Defending the True Faith in the Twilight of the Empire

The Palaeologian Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy in Its Slavic Translation

Supplementa

Études byzantines et post-byzantines

VOLUME 2

Editor

Andrei Timotin

Académie Roumaine
Institut d'Études Sud-Est Européennes
Société Roumaine d'Études Byzantines

Defending the True Faith in the Twilight of the Empire

The Palaeologian Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy in Its Slavic Translation

Ivan Biliarsky

with an Annexe by Antonio Rigo
The Tome of Condemnation of The Holy Mountain (Beginning of 1345)

HERLO Verlag UG
Heidelberg
2021

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie

Erste Auflage 2021

Supplementa Études byzantines et post-byzantines, Band 2

Defending the True Faith in the Twilight of the Empire. The Palaeologian Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy in Its Slavic Translation

Herstellung, Design und DTP: Adela Roxana Ristea, Marius Ristea
Verlagsgruppe, Druck: Dar Publishing Bukarest
Vertrieb: office@dardevelopment.ro

ISBN 978-3-948670-05-4

This book has been written under the research project financed by the National Science Centre (Poland). Decision number: DEC-2016/22/M/HS3/00212.

To
Nikola Christophorovič Palauzov
Spyridon Nikolaevič Palauzov
Marin Stoyanov Drinov
Mikhail Georgievič Popruženko
Jean Gouillard
Ivan Angelov Božilov
Masters and *Didaskaloi*, who studied and edited the Synodicon for the Sunday of the Triumph of Orthodoxy and passed away with our Lord Jesus Christ:
To them eternal memory! Trice!

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The present book is dedicated to the study of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy and to the publication of the texts from two known manuscripts of a specific version of it, formed during the époque of the Palaeologian dynasty, the period of the crepuscule of the Empire. The initial text of the Synodicon was created in 843 AD at the triumph of Orthodoxy and the restauration of the veneration of the images after the definitive termination of the iconoclastic controversy. It marked the beginning of what Paul Lemerle called 'the *First Byzantine Humanism*'[1]: an age of cultural, political, social and economic prosperity in Byzantium. The Synodicon is a complex literary work that was continuously modified by additions and adaptations to new challenges throughout the history of its transmission. Its aim was to anathemise heresies and heretics and to glorify Orthodoxy and Orthodox people. This purpose ensured its nature as a living text: additions were made on the occasions of different synods which reflected dogmatic as well as disciplinary decisions. This process continued from the 9th century until the time of the gloaming of the Empire on the eve of the Ottoman conquest. Jean Gouillard systematised this complicated reality of the living text by recognising three versions of the Synodicon in the course of its Byzantine transmission history. He assigned names to them related to the ruling dynasties of the different periods: Macedonian, Comnenian and Palaeologian. Each of these versions of the Greek Synodicon represents the dogmatic disputes during the respective époque. The development of the text led to the creation of local versions and to translations in other Orthodox countries: Georgia, Bulgaria, Serbia, countries of the Eastern Slavs. These versions will be further introduced in the next chapter, and the remainder of the book focusses on the South Slavic tradition.

Up to several years ago, the scholarly consensus was that all the witnesses to the translation of the Synodicon among the Southern Slavs appertain to the Comnenian variant. This view was radically changed after the publication

[1] P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin : notes et remarques sur l'enseignement et la culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle,* Paris, 1971.

of an almost unknown and never published manuscript from the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest (*BAR, Ms. sl. 307*)[2]. The present book continues the research commenced in that publication. Both books deal with the manuscript text of the South Slavic translation of the Palaeologian version of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy. The older book did not contain the text from the two manuscripts which are the focus of the current study. Only after the text of the Synodicon from the collection in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest had been studied and published it became possible to ascertain that the so-called Drinov text of the Synodicon belongs to this version. The Bucharest manuscript obviously pertains to the Byzantine 14th century, with its disputes about the Tabor Light, and reflects the clash between Hesychasts/Palamites and their opponents. Considering the profound similarities of the text in the Bucharest and Drinov manuscripts led to the conclusion that the Drinov manuscript, where the specifically Palaeologian passages are absent due to missing folia, also can be classified as belonging to the Palaeologian version. These findings certainly open new perspectives for the study of the text of the work, which is exceptionally important and complex in structure, and could be classed as liturgical but also as dogmatic and canonic literature.

The present book was created in the framework of a joined Polish-Bulgarian project focused on the study of heresies in Eastern Christianity. Undoubtedly, the Synodicon is one of the most important books of Byzantine literature on religious deviations, and is likewise important for the upholding of Orthodoxy. Although there are many theological and polemical treatises against heretics, only the Synodicon has the characteristics of an official act. It is important to stress its liturgical use: it was created to be read on the day of the feast of the Triumph of Orthodoxy from the pulpit of Saint Sophia cathedral; a practice normally reserved for the readings from the Holy Scripture. Regardless of all local variants within the text, it reflected the Church's official conciliar stance on various theological controversies. It was directly related to conciliar and synodic dogmatic decisions, and was meant for public reading in churches on official feasts that were part of the movable Lent cycle established by canonical decision after the victory of Orthodoxy over the Iconoclasts in 843. This could have been accomplished only through a public act of the ruling authority.

[2] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, София, 2013.

Without trying to make generalisations or draw definitive conclusions, I would like to raise the question here as to why this text was created precisely at this time, at the end of the Iconoclast crisis. This question will be addressed in more detail throughout this book. A related query is: why did some heresies continue to be mentioned in the controversy literature of Eastern Christianity, unlike others, which seem to have been no less significant? Examples of such long-lived heresies are Arianism, Iconoclasm, and, later on and somewhat locally, dualist heresies. This persistent attitude is combined with standard accusations against heretics who not only deviate in their views on the Trinity, on the Lord Jesus Christ or on the world as such, but also practiced different type of rituals, perceived as extremely disgusting and revolting for society at that time. I believe the controversy literature focused on Arianism and Iconoclasm due to the character of these two heresies and the values (theological, social, political, etc.) they embedded. It can be observed that for the Byzantines heresy is a manifestation of the Evil One. To the Orthodox polemicist authors all of them are basically the same: obstacles on the way to Salvation. Arianism and Iconoclasm may have acquired a symbolic meaning. They represent the first and the last of the major dogmatic deviations. The first and the last ecumenical councils, both in Nicaea, were convened to condemn them. Their elimination is a creation and recreation of what is called Orthodoxy. The end of Iconoclasm is not "restauration" but mostly "triumph" and "instauration" of Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy has been defined and shaped in response to the challenges posed by heresies and deviations. This is the context in which the text of the Synodicon was created. It serves to systematise, arrange and enhance the accessibility of knowledge about these deviations and their condemnation – especially considering the fact that the text was meant to be read in church during one of the high periods of the year – Lent. Thus, the importance of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy is defeating not only iconoclasm but all deviations from the true faith. This is confirmed by subsequent additions made to the text throughout its reception history.

It can be observed that interest in the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy, and its history, has been growing. This interest is noticeable with regard to its Slavic translation and to the Greek original. I dare hope that at least part of interest related to the fate of the Synodicon in Bulgaria and in Wallachia and Moldavia was raised by our book, written jointly with Ivan Božilov and Anna-Maria Totomanova and entitled (not very correctly) *Boril's*

Synodicon, which appeared in 2010.[3] This publication was achieved – as are most things – after a period of time in which the idea matured, was shared, was thought out more concretely, and was finally realised. The publication of this noteworthy text had its direct and indirect effects. Among the former we may list a series of articles by Anna-Maria Totomanova, which, of course, will be mentioned in the present book, articles by Marianna Tsibranska and Ivan Biliarsky, as well as the extensive study and forthcoming book by Radu G. Păun and Ivan Biliarsky about the Romanian Synodicon[4]. Among the direct results of the book in question, we may also count the comprehensive lexicological study of the text in the dictionary-index prepared by Anna-Maria Totomanova and Ivan Hristov[5], as well as my edition and study of the text of the Synodicon preserved in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest mentioned at the very beginning of this introduction.

Why did I mention that the title of *Boril's Synodicon* is not particularly correct? The problem is not related to the terminology but to the essence. However, I would like to say beforehand that this does not diminish the value of our collective book: its merit lies in identifying that the various copies pertain to one or another of the three versions of the Synodicon: the Macedonian, the Comnenian and the Palaeologian. It is evident that the text which is a result of the decisions of the council convened by Tsar Boril in 1211 precedes the time of the Palaeologian dynasty and cannot be classified under the version that bears their name. This is in fact the so-called Palauzov manuscript, which features prominently in this book. After the publication of the Bucharest manuscript, which follows the Palaeologian version, it became clear (based on analogy with that manuscript) that the Drinov manuscript also pertained to the Palaeologian variant. For this reason, the text of the manuscript which was first brought to light by Marin Drinov, and has been named after him, cannot be called "Boril's Synodicon". That term should be reserved for the manuscript named after Spyridon Palauzov. In light of these recent clarifications, the title

---

[3] Ив. Божилов, А. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов синодик. Издание и превод*, София, 2010 (2nd ed. 2012).

[4] R. G. Păun, Iv. Biliarsky, " La version roumaine du Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie (Buzău, 1700) et les combats pour la « Juste foi » à la fin du XVIIe siècle ", *Cahiers du Monde russe*, 58/3, Juillet-septembre 2017, p. 395-434; R. G. Păun, Iv. Biliarsky, *Du combat pour la « juste foi » au péché politique. Pour une histoire du Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie*, Vienna, forthcoming.

[5] А. Тотоманова, И. Христов, *Речник-индекс на словоформите в Бориловия Синодик*, София, 2015.

and editorial strategies of the edition of 2010 might be considered less than satisfactory. Nevertheless, its importance is unquestionable and I believe it has fulfilled its mission: to incite interest and to solve a problem.

The aim of this book is to examine and publish the text of two South Slavic manuscripts of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy – the one from Bucharest (*BAR, Ms. sl. 307*) and Drinov's (*NBKM, 432*). These two versions form the focus of the book, as the two manuscript witnesses to variant P in Slavic translation. Other Slavic witnesses to the Synodicon, such as the Russian manuscripts, the printed Synodicon in the Kiev, Lemberg/Lvov and Moscow editions, and the Palauzov manuscript, (which belongs to variant C, despite the later additions) feature throughout the book as comparative material, but are left outside of the detailed study, and their texts are not published here.

This is what the present book deals with. I can only hope it will produce the kind of interest and effects that the 2010 volume did. I dedicate it to the memory of my master Ivan Božilov, one of the three co-authors of that publication, and to all who have laboured over the text of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy.

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF RESEARCH ON THE SYNODICON FOR THE SUNDAY OF ORTHODOXY IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES

1. Theological debates, heresiology, condemnation of dogmatic deviations, and the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy

The period of the iconoclast crisis represents a critical time in the history of the Eastern Roman Empire. During this period the Empire gave up on some of the dreams it had inherited from Antiquity. Without losing the universalism of Ancient Rome, now grounded on Christianity, it became much more unified, acquired distinctness and a common faith. This was not only because it had abandoned its claims to Western Europe and the idea of dominating the entire Mediterranean area, but also due to the loss of the East, fallen under the power of advancing Islam. The battle with Persia and the Avar Khaganate, although resulting in a glorious victory[1], vividly demonstrated the fragility of the situation in the Eastern provinces. Soon after, the Arabs invaded, and those lands were forever lost to Constantinople[2]. Persia ceased to exist as such, and the Holy Land, Egypt, and North Africa collapsed under Muslim domination. At this time, the Empire was able to survive the battle with Islam. New forms of Christian identity were constructed, based on the idea of the New Chosen People, the New Israel. This was closely connected with the Holy War against the infidels, which

---

[1] On that story see the recently appeared monograph: M. Hurbanič, *The Avar Siege of Constantinople in 626. History and Legend*, Palgrave, 2019.

[2] H. Ahrweiler, "L'Asie mineure et les invasions arabes", *Revue historique,* 1962, p. 1-32; M. Brett, "The Arab conquest and the rise of Islam", in *The Cambridge History of Africa,* vol. II, Cambridge 1978, p. 490-55; J. F. Haldon, and H. Kennedy, 'The Arab-Byzantine frontier in the eighth and ninth centuries: military organisation and society in the borderlands', *Zbornik radova Vizantoloskog instituta*, XIX, 1980, p. 79-116; J. F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century. Transformation of a Culture*, Cambridge, 1990, p. 57 sq.; J. Howard-Johnston, *Witnesses to a World Crisis. Historians and Histories of the Middle East in the Seventh Century*, Oxford, 2010; M. Jankowiak, "The first Arab siege of Constantinople", *Constructing the Seventh Century* (= *Travaux et mémoires*, 17), Paris, 2013, p. 237-320; M. Hurbanič, *The Avar Siege of Constantinople in 626. History and Legend*, Palgrave, 2019.

was God's battle for the Salvation of the World in continuation of Israel's battle with the Philistines, and David's fight with their champion Goliath. Within this religious context, Byzantium pursued its *Reconquista*, aimed mainly at the Balkans, Southern Italy and Anatolia. This is the time of the creation of a political-cultural space that, centuries later, historians would call "Byzantium", but whose inhabitants considered themselves genuine Romans.

This delicate situation inevitably created tension in Byzantine society, which gradually integrated the barbarians living within its vast territories. The Byzantine empire dealt successfully with the most intense attacks of hostile foreign powers, but it struggled when it faced a severe internal controversy. The idea that the Byzantine Romans were the New Israel resulted in an attempt to introduce certain Old Testament practices that were not only in conflict with established Christian traditions but also challenged essential theological beliefs of Christianity[3]. Among such innovations was the rejection of the cult of images – especially the depiction of the Lord Jesus Christ. The double nature of the Saviour and the sensory perception of the Divine essence raise some very delicate issues. Those promoting innovations based on the Old Testament gradually came to doubt images, which led eventually to their complete rejection. They justified this based on analogy with the destruction of idols by the prophet Moses and the Law's prohibition of images. This is the origin of a purely theological heresy, designated as "iconoclasm". Worshippers of icons opposed the heresy not so much out of an affection for images grounded in esthetical or cult-related considerations, but mainly based on the belief that their rejection would question the Incarnation, the Sacrifice and the Redemption. The rejection of images touched the foundations of Christianity and was therefore not acceptable or tolerable.

After Emperor Leo III (717-741) came to power, and especially at the time of his son Constantine V (741-775), known as Copronymus, the Iconoclast doctrine acquired a political component and degenerated into a bloody persecution of icon worshippers, especially iconodule clergy. After dealing successfully with its foreign enemies, the Empire struggled to overcome its challengers within this internal conflict, which brought it to the brink of cultural and religious collapse. The crisis continued for more than a century, with one important, but

[3] This topic was elaborated by Paul Magdalino in the introduction to a collection of studies dealing with the influence of the Old Testament in Byzantium: see P. Magdalino, R. Nelson, "Introduction", *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, ed. P. Magdalino, R. Nelson, Washington, D. C., 2010, p. 1-38.

temporary, interruption. The final vanquishment of the iconoclast heresy in 843 not only made Byzantine society more firmly consolidated around Orthodoxy on the basis of more clearly defined religious principles, but also ushered in a remarkable cultural growth, designated by Paul Lemerle as "the first Byzantine humanism"[4]. This was accompanied by political consolidation and the beginning of Constantinople's influence over Europe, a start that was also the first step toward the emergence of the cultural and historical phenomenon that Dimitri Obolensky, nearly half a century ago, called the "Byzantine Commonwealth" and Ivan Božilov more recently designated as the "Monde Byzantin"[5].

The overcoming of iconoclasm was first achieved at the special ecumenical council convened in Nicaea in 787. This Seventh Ecumenical Council was also the last. Based on its location in that emblematic city, it is designated as the Second Nicaean Council. The council's rejection, albeit at first temporary, of iconoclasm was the work of Emperor Constantine VI and especially of his mother, Empress Irene. This temporary victory of Orthodoxy was followed by a second iconoclastic period during the first decades of the 9th century. On the occasion of the final triumph of Orthodoxy, a special holiday in honour of this event was established on the first Sunday of Lent; it was designated as Sunday of Orthodoxy, or Orthodox Sunday. That day commemorates the triumph not only over iconoclasm but over heresies in general. Iconoclasm was perceived as the arch-heresy, because it concerned not only Christology and the perception of Holy Scripture in its two parts – Old and New Testament – but the cult in general, the social position of the Church, and its relations with the state. The creation of the initial version of the text that is the topic of the present book – the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy, was an outcome of the triumph

---

[4] P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanism byzantin.*

[5] D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe 500-1453*, London, 1971; Ив. Божилов, *Византийският свят / Le monde byzantin*, Sofia, 2008. I shall not deal here with the discussion on the expression "Byzantine Commonwealth" used and introduced by Dimitri Obolensky. A bibliography and remarks can be found in several recent studies: Chr. Raffensperger, "Revisiting the idea of the Byzantine Commonwealth", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 28, 2004, 159-74; A. Cameron, *The Byzantines,* Blackwell Publishing, 2006; A. Cameron, "Byzantium and the Limits of Orthodoxy", *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 154, 2007, p. 129-152; J. Shepard, "The Byzantine Commonwealth, 1000-1550", in: *The Cambridge History of Christianity,* vol. 5: *Eastern Christianity*, ed. M. Angold, Cambridge, 2008, p. 3-52. As far as this book presents a study on a text that united the Orthodox community (more specifically, the Eastern Christian Chalcedonian community) throughout the centuries, I shall not enter the discussion but I cannot avoid to stress that all the countries belonging to the Orthodox tradition shared a common culture under the influence of Constantinople.

of Orthodoxy in 843. It was intended to be read aloud in churches so that the bloody but purifying crisis in Byzantine society might never be forgotten.

The context of the appearance of the work testifies to its importance for the Empire and the entire Orthodox world. For this reason, it continued to be complemented in response to various theological controversies throughout the centuries until the Ottoman conquest. The condemnation of certain beliefs, the praise of others, the commemorations of, and anathemata against, various individuals, occurred gradually over the course of centuries. In the history of its transmission three periods can be distinguished each of which relates to one of the three basic versions of the Synodicon. Jean Gouillard, the editor of the *editio princeps* of the Greek text attributed the following names to each of them, based on the names of the respective ruling dynasties: Macedonian (M), Comnenian (C) and Palaeologian (P). The work, which is at the same time doctrinal, liturgical and canonical, continued to evolve as it was further enriched in response to new theological and religious disputes. These disputes touched the innermost values of Byzantine culture.

The Synodicon did not remain enclosed in the Empire but was disseminated throughout all the Orthodox countries in the Balkans, among the Eastern Slavs and in the Caucasus. The oldest translation of the text is the Georgian Synodicon. Most probably, the first Slavic country it reached was Bulgaria, where it was introduced at the Council of Tărnovo in 1211. After this it migrated further to the Serbs and to the Eastern Slavs. The work later appeared in the Romanian lands. Printed editions exist in Greek, Slavic, and Romanian from the 16th-18th centuries. These are liturgical books where the text of the Synodicon is printed within the Triodion. The work thus enjoyed a wide dissemination. The attitude to the text varied in the different countries that received it. This led to different treatments of the text in the Slavic countries and Wallachia and Moldavia. While the translations in Bulgaria and Serbia added many names of local persons, commemorating or anathemising them, in the printed texts from Kiev, Lemberg/Lvov, Moscow or Wallachia, there are no, or hardly any, additions adapting the text to their new local contexts. The different ways the Synodicon was received in these countries confirms their different attitudes to the common Orthodox legacy. These attitudes developed especially after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, which resulted in the emergence of the phenomenon of "*Byzance après Byzance*", so well described by Nicolae Iorga[6].

[6] N. Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance*, Paris, 1935.

2. The text and its publication and study

Throughout the recent decade, there has been a noticeable growth of interest in the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy. It might be more properly termed a *revival* of interest in this remarkable text, which – at least in Bulgaria – has never been forgotten. However, the topic was long considered exhausted due to the limited number of witnesses and other extant materials and due to the unceasing interest displayed through commentaries and identification of the persons mentioned in the text, especially those pertaining to local realities (Bulgarian, Serbian, Russian) rather than to the sufficiently well-known persons in the original Greek text of the Byzantine Synodicon.

2.1. The Greek original

The first editions of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy did not involve studies of the text. These were liturgical books, the publication of which started in Venice in the 16th century. These publications placed it within the Triodion, because of its liturgical use in the liturgy of the Triumph of Orthodoxy, the First Sunday of Lent. The purpose of these books was purely liturgical. At the same time, they also served to ensure the uniformity of liturgical practices among the Orthodox peoples of the Balkans under Ottoman rule. The editions in question, as all liturgical books printed in the dominant centres of book printing in the 16th-17th centuries, also served political and politico-ecclesiastic purposes. The consolidation of a nation affiliated to a confession is ultimately aimed at the preservation of that nation against the threat of rival denominations. Such consolidation can also be aimed at the political restoration of statehood, in case of nations under foreign domination or occupation. The first of these Greek editions is that of Andreas Kunadis, dating from 1522, which presents a late (Palaeologian) version of the contents of the Synodicon, meant for the diocese of Patras[7]. The obvious anti-Roman-Catholic character of this text, prepared largely in the course of the Palamite disputes, provoked a reaction and the appearance of a moderate – in fact mutilated – version of the Synodicon, published in Bologna in 1724 at the insistence of Pope Clement XI. This text was prepared by Fr. M. Barbadico

[7] J. Gouillard, *Synodikon*, p. 36; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, Sofia, 2013, p. 98-99.

who had removed the additions made during the 11th-14th centuries[8]. This version was not widely used, except by Uniates, and the basic version of the Synodicon continued to be printed in Greek in the framework of the Triodion during the following centuries. All these editions were meant to be used in liturgy, and scholarly attention to the text is outside of their concerns.

The work's first edition not meant for purely liturgical purposes was that of Dom Bernard de Montfaucon, dating from 1715. It was based on a manuscript preserved in the National Library of France (*Coislin. 34,* XII c., f. 35-39); however, the text on which it was based does not give an adequate idea of the whole source[9]. In fact, the first scholarly edition of the original text of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy was published as late as the 19th century by Fedor Ivanovich Uspensky (1845-1928)[10]. This was certainly an important moment in the development of research on the source, although the Russian scholar did not aim to make a critical edition including all extant manuscripts known at the time. His edition is based on a limited number of manuscripts, as well as on the printed Greek text published within the Triodion.

