѢ КЪТИТИ СѠ ВЪ ПРАВОСЛАВНЪѠ ВЪРЖ** (f. 77b).

2. Chapter 45th, called in the book content **О ПАТЫХЪ НѢЛѢХЪ РАЗДРѢШЕНЬІ.** It contained the first published text, including the fragment about the Cheese-fare week **о сырниѣнѣлѣ правило.**

3. Chapter 67th: **о постѣщихъ сѧ въ сѣвоты.**

4. Chapter 68th: **О раздрѣшенѣ и срѣѣ и патѣ** to which the second published fragment was affiliated. It is worth mentioning that manuscript № 636 contained explicit data about the use of the term **Фрѣзи** in a supplementary anti-Latin cycle, stepping out the frame of the so-called Pseudo-Zonaras nomocanon. It has been recently studied in the light of the anti-Latin polemics in the Slavonic environment³⁹.

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

6. Chapter 71st **О ѡдѣщихъ съ еретикомъ** referred to the mentioned rule against the Bogomils.

The Moldavian manuscript proves that the numbering of chapters and their titles were a secondary phenomenon in textual development, but it should be conceived as a result of the typological features and the thematic point of the overall Canon law miscellany. The anti-heretic line was one of its essential peculiarities. In Moldova, it found its real political meaning during the 16th century. In august 1551, the Moldavian ruler Stephen Rareș (1551–1552), together with the Orthodox clergy, undertook persecutions over Armenians, Catholics, Protestants and Jews, for the purpose of restoring the Orthodox faith betrayed by his brother Elias Rareș, who, earlier in the same year (30.05.1551), in Istanbul, committed the gravest crime for an Orthodox ruler, namely the denial of the Orthodox faith and the conversion to Islam⁴⁰. The reasons for the Middle Bulgarian miscellany to have been widely copied beyond the Danube River were the same, which engendered its Slavonic translation: the protection of the Orthodoxy in difficult periods of its existence. The anti-heretic miscellany prototype with its wide range of anti-heretic issues served to compile a new true Orthodox encyclopedia against the heresies, whose fundament was set upon a Bulgarian 14th century textual matrix. The linguistic peculiarities of all early 14th century copies give enough proof for the Bulgarian origin of the translation. The preliminary study makes plausible the hypothesis of its coming to life into the chronological framework of the second half of the 13th – to the beginning of the 14th century. There can not be doubt that as early as the second quarter of the 14th century, this miscellany prototype recorded

³⁹ I. BOGDAN, *Cronice inedite atinătoare de istoria românilor*, București 1895, p. 79–102; a new attempt to reveal the rich content of № 636 was undertaken by A. Nikolov, see: A. НИКОЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 79–85.

⁴⁰ *Călători străini despre Țările Române*. Supliment I, *Foreign travelers about the Romanian principalities*, ed. ȘT. ANDREESCU ET AL., București 2011, p. 46; IDEM, *Presiune otomană și reacție ortodoxă în Moldova urmașilor lui Petru vodă Rareș*, SMIM 27, 2009, p. 25–60.

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

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

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

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