Nearly seventy years after F. I. Uspensky, Vladimir Mošin published a text of the Synodicon based on a manuscript preserved in the Vatican Apostolic Library (*Vat. gr. 1554*)[11]. This publication of the text from only one manuscript had no special ambition, and does not contribute significantly to the study of the Greek original text. It accompanied the publication of the Serbian text of the Synodicon, which was essentially Vladimir Mošin's main contribution to research on the topic in question.

In fact, the chief merit for the publication and study of the Greek Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy belongs to the French scholar Jean Gouillard. In 1967, he published his critical edition of the text in a monograph of several hundred pages, which was part of the series *Travaux et mémoires*[12]. It was a landmark publication: in addition to its other merits, it defined the principles of publication of the Synodicon. The problem is that the text in question is not

---

[8] E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique du XVIIIe siècle : Description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au XVIIIe siècle*, vol. I, Paris, 1918, p. 198, No 162.

[9] Bernard de Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Coisliniana olim Segueriana*, Paris, 1715, p. 96-102 (v. PG, vol 120, col. 724-736); J. Gouillard, *Synodikon*, p. 201-21.

[10] Ф. И. Успенский, *Синодик в Неделю Православия*, Odessa, 1893.

[11] Вл. Мошин, "Сербская редакция *Синодик*а в Неделю Православия. Тексты", *Византийский временик*, т. XVII, 1960, p. 349-353.

[12] J. Gouillard, « Le Synodicon de l'Orthodoxie : édition et commentaire », *Travaux et mémoires*, 2, 1967, p. 1-316.

unified, a feature deriving from its purpose. It is a liturgical work containing strong doctrinal and disciplinary-canonical elements. It was meant to be read during the divine service on the First Sunday of Lent, called Orthodox Sunday, and was devoted to the surmounting of the iconoclastic crisis. In the text of the Synodicon two distinct but interconnected parts can be distinguished: the doctrine and the diptychs. The doctrinal part presents the true faith, while the polychronion diptypchs contain lists of names of people to be commemorated and anathemata against heretics. The text was written in its first version for the Feast of Orthodoxy (AD 843) and continued as a living work, being modified in response to new challenges. Naturally, heresy did not end with the iconoclasts, although its defeat marked the end of an epoch in Church history, evidenced at least by the fact that no more ecumenical councils were convened after the one at which iconoclasm was condemned. Subsequent theological controversies and condemnations of heretics led to doctrinal additions and further anathemata in the Synodicon. These additions gradually changed the work, which was shaped in its three variants: the Macedonian (M), Comnenian (C) and Palaeologian (P). The merit of identifying them belongs entirely to Jean Gouillard. However, besides chronological additions, the Synodicon was also adapted locally. Examples of local modification are the differences between the Greek text and the texts of other Orthodox countries (Bulgaria, Serbia, Georgia and the Eastern Slavs), but also purely local additions within Byzantium or in the Byzantine cultural space. Usually, these additions commemorate or anathemise individuals; in some cases, the additions concern the doctrinal part in relation to heresies that were relevant to specific countries or regions. Its complicated and multifaceted reception history lends an exceptionally variegated character to the Synodicon. Some of its texts and recensions/variants differ to such an extent that they might be considered as independent texts.

The complex nature of the work raises many questions about how to publish its text: should the different versions be united, with respective indications of local particularities, or should they be considered and published as separate works? Either solution can be justified with arguments. Jean Gouillard decided to publish the Greek Synodicon as a united text with a single numeration of lines, achieving a remarkable synthesis between the different versions and recensions of the text. Thus, to the first variant (M) the additions made under the Comnenian dynasty (C) are added; and then, those from the time of the Palaeologian dynasty (P). The various local additions to the text are also present,

including the diptychs-polychronions, commemorations and anathemata related to local particularities or to local bishops. The French scholar offered a detailed presentation of his arguments in support of the underlying principles of his edition[13]. I think his approach to the Greek text is fully justified and well argued. Many copies of the text survive, along with various palaeotypes, which, even if organised according to different particularities, are still too numerous for a single edition and investigation. Trying to present all texts as they existed in the Synodicon's history of reception would most probably become too complicated and resulting in anything but an overall view of the source. The nature of the issue regarding the principles of publication of the Slavic (Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian) translations and their variants is different, due to the existence of only a small number of witnesses to the text.

The previous remarks do not lessen the value of Jean Gouillard's edition and commentary on the Greek text of the Synodicon; it remains a classical work to which little has been added since. A noteworthy recent contribution is F. Lauritzen's text and study of the Synodicon of Patriarch Alexius Studite within a volume dedicated to decrees of the ecumenical and other ecclesiastical councils; the book contains a separate section with various translations of the Synodicon[14]. The choice of this text is well argued by the editor and certainly represents a significant contribution to the study of the work's Byzantine form. Before his publication of this text, Lauritzen had already dedicated several articles to the Byzantine Synodicon, offering a detailed study of the issue.[15]. Without claiming to give a comprehensive overview of studies on the Byzantine Synodicon, I would like to mention several recent works by Antonio Rigo, which deal with new witnesses to the text extremely relevant for the present study on the Palaeologian Synodicon[16]. The other studies of the

---

[13] J. Gouillard, *Synodikon*, p. 37-42.

[14] *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. Decisions and Synodika. From Constantinople 861 to Constantinople 1872*, ed. A. Melloni, Turnhout, 2016, p. 377-380.

[15] F. Lauritzen, "Against the Enemies of Tradition, Alexios Studites and the Synodikon of Orthodoxy", in: *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Byzantium. The Definition and the Notion of Orthodoxy and Some Other Studies on the Heresies and the Non-Christian Religions*, ed. A. Rigo, P. Ermilov, Rome, 2010, p. 41-48; F. Lauritzen, "Synod Decrees of the Eleventh Century", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 105/1, 2012, p. 101-116.

[16] A. Rigo, « Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie et le Palamisme. La forme primitive de p (1351 – avant 1360): les sources et les témoins », in I. Biliarsky (éd), *Laudator temporis acti. Studia in memoriam Ioannis A. Božilov. II, Ius, Imperium, Potestas Litterae Ars et Archaeologia*, Serdicae, 2018, p. 227-241; idem, "Un nouveau témoin du Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie P :

same author refer to a topic directly related to the content of the Synodicon in the Bucharest manuscript (*BAR, Ms. sl. 307*), which includes the so-called *Mount Athos letter* (*Hagioretikon gramma*), presenting the condemnation of a group of heretics on Mount Athos around the middle of that century[17]. This document will be touched upon many times throughout the present study.

2.2. The *Georgian* Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy is the oldest translation of the Greek text. It was translated twice, first in the 11th and again in the 13th century. The second translation seemed to have had only local significance. It made in the Shio-Mgvime monastery and was not disseminated. Known only from one manuscript, it was evidently used mostly if not exclusively in the monastery for which it was translated. The first and main Georgian translation of the Synodicon dates from the 11th century and is connected with Mount Athos which functioned as a place of contact between Orthodox nations, including between Byzantines and the Caucasus. The translation was the work of St. Euthymius of Athos (hegumen of Iviron and son of the monastery's founder, St. John of Iviron[18]), who died on May 13, 1028. In one of the copies, Emperor Basil II is mentioned in a polychronion. Considering the fact that Basil died on December 15, 1025, St. Euthymius's translation can be dated to November or early December of 1025. Three manuscripts attesting to this early Georgian translation of the Synodicon are known, all dating from the same epoch[19]. Probably the earliest is manuscript S

le manuscrit de la Sainte-Trinité à Chalki 34", *Revue des études byzantines*, 76, 2018, p. 73-98 ; idem, "Gli estratti del *Synodikon dell'Ortodossia* del *Vat. gr.* 1700 (verso 1370)", *Ambrosiana, hagiographica, Vaticana. Studi in onore di Mons. Cesare Pasini in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno,* a cura di A. Piazzoni, Città del Vaticano, 2020, p. 575-580; idem, "Il *Synodikon dell' Ortodossia* di Lavra (1400 circa)", *Revue des études byzantines,* 75, 2017, p. 255-282; idem, "*Il* Synodikon dell'Ortodossia *di Tessalonica"*, *Revue des études byzantines* 78, 2020, p. 193-217; idem, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie à l'époque des Paléologues"*, Travaux et mémoires,* 2021, forthcoming.

[17] A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale atonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili (ms. Vat. Gr. 604 ff. 11r-12v)", *Cristianesimo nella storia. Ricerche storiche, esegetiche, teologiche*, 5, 1984, p. 475-506; idem, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivole agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, Firenze, 1989.

[18] M. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirklichen georgischen Literatur auf Grund des ersten Bandes der georgischen Literaturgeschichte*, Città del Vaticano, 1955, p. 126-154; B. Martin-Hisard in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 397.

[19] *Ibid*., vol. IV/1, p. 398-401.

143 from the collection of the Institute of Manuscripts in Tbilisi. Manuscript A 96, at the same Institute, is the only one that contains the translator's colophon, but has been dated to the time of Emperor Romanus III Argyrus (1028-1034) and was copied in the Chora monastery in Constantinople in 1031. The third known witness to the first Georgian translation is manuscript 92 at the Eastern Institute in Saint Petersburg, which has also been dated to the 1030s. Thus, all three manuscripts were produced in the decade after the completion of the translation.

The Georgian text of the Synodicon differences from its Greek *Vorlage*. The first difference to notice is the title and the presence of a sub-title, which due to their long length will not be presented here. Suffice it to say that they offer explanations about the work, indicating when (the year 843) and why (the Triumph of Orthodoxy) the work was created and what its purpose was (public reading on the First Sunday of Lent)[20]. The text is defined as "Definition of the faith" (with the corresponding Georgian word *horos*, ὅρος) and it has been combined with a Nomocanon[21], which indicates, if not a view of the text as legal, at least the idea of the normative character of the statements it contains. The opinion has been stated [22] (and seems acceptable to me) that the early translation of the Georgian text and its preservation without any significant later additions strongly indicate that it was made from the earliest, and original, Greek text of the Synodicon, from 843.

The Georgian Synodicon was published in 1972 within the Nomocanon.[23] It has been translated into German, and in English as part of the latest edition of the text[24].

2.3. *The Slavic versions* of the Synodicon have also long been in the focus of interest. The Bulgarian version, emotionally charged as it is, is of special interest as it profoundly influenced national identity and came to be cherished as a kind of national symbol. It has been held dear, not only as a subject of research, but also as an integral part of Bulgarian cultural memory. Here, I

[20] *Ibid*., vol. IV/1, p. 400-401, 404-405.
[21] *Ibid*., vol. IV/1, p. 398.
[22] *Ibid*., vol. IV/1, p. 401.
[23] Е. Джунашвили, *Малък Номоканон (превод на заглавието)*, Тбилиси, 1972.
[24] M. Van Esbroeck, N. Karadeniz, "Das Synodikon vom Jahre 843 in georgischen Übersetzung", *Annuarium historiae conciliorum*, 19, 1987, p. 300-313; B. Martin-Hisard in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 404-425.

shall very briefly present publications and studies of the Slavonic texts. The Bulgarian version will be left as the last tradition to be introduced here, as it is central to the topic of this book. It has to be stressed at the outset that the texts of the different Slavic Synodica – Bulgarian, Serbian, Ruthenian or Russian – differ from one another to the extent that they hardly have any common ground, except of course the shared doctrine of the Orthodox Church. The diptychs specific for each country are very distinct, and the orthography varies profoundly. They have no common origin and their translations should be traced separately.

2.3.1. *The Serbian Synodicon* is known in three early manuscripts dating from before the Ottoman conquest. In his classical study and edition of the text, Vladimir Mošin assigned the following names to them: 1) A manuscript from the Plevlja Monastery; 2) the Zagreb manuscript and; 3) the Dečani manuscript[25], incomplete. The fragmentary text of this last manuscript has been edited by archimandrite Seraphim Ristić, the hegumen of Dečani monastery, and published in 1864[26]. Recently a new edition of the Serbian Synodicon was published by T. Subotin-Golubović within the volume of decrees of the Ecumenical Councils and the general councils, which has already been introduced[27]. The Serbian Synodicon is early in terms of content and variant (it is based on the Comnenian variant, C). The extant manuscripts are also early. The Dečani fragment was lost[28] after it was published by archimandrite Seraphim Ristić, and the published text does not provide a clear idea of the date of the manuscript. The Plevlja and Zagreb manuscripts came into existence approximately during the same period, the third quarter of the 14th century. The Zagreb text was probably copied, with modifications, from the Plevlja manuscript[29]. The Serbian Synodicon is of particular interest in relation to the study of dualist heresies in the Balkans, as it contains information about

[25] Вл. Мошин, "Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю Православия. Анализ текстов", *Византийский временик*, XVI, 1959, p. 361-366.

[26] С. Ристић, *Дечански споменици. Скупио и издао архимандрит Дечански Серафим Ристић*, Belgrade, 1864, p. 24-26; Vl. Mošin, "Plevljanski rukopis Sinodika Pravoslavlja", *Slovo*, VI-VIII (= *Vajsov zbornik*), Zagreb, 1957, p. 157-176.

[27] *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 471-496.

[28] Вл. Мошин, "Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю Православия. Анализ текстов", *Византийский Временник*, XVI, 1959, p. 364-365.

[29] Вл. Мошин, "Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю Православия. Анализ текстов", *Византийский Временник*, XVI, 1959, p. 320-321 (note 18 and 19), 362-363 (and note 143);

the Bosnian Babuns. It does not cover the theological disputes related to hesychasm and the Palamite controversy that took place approximately in the middle of the 14th century, a topic that is the most characteristic feature of variant *P* of the Greek Synodicon.

2.3.2. The presence of the Synodicon in *Kievan Rus',* and later among the Ruthenians and in *Russia,* raises some questions. The first query concerns the time of translation of the text for the Eastern Slavs. The question has been raised in connexion with various interpretations by Russian scholars regarding the mention of the year AD 1108 in the *Primary Chronicle*. According to this work, after the death of St. Theodosius Pechersky, Prince Svyatopolk ordered the metropolitan of Kiev to include the name of the saint in the Synodicon for commemoration during the liturgy[30]. Based on this unclear passage, some Russian scholars have claimed that the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy existed in Rus' from the beginning of 12th century onward. This question is outside the topic of our study and here I shall only note that, according to some interpretations, the fact indicates there was a translation of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy in Rus' prior to 1082 (in view of the absence of anathemata against John Italus); according to another opinion, in this case the diptych part was mentioned only as an ordinary list of names for people to be prayed for, for which an old English word exist, bede-roll. It is worth noticing that in Russian the term "synodicon" is used for such a bede-roll. [31]. It is relevant to stress the opinion of V. V. Dergačev that this was a Greek copy of the text, sent by the Ecumenical Patriarchate to its subordinate metropolitan sees, one of which was that of Kiev at the time[32]. Hence, the text had no Slavic translation then and was accessible only in its Greek original in the metropolitan see of Rus'. Without entering into the discussion, in my

T. Subotin Golubovic in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 483.

[30] *Повесть временных лет*, Sankt-Peterburg, 1996, p. 120, 258, 540.

[31] Here I shall cite only the two most recent and contrasting views, that of Н. В. Понырко (*Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси*, т. II, *Вторая половина XIV-XVI вв.,* Leningrad, 1989, p. 339-344; see and http://lib.pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4598, 4 August 2017) and that of K. Maksimovič (*Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 499-501).

[32] В. В. Дергачев, "Вселенский Синодик в древней и средневековой России", *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, 3, 2001, p. 17-28 and especially p. 20-21.

view it is unlikely that there is evidence for an 11th century translation of the text in Rus'.

It seems more likely that the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy was translated into Russian during the second half of the 14th century, when Muscovy prospered. Tangible evidence of the *Russian* Synodicon exists in the form of three manuscripts from the 15th century.[33] This is a small number of witnesses indeed within the rich Russian medieval literature. The earliest manuscript is part of the Moscow Synodal Collection, and is now preserved in the State Historical Museum (GIM) under No 667. It consists of two parts, the first of which, containing a translation of the Byzantine Synodicon, dates from approximately the middle of the 15th century. The second, specifically Russian part is from the 17th century and contains some additional names in the diptychs. The second manuscript, so-called *Mazurinski Codex*, is from the Russian State Archive Collection of Ancient Acts (RGADA /РГАДА/, f. 196.1 no. 289) and dates from the end of the 15th century[34]. The text is fragmentary and is dependent on the text of the manuscript found in the Moscow Synodal Collection. The third manuscript, preserved in the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg (Соф. *1058*), also contains both the Byzantine and the Russian parts – particularly the diptychs.

The Russian Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy is based on variant P and contains the additions, made at the time of the Palaeologian dynasty, related to the hesychast and Palamite controversy. The last mentioned ecumenical patriarch is Joseph II, which would date the text to approximately the middle of the 15th century.

In addition to the manuscripts, printed editions of the Synodicon (as in the case of the Greek liturgical books discussed earlier, placed within the Lenten Triodion) circulated among the Eastern Slavs in the 17th century, mainly among the Ruthenians. These books form a distinct tradition. They are not connected with the manuscripts, but were translated from the printed Greek edition of the Triodion. The Russian Synodicon was first published

[33] For details on the tradition, see К. А. Максимович, „К уточнению корпуса русских домонгольских переводов с греческого: *Синодик* в Неделю Православия", *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, 46, 2011, p. 77-84; K. A. Maksimovič in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 501-502.

[34] И. В. Дергачева, „Типология *Синодиков* в русской письменности XV-XVII вв.", *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописных книг*, Moscow, 1990, p. 254 sq.

for non-liturgical purposes by N. I. Novikov in 1775. It is a book designed for individual reading, rather than a scholarly edition of the text. [35]. A true academic edition of the text was presented at the end of the 19th century by F. I. Uspensky in the context of his comprehensive study of the source. His edition is based on the oldest manuscript, from the Moscow Synodal Collection[36]. It was soon followed by the classical edition and study of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy, in two volumes, edited by E. V. Petukhov, with the same manuscript as the base-text in a diplomatic edition[37]. A recent edition has been provided by Kiril Maksimovič in the volume dedicated to the ecumenical and general councils and their decrees[38].

2.3.3. *The Romanian* Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy is known only as a printed edition, within a Lenten Triodion, published in Buzău, Wallachia, in 1700. The purpose of that edition was liturgical and political. The text has been translated from that of the Synodica (also within the Triodion) printed at Kiev (1648, 1664, 1699) and Lemberg/Lvov (1627, 1640). It has not been republished yet, but I should announce that my colleague and friend Radu G. Păun and I are preparing a typeset edition[39]. We have already studied the edition from 1700 in its historical and political context.[40]

2.3.4. The *Bulgarian Synodicon* for the Sunday of Orthodoxy, translated from Greek variant P, will be discussed in greater detail inasmuch as it is the topic of the present book. As a preliminary remark, I should say that I include in this category the manuscript from Bucharest (*BAR, Ms. sl. 307*), which has connexions with Mount Athos and with Wallachia.

---

[35] Синодик, изд. Н. И. Новиков, *Древняя Российская вивлиофика или собрание древностей российских до Российской истории, географии и генеалогии касающихся*, 8, 1775, p. 1-125.

[36] Ф. И. Успенский, *Синодик в Неделю Православия. Сводный текст с приложениями*, Odessa, 1893.

[37] Е. В. Петухов, *Очерки по литературной истории Синодика*, т. I-II, Sankt-Peterburg, 1895.

[38] K. A. Maksimovič in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 499-505.

[39] Its edition is forthcoming: R. G. Păun, Iv. Biliarsky, *Du combat pour la « juste foi » au péché politique. Pour une histoire du Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie*.

[40] Iv. Biliarsky, R. G. Păun, " La version roumaine du Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie (Buzău, 1700) et les combats pour la « Juste foi » à la fin du XVIIe siècle ", *Cahiers du Monde russe*, 58/3, Juillet-septembre 2017, p. 395-434.

The history of research on the Bulgarian Synodicon of course follows that of research on the Byzantine work, but has a significant tradition of its own. This is probably due to the accidental discovery of the so-called "Palauzov manuscript" before the middle of the 19th century, which was delivered from Bulgaria to the well-known Russian scholar of Bulgarian origin Spyridon Nikolaevich Palauzov by his relative Nikola Christophorovič Palauzov.[41] In 1855, he reported the discovery of the text of the Synodicon within this 14th century manuscript to Russian scholars.[42] Another article by him appeared in 1858, and these two publications mark the beginning of research on the Slavic text of the Synodicon, related to Bulgaria. Later, the so-called Drinov manuscript of the Synodicon was obtained by the founder of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Marin Drinov, offered to him by a Bulgarian from Panagyurishte. Its adventures will be presented in the following chapter. The subsequent history of scholarship on the Bulgarian Synodicon was no longer due to accidents. Gradually the Bulgarian version of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy acquired special emotional and ideological significance in the context of the recently restored Bulgarian state. The work became akin to national bede-roll of exceptional importance for the construction of the nation's pantheon. The national significance of the text explains the great interest it has provoked. The text did not have this social function in the Greek or Serbian environment or, to the best of my knowledge, among other Orthodox nations. Paradoxically, the study of this text continued through the efforts of a Russian scholar, Mikhail Georgievič Popruženko, who produced the first scientific edition of the complete text of the Bulgarian Synodicon. He created two editions of the text, employing different editorial decisions in each of these books, as will be presented further on. The first edition was entitled "Synodicon of Tsar Boris" and appeared in Odessa in 1899.[43] The tsar's name, differing from that of the Bulgarian ruler who convened and conducted the anti-heretical council of 1211, was given in this form due to the influence of the standard name "Boris". M. G. Popruženko thus continued the reading which had also been preferred by Spyridon Palauzov. In 1928 M. G. Popruženko's second edition was published in Sofia as Volume VIII of the collection *Bulgarian Antiquities* [„Български старини"]. It remained the

[41] Regarding this, see М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Бориса*, Odessa, 1899, p. I-III.

[42] С. Н. Палаузов, „*Синодик* царя Борила: рукопись XIV века", *Временник императорскаго московскаго общества истории и древностей Российских*, 21, 1855, p. 1-20.

[43] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Бориса*, Odessa, 1899.

standard edition for over 80 years[44]. Thus, it can be said that studies on the Bulgarian version of the Synodicon have a comparatively long history and developed according to their own logic.

The nature of Popruženko's two editions will be discussed in more detail in relation to the larger issue of the most appropriate way to publish the available witnesses to the Bulgarian Synodicon. Popruženko knew of two manuscripts, named Palauzov and Drinov, which differ considerably from each other. It has proven impossible to classify the manuscripts (even provisionally) under variant C (Palauzov) or variant P (Drinov) because the classification (M, C and P) was established by Jean Gouillard based on a later situation of the Greek Synodicon, which had continued to develop after the Bulgarian translation was made. This raises the question of how to include them in the publication of the text. M. G. Popruženko, who can be considered a pioneer in this respect, chose a different approach in each of his two editions. In the earlier edition, the one from Odessa, he compiled a unified text based on the older copy, that of Palauzov, rearranging some of its sheets and filling in the lacks, where possible, according to the Drinov manuscript and the edition by E. V. Petukhov[45]. In the newer edition, published thirty years later in Sofia, the Russian scholar chose a synoptic approach, presenting the text of both manuscripts Palauzov and Drinov parallel to each other[46]. They are placed on facing pages, on the back and front sides of the sheets. In cases of lack of correspondence between the two, where there are no corresponding texts, the opposite side is left empty. There are advantages of and disadvantages to each of these two editorial strategies. It is probably not fair to compare them with Gouillard's "gathered" text, as the Russian scholar's edition is older and based on only two known manuscripts. It should also be taken into account that a publication in parallel with the Greek text would be impossible.

More than eighty years after M. G. Popruženko's last edition, a new edition of the text was realised by a team of three researchers: Ivan A. Božilov, Ana-Maria Totomanova and Ivan Al. Biliarsky[47]. It is based on the two Bulgarian manuscripts of the work – the above-mentioned Palauzov and Drinov

[44] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, Sofia, 1928. Here the name of the tsar is given as "Boril".

[45] Попруженко, *Синодик царя Бориса*, 1899, p. V-VI, 1-82.

[46] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, Sofia, 1928, passim.

[47] Ив. Божилов, А. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик. Издание и превод*, Sofia, 2010 (второ издание 2012).

manuscripts, named after the persons who discovered or first studied them, and preserved in the National Library Saints Cyril and Methodius in Sofia. In preparing the edition, the scholars decided to compile a unified text of the Bulgarian Synodicon based on the older manuscript, Palauzov's (14th century), with additions from the Drinov manuscript (16th-17th century) to cover the missing parts in the first manuscript[48]. In a sense, this approach repeated that of M. G. Popruženko in his 1899 Odessa edition, but without the use of E. V. Petukhov's edition and with the addition of variant readings to indicate the difference between the two manuscripts in the sections where they cover the same text. I would say this approach was admissible in light of our knowledge of the Synodicon at that time. But the situation changed significantly with the publication and study of the manuscript in the collection of the Library of the Romanian Academy (*BAR, Ms. sl. 307*).

That manuscript was little known until a few years ago, and was not taken into consideration in the 2010 edition. This absence can be justified as the manuscript does not contain any specifically "Wallachian" or "Bulgarian" data and cannot be defined in terms of ethnic affiliation, it does not relate to "Boril's" tradition either. Attention is turned to this manuscript in the 2013 edition and in the present study, including editions of its text.

My interest in this remarkable work, the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy, evidenced by my participation in the above-mentioned team of authors, dates from long ago and drew my attention to the Bucharest manuscript in the course of my research on the collection in the manuscript section of the Library of the Romanian Academy. Despite the very bad state of the manuscript, it became clear from my very first reading that this was an insufficiently known Slavic copy of the Synodicon relating to the Palaeologian variant (P). This is evidenced above all by the well-preserved beginning of the chapters against Barlaam of Calabria and Gregory Akindynos, characteristic of variant P, and also by some of the commemorations and other elements. It should be emphasised that this is the first clearly identified witness to a South Slavic translation of the Synodicon pertaining to this variant. Before the study of the Bucharest manuscript, only East Slavic witnesses to the P variant were known: the Ruthenian and Russian texts and the text of the Synodicon

[48] It should be noted that A. Totomanova has taken the same approach in the above-mentioned prestigious edition of the conciliar decrees, which includes the text of the Bulgarian Synodicon accompanied by a brief commentary – A. Totomanova in: *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 429-468.

within the 17th-century Triodion printed in Kiev and Lemberg/Lvov. This affiliation to the P tradition makes the Bucharest copy unique amongst the South Slavic witnesses to the text, and raises questions about its relation to the other manuscripts and printed texts. Shedding light on this matter will be one of the tasks of the present study: to determine the place of the copy from the Library of the Romanian Academy among the other witnesses, to study its text compared with the other ones, and to publish it in parallel with the text of the Bulgarian Synodicon contained in the Drinov manuscript.

In my study of 2013[49], I concluded not only that the Bucharest manuscript pertains to variant P of the Synodicon but that the same applies to the Drinov manuscript (based on its similarity to the Bucharest manuscript). This conclusion has radically changed the perception of the work and of its Slavic variants, and also raises the issue of when the translation was, or translations were, made. I consider that the examination of this issue is beyond my field of competence, and it will be left to philologists to shed light on this matter. Instead, in this book I aim to facilitate the combined study of the Drinov and Bucharest manuscripts. Their joint study, separate from the Palauzov manuscript (which follows the Comnenian tradition), seems necessary to me. I have decided to present their texts separately, as such a synoptic edition provides advantages in commenting on them and thus serves my purposes better than a unified, critically edited, text would do. Such an approach would have been an option, and has been taken in the editions of 1899 and 2010.

The other basic task I set myself in this study has been to identify the individuals mentioned in the commemorations and the anathemata. Here, special attention should be devoted to the customary diptychs of the emperors, patriarchs, and other bishops. The additions to the basic text of the Synodicon, regional or other, provide the most interesting data. The nature of these additions should be established and explained, after which attempts can be made to utilise them in order to date and locate the source manuscript.

Certainly, the most important goal set in this study is the publication of the texts. The texts in question are not unfamiliar, but the study of the two in conjunction may lead to interesting and important conclusions. The present book, devoted to all these tasks, aims to enhance knowledge of one of the essential works presenting the spiritual life both of the guardians of Orthodoxy and of deviants from the true faith in South-Eastern Europe in the Late Middle Ages.

---

[49] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, Sofia, 2013, p. 48-50, 66-67.

CHAPTER II

THE MANUSCRIPTS AND THE TEXTUAL CONVOY OF THE SYNODICON

Both South Slavic texts of the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy which are the focus of this book were transmitted within manuscript codices which also contained other texts. The current chapter will present the Bucharest and Drinov manuscripts and offer descriptions of their contents. This way attention will be drawn to the textual environment (so called textual convoy) in which the work has been placed. I should make the preliminary remark that the textual convoys of the two manuscripts are different and should be examined separately.

Manuscript BAR, Ms. sl. 307 (Lenten Triodion and Pentecostarion with Synodicon, before the middle of the 16th century)

1.1. Description of the manuscript

The manuscript consists of 124 paper folia measuring 215x140 mm, in quarto format. It used to be in a very bad condition. Although it has been restored, the text is so sullied by repair materials that it is almost illegible in many places. According to the descriptions of A. I. Yatsimirsky and P. P. Panaitescu, the beginning, the end, and some sheets in the middle of the manuscript are missing[1]. This has been confirmed by my own study. A. Yatsimirsky writes that at the time he was working with the codex, all the sheets were moist and stuck together which made it very difficult to use the manuscript.

The watermark has been identified as a variant of a hand with a flower (five-leaf), which, in Alexandru Mareş's catalogue, is dated to the first half of the 16th century and has not been recorded (at least in the two principalities) after the

[1] А. И. Яцимирский, *Славянския и русския рукописи румынских библиотек*, Sankt-Peterburg, 1905, N° 152 (282), p. 479; P. P. Panaitescu, *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române şi slave din Biblioteca Academiei Române*, vol II, Bucharest, 2003, N° 307, p. 48. At the time A. I. Yatsimirsky was working on the manuscript, it was still in the *Museul de Antichităţi*.

second half of that century[2]. The author relates its origin to the papermaking workshops of Italy or southern France. In a personal consultation with this leading specialist in the watermarks and paper used in Wallachia and Moldavia in the late Middle Ages, and after his concrete study of the manuscript in question, Alexandru Mareş confirmed that the paper in manuscript *BAR Ms. sl. 307* dates from the first half of the 16th century. In extending my special thanks, I accept his opinion and would propose dating the manuscript to before the middle of that century.

The binding is new (restored), made of leather. Only part of the old binding has been preserved, glued onto the new one. In his description made before the restoration, P. P. Panaitescu notes that the binding is old, made of leather and wooden boards, severely damaged[3].

Script: uncial/semi-uncial. It was once clear and legible, but is now very damaged. The orthography is two-ier (ъ and ь) and without nasal vowels (neither ѫ nor ѧ), Resava type of orthography.

There are 23-25 lines per page and 28-33/35 characters per line, in black-brown ink, within a frame sized 155x90-95 mm. The titles, initials, digits, and reference notes for the text are written in red. On f. 1r, there is a decorative interlace in red and blue on the frontispiece.

In his description, P. P. Panaitescu mentions a note that does not exist anymore since the manuscript has been restored, as it was written on the inside of the back cover: **Пиⷭ҆ аꙁ ѥмⷬонаⷯ поⷫ ѳеѡдосиѥ въ лⷮѣ ꙁр҃иı**.[4] The year after Creation is 7118, which corresponds to 1609-1610. If one assumes that this note was made by the copyist, the miscellany should be dated to the early 17th century. In spite of this note, Panaitescu suggests dating the manuscript to the 16th century but without discussing it with arguments. In my view there are no decisive arguments to conclude that this note was made by the copyist of the manuscript. Thus, there is no reason to alter the proposed dating, based on the watermark, to before the middle of the 16th century.

---

[2] Al. Mareş, *Filigranele hîrtiei întrebuinţate în ţările române în secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucharest, 1987, p. XXXII, fig. 1608-1625, p. 415.

[3] А. И. Яцимирский, *Славянские и русские рукописи румынских библиотек*, Nº 152, p. 479; P. Panaitescu, *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române şi slave din Biblioteca Academiei Române*, vol II, Nº 307, p. 48.

[4] P. Panaitescu, *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române şi slave din Biblioteca Academiei Române*, vol II, p. 48.

The manuscript can be identified as a liturgical miscellany, with as its main works a Lenten Triodion and Pentecostarion[5]. The Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy (the first Sunday of Lent) is part of the first-mentioned item.

Here is an expanded description of the contents:

1. f. 1r – Beginning of the Triodion of Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulus:

... НІА Въ НАРОѴНТы Со ТРъ
пѣ҇нца пра́зникы. Едн́нь кьж҇о
сло́вѹюща. ка́ко ко҇га е҆же
... еткы бы҇ . и҆ за́ ю҆же вин҆ѹ ѿ
с҇тых ѿц҇ь на́ших ѹ҆чини́ше҇ . съ нѣ
кы҇ми пристоа́ними чь҇тных . на
чи́наемаа ѿ мы́тара и҆ фарїсе҇а .
и҆ докончава́юща до с҇ты въс҇ѣ́ . тво
ре́нїе моу́дрѣнша҇го и҆ словеснѣ́ншаа҇
... [нї]кїфо́ра ѯанѳѡ҆̀пѹла , дла́
... гѡмѣсе́чника събра́нїе
... н пѣ́сни ꙗ҆к҇о ѡ҆бычно прочи́
... . пото́мже настое́щаа ~
... ~ Въ тъ́ж҇е д҇нь е҆ж҇е
... ꙗ҇ мы́тара и҆ фарїсе҇а :~

The next three rows, written in black ink, are completely illegible.

f. 1v – completely illegible. After this, several sheets are missing.

f. 2r – Beginning of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy (the text of which will be presented in the next chapter).

On f. 21r, the writing becomes completely illegible. On the following sheets, due to the deteriorated condition of the manuscript, only separate words are legible. Up to approximately f. 50, only the red titles are legible:

f. 39r – Въ тъ́ж҇е д҇нь е҇́ / ѿ и́стиннѣ҇ па́сцѣ, н҇еля православа́/вная . вънѥ́г҇а па́ме҇ пра́зн҇ѹет се / възѡ҆бражѐнїю с҇ты҇ и҆ чь҇тных и҆кѡ҇ . ї҆ѹ . The same is written in the top margin of the page.

[5] It is worth noting that the manuscript was in such a condition that A. I. Yatsimirsky was unable to identify its contents and classify it. According to his catalogue, this was a „Сборник поучений" [Collection of Precepts], containing the *acolouthia* of the Akathist for the Sunday of Orthodoxy and precepts for the days of Lent, which bear no author's names and are brief and artless; at the end there are precepts for Easter and the Pentecost – А. И. Яцимирский, *Славянские и русские рукописи румынских библиотек*, № 152, p. 479.

f. 44v – Вь тъ́ж҃е д҃нь є҆́же ѿ и҆́стиннѣи па́/сцѣ . и҆ нє҃лѧ тре́тїа по́ста . покло/нє́нїє чьтнаа҃ и҆ животво́рещааг҃ / кр҃та . Кр҃ тоу ... The same is written in the top margin of the page.

f. 46v – Въ тъ́ж҃е д҃нь, и҆ че́твръть҃, є҃ нє҃лє́/ по́ста . въ́н҆же бывае҃ послѣдо/ванїє ве́ликааго кани́на :~ / Сего є҆́же ... ї҃ѕ. The same is written in the top margin of the page.

f. 48v – Въ тъ́ж҃е д҃нь, и҆ соу҃та несѣдалнѡ҃. / є҆́же є҃ па́ме҃ чю҃сы̀ прѣстые б҃же . / Пѣ҃нми ... In the margin down: ※ Сѹ҃та, а҆ка́ѳїстѹ :~ .

f. 52v – Вь тъ́ж҃е д҃нь ѿ гп҃осцѣи па҃цѣ . и҆ въскр҃се́нїє пра́в҃єнааго ла́зара. The same is written in the top margin of the page.

f. 55a – нє҃лѧ цветоносі́а ÷.

f. 56v – Въ тъ́ж҃е д҃нь , и҆ с҃тыи и҆ вели́к[ыи по]/нє҃лникь: Ѻ҆́бразы ...... Two rows further down: Ѻ҆ ..... / смо́ковницн.

f. 59r – [Вь] тъ́ж҃е д҃нь , и҆ с҃тыи и҆ ве́ликыи / [вт]о́рникь.

f. 60v – Въ тъ́ж҃е д҃нь , и҆ с҃таа и҆ ве́ли[каа срѣда] / па́ме҃ женѣ и҆злїа́вшои ..../ гла́вѹ х҃воу. въ д́ѡмѹ сї... / каженнаго · жена̀ ... In the bottom margin below the text: Въ с҃тѹю и҆ ве҃ќѹю срѣдѹ :~

f. 62v-63r – Въ тъ́ж҃е д҃нь въ коу́/f. 63r/ [...]с҃тые па́схы и҆ съврьше́нїє / [...] нѣи ве҃рн ~ Соу́гѹбаа ве́ра ... One row further down the text about the washing of the disciples' feet is presented: [Ѻ҆ ом]ывє́нїи . Ѻ҆мы́вае҃ оу҆ченикѡ҃ ... х҃с́ нѡ́гы. И҆́же нѡ́гама/ below: ...на прѣда́нїє ~ Ѵ҆то́же мьчн/

f. 67v – Вь тъ́ж҃е д҃нь и҆ с҃тыи и҆ ве́ликы[и п҃ткъ ра]/спе́тїа г҃а на́ше҃ і҆и҃ х҃а́ ... / Two rows further down: пра́вє҃номѹ разбо́никѹ.

f. 73v – Въ тъ́ж҃е д҃нь и҆ с҃т[аа и҆ ве́ликаа събота]/ Снє́тїє г҃а на́шего і҆и҃ х҃а. И҆стръ/заеть гвѡ́здїє и҆́ми же а҆да́мь ... Further down on the page: Ѻ҆ погребе́нїи ~ / Сто́бою бѣгае і҆ѡ́сїфь. Still further down on the page: ѻ҆ ѹтвръжденїє с҃тго / грѡба̀ · Выже хранишн ка́мень.

f. 75v – Въ тъж҃е д҃нь. И҆ с҃таа и҆ ве́ликаа н[едѣлѧ]/ па́схы. Въскр҃е́нїє / г҃а на́шего і҆и҃ х҃а ·

f. 78v – Въ тъ́ж҃е д҃нь и҆́же ѿ [госпо҃сцѣи па]/сцѣ, но́ваа нє҃лѧ. Въне́г҃а двере / затво́рено҃, оу҆ченикѡ҃ пр҃ѣста̀ с҃пс :~ /f. 79r/

f. 81r – Въ тъж҃е д҃нь и҆ є҆́же ѿ госпо҃сцѣи / [п]асцѣ. нє҃лѧ мνрѡнѡ́сицы̀. Хоу́/

f. 83v – Въ тъ́ж҃е д҃нь и҆ є҆́же ѿ [госпо҃сцѣи] / па́сцѣ. нє҃лѧ ѧ҆́же ѿ р[аслабленомъ]/ Гл҃ь х҃въ̀ ст҃е же разсла́[бленомъ]/

f. 85v – Въ тъ́ж҃е д҃нь є҆́же ѿ госпо҃сцѣ[и па́]/сцѣ Срѣда̀ прѣполовлє́нїѹ. Further below: Въ́ срѣдѹ разсла́бл[енаго прѣ]/половлє́нїю пе҃де҃тнице

f. 87v – Въ тьѭе дн҃ь ѥже ѡ̀ и́стиннѣн па/сцѣ. нѣлꙗ ѡ̀ самара́нины . [....]/ Вода почры́п'стн...

f. 91v – Въ тьѭе дн҃ь ѥже ѡ̀ госпо́сцѣ[н] / пасцѣ. нѣлꙗ ѡ̀ слѣпцѝ ~ / Wплюнове́нїа новаго ...

f. 94v – Въ тьѭе дн҃ь ѥже ѡ̀ госпо́сцѣ[н] / пасцѣ. въzнѐнїе хв҃о̀. In the top margin: Въ чѐ, въzнѐнїа :~

f. 96v – Въ тьѭе дн҃ь, ѝ нѣлꙗ шес[таа[6] по] / па́цѣ, Ст҃ыѝ трїѝста ѝ о[семнадесеть] / бг҃онѡ́сныѝ ѿцѣ́, и́же въ н[нкен] / Събо́ра хвала́ю сп҃ныи ... In the top margin : нѐ .s҃. по̀ па́цѣ :~

f. 100r – [Въ тьѣ]ѭе дн҃ь ѥже ѡ̀ госпо́сцѣи па́ці́ѣ / [нѐ]лꙗ пѣ́дѣ́тнаа · Въниѣ́га дх҃ь / ст҃ын на а́плы сънндѐ. Скорѣе ...

f. 102r – Въ тьѭе дн҃ь ѝ пн҃е́ннкь по пѣ́дѣ́тнн/цн ст҃аго дх҃а · Въсако дыха́нїе /

2. The last identifiable text is the vita of St. Gregory the Decapolites: f. 113r – [Жн]тїе вь кратцѣ прп҃внаа́ wц҃а на/[ше]го грїго́рїа декапо́лїта . бл҃вн w҃ :~ ...ѣмже прп҃вныѝ ѝ бг҃8 ... ... їе жи́zнь полѵчно̀ ѝ польzно . w

The form Декапо́лнтъ and ѿ Дѣ́тогра́дъ also occur.

From there to the end of the manuscript, there follows a text that is difficult to read or in places quite illegible (f. 124). It seems that on f. 123r there used to be a text, of which nothing remains now. On f. 123v there are traces of a comparatively long text written in red ink, but it is much damaged and quite illegible. At f. 124r (the last sheet of the manuscript) there was a text that has been very damaged and of which only a few lines have been preserved: [....] бг҃а на́шего [їѵ҃ хр҃а...] / [....]авные вл҃уце на́ше бц҃е ѝ прнс/[нодѣве ма]рїе [....] ѝ бг҃ови́дныѝ а҃г҃гла҃ . ѝ въ/[сѣхь с]т҃ыѝ, а҃ми́нъ :~

1.2. History of the manuscript

The text of the Synodicon in manuscript *BAR Ms. sl. 307* of the collection of the Library of the Romanian Academy is not unfamiliar to science. Jean Gouillard drew attention to it and explicitly noted that this is some local redaction of the Synodicon[7]. Later, it was mentioned by Antonio Rigo in connexion with his research on the text of the *Hagioretikon gramma* of 1345

[6] Sunday of the 318 fathers of the First Ecumenical Council is the seventh, not the sixth, Sunday after Easter.

[7] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 40 (note 216), 237. In fact, Jean Gouillard explicitly notes that he would have worked more on the text of the Bucharest copy, but the condition of the

AD[8]; his findings will be engaged with in the present book[9]. Unfortunately, the condition of the manuscript, as well as the nature of the contents (which follows the normative requirements for a Triodion's contents) have created considerable difficulties for researchers.

More can be said about the manuscript codex, the physical object carrying the text. From the description in Panaitescu's Catalogue, it is understood that there are no longer any colophons in the manuscript, because the only one such was destroyed in the course of restoration; besides, it affords no possibilities for interpretation, even though it contains the Universal/Creation Year 7118 (1609-1610 AD). It is not quite clear where the colophon was written. I believe, nevertheless, that it can be claimed with some degree of certainty that it was written in the Romanian lands (most probably in Wallachia).

It is important to establish where the manuscript was written. This is partially related to the question as to where this concrete text of the Synodicon was produced, although the localisation of the two may certainly be different. Analysis of the text indicates that it was most probably written on Mount Athos in connexion with the General Assembly, in 1345, at which a group of monks connected with Irene Porenè was condemned on the charge of carrying out unacceptable practices. This is made evident within the anathemata in the Synodicon. Anathemata against this group are not found in any other witness to the work, neither in Greek, nor in Slavic, or other traditions. The text (of this particular version of the Synodicon, with anathema against the aforementioned group) seems to have been originally written in Greek, which can be confirmed based on the text of the *Hagioretikon gramma*, published by Antonio Rigo[10]. These events are connected with the beginning of the Palamite controversies, as will be discussed in more detail later on in this book. There are no certain, concrete data that might assist in determining the

manuscript was very bad. He was evidently familiar with it or had received information about it, because he cites the page of the text he was referring to.

[8] The date 1344, proposed originally by the editor of the manuscript Antonio Rigo was changed in 1345: M. Hinterberger, "Die Affäre um den Monch Niphon Skorpios und die Messalianismus-Vorwürfe gegen Kallistos I.", in A. Rigo (ed.), *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*, Firenze, 2004, p. 227. See also the annexe to this book by A. Rigo.

[9] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismorevolte agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, Firenze, 1989, p. 32, 144-145, 179, 187 note 1.

[10] See the annexe to this book.

place where the translation from Greek into Slavic was made. It might have been on Mount Athos immediately after the original was written, or it might have been later and somewhere else, anywhere in the Balkans. The question as to the exact date of writing of the Greek original of this version of the Synodicon will be further discussed, but most probably it was in the second half of the 1360s. There are two arguments in support of an early translation into Slavonic: the situation on Mount Athos, which was a place of contact and exchange and where the condemnation of the Irene Porenè group (later resonating in Tărnovgrade) was a topical issue, and the Palamite controversies that flared up in the same period. Both issues were vehemently discussed in Bulgaria. A possible argument against the idea of a Slavonic translation (made on Mount Athos or in Bulgaria) as early as the 14th century, is that the orthography would not be the same – the Tărnovo two-ier and two-nasal vowels norm would have been used. This is however not a decisive argument, as it is possible that the orthography was adapted to the then current norms within the history of transmission of the text. Due to the lack of decisive evidence any suggestion regarding the date of translation cannot be more than a hypothesis. The data from the content and orthography, and codicological analysis of the manuscript indicate that it could have been written in a South Slavic environment and then reached Wallachia, but it is not to be excluded that the manuscript was produced in the principality north of the Danube based on a South Slavic *Vorlage*. In either case, this was a very important manuscript, as it was probably the material carrier through which the text of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy reached the Romanian lands, or at least it is a manuscript produced from that carrier.

It is difficult to establish the ethnicity of the copyist of the manuscript based on the orthography it uses. The Resava orthography adhered to in the text was the most widespread Cyrillic orthography in the Balkans (with the exception of Moldavia) during the early Ottoman era. The copyist could thus a Serb or Bulgarian, or from the Romanian Lands.

It seems to me the only useful clue is the presence of the *Vita* of St. Gregory the Decapolites at the end of the manuscript[11]. This text, and the fact that the manuscript is in Bucharest, point towards a strong connexion between the

[11] Regarding it, see Fr. Dvornik, *La Vie de Saint Grégoire le Décapolite et les Slaves macédoniennes au IX siècle. Travaux, publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves*, V, Paris, 1926, edition of the text, p. 45-75; G. Makris, *Ignatios Diakonos und die Vita des Hl. Gregorios*

book and the Romanian lands[12]. Special attention in this respect should be paid to the powerful cult of this saint in Wallachia: it arose due to the translation of his relics to the Bistriţa monastery by the Ban of Oltenia Barbu Craiovescu, who initiated this veneration[13]. Of course, the cult was accompanied by the necessary literary and artistic attributes. Apart from the Greek *vita* of the saint, a Romanian *vita* existed. We know it has been translated from a Slavic text which in its turn was a translation from Greek[14]. However, such a complete text did not seem to have survived. I know only of brief synaxary *vitas*[15]. Those texts are completely different from the one preserved in the Bucharest manuscript, and no other attestations of the Slavic *vita* are known to me. Thus, the question could be raised of whether this text, in this manuscript, could be Slavic text from which the translation into Romanian was made. This could hardly be proven convincingly, but raising the issue relates to considerations about the place where the manuscript *BAR Ms. sl. 307* was written. If it was the material carrier of the Synodicon and of the *Vita* of St. Gregory the Decapolites to Wallachia, it must have been written elsewhere. This complicates the search for an answer even more, because there are no indications except the fact that the original (the Greek one, and probably the Slavic translation as well) of the Synodicon was or were created on Mount Athos. It is quite likely that the text travelled from Mount Athos to the lands north of the Danube. In spite of these suppositions and hypotheses, no definite answers can yet be provided regarding the date and place of the creation of the manuscript, nor regarding when the *vita* was translated. I find it difficult to believe that the Slavic translation of the work of Ignatius the Deacon was made specifically

Dekapolites. (= *Byzantinisches archiv*, Band 17), Stuttgart und Leipzig, 1997, Greek text with German translation, p. 56 - 153.

[12] Ив. Билярски, „Житието на св. Григорий Декаполит в ръкопис Ms. sl. 307 от Румънската Академия“, *Зборник радова Византолошког института*, L, 2013, p. 213-221

[13] Dr. P. Petroşanu, “Sf. Grigore Decapolitul din mănastirea Bistriţa-Vâlcea”, *Biserica Ortodoxă Română*, LIX/11-12, 1941, p. 682-703; D. Bodin, “Grigore Decapolitul şi Ioan de Capistrano”, *Revista istorică română*, XIV/3, 1945, p. 307-315; W. Wolska-Conus, « De quibusdam Ignatius », *Travaux et mémoires*, 4, 1970, p. 340-344; P. Năsturel, “Le surnaturel dans les sources médiévales roumaines”, *L’empereur hagiographe. Culte des saints et monarchie byzantine et post-byzantine*, Bucharest, 2001, p. 133-136.

[14] Petroşanu, “Sf. Grigore Decapolitul din mănastirea Bistriţa-Vâlcea”, p. 696-697.

[15] Р. Павлова, *Станиславов (Лесновски) пролог от 1330 година*, Veliko Tărnovo, 1999, p. 85; Г. Петков, М. Спасова, *Търновската редакция на Стишния пролог. Текстове, лексикален индекс*, т. III (месец ноември), Plovdiv, 2009, p. 71.

because of the presence of the relics of St. Gregory the Decapolites in Oltenia. Very likely, the translation had already been made among the Orthodox Slavs in the Balkans. This, however, could be the topic of a separate study.

Drinov copy (NBKM №432)
Damascene, 16th century

2.1. Description of the manuscript.

The manuscript is a miscellany of different works, written on paper in the 16th century (NBKM №432/634)[16]. It consists of V+216 sheets sized 145x105 mm. The written area is 73x111/116 mm. The paper is smooth, strong, but yellowed. In some places the sheets are thinner, and in a few cases, punctured by the ink. Because the paper has become thinner, and the writing is dense, it is difficult to find the watermarks[17]. In his description, B. Tsonev indicates a watermark: "an anchor within a circle, with a cross above it". In a later study, the same author explains that the manuscript can be dated to the end of the 16th century or the beginning of the 17th based on its grammatical and palaeographic particularities. He there describes the watermark as an encircled anchor with a sword-like cross above it, and points out that according to the Briquet catalogue it dates from 1577.[18] The manuscript has no original foliation (or pagination). It was added later, in Arabic numerals, in the upper outer corner, but not on every sheet. Below, in the middle of the first page of the sheet, there is a numeration stamped on with a seal, which I shall follow in my presentation. Apart from the general numeration, the sheets are marked with numbers at the bottom of the inner sides. There is likewise no original numeration of the tetrads.

The binding is relatively well preserved, leather, with clasps, one of which has been completely preserved. On the front and back cover, there are geometric interlace vegetable ornaments. On the front cover, in the middle

[16] See also the description of the manuscript in Б. Цонев, *Опис*, т. I, p. 438-442, No 432 (634); Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 83-88.

[17] For the filigree analysis, I give my thanks to Nona Petkova, at the time archivist in the Department of Manuscripts and Old Print Books at the National Library Saints Cyril and Methodius, Sofia.

[18] The author does not indicate the number of the drawing in the catalogue and gives no details about it: Б. Цонев, *История на българския език*, Sofia, 1984, p. 230.

of the bands with interlaced vegetable motifs, there is a rhombus of the same motifs, and in the four corners of the enclosed area, there are four flowers.

There is practically no ornamentation within the manuscript. In some places, the indications in the margin represent a hand with pointed finger (f. 28v with a branch, f. 100v, f. 147v, f. 165v, f. 214v) or small figures (f. 37r – something resembling a bird next to the title). On f. 128r there is a drawing of a scale illustrating the text about the weighing of the sins and the condemnation of sinners. On f. 47v, a later writer has made something like an ornament above the title, very crudely drawn. There are also a few drawings of flowers in the margins surrounding the lunar calendar.

The characters are in a small semi-uncial script, 20 rows per page. The ink is black and the titles and some initials are in red. Also written in red ink are some of the indications in the margins identifying the text. The copyist has followed the Serbian Resava norm, but the use of signs for the "ier vowels" (ъ and ь) is not consistent. Although this orthographic norm is generally without nasals, a few ѫ signs can be found in the text: львꙋ̑ папѫ (f. 195r), съ҃данѫ сн҃писанѫ мр҃ьтвнѫ (f. 195r), ѿмещѫщꙋ̑ (f. 197r). In pointing out such examples from the Drinov manuscript of the Synodicom, M. G. Popruženko concludes not only that the copyist transcribed from a Bulgarian original but that he was certainly of Bulgarian origin, which seems quite probable.[19] Although the manuscript consists of clearly separate parts, it is all written by the same hand; the separateness is not due – as in the case of the Palauzov manuscript – to the gathering together of completely different parts of manuscripts.

Contents:

1. f. 1r-183r: comprises the translation of different sermons by Damascene Stoudite and other authors[20].

(1) f. 1-20: Sermon on the Annunciation, the beginning of which is missing.

(2) f. 21r: Дама́скїна ѡ҆нно́ка ѡ҆подїа́кона и ст҃днта. Сло́во ѡ҃вщи҆̑ є҃зы́кꙋ̑, по вьстанн лазр҃е́вѣ на ср҃тте́нїе хв҃ꙋ̑ съ ваї́емь . цвѣтоно́сїе сло̑ ѡ҃ бл҃вы:~

In the upper margin of the page, there are signs of references written in red ink, but they are illegible.

[19] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодикъ*, p. XXVIII-XXIX.

[20] The sermons have been described in detail by B. Tsonev (Б. Цонев, *Опис*, I, p. 438-439).

(3) f. 37r: Поꙋче́нїе прѣложи́тел'но. ѡ҆ по́стѣ. и҆збр҃ се ѿ и҆же въ и҆ноцѣ мьн'ша҃ дама́скїна. и҆подїако́на и҆ стꙋди́та. въ нде́лю сыропꙋстнꙋю :· In the top margin of the page, there are traces of some references written in red ink, but they are illegible. I can only distinguish: сло҃ . г҃ ..
(4) f. 49r: Дама́скина и҆нѡ́ка. и҆по́дїако́на и҆ стꙋди́та. повѣсть ѿ че́стни и҆ ѡ҆ чюдесе́. и҆ и҆зобра́женїа. би́в'шии ѿ прѣвеликыи чи́ноначе́лни. Мїха҆ила и га́врїила, бл҃вы ѡ҆ч҃е :~ In the top margin of the page, there are traces of some references written in red ink, but they are illegible.
(5) f. 86r: Дама́скїна и҆но́ка и҆ и҆подїако́на и҆ стꙋди́та. сло́во про́стим сказанїем, ѡ҆ десе́ты сло́вь мѡѵсеѡ҆вѣх' ∴ In the top margin of the page, written by a later, but quite ancient, hand, and in a different ink: сло҃ є҃.
(6) f. 96v: Ѳеѡ́фана и҆но́ка, и҆ рито҃. ꙋчител'ство къ правосла́вным хрїстїаном. про́стим' сказанїем ѡ҆ всѣхь съставь, пра́вїе вѣри. In the top margin of the page, written by a later, but still quite ancient, hand, and in a different ink, in red: сло҃ ѕ҃.
(7) f. 103v: ПОВѢСТЬ АФРОДЇТЇАНА ПЕРСѢНИНА съписавша се ѿ фили́п'па прѣзви́тера. сїггла быв'шаго прїи ѡ҆анна Златоустаго. ѡ҆ рождьствѣ хс҃вѣ, и҆ ѡ҆ ѕвѣздѣ ꙗ҆вльшо́и се тогда, и҆ покло́ненїе вльхвом. и҆ дари и҆ и҆же ѿ перси́ди принесше. бл҃вы. ѡ҆че́ ~ In the top margin of the page, written by a later, but quite ancient, hand, and in a different ink, in red: сло҃ з҃.
(8) f. 109v: Въ нде́лю мсопꙋст. Да́маскына и҆нок и҆по́дїа́кона стꙋди́та. слово ѡ҆бщим сказа́нїемь ѡ҆ скон'чани мира. и҆ ѡ҆ а҆нтихрїстѣ. и҆ ѡ҆ втором пришесты г҃а нашего і҆у҃ ха҃ прѣложи́ се ѿ сло́ва. и҆же въ стых ѡ҆ца на́шего. и҆по́лита, папи рим'скаго намѣстныка стых а҆пль, ѿ бл҃ви :~. In the top margin of the page, written by a later, but quite ancient, hand, and in a different ink, in red: сло҃ и҃.
(9) f. 136v: Дама́скина и҆но́ка и҆пода́кон' (sic!) и҆ стꙋдита. Слово простим сказанїемь, на и҆же по пльти рождьство г҃а наше і҆у҃ ха҃ . в҃. ѿ :~. In the top margin of the page, above the title, written with red ink: мц҃а. дек кє҃. сло҃ ѳ҃. The numeration of the sermon (the last two words and the number) is written by a different hand and with a different ink, but is quite old.
(10) f. 160r: Дама́скїна мо́нах и҆ иподїако́на и҆ стꙋдїта. сло҃ ѡ҆бщим є҆зыком. на мѣсто дне́вное г҃а на́шего і҆у҃ ха҃ на срѣтенїе :·. In the top margin of the page, written in red ink: мц҃ ф҃ в. сло҃ і҃. Again, the number of the sermon seems added later, but by a quite ancient hand and with a different ink.

2. f. 184r-203v: Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy. After that, two sheets are left empty (f. 204-205). According to B. Tsonev, these sheets may have been added in order to fill in the beginning of the calendar, from which the first eight lunar circles are missing[21].

3. f. 206r-209r – Lunar calendar written in red and black ink in a well-ordered table.

4. f. 209r-211v – НАⷰЄⷧ ѠКЛꙋⷠНОⷨ ВЇДЄНЇЄⷨ СЛѠⷡ : а҃. (Globe-shaped Earth).

5. f. 212r to the end – Повѣ́сты и҆ ꙋкаⷥ и҆ рѣчи и҆збра́нны: дрєвныⷯ мꙋжїи. и филоⷭѡⷴ . є҆дн̀и гл҃ь мнѡ҃ разꙋⷨ и҆мꙋщь. и на полꙁꙋ слышєщїиⷨ. Different brief precepts, which B. Tsonev considers to be typical for so called “*damaskin*’s” literature. The maxims are divided by sub-titles written in red ink, indicating the names of various ancient philosophers or Christian theologians and/or the theme of the concrete thought. The texts are usually not long – a few rows each.

Before presenting the marginal notes and colophons as well as what they reveal about the path and vicissitudes of the manuscript over the centuries, I should point out there are many marginal notes made by the copyist (виⷲ, ниⷤ, вєⷧгласⷩо). In some cases, there are titles, or rather references, in ordinary ink added to the text, but in other places red ink has been used for these notes, usually in the bottom margin of the page. They are not relevant to the present study. These are either additions made where text is lacking, or emphases drawing attention to certain features of the text. They are relevant to the main narration and to the use of the text and not to the history of the manuscript, and are not independent expressions or texts. I shall attend to them only when they are relevant.

Colophons and notes:

1. On the inner side of the cover, there are several notes from the 18th century concerning accounts related to the economic activity of the manuscript’s owner:

а) дадохь цонꙋ 2 гроⷲ
ѿ хако
паки ꙁ҃ пиⷬ
паки к пиⷬ

[21] Б. Цонев, *Опис*, I, p. 441.

b) wстана на нндєлуа
за хако да знма я гр҃ѡ҃
ке п҃н
... г҃ра
останаха
... д г҃ра
зе́ль к҃ п҃н
зе́ль н҃ п҃н
нкона

зе̂ wстѧ̑ (the word has been crossed out) в҃ г҃ра
wс҆тѧ̑ ї п҃н

2. On the first empty, unnumbered sheet, in a similar handwriting from the same epoch:

a) Мц҃а апрнлїа вца́ннхь
момуе недєлуо за шесь
месецн 21 г҃ра зе́ль
ѿ хаков сн
6 г҃ра 10 п҃н

The whole text above was later crossed out.

b) вца́ннт҃ г҃р 41 (at the side, written by a different hand: нек҃а)
зе́ль 5(?)г҃ 11 п҃н
ст҃ошн плоска за гр҃ѡ҃ 6
станаха ... г҃ра 11 п҃н

станаха 3 г҃ л҃д п҃н

c) Below, written with a different ink: станаха and lower стоѧ́нко. There follow the Arabic numerals from 1 to 9, written in a vertical column.

3. On the reverse side of the fourth unnumbered empty sheet, in the upper left corner:

Г҆де̂ бж҃е̂ моѧ́ оустє нашь

4. f. 22r-23v – in the bottom margin of each of the four pages, written by a later hand (in the 19th century) in paler ink:

Книга сїа м҃нѣ па-// пахѡ́мїа // прої҆гу́мена // рылї́ота

5. f. 47r – after the end of the text, there are several illegible stamps. Someone was evidently testing his seal.

6. f. 47v – the page is left empty, and the following note has been written on it, probably in the 18th century:

сне ѡ҃ бѣсно ѱѐ н ѡ҃ ꙁ
вѣра. напншн на прѣ
сень хлѣбь на кор8
да нꙁедеть прежѐе
сланце вь нѐлю сїа
слова
8готїск ронак
н. кннфн, шест
нн, ад҃ѿ̃ꙁеѣ ад҃а̑
ѿ̃ кавгш ѱѡ҃мь
прꙁлеорклала
ѵѡ҃дсос 8ienѕ ∽

Below these strange rows there are seals representing a face with interlace ornaments of the kind that are placed above a title.

7. f. 48r – the page was empty, probably having been added to replace a missing one, and then someone in the 18th century wrote the following notes:

а) снѣ да ꙁнае що даваме
каꙁарацнкь на мола м8стафа
пакь ѡ̄кн к̄ ꙁ̄ по̂ пакь ѡ̆кн к̄ а̄
н҃ по̂
на ꙁелека ѡ̆кѝ ѵ̄ д̄ н҃ по̂
пакь шкн ѳ̄
като бѣхме на п̂нава. ꙁель шкѝе̄ї п̂[о]
пакь ѡ̆н
ї҆в̄

Several lines follow, written by a different hand and not well legible.

Пн҃ше п[є]л̊о н҃ма сн̈ (?)
мън...
доде....
да мн...
с ловце
аꙁь в .....̂хь
с ловце
.....

At the lowermost part of the sheet, written in the same handwriting as at the beginning of the page, is added:

юкень ѿкн р҃л҃а҃

8. f. 48v – the page was originally empty. Again, many seals have been stamped on it, and in the middle, to the right, is written:

цвѣтко

нма да ꙁема

The handwriting is from the 18th century.

9. f. 183v – at the uppermost part of the sheet there are some incomprehensible doodles, and to the side, perpendicular to them, a note from the year 1858 about the classification of the book. Approximately in the middle of the page is written: да са ꙁнⷶе. Below are written the letters СТ.

At the bottom of the page, there are two dated notes:

a) from May 28, 7143 (=1635 AD)

Въ лѣⷮ ҂ꙁ҃р҃м҃г҃. мцⷭа маꙗ҃. к҃н.

дн҃ь. прѣнде. пⷪ҇ петрь. хаџ҃н.

b) from 7130 (=1622)

Въ лѣⷮ ҂ꙁ҃р҃л҃. ѹ҆бїхж́ сѹльтаⷩ҇ъ

ѿсмана

1622

10. f. 217v – on the last page, there is a colophon written by the copyist:

Пн а҆ꙁъ грѣ́шнн роукою

граматнкь нменемь

ѳрꙁїоѳпь (B. Tsonev reads this cryptographic writing as Ангелакъ / Angelak)

In the middle of the sheet is written: 7122

5508

1614

There is also a note written in the beginning of the 20th century: 13/III/1915 Свършихь прѣгледа на книгата. Д. М. (Drinov, Marin?)

Bottom-most is a note from the year 7122 (=1614 AD):

Въ лⷴт҃ ҂ꙁ҃р҃к҃в҃ мцⷭа ю҆лїꙗ в҃і. дн҃ь.

даⷭ ꙁнае ч҆є́ прїнде́ ѿсмь таⷲ сторн ꙁло.

B. Tsonev proposes localising the event in Loveč, where the manuscript was kept in 1614. The Loveč monastery was there, south of the city; it may

have been destroyed by a flood of the river Osăm[22]. M. Popruženko seems to agree with Tsonev[23].

2. 2. History of the manuscript and its relation to other witnesses

It can be summarised that the Drinov manuscript of the Synodicon probably was created in the 16th century somewhere in the western Bulgarian lands, perhaps in Macedonia, where Serbian influence was the strongest in the Late Middle Ages, as evidenced by the orthographic features of the text. Certain particularities support the argument that the manuscript was copied from a Bulgarian source and that the copyist was probably of Bulgarian origin. These specifications enable the search for other data that might allow tracing the destiny of the manuscript. The marginal notes in it may suggest certain solutions within this quest.

First of all, the colophon provides the name of the copyist – gramatik Angelak. Unfortunately, there is no additional information about him. He may have been a cleric. The note on the last page gave both B. Tsonev and M. Popruženko reason to assume that the manuscript had remained for a long time in Loveč (if it was not also written there), specifically, in the Loveč Monastery, whose ruins are located south of the city, in the area *Monastirska Cheshma* (*Monastery fountain*). This is an interesting assertion, because the Palauzov manuscript is also connected with that city. Unfortunately, however, the claim cannot be definitely and indisputably confirmed, although it is clear that the manuscript was kept at least temporarily somewhere in the area along the Osăm river.

Another indication of the locality where it was kept is the mention of prohegumen Father Pachomius Riliot as the owner of the book. This would logically mean it was kept in Rila Monastery. This is not to be excluded, although there is no other direct information confirming this statement.

The note from 1622 mentions the murder of Sultan Osman – f. 183v. This refers to the murder of Sultan Osman II (born 3 November 1604, sultan 1618-1622), also called Osman Genç (Genç = the Young), who attempted to change the policy of the Empire and to decrease the influence of the janissary corps,

[22] Б. Цонев, *Опис*, I, p. 442.
[23] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. XLI.

but was killed in Constantinople on 20 May 1622.[24] This gives some indication as to the dating of the notes in the manuscript and also as to the acquirements of its owner, who was evidently aware of current affairs. Above this note, on the same page, there is note from the year 1635, which announces the decease of the priest Peter Hadji on May 28. We may assume that the mentioned cleric was either a very influential person in the milieu of the manuscript's owners, or a relative. Most probably, he was both, since the very mention of pilgrimage (he is called "Hadji"), and in the 17th century at that, testifies to the prestige and high social status of a Christian in the Ottoman Empire. For the present study it is relevant that the manuscript was probably in the possession of an ecclesiastic.

There is also a group of more recent notes – which seem to be from the 18th century – that present the economic activity of the manuscript's owner at that time; they are on the back of the cover, on the first numbered page, and on f. 48r. They contain calculations, records of loans given and due, notes on economic relations, hiring of workers, etc., which testify to a change of the environment in which the manuscript was then kept. It may be claimed with relative certainty that the book was for a significant period of time in the hands of a merchant or craftsman who noted important things in it. No doubt, it was not used for any liturgical purposes, such as reading of sermons and instructive oratory on religious holidays, and remained as a book to be read at home or in some other informal environment.

Marin Drinov received this manuscript from a member of a prominent family from Panagyurishte. Most probably the book was acquired by Tsvyatko Panagyurets, the publisher of the Eternal Calendar of 1818 in Budapest. In 1797, he signed his name as owner within a manuscript now kept in the Plovdiv National Library. One of his heirs, Georgi, gave the codex to Marin Drinov.

The question can be raised whether there is a connexion between the two manuscripts, and between them and the Palauzov manuscript. Had they

[24] V. Ostapchuk, "An Ottoman Gazânâme on Halil Pasa's Naval Campaign against the Cossacks (1621)", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 14, 1990, p. 482-521; G. Pieterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, Berkeley, 2003; B. Tezcan, "The History of a Primary Source : The Making of Tughi's Chronicle on the Regicide of Osman II (1622) in 1623", *Bulletin of School of Oriental & African Studies,* 72 /1, 2009, p. 41-62; S. Peksevgen, "Osman II", in: G. Ágoston & B. Masters**,** *Encyclopaedia of the Ottoman Empire*, New York, 2009, p. 446-447.

"met" somewhere in the course of their wanderings? This question, of course, concerns not only the history of the manuscripts but also the history of the texts, they are interconnected.

First, observations will be made without any textological study. The two manuscripts are from similar epochs and have similar orthographic particularities. In this respect, they differ from the Palauzov manuscript, which dates from the 14th century and has been written in Tărnovo orthography. Mikhail Popruženko discusses in detail the particularities of the Drinov manuscript with regard to its possible dependence on the Palauzov one. He presents his argument that PAL served as a basis for the creation of DRIN. The Russian scholar notes that, in some parts, the two texts are so similar that he considers them two copies of the same source; the examples he gives lead him to the conclusion that the writer of the Drinov copy had at hand the same text that has reached us in the Palauzov copy[25]. At the same time, however, in some places they differ significantly not only in terms of grammar and vocabulary, but also with regard to the additions and omissions. M. G. Popruženko thus constructed a hypothesis that both manuscripts were compiled based on the text of the same older source, but in each case with different editorial intervention aimed at correcting the inaccuracies and obscurities in the text (such as unclear and too literal translation, inappropriate words, additions that contain historical inaccuracies, etc.). In making this editorial intervention, the copyist, M. Popruženko believes, had at hand not only the older text, which he was copying and reworking, but also the Greek original of the Synodicon[26]. The literal translation in the older manuscript created expressions so untypical for the language as used at that time, that many of the theological formulations – already difficult to understand– became incomprehensible. According to M. Popruženko[27], this caught the attention of the hierarchs of the Church who commissioned a re-edition. Here the question has to be raised when such a scenario might have occurred. I would doubt such a step with regard to the text could have been taken in the late 16th or even 17th century, when the book did not seem to have been used in liturgy, especially not regularly. The text of the Drinov manuscript was rather meant for unofficial reading, as confirmed by its textual convoy. Mentioning the names of medieval rulers was hardly a

[25] М. Г. Попружено, *Синодик*, p. XLVII-XLVIII.
[26] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. XLIX-LXXXVI, XCII ff.
[27] М. Г. Попружено, *Синодик*, p. LIII.

priority under Ottoman rule. There was simply no elite to express this kind of ideas and to initiate a new edition of the Synodicon. Secondly, there would not have been many people in the peripheral areas (and western Bulgaria certainly was such) competent to carry out such a revision of the text.

In fact, M. Popruženko suggests that this re-edition was made long before the creation of the Drinov copy – probably as early as the 14th century – and even argues that it was made by Patriarch Euthymius himself[28]. To his linguistic, literary, and stylistic arguments I would add the consideration that this was an official text of a very high order, which makes the intervention of the Patriarch of the Bulgarian Church more likely. In this case the topic of an "encounter" of the two manuscripts can be dropped. The possibility they were kept in Loveč – which is not fully certain – should not lead to a different view. M. Popruženko in fact believed that the scribe of the Drinov copy had before him two Bulgarian sources – edited or not – which he handled rather carelessly[29]. The Russian scholar offers an interesting characterisation of this copyist, which is not very merciful towards his shortcomings. In any case, these hypotheses cannot be convincingly proven and remain assumptions based chiefly on the idea of the unity of the Synodicon text in the Bulgarian environment – an idea that I would call romantic.

As for the manuscript in Bucharest, the idea of an encounter with the other two Bulgarian copies did not arise.

Textual convoy of the Synodicon in the two manuscripts.

The Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy, in its Greek original and its translations did not circulate on its own. It was copied and disseminated combined with other works, in various types of miscellaneous codices, most typically within liturgical miscellanies, because actually it was a text for liturgical usage. This reception of the text, combined with other works, adds to the variation within the tradition related to the Synodicon. Not only is it characterised by variation in contents, in the first instance the Macedonian, Comnenian, and Palaeologian variants (followed by further modifications as

[28] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. XCI-XCVIII.
[29] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. LXXXVI ff.

versions were created where the text was adapted in various ways to new contexts), but also in the types of miscellanies in which it circulated.[30].

Among the extant Greek attestations to the text of the Synodicon, the liturgical and legal miscellanies hold a special place. This also counts for its subsequent reception, for example in the south Slavonic translations. The manuscript in which the Palauzov copy of the Bulgarian Synodicon has been transmitted is certainly liturgical[31]. The miscellany containing the Drinov copy is of a different character. It belongs to the so-called category of "Damaskins", consisting in its main part of sermons by Damascene Stoudite.[32] This different textual context can be explained by the fact that it originated in a different epoch and probably had a different purpose. The witnesses to the text from Serbia again circulated in different manuscript contexts. In their case, the liturgical context of the text is likewise significant: these are the Plevlja breviary (1380-1395), the Zagreb copy (1380-1390), the Dečani copy (a lost text that was included in a now unknown, probably late, manuscript)[33]. In Russia, the designation "synodicon" is also used for a simple "bede-roll" (prayer list), by itself[34]. Here I shall not touch upon the delicate question whether and how (in Greek or in translation) the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy existed in Russia as early as the 12th century (I am referring to the reference in the *Primary Chronicle* under the year 1108 and the reference in Prince Vsevolod-Gabriel's charter to the local clergy in 1135), as this issue is beyond the aims of the present study[35]. Regarding the question, it is important that two Russian editions of the work under study exist, the first of which

[30] See J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 14-35.

[31] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 57-72.

[32] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 84.

[33] Љ. Стојановић, „Требник манастира св. Тројице код Плеваља", *Споменик Српске Амадемије*, LVI, Београд, 1922, p. 22-30; Вл. Мошин, „Плеваљски рукопис Синодика Православља", *Слово*, VI-VII (= *Vajcов зборник*), Zagreb, 1957, p. 157-177; Вл. Мошин, *Ћирилски рукописи Југославенске Академије*, т. I, Zagreb, 1955, p. 59-61; Вл. Мошин, "Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю Православия. Анализ текстов", *Византийский временик*, т. XVI, 1959, p. 361 ff.

[34] Е. В. Петухов, *Очерки по литературной истории Синодик*а, p. IV-VI, 83 ff.; И. В. Дергачева, *Посмертная судьба и „иной мир" в древнерусской книжности*, Moscow, 2004, p. 146 ff.

[35] Е. В. Петухов, *Очерки по литературной истории Синодика*, p. 59-61; М. Г. Попуженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, p. IV-V; Вл. Мошин, „Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю Православия", *Византийский Временник*, 16, 1959, p. 347-348; Вл. Дергачев, "Вселенский Синодик в древней и средневековой Руси", p. 20-21; И. Вл. Дергачева,

is connected with manuscript N°667 from the Moscow Synodal Collection (now in the State Historical Museum - GIM[36]), and the other is related to the tradition of the Triodion (more precisely, the Kiev printed Triodion) and hence is of special interest in the context of the study of manuscript 307 from the collection of the Library of the Romanian Academy.

1. Textual convoy in manuscript BAR, Ms. sl. 307.

As already mentioned, in the framework of this manuscript, the Synodicon is part of the Triodion of Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos. I believe that the presence of the Synodicon in a manuscript containing the Triodion is something natural, given the close connexion of the work with liturgy and its purpose: to be read on the Sunday of Orthodoxy, the first Sunday of Lent. Several Greek witnesses to the text have also been transmitted in Triodia, thus attesting to its original purpose. This is the case for all manuscripts belonging to the Comnenian variant of the Synodicon, from the group designated by the publisher as the "Hellas" group because they were meant for the suffragan bishopric of the Athenian archbishopric (variant *Cfghij*)[37]. The fact should also be mentioned that, not accidentally, the first Greek printed edition of the Synodicon appeared in Venice on March 31, 1522, as part of the Triodion[38]. In the general context of the present study, it should also be pointed out that the first Slavic printed edition of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy was in the framework of the Kiev printed Triodion of 1627. This edition was reprinted several more times until the end of the 17th century[39]. According to

Посмертная удьба, p. 148; K. Maksimovič in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 499-501.

[36] Henceforth, GIM.

[37] J. Gouillard, « Synodikon », p. 27-28. I should note immediately that the text we are studying (the south Slavonic translation according to the P version) could have no connexion with these manuscripts, which contain many additional elements "borrowed from who knows where" as Jean Gouillard puts it, and which do not correspond to the text as preserved in the Bucharest manuscript – the extensive anti-Bogomil section, the anathema against Constantine V Copronymus, etc.

[38] For the present study, I am using the printed edition of the Triodion from Venice, 1559, which is accessible in the National Library Saints Cyril and Methodius in Sofia (pressmark: R. гр. 559.1). There, the Synodicon is placed at ff. 76r-83r.

[39] For the present study, I am using this edition, which is accessible in the National Library Saints Cyril and Methodius in Sofia (pressmark: R. ц. 664.1): **Трнωднωнъ сн́ є̓сть Трїпѣснець, въ Лвовѣ в҃ ρóкѹ ҂ахз҃д Мц҃а окт҃о: в҃ı**. The rite in the Sunday of Orthodoxy begins at f. ρн҃ѳ r, and the Synodicon itself is at f. ρо҃г r.

E. V. Petukhov[40], that printed edition contains a new translation, especially made for it from the text of the printed Greek Triodion. He also points out that the translator consulted the older translation. Here I should say that, when comparing this text printed in Kiev with the Drinov manuscript of the Bulgarian Synodicon, a certain similarity can be noticed. Based on these similarities M. Popruženko suggested that the text as found in the Drinov manuscript was also known to the translator of the text published in Kiev, and later in Moscow[41].

Elsewhere we (my colleague Radu G. Păun and I) have devoted attention to the printed Synodicon, which has also been printed in Romanian within the Triodion.[42] We consider it likely that this is a translation of a Ruthenian (or less probably Russian) printed Triodion that was evidently very widely disseminated among the Orthodox nations. The Romanian Synodicon was printed in 1700, Buzău, at pages ρчѣ (197) – сі҃д (214)[43]. Although this text likewise has features in common with the manuscript in the Library of the Romanian Academy, I cannot say there is any direct dependence between the two and I would consider it more sensible to compare the Romanian printed Triodion with other palaeotypic variants – Greek or Slavic – rather than with the Bucharest manuscript.

The Triodion (or Three-Odes Book) is a liturgical book containing parts of the rite with changeable prayers for the movable feast cycle, starting from the Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee and ending with All Souls[44]. The Triodion was divided into Lenten and Pentecostal as early as the 10th century. The Greek designations are respectively Τριώδιον and Πεντηκοστάριον. Since the content of the Triodion is fixed and known, it can be compared with the text found in *BAR Mss. sl. 307*. This manuscript has several gaps, due to lost pages. At the beginning the four pre-Lenten Sundays are missing, so that

---

[40] Е. В. Петухов, *Очерки по литературной истории Синодика*, p. 68-69.

[41] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. CXIII-CXVIII.

[42] Currently, my colleague Radu G. Păun and I are preparing a separate volume with a typeset edition of, and study on, this Romanian text. See also our article: Biliarsky, Păun, « La version roumaine du Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie (Buzău, 1700) et les combats pour la « Juste foi » à la fin du XVIIe siècle », p. 395-434.

[43] I. Bianu, N. Hodoș, *Bibliografia românească veche, 1508-1830*, Bucharest, 1903, t. I (1508-1716), No 121, p. 402-409.

[44] See М. А. Момина, „Постная и Цветная Триоди. Содержание Триоди (состав служб)", *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*, вып. 2, часть II, Moscow, 1976, p. 389.

the first extensive text in the codex is that of the Synodicon of the first Sunday of Lent. The second Sunday is also missing, and the text goes straight to the third, dedicated to the Adoration of the Holy Cross. This is followed by the Saturday of the Raising of Lazarus and next day, the Entry into Jerusalem (Palm Sunday). That is the fifth Sunday, which means the fourth is missing. All the texts related to Holy Week are presented in the manuscript, including the Resurrection (Easter is on f. 75v). The Bright Week is not presented and the manuscript goes straight to the Sunday of Saint Thomas (f. 78v), followed by the Sunday of the Myrrh-bearers (f. 81r), the Sunday of the Paralytic (f. 83v) and Mid-Pentecost (f. 84v), Sunday of the Samaritan Woman (f. 87v), Sunday of the Blind Man (f. 91v), and the Ascension of Christ (f. 94v). Then comes the Sunday of the 318 Fathers of the First Council of Nicaea (f. 96v), and after that, the Sunday of Pentecost (f. 100r). The last service is the rite of the Holy Spirit, celebrated on the Monday after Pentecost (f. 102r). There is no doubt that the lacks are due to the loss or destruction of manuscript leaves.

The content of the Triodion has thus been followed in *BAR Mss. sl. 307*, and the deviations here can be ascribed to its fragmentary state: many of the sheets are entirely or partially lost. This can be illustrated from the beginning of the text, where the title is mentioned: the Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee, but the text of the rite is missing. Certainly, regrettably, a large part of it has been lost.

It is worth noting that the Lenten and Pentecostal Triodia are joined together in one book, which is typical for the older manuscripts, according to the study by M. A. Momina. She lists Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian examples of such a joint presence in the 12th- 14th centuries[45]. Can this serve as a reference point for identifying the protograph of the manuscript under study? Insofar as there is data about certain reference points in the 14th century (the account of events on Mount Athos in 1345, and the reference to Jacob, Metropolitan of Hierissos – f. 20v – who will feature further on in this study), this seems a very attractive possibility. Nevertheless, I do not believe it can be established whether or not the original Greek text of the Synodicon, from which the translation preserved in *BAR, Ms. sl. 307* was made, circulated within a Tridion. For this reason, it may not be appropriate to use manuscripts identified by M. A. Momina to date the version of the work preserved in BAR, Ms. sl. 307.

[45] М. Момина, „Постная и Цветная Триоди", p. 391-392.

In connexion with this topic, it is worth paying attention to M. Momina's observation that the Triodion of Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos contains synaxarian readings connected with the respective holiday, which are usually placed after the sixth song[46]. As an example, she points to the manuscript from the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 13.I.4 / ПС No 880 (similar to the Triodion of Orbel, 13th century), which contains, after the sixth song for the first Sunday of Lent, a text entitled: събрание в неDл аz поста (f. 62). She interprets the word "събран·е" ("gathering together") as an exact translation of the Greek "συναξάριον".

2. Textual convoy of the text in manuscript NBKM 432.

In the content of manuscript *NBKM 432*, the Synodicon acquires a particular context. The convoy is significantly different from that of the Palauzov and Bucharest manuscripts. The context clearly differs from the selection of other readings in the book, and from their purpose. What is it that had changed, what was the new environment and audience of this miscellany?

The manuscript *NBKM 432* contains mainly sermons, especially by Damascene Stoudite. I believe the sermons were meant for home reading or generally for unofficial reading, as well as for liturgical reading during the divine service. This is indicated by the presence of instructions written in red ink above the title, various instructions in the margin, as well as clarifications attached to the text. True, the instructions above the titles and the holiday dates have not been preserved in all cases, but this is due to damage to the manuscript. What is the place of the Synodicon in this context? Was it meant for reading during the liturgy on the holiday of the Triumph of Orthodoxy, or was it meant for unofficial reading?

Analysing the content of the miscellany will shed light on this issue. The miscellany can be classified as a "*damaskin*", a widespread type of miscellany in the 16th – 19th century. At first, this term referred to various Slavic translations of the collection of sermons, called "The Treasure" (Θησαυρός, Thesaurus), by the 16th century Greek cleric and writer Damascene Stoudite. He was born in Thessalonica in the early 16th century, studied in his native city and then in Constantinople, where he became a monk and hypodeacon, and carried out various ecclesiastic missions. In 1564 he was consecrated as bishop of Lètè (the ancient Mygdonia) and Rentina, a suffragan diocese of Thessalonica,

[46] М. Момина, „Постная и Цветная Триоди", p. 396.

and in 1574 he became Metropolitan Bishop of Naupaktos (Latin: Lepanto) and Arta, Exarch of Aetolia, which he remained until his death in 1577.[47] His literary activity is remarkable for its great contribution to the development of Modern Greek literature and also to Modern Bulgarian and other South Slavic literatures. Damascene Stoudite was canonised in 2013; his feast day is November 27[48]. His book "The Treasure" was published in 1558 in Venice, the largest book-printing centre for the Balkan Orthodox nations under Ottoman rule. The language of the book, close to the colloquial Modern Greek speech of the time, is commonly considered to be its characteristic feature, but what seems most significant for me is the purpose of the edition. These are instructive texts and sermons meant to reach the minds and hearts of people with as their ultimate goal salvation through faith. The sermons of Damascene Stoudite quickly spread to the Slavic Orthodox population of the Balkans and the tradition of *damaskins* and *damaskin literature* was thus gradually established as exceptionally important for the culture of the peninsula during the time of Ottoman domination. The book was translated as early as the 16th century. Later miscellanies containing his sermons acquired a life and development of their own, which led to a variegated reception history of his works circulating in different combinations with other compositions.

Damaskins are divided into three types based on their content and the time of their creation[49]:

1) The first translations of the sermons of Damascene Stoudite, made in the 16th century, i.e., almost immediately after the publication of the book in Venice. This category is reserved for collections of sermons exclusively by Damascene Stoudite. It has long been noticed that, Gregory, Bishop of Pelagonia and Prilep, is noted as translator in the title of the Sermon on the

---

[47] П. А. Лавров, *Дамаскин Студит и сборники его имени „дамскины"* в югославянской литературе, Odessa, 1899; L. Petit, "Damascène le Studite", *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,* vol. IV, 1924, p. 27-28; Ю. Трифонов, „Ритор Теофан и иподякон Дамаскин", *Списание на БАН*, t. 71, Клон историко-филологичен, 34, 1950, p. 1-27; Д. Петканова, *Дамскините в българската литература*, p. 8-16; G. Podskalsky, "Damaskenos Studites", *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd ed., vol. III (1994), 1381; L. N. Manou, Δαμασκηνός ο Στουδίτης: ο βίος και το έργο του, Athens 1999, Е. К. Лицас, „Дамскин Студит: некоторые нерешенные вопросы его биографии и творчества", МОΣНОВІА: К 60-летию Б. Л. Фонкича, Moscow, 2001, p. 247-258.

[48] http://www.saint.gr/4349/saint.aspx (visited on 23 September 2017).

[49] Д. Петканова, *Дамскините в българската литература*, Sofia, 1965, p. 4-5, 42 sq.; Д. Петканова, *Народното четиво през XVI-XVIII век*, p. 7-12.

Prodigal Son. His name is connected with this first translation, made as early as the 16th century based on the Venetian edition. The translation can be dated to between 1558 (the year of the printed book) and 1580, when the Pelagonian chair was raised into a metropolitan diocese and Gregory would no longer have been referred to as a bishop[50]. This translation, called "Macedonian" after the place it was made, has been preserved in seven manuscripts[51].

2) Miscellanies called "*damaskins*" appeared as early as the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century; but *only part of the sermons in them were by Damascene Stoudite,* albeit the predominant part. These manuscripts of mixed content represent the second translation of the work, again made in the western Bulgarian lands. It includes a sermon on the Symbol of Faith by Theophanes Eleaboulkos (called Theophanes the Rhetorician), teacher of Damascene Stoudite[52]. I would also note Presbyter Philip's Sermon on the Nativity, which is not known to have circulated in other *damaskins* than *NBKM 432*[53]. The question arises whether this translation covered all the sermons or only part of them. Clues about its dating can be found in the note in manuscript *NBKM 432*, which refers to the flood of the Osăm River in 1614, and inasmuch as the note is not by the manuscript's copyist, it justifies dating the codex (or at least the translation of the text) to the end of the 16th century. This translation has traditionally been called "*srednogorski*" (from "Sredna Gora", a mountain chain in central Bulgaria), but D. Petkanova offers sound arguments that it should be called the "Rila" translation[54]. She presents a list of twelve manuscripts containing it[55]. Before continuing with conclusions about the convoy and the purpose of the manuscript, two things will have to be pointed out. *First,* the Rila translation of the texts was made from a Greek manuscript, but not from a printed book because in the printed editions,

---

[50] П. А. Лавров, *Дамаскин Студит и сборники его имени „дамскины"*, p. 19; П. Илиевски, „За македонскиот превод на дамаскинот", *Македонски јазик*, год. XI-XII, Skopje, 1961, кн. 1-2, p. 33-51; Д. Петканова, *Дамаскините в българската литература*, p. 42-43; Е. И. Демина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин. Болгарский памятник XVII века*, Sofia, 1968, p. 42-44.

[51] Д. Петканова, *Дамаскините в българската литература*, p. 51-53.

[52] Ю. Трифонов, „Ритор Теофан и иподякон Дамаскин", p. 3-5.

[53] Е. И. Демина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин. Болгарский памятник XVII века*, p. 48.

[54] П. Илиевски, „За средногорскиот превод на дамаскинот", *Македонски јазик*, год. XI-XII, Skopje, 1961, t. 1-2, p. 53-71; Б. Цонев, *История на българския език*, т. I, p. 229-237; Д. Петканова, *Дамаскините в българската литература*, p. 43-48.

[55] Д. Петканова, *Дамаскините в българската литература*, p. 53-55.

the Sermon on the Ten Commandments of God handed down to the prophet Moses was first included in the 1630 edition, 16 years after the date of the 1614 note referring to the flood of the Osăm River.[56] D. Petkanova proposes that the Greek *Vorlage* could have been a manuscript compilation made on Mount Athos and later translated and disseminated among the Balkan Slavs[57]. *Second*, the text and the contents of the collection in question were probably not the work of the translator himself but of a later copyist, inasmuch as the number of Damascene sermons is small and did not include the translated sermons. D. Petkanova distinguished two editions of this translation and classifies *NBKM 432* under the first, which is closer to the original Greek text.

3) In the course of the 18th century and the first half of the 19th miscellanies appeared, which were still called "*damaskins*", even though they did not contain any sermons by Damascene Stoudite. This group is not of interest for the present study[58].

The Drinov miscellaneous manuscript which is of interest for the present study due to the text of the Synodicon it contains, evidently belongs to the second group. Damascene's sermons are predominant amongst its contents, which also contains other works. Since the time of Benyo Tsonev the manuscript has been date to the 16th century. However, B. Tsonev used unconvincing arguments in support of his suggestion. It is based on his dating of one of the works to 1577 without any references and without arguments in support of such an early date for the creation of the manuscript.[59]. The composition of the sermons cannot convincingly prove a dating from the beginning of the last quarter of the 16th century, although the manuscript is amongst the earliest attestations of the Rila translation. The earliest of the dated annotations on the codex is from 1614, and the next one, mentioning the assassination of Sultan Osman II, from 1622. The manuscript must have been written some time before the earliest note, possibly at the end of the 16th century, but early in the 17th century is not to be excluded.

For the present research, exactly dating the manuscript is less relevant than defining the nature of the textual convoy and the purpose of the miscellany. I

---

[56] Ю. Трифонов, „Ритор Теофан и иподякон Дамаскин", p. 20, note 1; Е. И. Демина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин. Болгарский памятник XVII века*, p. 50.

[57] Д. Петканова, *Дамаскините в българската литература*, p. 55-57. Вж. и Е. И. Демина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин. Болгарский памятник XVII века*, p. 50.

[58] Regarding them, see Д. Петканова, *Дамаскините в българската литература*, p. 250-255.

[59] Б. Цонев, *История на българския език*, т. I, p. 230.

believe it can be asserted that it was meant both for reading and for liturgical use. The general purpose of the miscellany testifies to the first of these uses, and the various marginal annotations explaining features in the text, the indications of holidays and the numeration of sermons, points to the latter. All these notes were made to be quite conspicuous. This gives us some suggestion as to the purpose of the Synodicon's text itself. It may have been meant for reading, and it may also have been meant for liturgical reading during divine service on the first Sunday of Lent. Whether it has actually been used as such cannot be decided on the basis of the manuscript alone, but in light of the general practice of the Ecumenical Patriarchate during that epoch.

CHAPTER III

CONTENTS AND TEXT OF THE SYNODICON FOR THE SUNDAY OF ORTHODOXY BASED ON THE MANUSCRIPT IN THE LIBRARY OF THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY IN BUCHAREST (BAR MS. SL. 307)

Section I
Contents of the Synodicon based on the manuscript in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest

The Synodicon in BAR Ms. sl. 307 is part of the Triodion and is placed in the section for the first Sunday of Lent – the Sunday of Orthodoxy. Due to the particular nature of the work and its use in different churches, there are considerable differences between the various witnesses to the text. This variation can be explained based on to the different purpose of each witness and the way the text has been adapted to the respective local contexts. Hence, it is worth presenting the contents of the work as preserved in the two manuscripts to which this book is devoted. In the present chapter, the contents and text of the manuscript kept in of the Library of the Romanian Academy will be presented. Folia numbers are provided in brackets; the abbreviation G. ll. is used to refer to the Greek text as found in the edition of Jean Gouillard, with the respective line numbers.

1. As can be expected, the Synodicon begins with a preamble or introductory part[1] (B, f. 2r-5v_{22}; DRIN f. 184r-187v_{8}; G. ll. 1-107). The first partially preserved sheets of the Bucharest manuscript, albeit severely damaged, contain the work's initial text, from the time of the Macedonian dynasty (classified by Jean Gouillard as variant *M*) and concern the doctrine of the holy images. This is in fact a homily to be read on the Feast of Orthodoxy. This introductory part includes besides the preamble, common commemorations presented in the form of theological topics.

---

[1] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 141-142; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 3-15, #1-9; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 91-103; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, с 68-74.

a) f. 2r-4r_{14} (DRIN, f. 184r-186r_6; G. ll. 1-60) – the preamble.

b) f. 4r_{14}-5v_{22} (DRIN, f. 186r_7-187v_8; G. ll. 61-108) – common commemorations by theological topics.

2. Diptychs[2] (B, f. 5v_{22} – 6v_{15}; DRIN f. 187v_8-188r_{18}; G. ll. 108-133). This section is dedicated to the memory of various fighters for Orthodoxy against the iconoclast heresy during the Second Iconoclastic Period (815-843). It is worth drawing attention to the commemoration of St. Andrew of Crete (BAR, Ms. sl. 307, f. 6r – the last two rows), which is present in the Drinov manuscript but not in the Palauzov manuscript[3]. It is also missing from the Greek text published by Jean Gouillard[4]. The presence of this commemoration only in B and DRIN confirms the similarity between these two witnesses.

Commemorations can also be seen as indicators of the affiliation of some variants. Thus, the commemorations of St. Stephen the Younger and St. Theophanes the Confessor are missing from the classical variant M (Macedonian), which reflects developments between 920 and 1050[5], while, as can be expected, they are present in Synodicon B (ff. 6r and 6v), as well as in PAL and DRIN. Noteworthy is the presence in B of two Orthodox confessors, Theodore and Theophanes, who are absent from PAL or DRIN, and from the Greek text published by Jean Gouillard, and from the printed Synodica within the Triodion[6].

3. Anathemata[7] (B, f. 6v_{15}-10r_7; DRIN f. 188r_{19}-191v_{16}; G. ll. 134-179). These anathemata are extensive presentations of theological ideas considered as heretical, and the adherents of which are anathemised. Most of them are closely connected with iconoclasm, and thus related to Christology, reflecting ideas of the Incarnation and the admissibility of depicting the Incarnate

---

[2] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 142-149; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 15-19 / # 10; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 104-106; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 74-75.

[3] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 105 line 20 (see the variants in the footnote).

[4] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 53.

[5] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 15, 21-22 (the commemorations appear in some other *M* variants as well, but are finally adopted in *C*).

[6] According to A. Totomanova, these are St. Theodore Studite and St. Theophanes the Confessor – A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 171.

[7] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 149-153; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 21-33 / # 11-24; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 107-112; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 75-80.

Word. This characteristic relates to the initial purpose of the Synodicon. The anathemata follow the traditional order in the Greek original of variant *M* and do not pose any special problem. It is only at the end of this part of the Synodicon that the anathemata are specified for particular persons, rather than reflecting theological ideas.

a) f. $6v_{15}$-$9v_{16}$ – anathemata under theological topics. The part placed on f. $6v_{15}$-$8r_4$ follows exactly the six anti-iconoclastic anathemata from the text's initial Greek variant *M*. The following six anathemata in B (f. $8r_5$-$9v_{16}$) do not match the structure of the Greek text of variant M. They are missing in that place from PAL and from the Serbian Synodicon, but are present in exactly the same form in DRIN (f. $189v_{12}$-$191v_4$). There is an interesting situation in the Russian Synodicon published by E. V. Petukhov (manuscript Synod 667) where the first and beginning of the second of the anathemata in question are present (f. $25v_6$-$26r_8$), after which the rest of the page (f. 26r) has been left blank. The following page (f. 26v) has also been left empty[8]. I believe this indicates that the copyist intended to add the texts which follow in other witnesses. In the printed Synodica (Greek and Slavic), these prayers follow the same order as in B and DRIN[9]. In fact, these condemnations are present in the Greek original as well, judging by the manuscripts, but elsewhere in the Synodicon. They are found on the following lines in the Jean Gouillard edition: the first two, on G. ll. 391-403; and the other four, on G. ll. 435-471. These are anathemata pronounced in connexion with the condemnation of Eustratius of Nicaea and have been placed within discussion about the sacrifice of Christ. There is a misunderstanding with regard to the anathema placed on B f. $8r_{5\text{-}11}$ and on DRIN f. $189v_{12\text{-}18}$. It is missing from PAL and from the Serbian Synodicon. On the contrary, it is present in the printed Slavic Synodicon and in the printed Greek text within the Triodion[10]. E. V. Petukhov and M. G. Popruženko, as well as A. Totomanova in her latest article, express the

[8] Е. Петухов, Синодик, p. 33 (footnote *). In the latest edition, by K. Maksimovič, this is not mentioned – *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 515.

[9] Checked in the Greek edition of the Triodion from 1586 and in the Ruthenian edition published in Lvov, 1664 – f. ρο̃ε$_v$-ρο̃ϛ$_v$.

[10] Checked in the Greek edition of the Triodion from 1586 and in the Ruthenian edition from Lvov, 1664 – f. ρο̃ε v.

opinion that it is absent from the basic Greek text; so, the authors have published it on the basis of other sources (a manuscript from Vienna or from the printed Synodicon)[11]. Actually, there is a misunderstanding here, due to the differences between variants C and P of the Synodicon. The text of this anathema is part of the general practices reflecting the condemnation of Eustratius of Nicaea, and has been published by Jean Gouillard – G. ll. 391-394[12].

b) f. $9v_{17}$-$10r_{7}$ – personal anathemata against the heretics Anastasius, Constantine, Nicetas, Theodotus, Antonius, John, Paul, Theodore Gastes, Stephen Molites, Theodore Crithinus, and Leo Laloudius, which fully coincide with the names in the Greek original of the Synodicon and with the list in PAL and DRIN, as well as with the Serbian and Ruthenian/Russian lists.

4. Anathema against Gerontius of Lampé, which is considered to mark the beginning of the Comnenian variant of the Synodicon[13] (B, f. $10r_{7\text{-}14}$; DRIN f. $191v_{16\text{-}21}$; G. ll. 180-184).

The chapters against John Italus begin after this anathema both in DRIN and in B matching the original Greek text. By contrast, in PAL several anathemata borrowed from the decisions of the Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea have been placed after the one against Gerontius of Lampé and before the chapter concerning John Italus (G. ll. 752-762)[14]. The same texts are found in the Serbian Synodicon, followed by anathemata against the Babuns, characteristic of this variant of the Synodicon found only on the western Balkans[15]. In the Petukhov edition of the Russian version, the text

---

[11] Е. Петухов, *Синодик*, p. 32-33, f. $26v_{6}$-$26r_{6}$. The author quotes in a footnote the Vienna Greek copy. This refers to manuscript *Vind. theol. gr. 307* circa 1300. It is worth noting that in the latest edition of the Russian text of the Synodicon, published by K. Maksimovič (*Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 515), the text of this anathema has been omitted, which does not contribute to the usefulness of the edition. М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, p. 18-19 §16, p. 27 note 2; A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 183.

[12] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 69-71.

[13] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 15, 21-22. The anathema appears in several variants of *M* as well, but is finally adopted in *C*), 186-187; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 33 / # 25; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 112; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 80.

[14] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 115 (f. 9v).

[15] *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 492_{57}-493_{71}.

against Gerontius of Lampé is followed by an anathema against Constantine, the former metropolitan bishop of Kerkyra (Corfù)[16].

5. The chapters against John Italus[17] (B, f. $10r_{14}$-$12r_{20}$; DRIN f. 192r-$194r_{4}$; G. ll. 185-246). It is notable that the text placed at G. ll. 243-246 is missing from B, while in DRIN, it is placed elsewhere, on f. $195v_{12\text{-}17}$. This is the personal anathema against John Italus (and not a condemnation of his doctrine); its omission is typical for the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon, except for variants *Pk* and *Py* (in Gouillard's classification)[18].

6. The anathema against the monk Nilus of Calabria[19] (B, f. $12r_{20\text{-}22}$; in DRIN the text occurs twice – on f. $194r_{4\text{-}6}$ and f. $195v_{18\text{-}19}$; G. ll. 247-249). It is undoubtedly connected with the preceding anathema as the monk Nilus of Calabria was considered the spiritual successor of John Italus; like his teacher, he came from southern Italy. The trial against him was held before 1094, but after the condemnation of John Italus. The text was probably added to the Synodicon at that time.

After this anathema, a relatively large passage from the original Greek text (G. ll. 250-478) is absent from this copy. These texts were used only in specific dioceses and can be divided into three parts: 1) condemnations of the Bogomils and similar sects (G. ll. 250-287)[20], the first section was used in an unknown metropolitan diocese, and the second, in a diocese suffragan to Athens; 2) the anathemata against Eustratius of Nicaea[21] (G. ll. 388-423), of which the first section was in general use, the second was used in the Lacedaemonian Church, and the third in an bishopric suffragan to Athens; 3) the anathemata related to the controversy with Soterichus Panteugenus regarding Christ's

---

[16] Е. Петухов, *Синодик*, p. 35.

[17] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 188-202; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 33-39 / #26-35; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 113-121; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 80-84.

[18] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 190-192 note 57; A. Rigo, « Un nouveau témoin du *Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie P* : le manuscrit de la Sainte-Trinité de Chalki 34 », p. 75, 79, 82 ; A. Rigo, « Il *Synodikon dell'Ortodossia* di Lavra », p. 261.

[19] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 202-206; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 39 / # 36; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 121; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 84.

[20] These additions are typical for manuscript *Cc*, (in the Gouillard classification) and they belong to a provincial eparchy, being very similar to the Bulgarian Synodicon – J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 23-24.

[21] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 206-210; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 126-127.

Sacrifice[22] (G. ll. 424-471), which was widely used. These parts have been placed earlier in the text both in PAL and DRIN – not, however, in the same place as in the Greek original, but immediately before the anathemata against Constantine, the former metropolitan bishop of Kerkyra[23].

7. The first Synod regarding the discussion about "My Father is greater than I" (John 14:28)[24] (B, f. $12r_{23}$-$13v_{3}$; DRIN f. $194r_{6}$-$195r_{8}$; G. ll. 472-509). The first words are missing, regarding the first synod for the condemnation of the heretical doctrine related to the controversy about the Gospel passage "My Father is greater than I" (John 14:28) – G. ll. 472-478. Here, only G. ll. 479-509 is present, as the beginning is omitted.

8. Second Synod concerning the theological dispute regarding the quotation "My Father is greater than I" (John 14:28)[25] (B: ff. $13v_{3}$ – $15r_{16}$; DRIN f. $195r_{10}$-$195v_{12}$; G. ll. 517-571). It should be noted that the beginning of the Greek text (G. ll. 510-516) is missing from B, from PAL, and from DRIN[26].

a) the beginning of the main part (G. ll. 510-532). In B the text of this part has been placed on f. $13v_{3}$-$14r_{5}$.

b) the part against the ex-metropolitan bishop of Kerkyra (Corfù) Constantine, nephew of the Archbishop of Bulgaria (G. ll. 533-561). In B it covers f. $14r_{6}$-$14v_{25}$.

c) the part against John Eirenicus (G. ll. 562-571). In B, it covers f. $15r_{1-16}$.

9. There follows a series of anathemata[27] (B, f. $15r_{16}$-$15v_{7}$; PAL, f. $9r_{21}$-$9v_{20}$; G. ll. 752-764, G. ll. 765-766 are missing) that are related to the topic

---

[22] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 210-215; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 127-131.

[23] These chapters (G. ll. 391-471) are present both in the Palauzov (ff. $16a_{4}$-$18b_{21}$, # 54-59, Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 126-131) and the Drinov manuscript (ff. $197b_{4}$-$199a_{21}$, М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 47-53, # 61-66) преписи на Синодика.

[24] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 39-41 / # 37-41 DRIN.; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 132-134; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 84-86. For a comprehensive treatment of the theological discussion (and not only of the First Synod), see: J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 216-226.

[25] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 41-43 / # 42 with differences in the text; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 134-139; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 86-88.

[26] Regarding these additions to the basic text of the Greek Synodicon, see: J. Gouillard "Synodikon", p. 76-77 note 291.

[27] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 88-89.

of iconoclasm and are not in the same place in the original Greek text. In fact, these are anathemata against iconoclasm pronounced at the Seventh Ecumenical, or Second Nicaean, Council and are presented in the form they were given at the creation of *Tomos unionis* (AD 920)[28]. In the Greek text, they are placed after the commemoration of St. Gregory Palamas and the hesychasts and immediately before the polychronion for the *basileis*. In the printed Greek Synodicon within the Triodion, these anathemata have been placed immediately after the condemnation of John Eirenicus and immediately before the chapters against Barlaam and Gregory Akindynos; they are in the same place in the printed Slavic Triodion[29]. The proclamations are present in the Palauzov manuscript (ff. 9r-9v)[30], but not in Drinov, which is probably due to missing folia. In the original Greek text these anathemata are first encountered in variant C, in manuscripts *Cbdenpq*[31]. They were added to the Synodicon around the end of the 12th century, when the doctrinal part of the work was complemented with particular care. The first and the last anathema from the Greek original, aimed against all heretics (G. l. 752), are missing from the Bucharest manuscript (G. ll. 765-766). The rest of the anathemata are the same as in the original. In this respect, it is important to note that the first anathema is present in PAL, but the order of the rest is interrupted and does not include the last two (G. ll. 763-766 are missing), which is not due to damage of the manuscript.

10. The next text presents the decisions of the general assembly of Mount Athos against the heretical monks[32] (B, f. $15v_8$-$16r_{21}$). The merit of identifying the Greek original of the text belongs to Antonio Rigo, whose book on the hesychast monks and the "Bogomil" monks on Mount Athos focusses precisely on these events[33]. This text will be analysed in more detail further on.

---

[28] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 92, v. note 308, with the sources and literature indicated there.

[29] Checked according to the Greek edition of the Triodion from 1586 and the Ruthenian edition from Lvov, 1664. – f. ρ̃οι v-ρ̃ο̃ο̃ r.

[30] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 112-113.

[31] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 21-22.

[32] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 89-90.

[33] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivole agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, (Orientalia Venetiana, II), Firenze, MCMLXXXIX. The text of this *Hagioretikon gramma* is published again by Antonio Rigo as annexe to this book.

11. The chapters against Barlaam of Calabria and Gregory Akindynos[34] (B, f. $16r_{22}$-$17r_{24}$; G. ll. 572-691). This part is typical for the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon. They are absent from DRIN due to missing sheets.

12. Commemoration and praise of St. Gregory Palamas and the other hesychasts[35] (B, f. $17r_{25}$-$19r_{14}$; G. ll. 692-751). The text is not present in DRIN due to missing folia. This and the previous element of the Synodicon are reliable indicators that it can be classified as belonging to variant P of the work. The eulogy on the Metropolitan bishop of Thessalonica does not belong to the initial variant of the Palaeologian Synodicon (after 1351) but was added after the death of St. Gregory Palamas in 1368, which was followed almost immediately by the establishment of his cult[36].

13. Commemorations of the *basileis*[37] (B, f. $19r_{19}$-$19v_{20}$; DRIN: $201r_{1-15}$; G. ll. 801 ff.) The list differs in the different manuscripts and variants, while the *basilissai* are entirely missing. This topic is examined in the present book in the section devoted to the commemorations.

14. Commemorations of the patriarchs[38] (B: ff. $19v_{21}$-$20r_{24}$; G. ll. 881-905). They are missing from the Drinov manuscript, probably due to lost sheets. They are examined in the section devoted to the commemorations in this manuscript of the Synodicon.

15. Commemorations of the patriarchs of Antioch[39] (B: f. $20r_{24}$-$20v_{5}$; G. ll. 927-929). They are missing from the Drinov manuscript, probably due to lost sheets. They are examined in this book after the part dealing with the commemoration of the Ecumenical patriarchs.

---

[34] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 90-92; A. Rigo, « Le *Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie* et le Palamisme », p. 227-241; A. Rigo, « Un nouveau témoin du *Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie P* : le manuscrit de la Sainte-Trinité de Chalki 34 », p. 83.

[35] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 92-94; A. Rigo, « Le *Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie* et le Palamisme », p. 227-241.

[36] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 30-31.

[37] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 94-95.

[38] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 95-96.

[39] R. J. H. Jenkins et C. Mango, "A Synodikon of Antioch and Lacedaemonia", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 15, 1961, p. 225-242; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 96; A. Rigo, "Il *Synodikon dell'Ortodossia* di Tessalonica", p. 200, 202, 209; A. Rigo, « Il *Synodikon dell'Ortodossia* di Lavra », p. 258.

16. Commemorations of the metropolitan bishops from an unknown see or sees[40] (B, f. $20v_{5-13}$; Gouillard, p. 118 ll. 1-5). They are examined in the respective place.

17. Commemorations of the bishops of Hierissos[41] (B, f. $20v_{14-16}$). These have no parallels in the Greek texts. They are exceptionally important for dating and localising the original Greek text of this witness to the Synodicon, and are therefore examined separately in the present book.

18. Concluding formula (B, f. $20v_{16-24}$; G. ll. 930-936). With this, the Synodicon ends.

Section II
Text of the Synodicon according to the copy in the collection of the Library of the Romanian Academy (BAR, Ms. sl. 307)

In the present chapter, I offer a diplomatic edition of the text of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy according to manuscript BAR Ms. sl. 307. The text is presented folio by folio as in the manuscript; I have attempted to indicate the number of missing sheets. Before each page, I indicate the corresponding places in the Greek original based on the edition of J. Gouillard, in the Drinov manuscript, in the edition of M. G. Popruženko, and in the printed Triodion from 1664. Historical and other commentaries (apart from those concerning the manuscript) are given elsewhere or are included as notes to the translated text. To compensate for the damage in the manuscript, I have endeavoured to restore the missing parts of the text, placing these restorations (mainly based on the Drinov manuscript) in square brackets [ ].

[40] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 96-97; A. Rigo, « Un nouveau témoin du *Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie P* : le manuscrit de la Sainte-Trinité de Chalki 34 », p. 77, 82, 84.

[41] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 97.

Text

► f. 2r (= GR /Gouillard/ ll. 1-14; DRIN f. 184r; Popruženko, p. 3; Triodion 1664, f. р҃ог r)

[Сі́нѡ́дї҇ прочнтаем҇ въ прьвꙋю҇ нед҇лю пос҇та:
ж҇е е҇ ꙋста́влен҄но ѿ бг҃оносны҇ ѿц҃ь нш҃н ѡ҇ бл҇:~][42] вн҇кѡ[43]
[Дльжноѐ къ бг҃ꙋ лѣпноѐ благод]аренїе, вь
[н҄жѐ дн҃ь въспрїехѡ҇ бж҃їю] цр҃ко́вь·
[съ ꙋзаконе́нїе҇] бл҃гочьстїа прѣда́нїн.
[н҆ разо́ренїемь зл]о́бы злочьстїа̀:
[Прр҃чьскый҇ послѣ]дꙋюще глб҃омь. а҆пс҃ль нж҇
[скымѝ же вѣщан҄м]н првво́днмн.
[н҆ е҆ѵг҃лскымь повѣд]а̀нїемь прнла́гаю
[ще се. о҆бновле́нїа дн҃]ь пра́зд҇ноуемь.
[н҆саїа̀[44] бо̀ ꙋбо̀ ре҇, о҆бна́вл]ааатн се ѿстро
[во҇ къ бг҃ꙋ. н҆жѐ ѿ е҆зы]кь ꙗ҆влꙗ́е цр҃квн·
[сꙋ҇ же црквы не е]же храмѡ̀вь про́
[сто зда́нїа н҆ свѣтл]остн, нь҃ н҆҆же въ
[нн҇ бл҃гоч҇]тнвы҇ н҆спльне́нїе, н҆ н҆҆мн҇
[о҆ны̀ бг҃вы] пѣ҇н҄мн н҆ славословле́н҄мн
[ꙋгаж҇аю]ть. а҆пс҃ль же[45] са́мое се҇ по
[ꙋчаѐ. въ о҆]бновле́нн жнзнн хо҆днтн
[повелев]а́еть . н҆ а҆҆ще кто҇ о҆ хр҃ѣ но́
[ваа тварь] ѡ҆бнавлꙗ́нте се. гн҃ꙗ же
[словеса̀.[46] пр]р҇чьскоѐ ꙗ҆влꙗ́юща оу҆строе́
[нїе. быш҇ ре҇] ѡ҆бновле́нїа въ і҆ерслмѣ҇,
[н҆ зн́ма бѣ̀. нлн]мы́сльнаа въ нюѐ же
[і҆ю́деі́скы е҆зы́к]ь на ѿвшаго спс҃а
[оу҆бїн́ствнїе п]одвн́заше боуре же

---

[42] The title here is given according to DRIN. The beginning of the Synodicon is missing from PAL.

[43] All theological references of this sort are written in the outer margins; i.e., on the recto side of the sheet, they are in the margin that corresponds to the reader's right hand, and on the verso side of the sheet, they are on the reader's left-hand side.

[44] Isaiah, 41:1.

[45] Romans, 6:4.

[46] John, 10: 22.

► f. 2v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 14-27; DRIN f. 184r-184v; Popruženko, p. 3, 5; Triodion 1664, f. ро҃г r)

[и҆ съмꙋщéнїа. и҆ли и҆же телесна̀а чюв҄ства
въздꙋшнымъ прѣложенїемъ.
н]а стꙋ҆д[ен҇о прѣтвараѐ. вы҇с ꙋ҆во]
вы҇с и҆ на на҇с зн҇[ла҇ немала. н҆ъ ꙗ҆же по и҆]
стинѣ великые зло[би и҆зливаю҇щ]
соуров҄ство̀. н҇ь про[ц҄вте на҇ блг҇ты]
бж҃їе прѣлѣ́т[н] щ.ꙋ.. [пролѣ́тїе. вь иже]
и҆ блг҃одарéнїе [е҆же ѿ блгы҇х жетви̇̀]
бв҃и сънидохо҇ [се сътвóрити. ꙗ҆ко да]
оу҆во ре҇мь ѱ[ала҇ми[47] Лѣто и҆ веснꙋ] вы҇ш
ты҇ създа̀ ꙗ [помѣни сїа ⁝ Є҆н ꙋ҆во̀] ни҇ж
поноси́вши҇х [гв҇ы врáгы҇. и҆ сего̀ ст҃ое по]
клонéнїе є҆[же въ ст҃ыи҇х и҆кона҇х о҆бе҇с]
чьстившихъ. в[ъзетѿ же и҆ възви́ше]
ино҇ бывшемь нечьстїемь[и҆и́звръ̀]
же си́хъ и҆же чюдесе҇ бь ⸱ ѿ [шетанїа]
ѿстꙋпнаго въ пр[ь҇с и҆и́зложи̇̀. ни]
жѐ во прѣзрѣ̀ . гла҇с въ[пїющи҇х къ немꙋ[48]] вы҇ш
Помѣни̇̀ г҃и поношéнїе рабь[49] т[вои҇х е҇ж]
оу҆дръжа̀[50] въ нѣдрѣ мое҇ м[но́гы҇х е҆зы҇к]
е҆же поноси́ше врáзи т[вои г҃и е҇ж]
поноси́ше и҆змѣ[н]éнїе [х҃а твоего̀]
И҆змѣнéнїе же оу҆во е҇с [Хв҇о и҆же сьмр҃]
тїꙋ е҆го̀ искꙋплéнии [бив҄шѐ и҆ вѣро́]
вавше то́мꙋ . Сло́во[мь проповѣдáнїа]

► f. 3r (GR /Gouillard/ ll. 27-40; DRIN, f. 184v-185r; Popruženko, p. 5, 7; Triodion 1664, f. ро҃г v)

[и҆ и҆кѡнны҇ и҆зло̀раженїе҇ и҆м҄же великое
съмотренї]а̀ д[ѣло и҆збавлѐннїи҇
познавае]т҄се ⸱ кр[ьс]томь же и҆ и҇ж

[47] Psalms, 73: 17.
[48] Psalms, 88: 51-52.
[49] In DRIN – вра҇г.
[50] In DRIN – съдрь҇ж.

[прѣжⷣе крⷭ҇та и҆ по̑ крⷭ҇тѣ̀ стрⷭ҇тмѝ же
. [и҆ чю̑ⷣс]емь ѿ ни́хже и҆ є҆́же то́го
[стрⷭ҇те]мь п[оⷣ҇ов]·е . вь а҆пⷭ҇лы, и҆ ѿ
[тоⷣу҇ въ мⷪ҇ни пр ѣ]хо́дить. и҆ тѣ
[ми] поꙋчена [до и҆сповѣ̑днкъ, и҆ по́стни
[кь нисходиⷮ҇] нмь повѣд [Ѳегѡ̀] ꙋ҆бо поноше́нїе
[....] обновле́нїи д҃ни [....][51] Є҆́же поно́
[сише...]о рⷪ҇е , ѡ҆бн[овленї...][52] помѣнꙋвь
[б҃гь наш...]оу . и҆́же ѿ [своимь] мл҃рдїемь
[....]ов҃н. не є҆́[....]ыми є҆го̀
[м҃лбами] прѣ́[кла]нꙗⷨе. Є҆́щеⷤ и҆ а҆пⷭ҇ль
[скїиⷨ и҆] въсѣⷯ с҃тыхь . и҆́же сь ни́мь
[досажⷣени] бы́ше и҆ съоу҆ничи́жнше се
[на и҆конаⷯ] да ꙗ҆ко́же съпострⷣа́ше
[пльтїю] снце оу҆бѡ ꙗ҆ко же є҆ⷭ҇ поⷣобно,
[и҆ є҆́же на] чⷭ҇ьтые и҆кѡ́ны то́мꙋ съ
[прїѡб]щет҆ се досажⷣе́нїемь . съ дѣ́
[ла посл]ѣ́дн є҆гда̀ въсхо́тѣ дⷭ҇нь . и҆ съ
[дѣа] вто́ро є҆же врь́шн пръвѣе .
[прьвѣ]ѐ оу҆бо по мнⷪ҇голѣ́тнѣⷨ
[нѣкоемь] врѣмени с҃тыⷯ и҆кѡ́нь
[ꙋ҆ничи]же́нїа и҆ безчь́стїа . възвра́

► f. 3v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 40-54; DRIN f. 185r-185v; Popruženko, p. 7, 9; Triodion 1664, f. р҃ог v)

[ти се б҃лгочⷭ҇тїе въ се́бе н҃нꙗ є҆же]
в[ътороѐ мало не въ тридесетилѣтїи ѻ҆]
зловле[нїа. с]ъвръш[и недоⷭ҇тоиниⷨ наⷨ]
злⷪ҇лютныⷯ свобожⷣе́нїе [и҆ скрь́бныⷯ и҆зба]
вленїе . и҆ б҃лгочⷭ҇ьтїа пакы̀ [проповѣда́нїа]
и҆ и҆кѡ́ннаго покла́нꙗнїа [ꙋ҆тврьжⷣенїа.]
и҆ и҆́же въса̀ прино́сащїи на́мь [пра]
зⷣники съ҇ . на и҆кѡ́наⷯ бо [видиⷨ єⷤ наⷭ҇]

[51] Here, the BAR Ms. sl. 307 text differs from DRIN and PAL and from the printed Synodicon text.
[52] Here too, there are certain lexical differences compared with DRIN and PAL.

радѝ вл҃чнее ст҃ртн ~ Кр҃ть Г[робь ада] вы́
оумръщвлꙗема н плѣнꙗ[ема. мнѝчь]
скаа ст҃ранїа ⁘ Вѣнцѐ. С[амое то сп҃енїе]
ѥже пръвын нашь [повнгоположоуте]
н подвнгодатель, н в[ѣнчатель посрѣ]
ѕемлꙗ съдѣаа ~ С[їе] д҃нь [тръжьство праз҃нꙋ] нн́
емь. въсемь м҃лтвамн н м[ленїе. въ]
кꙋпѣ веле҃ще се н рагꙋюще се, Ѱ[л҃мн[53] възн]
ваемь н пѣнмн ~ Кто б҃ь [велн ꙗко б҃ь] възл
нашь. г҃. Ты есн б҃ь н[а творен чюдеса едн] сн
Оукорнтелꙗ бѡ твоее сла[вы ꙋннчнжн] нн
есн. Смѣлые на твон ѡбраз[н дрьзостн]
вые, страшнвы н бѣжа[щн показаль]
есн. нь оубо ѥже вь б҃а [бл҃годаренїе н]
вл҃чнꙗа ꙗже на съ[протнвоборнн побѣд]
да въ сн. а ꙗже на нкѡново[р҃це повн]
ѕн н боренїа, дроугго слово н [словопнсанїе]

► f. 4r (GR /Gouillard/ ll. 54-66; DRIN f. 186r; PAL f. 1v; Popruženko, p. 9, 11; Triodion 1664, f. рог v- род r)
[простран҃нѣншее, ꙗвн ꙗко въ ꙋпокоенн]
нѣкоє по пꙋстынню пр
[ѣшьствы]. въ Одръжанн мысльнаго
[їерл҃ма быв]ше. мѡѷсенскымь нѣкы
[повїе] паче же бж҃твнымъ по
[велѣнїе] ꙗко стлъпꙋ нѣкоемꙋ
[ѿ велнкїн к]амень състроенномоу.
[н къ поет]їю пнсанїа оуправленномꙋ.
[братн]нмь ср҃цамь бл҃вленїа, ꙗже длъ
[жна сꙋ]т нже закѡ хранещн. н кле
[твы ...]мѣ · себе ѡбложнше. нже за
[кѡ прѣстꙋпа]ющн праведно же
[н дльжно неп]щевахѡ напнсатн. тѣ
[мже г҃лем҃ сн҃це :~] Нже плътьское б҃а възѕ
[слова прї]шьствїе словомь. оусты. гла

53 Psalms, 76: 14, 15.

и оумо́мь . писа́нїемже . и и
[конамѝ] и́сповѣ́дающимь. вѣчнаа
[и́мь памѧ́т҃] г҃ . Вѣ́дѣщїй х҃[ва] є́ди́ного
[и т҃ожѐ съ]става . є́же въ соу́ществѣ́
[раꙗ́вьст]вное, и того́ є́же създава́нное,
[и є́же] несъꙁда́нне : ви́димое и неви́мое.
[страст]ное и ѥ҆стр҃тное . ѡпи́санн҃е,
[и неѡ́писан҃ное, и] вжт҃вномѹ оу́во
[сѹщ҃ствѹ.] несъꙁда́нное и се́мѹ по́добнаа
[прикла]дающимь . чл҃чьскомѹ же ѥ҃ствѹ

► f. 4v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 66-81; DRIN 186r-186v; Popruženko, p. 11; Triodion 1664, f. р҃од r)

[и ѡна́а и ѡ́писан҃ное и́сповѣ́дающїй.]
и словомь и ѡбразы, вѣчн[а па́мѧ́т҃ ~ г҃.]
Вѣ́рꙋющїимь и проповѣ́да́ющ[їимь сїю҃вѣ́]
бл҃говѣ́ствꙋющїй словесѣ̀ [въ пи́сменѣ́.]
ве́щи же въ ѡ҃бразѣ́ . и въ ед[и́нѹ ѡбои́]
съврѣ́шатн се по́лꙁѹ г҃лющи[їи́. и́же сло́в]
весы̀ проповѣ́данїе . и ѥ҃же ѡб[разѣ̀ и́стиннѣ́]
и́ꙁвѣщє́нїе, вѣ́чнаа па́мет[: г҃.]
Ѥ҃же сло́вомь ѡ҆с҃ща́ющїи́ оу́стны [таже]
послѹша́телѥ сло́вомь вѣ́де[щїи́ же]
и проповѣ́дющїи́ ꙗ҃ко чѣ҃тн҃[ми и́ко]
нами та́кожѐ ѡ҆с҃ща́ютсе оу́б[ѡ ѡчи́ꙁре́]
щїй҃ . въꙁво́днт҃ же се т҃и҃ѣ оу́м[ъ къ бг҃ѹра]
ꙁѹмїю · ꙗ҃ко́же и бж҃[ственнми храмѝ.]
и с҃ще́ннымин съ҆сѹды . и҃ ѝнымин [сщ҃енни́ и с҃тымин]
съ҆сѹды . вѣчнаа па́мѧ́т҃ ~ г҃. В[ѣдещи́]
ꙗ҃ко жьꙁ҃лъ и скрижал[ъ . кнво҃ и св҃ѣ]
щннкъ и тра́пеза и кади́[лница. въсѣ҆с҃твю]
пропи́соваше и проѡ҆бра́ꙁоваше [дв҃ѹ и]
бц҃ѹ мари́ѹ . и ꙗ҃ко сїа҃ оу́во проѡ҆[бразо́]
ваахѹ ѡ҆нѹ҃ . не бы҃ же ѡ҆на̀ сїа҃ . [бы҃ же]
ѡ҆троко́вница . и прѣ҆вы́ва҃ѣ [по] бг҃[орожѐенн]
дв҃а . и то́го ради́ па́че [ѿ]роков[и́цѹ тѹ҃]
и҃кѡ́намин пи́шѹщи́ и҃лѝ ѡ҆бра[зова́нмин]

сѣннопи́шꙋщнмь, вѣ́чнаа памѧ́ [..]

► f. 5r (GR /Gouillard/ ll. 82-96; DRIN, f. 186v-187r; Popruženko, p. 13; Triodion 1664, f. р҃од r-v)

[и҆́же пр҃р҃ч҃каа вѣ́нїа. ѩкѡ́ бж҃тво.
сї҃]а и҆зы҆ꙋ́бразн, и҆ прошвра́
[зова вѣ]дѣ́щнмь и҆ пр҃їе́млющнмь .
[и҆ вѣрꙋющїи҃ ѩкѡ́ пр҃рческ]ыи лн́къ вн́дѣвше по вѣ́ [54]
[рѣ и҆ е҆]же а҆п҃лы и҆ въ ѡ҆ц҃е́ достн́за
[ющен п]нса́нное же и҆ непнса́нное прѣ
[данїѧ҃ ꙋкр]ѣплꙗ́ющн҃ . и҆ се́го ради҆ ѡ҆́вр҃
[зꙋющїи҃] с҃таа и҆ почн́тающн҃ , вѣчнаа па́мѧ҃ :~ г҃́.
[Разꙋмею]щн҃ мшї́се́ю[55] гл҃ющꙋ . вънемл҃ли́те
[сѧ҃ ѩко] въ дн҃ь въ и҆же гл҃а гъ҃ бъ҃ въ хорн́
[вѣ на гор]ѣ . гла҃ гл҃ь вы слы́шасте . по҃о
[бїа же не] вн́дѣсте . и҆ вѣ́дещн҃ ѿвѣщꙋа
[тн правѣ.] а҆́ще ли же вн́дѣхѡ҃ что҃
[и҆стнною҃] внд҃ѣхѡ҃ . ѩко же гро́
[мовь сн҃]ь на҃ навчн ~ ѯ҆же вѣ҃ и҆спръва . вы҃́
[е҆же сл]ы́шахѡ҃ . ѯ҆же ꙋ҆зрѣ҆хѡ҃ . е҆́же
[вндехомь очнм]ѧ на́шнма . и҆ рѣкы на́ше
[о҆сезá]ше о҆́] слове҃сн҃ жнвотнѣ҃ . и҆ сїа҃
[свѣ҃]тел҆ствѣемь ~ ꙗ҆Н пакы ѩкѡ́ дроꙋ́зн. нн҃
[слова] оꙋ҆́ченнцн . и҆ съ ни́мь а҆́дохѡ҃ . и҆ съ
[нн]мь пи́хѡ҃ . не прѣ́жде сн҃рти тъ́кмо,
[нъ и҆ по] стр҃н҃ и҆ въсѣ́крсе́нн . и҆́же оꙋ҆́во
[разнь]ствов[атн] ѿ бѣ оꙋ҆крѣпли́нны҃ .
[е҆же вь] за́конѣ завѣщан́їе . и҆ е҆́же въ
[бѣлг]т҃н оꙋ҆че́нїе . и҆ е҆́же въ ѡ҆номь ѕво

[54] DRIN вѣдѣше и҆спов҃ѣдаше, J. Gouillard, “Synodikon”, p. 51, ll. 83-84: καὶ πιστευόντων ἅπερ ὁ τῶν προφητῶν χορὸς ἑωρακότες διηγήσαντο, καὶ τὴν διὰ ἀποστόλων καὶ εἰς πατέρας ...
[55] Deutoronomy, 5.

► f. 5v (GR /Gouillard/ ll. 96-109; DRIN f. 187r = f. 4r PAL the end; Popruženko, p. 13, 15; Triodion 1664, f. о҃д v)

нев[н҃мое вь сеже н҃ вн҃мо н҃ о҃сѣжнмо.]
н҃ се́го ради вндѣннаа н҃ ѡ҃се́зан[наа на н҃]
кѡ́на́ пи́шѫщѣ҃ . н҃ покла́нѣаю[щнмъ се]
вѣчнаа памѧ́ ~ г҃′ ~ Пр҃р҃ц҃н [ѣ́ако҃ вндѣвъ] въ҃зг҃л҃.
ше . а҃пл҃ы ѣ́ако҃ навчнше. ц[рк҃вы ѣако҃]
прѣ́ѣть . оу҃чи́телїе ѣ́ако҃ пр[ѣ҃ше. въ]
селе́ннаа ѣ́ако҃ съ є҃дино́моудрь[ствова]
вл҃ть ѣ́акоже въ[сїа] и҃стнн[аа ѣ́ако҃]
оу҃ка́за се. лъж[а ѣ́ако҃] прогна[на вы҃. прѣ]
моудро́сть ѣ́ако́ же дрьзн[ове́нїе прїѣ́.]
х҃с ѣ́ако же пода҃́, си́це мѫдр[ьствѫ́ѧ.]
си́це г҃лѣмь си́це про҃пове́д[а҃ѧ х҃а и҃стн]
ннаго б҃а на́шего н҃ того҃ с҃ты[е: Въ словѣ]
сѣ́ почи́тающе . въ съпи́са[нныхь въ разѫ́] н҃н́
мѣ́нѣ́ . въ жрѣ́тва́ . въ ц҃ркваѣ́ ѣ́ак[о въ и҃кѡ]
на́ѣ́ . ѡ҃во́мѫ оу҃во ѣ́ако б҃оу [н҃ вл҃цѣ́ покла҃]
нѣающе се н҃ чѣ́тѫщне ѡ҃в[ѣ́ ѡ҃бщаго]
ради҃ вл҃кы . н҃ ѣ́ако то҃ бли́жнее р[авы по]
чи́тающе . н҃ є҃же по лю́бвн покла́н[ѣнїе]
въздаю́ще. Сїа҃ вѣ́ра а҃пл҃ьска . Сї[а҃ вѣ́ра] въ҃зг҃л҃
ѿ҃чьска . Сїа҃ вѣ́ра правосла́вны́ѣ́. Сї[а҃ вѣ́ра]
въселе́нѫю оу҃твръдн. Къ си́мь [н҃же] н҃н́
бл҃гочѣ́стїа проповѣ́дннкы . вр[атскы]
же н҃ ѡ҃ч҃елю́бно. въ сла́вѫ . н҃ чѣ́ст[ь бл҃го]
чѣ҃тїю ѡ҃ не́м҃же подви́заше се, в[ъсхвалѣ҃ѧ]

► f. 6r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 109-124; DRIN, f. 187v; Popruženko, p. 15, 17; Triodion 1664, f. о҃д v- о҃е r)

[н҃ г҃лемь : Ге́рманѫ, тараси́ю, мал
никнфорѫ і҃ меѳо́дїю н҃же] нстнною
[а҃рхїереѡ҃ бж҃їи҃м. н҃ прав]осла́вїа
[заб҃ралѡ҃ н҃ ѵчнтелмь]вечнаа па́ме҃ ~ г҃′ ~ [56]

[56] Here, in DRIN – М. Г. Попруженко, Синодик, p. 15 – there is a text written in red ink (воѯвнзан҃ десною рѫкою н҃ показѵн прьстомь по о҃вчаю вѣчнаа памѧ҃ :~) that is missing from

[῎Игна́тїю, фо́тїю сте]фанꙋ῎ антѡ́
[нїю, и николаꙋ ст҃]ѣнши҃ и правосла́
[внїи҃ патрїархѡ҃,] вѣчнаа па́ме҃ ~ г҃ ~
[Въса ꙗже на ст҃їе пат]рїархы . ге́рмана῎
[тара́сїа.] и меѳѡ́дїа῎ игна́
[тїа. фо́тїа. ст]е́фана . антѡ́нїа,
[и николи, писани]аа или гл҃аниаа ,
[анатема:] Въса ꙗже чрѣсь црк҃
[вного прѣда́нїа] и оучєнїа и въѡбраже́
[нїа ст҃їи҃ и п]рн҃опоминаемы҃ ѿц҃ь .
[но́вовъвѣни]аа, или посе҃ съдѣа́ти се
ана́ѳема ~ г҃ ~ Сте́фан҃ възгл҃
[Стефа́нꙋ прѣпо҃бнїмн]кꙋ и исповѣдникꙋ новом҃,
[вѣчн]аа па́ме҃ ~ г҃ ~ ᾿Єѵѳімїꙋ῎ ѳеѡ ни҃
[фі҃л]ꙋ . и емилїа́нꙋ῎ прн҃опоминаемы҃
[ис]повѣдникѡ҃ и архїепкпѡ҃, вѣчнаа
[па́]ме҃ ~ а҃ ~ Ѳеѡ́фїла́ктꙋ · пе́троу ·
[мїха]и́лꙋ · їѡси́фꙋ · бл҃аженны҃ ми
[трополи]тѡ҃ , вѣ́чнаа па́меть ~ а҃ :~
[῎Андре]оу[57] прп҃обномн҃никꙋ и исповѣдникꙋ
[иже]въ критѣ, вѣчнаа па́ме҃ ~ г҃ :~

► f. 6v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 125-139; DRIN, f. 188r; Popruženko, p. 17-19-21; Triodion 1664, f. рое r)

Іѡа[нꙋ, нико́лаꙋ, и геѡ҃ргїю, трїбг҃а]
ты҃ испов[ѣдникѡ҃. і архїепи҃кпѡ҃ и въ]
сѣмь иже [единомꙋдрьствова]
вшїи҃ ᾿Єпкпѡ҃ [вѣчнаа паметь г҃]
Ѳеѡ́дорꙋ въсепр[ѣпо҃бномꙋ игꙋменꙋ стꙋ] възгл҃
дїи́скомꙋ, Вѣчн[аа па́меть :~ г҃ ~ ᾿Іса́кїю] ни҃
чюдотво́рцꙋ . и і[ѡ́анїкїю прр҃чьствномꙋ]
вѣчнаа па́ме҃ :~ г҃ ~[Иларїѡнꙋ прѣпо҃бномꙋ]
архїмандри́тꙋ и и[гꙋменꙋ далмитско]

B and from the Greek text of the Synodicon in the Gouillard edition. It is also absent from the Greek and Slavic printed Triodia.

[57] The commemoration of St. Andrew of Crete is present in DRIN, but not in PAL. It is not present in the Greek text based on J. Gouillard, nor in the Greek or East Slavic printed Triodia.

мѵ, вѣчнаа па́мѧ҃ ~ г҃ ~ [Сѷ́мео́нѵ прѣпо́] възгл҃
вн҃ѣншомѵ стлъпнник[ѵ вѣчна памѧ҃]
Ѳео́дорѵ и҆ ѳео́фанѵ, [.....]
и҆сповѣ́дникѡ҃ и҆ на҆пи[.....][58]
Ѳео́фанѵ прп҃овн҃ѣншомѵ [и҆гѵме́нѵ велїкаго] възгл҃
села҆ . вѣчнаа па́мѧ҃ ~ г҃ ~ С[їа҆ко вл҃вен] нн҃
нїа ѿчѣ҃скаа, на на҃ сн҃ы, р[евнѵю́щи тѣ҃]
бл҃гочс҃тїю прѣхо́дн҃ · [тако҃ и҆ кле҃вы]
ѡ҆ц҃едосадни́теліе. и҆ вл҃чны҃ ꙁап[овѣдн]
прѣꙁни́рателіе, постни́заеть . тѣ́м[же]
о҆вы҃щнѣ въсѝ, ᾽Єли́ко бл҃гочс҃тїа и҆сп[лы́не]
нїе᾽᾽ Сни́це сни́мь кле́твѵ, е᾽же са́мин [се́бе]
по҆ло́жнише, прине́семь ~ ᾽Н[же] сло́в[омь]
оу҆́во пл҃ьскоѥ҆ съмотре́нїе ба҃ сло́в[а прї]
е҆млющ҃и҃ . Ꙁрѣ́ть же се҃ на и҆кѡн[а҃ не трь]
пещ҃и҃. и҆ се́го ради҃ гл҃ы оу҆́во прне́м[ати о҆бразѵющнн҃и҃]

► f. 7r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 140-154; DRIN, f. 188v-189r; Popruženko, p. 21, 23; Triodion 1664, f. р҃ое r)

[н ве́щїю же сп҃енї]а
[ѿмѣтаю́щїн҃ се] а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃ ~
[᾽Нже гл҃ѵ нео҆пнсан҃наго зл]ѣ҃ прнла́гаю
[щн҃ се. и҆ сего] ради҃ нехоте́щн҃ на и҆кѡна҃
[пнса́ти и҆]же прни҃скръннo на҃ пль҃ти
[и҆ крьви́ прно҆б]щи́вшаго се х҃а҆ и᾽стнннаа҃
[ба҃ нашего] ѿсоу́дѵ мъчта́телїн по
[казавющн҃ се а҆на́]ѳема ~ г҃ ~ ᾽Нже
[пр҃р҃ческаа ѵво вн]дѣ́нїа а᾽ще и҆ не хо́те҃
[прїемлющїн҃. а҆вл]е́ннаа же сни́мь ѡ҆вра
[зованїа о҆ чю́десн҃] и҆ прѣ҃же въпльще́нїа
[сло́ва. не прїе́млю]щн҃ нѣ҃ и҆лн са́мое то҃
[непостнжное и҆] невиднмое соу́щьство
[а҆вити се вид҃ѣ]вшїнмь тъщесла́вѵють .
[и҆лн о҆бразн] оу҆́во сїа҃ и᾽стнныи и҆зьѡвр҃

[58] The text on this and the previous line is absent from DRIN and PAL, from the Greek Synodicon in the Gouillard edition, and from the Greek and East Slavic printed Triodia.

[же́нїа ѣ҆вити се] зре́щимь съ сла́гающи
[мсе о҆бразн же напи́совати въ҃чл҃ни
[вшаго се слова. и҆] ѥ҆же ѡ҆ на҃ то҃ стр҃ти
[непрїе҃мл]ющ҃и, а҆на́ѳема″: ~ г҃ :~
[″Нже слыше]ще г҃а [59] . ѣ҆ко а҆ще вѣ́ровали бы́
[сте мшїсе́ѡв]н, вѣ́ровали оу҆́бо бы́сте
[ми́нѣ и҆ проче́е. и҆ еже] пр҃рока ва́мь въ
[здвигне҃ г҃ъ бг҃ъ на́шь] ѣ҆ко мене, мшїсе́ѡ
[г҃лющ ра]зумѣ́ющ҃и҃ . та́же г҃лѣть
[прїети ѡ҆]во пр҃рока . не въво́дет҇ же и҆ко́

► f. 7v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 154-168; DRIN, f. 189r-189v; PAL f. 8r end and the beginning of f. 8v; Popruženko, p. 25, 27; Triodion 1664, f. ѳое r-v)

нам[60] [бл҃ть. и҆ въсемирное́ с҃пе]
нїе . ѣ҆ко вид[ѣнь бы́ ѣ҆ко съ чл҃кы пожнве.]
ѣ҆ко стра́сти [и҆ недѡгн. исцѣлєнїа вѣщ҇]
ш҇и ѥ҆сцѣл[н. ѣ҆ко] распе[тсе ѣ҆ко погре]
ве́нь бы́ . ѣ҆ко въ҃скрсе ѣ҆[ко въса́ за ны҃]
и҆ пострада́ и҆ съ҃тво́р[н. и҆же ѡво сїа́ въсе́]
ми́рнаго с҃псе́нїа дѣ́[ла. на и҆кона҇ зрѣти]
нетрѣпещ҇и, нн [покла]
нающ҇и се си́мь [а҆нафема :~ г҃ Прѣвн]
вающ҇и въ и҆кѡн[оворѣскон е҆ре́сн. пачѥ҆.]
х҃ѡворно҃ѡ ѡ҃ст[ѡпленн. и҆ нн мшїсенскы҃и]
за́конополо[женїе҃. къ с҃пенїю своему҃ѡ]
възве́сти хоте́ще҃ [ни́ а҆пл҃скы́мн]
оу҆чѐнѣмн ѡ҆бли́стати [се бл҃гочт҃ни́мь]
прои҆звóлеще҃ . ннже҆ [ѡ҃чѣскымн поѡче]
нѣмн и҆ наста́вленѣмн [прѣльсти своее҆ ѡ҃]
врати́ти се пока́[рающ҇и се ннже съгла]
сїю ѥ҆же по въсе въс[еленѣи҆ ц҃ркви]

[59] Deutoronomy, 18:15; John, 5:46.

[60] не въво́дет҇ же и҆кѡнам is missing in DRIN. J. Gouillard, “Synodikon”, p. 55, ll. 154-155: οὐκ εἰσάγουσι δέ δι‘εἰκονισμάτων τὴν τοῦ προφήτου χάριν καὶ τὴν παγκόσμιαν σωτηρίαν ... The text is similar in the Greek printed Triodion with Synodicon. In the Lvov printed text: Та́же г҃лю́щимъ, пр҃и́тн оу҆́вѡ Пр҃рока, не въводѧщимъ же ″Нзѡвражѐнѣмн бл҃ть Пр҃рвѳ, и҆ всеми́рное с҃пнїе.

б҃жїи҃ повинꙋвшїи҃ се нъ е[дниою себе]
їꙋдеискои и еллинскои чес[ти положь]
шихь . ꙗже бѡ непо[ср҃ѣствнѣ ѻни]
на прьвоѡбразн[ое х҃ꙋле, и сїи сего ѻ]
бразо, въ самое [то ѻбразꙋемое дрьзости]
нестыдет се . иже оубѡ н[е възвратнѣ]
прѣльстїꙋ сею съдрьжнмы [и къ въсакомꙋ]

► f. 8r (= GR /Gouillard/ ll. 168-170, 391-402; DRIN, f. 189v-190r; Popruženko, p. 27; Triodion 1664, f. ҏ҃ое v)
[словесн бж҃твномꙋ и д҃ховно]мꙋ оуч
[енїю ꙋшн з]атькнꙋвшїи҃ . ꙗко [ꙋж]е про
[чее сьгна]вши҃ . и ѡбращаагѡ тѣлесе црко
[вна и ѿсѣ]кши҃ себе, анаѳема ~ г҃ ~[61]
[Въводещи ѻ] неизрѣнномь плъскомь
[съмотренї]и г҃а и б҃а и с҃па нашего і҃у х҃а,
[тьщег҃л]асїа нѣкаа. и г҃лющи или мꙋ
[дрьств]ꙋющїи҃ . покланꙗти се ч҃лчьствꙋ
[х҃вꙋ.] непристꙋпномꙋ бж҃твꙋ рабскы .
[и ра]ботꙋ приносоущиꙋ имѣти . ꙗко соу
[щь]стьвнꙋ и неѿложнꙋ . анаѳема ~ г҃ ~
[Иже не] съ въсакы говѣнїемь приемлющи.
[еже по] прнмышленїꙋ раздѣленїе .
[кь ꙗвленїю] тьчїю таинства иже въ
[х҃а съ]екшихсе неизрѣнно двѣю есть
[т҃вꙋ.] и въ немь несьлїанно и нераздѣ
[лно съвъ]коуплыпихсе, нь злѣ прие
[млющихь таковое] раздѣленїе . и г҃лю
[щии] прїетїе не ество тьчїꙋ ино, нь
[и] саномъ . и ꙗко слоужить б҃ви · и слꙋ
женїе приносить рабско . и чьсть
подѡбнꙋю въздаеть ꙗко дльгь, ꙗко
[сл]оужебнїи дꙋси . иже б҃ви работаю

[61] At this place, several anathemata are omitted, which in the Gouillard edition are located on ll. 171-183. The whole part up to l. 391 is also missing. The Greek and East Slavic printed texts agree with B.

[ще]нже и҃ слоу́жеще и раб҃скы . и҃ ѡ со́бъ
[прї]не́тїе, а҆рхїере́а вели́ка бы́ти оу҃чи҃.

► f. 8v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 402-403, 435-448; DRIN, f. 190r-190v, Popruženko, p. 29; Triodion 1664, f. р҃оє v – р҃ов r)
а не҃ бг҃а [слова а҆́ко чл҃кь а҆́ко снцевы]
ми еднного хр҃а г҃а на́шего и҃ б[г҃а]
ла́тн дръ҃жающ҃и по съ҃ставѹ [62]
Гл҃ющ҃и а҆́ко и҃же въ вр҃ѣме м[нроси҃нте]
л҃ные стр҃тн г҃а и҃ бг҃а и҃ спса на́[шего і҃в хр҃а`]
прннесе́ннвю ѻ҆ на́ше҃ спсе́нн ѿ [него жрь]
тво҃ чс҃тна҃а҆ е҆го҆ тѣ́ла и҃ кръ[ве. а҆́ко]
а҆рхїере́ѹ по чл҃чьскомь на҃ радн҃ в[нв҃шомѹ]
а҆́ко ѹво тѣ́же и҃ бс҃ь и҃ жрь҆ць и҃ жрь[тва]
по вели́комѹ въ бг҃ословїа грїго́рїа [прн]
несе оу҃во тъ҆ бо҃у и҃ ѡц҃ѹ . [прї]етѣ҃
а҆́ко бс҃ь съ ѡц҃емь тъ҆ са́мь е҆дино[ро]
днын, н҃ дх҃ь с҃тын · а҆́ко си́мь [ѿтоужа҃]
ющ҃и . са́мого же бг҃а сло́ва [и҃ единосѹ]
щнаго . и҃ е҆ди́носла́внаго се́мѹ оу҃[тешн]
тела дх҃а . бг҃опо҃о҃бнаго е҆ди́ноч[ѣ҃тїа же]
и҃ достои́н҃ства, а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃́ ~
҃Нже на къждо прнносимѹю жръ҃тв[ѹ]
пр҃ѣ́мшїи҃ ѿ хр҃а бж҃т҃вны҃ та́ннь . [с҃ще]
нод҃ѣ́нства . непрї҃е́млющ҃и с҃тѣ҃н [тро]
и́цн прнно́снти се . а҆́ко съпроти́въ в[҃к]
ща́ющ҃и ѿ соу́дѹ с҃ще́н[нымь]
ѡц҃е́мь . васи́лїю же . и҃ зла́то[г҃лывѿ҃]
н҃мже сьгла́шаю҃ и҃ про́чїн бг҃оно́сн[ы ѿц҃н]
въ свои҃ словесе҃ же и҃ съпнса́нн҃, а҆на́ѳ[ема ~ г҃́ ~]

► f. 9r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 449-463; DRIN, f. 190v-191r, Popruženko, p. 29, 31; Triodion 1664, f. р҃ов r)
[҃Нже слы́шещна҃ ѹво и҃ еже ѿ]
[то҃ пр҃ѣда́н҃наго] бж҃твны҃ танн с҃ще́нно

[62] Here again, a considerable part of the Greek text is missing: J. Gouillard, ll. 404-434. The Greek and East Slavic printed texts agree with B.

[дѣнств]а, гл҃ющѧ . Сѐ҇ тво́рите въ
[мое въспо]мина́нїе [63]. не пр[їе]мющꙗ же
[правѣ въспо]мина́нїе. нѣ дрьза́ющꙗ
[гл҃атн ꙗ҆ко] пона́влꙗѣ мъчта́тел҃но
[ѝ ѡ҆бразнѡ], е҆́же на чѣ́тнѣ҇ кр҃тѣ҇ ѿ
[сп҃а на́ш]его принесе́ннꙋю жрь́твꙋ,
[свое тѣ]лесе҇ ѝ кро́ве въ ѡ҆́вщꙋю чл҃чь
[ского е҆́тва] ѝзва́вѧ же ѝ ѡ҆цѣще́нїе ·
[ꙗ҆же на кѫ́ѣ҇] д[нь] принѡ́снмаа жрь́тва ·
[ѿ ѝ҆́]же бж҃тв҃наа с҃ще́ннодѣ́йствꙋю
[щѧ тан]н҃ства · ꙗ҆е҇ с҃псь на́шь ѝ вл҃ка
[въсѣ́ прѣда҃] ѝ се́го ра́дѧ ѝ҆́нѧ бы́ти сїю҇
[ѿ ѝ҆́]же ѝзна́чела с҃псомь съвръше́нные
[въвод]е҆́нь . ѝ къ ѻ҆ноѝ мъчта́тел҃но ѝ
[ѻ҆бра́зно възно]снмѣ · ꙗ҆́ко ѝстꙋ́ща
[ющѧ е҆́же стра]шнаа҃ ѝ бж҃т҃внаго
[с҃ще]нодѣ[йства] таи́н҃ство҆ ѝ҆́мже
[в]оу́дѧщее[64] жи́зны за́логъ прнѐмлемъ .
[ѝ с]·а҃ бж҃т҃вномꙋ ѡ҆́цѹ́ на́шемꙋ ꙗ҆ѡа́ннꙋ
[п]рѣм[оу]дромꙋ ѝ златогл҃нвомꙋ ѝзыа҃
сна[ю]щѹ . е҆́же жрь́твы непрѣмѣ́нное .
въ мно́гы҃ велнкаа҃ па́вла гл҃ѣхъ тлъко
вани . а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃́ ~ ҆Нже врѣме́ннаа

► f. 9v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 463-471, 171-176; DRIN, f. 191r-191v, Popruženko, p. 31, 33; Triodion 1664, f. р҃оѕ r-v)

раст[о́анїа ѡ҆ прнмнре́нн чл҃вчьскаго е҆́т]
ства · Къ бж҃твном[оу] ѝ бл҃а[женномꙋ]
е҆́ствꙋ, живонача́лные ѝ в[ъсенетлѣ]
нные тр҃нце . оу́мы́шла[ющѝ ѝ прївъ]
во́дещѝ · ѝ пръвѣкıе оу́вш е҆́[дноро́номꙋ]
сло́вꙋ[65] за́конополага́ю҃ . ѿ [само́го]

[63] Luke, 22:19.

[64] In DRIN бж҃внїе. The Greek and East Slavic printed texts agree with B

[65] It is worth noting that in this place in DRIN, it was initially ѿц, later corrected to слов. This is the correct version with respect to the context. The Lvov printed text agrees with B.

прнмнрнтн[66] се на́мь прнѣт[їа послѣ]
дн же бо҃у ѝ ѡ҃ц҃ѣ̀ въ сп҃ноѝ ст[р҃ти сп҃а]
х҃а̀, ѝ раздѣлпаю҃ нераздѣлн[аѧ бж҃т]
внымь ѝ бл҃же́ннымь ѡц҃е[мь съмо]
трен҃їа та[нн҃ствѡ҃ въс]ако [прнмнрнтн]
на҃ се́бѣ ѣдни[орѣ́но]мѵ҃ оу҃чѣщн[мь]
ѝ со́боюж҃ ѝ въсе[мь бо҃у] ѝ ѡ҃ц҃ѣ̀ . пос[лѣдо]
вател҃но же въса́ко ѝ пр҃ѣс҃то[мѵ҃ ѝ живо]
тво́рещомѵ҃ д҃хоу҃″ ѩ҃ак[о т]ѣщїн[хь ѝска]
нїн ѝ непо҃о́бнык҃ ѡ҃бр҃ѣта́тель [ана́ѳема ~ г҃ ~] [67]
҃Ѧнаста́сїа, констандѝ́[на. ѝ нникты] [68]
ѥ҃же прн ҃іса́вр҃ѣ на[чел҃ствюшѝ]
ѣресмн, ѩ҃ако несѡ҃ш[енник]ые, ѝ наста[вни]
кы погы́бѣли, ана́ѳема ~ ѳ҃ешдо[та]
ѝ антѡ́нїа″ ѝ ҃іѡа́нн[а ѝже] дроу́г[ь]
дроу́гѵ҃ ходя́тае зл҃ы̀[мь] ѝ дроу́гь дроу́
га пр҃ѣ́[мнык]ы злочъ[т҃]їю , ана́ѳема
Павла ѥ҃же въ са́вла ѡ҃бра́щьшаго се″ ѝ
ѳеѡ́ра нарн́цаемаго га́ста″ ѝ сте́фан[а]

► f. 10r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 176-190; DRIN, f. 191v-192r, Popruženko, p. 33; Triodion 1664, f. p̄os v)

[молнта. ѣщ҃ѐ ѝ ѳеѡ]дор[а к]рнтїна ·
[ѝ лалоудїа. ѝ ле]шнда . ѝ къ сѝмь а҃ще кт҃о
[р҃ѐннѝ] по҃об҃нь злочѣ́стїе҃ · Какова̀
[любо а҃ще в]оу́дѐ҃ прн́чьта . съсло́вїа .
[нлѝ сана кое]го · нлѝ начѝнанїе прохо́де″
[сн҃ къ҃с҃ѣ] пр҃ѣвы́вающѝ҃ въ сво҃ѐ҃ злочѣ́
[стїемь ана́ѳ]ема ~ г҃́ ~ Гер҃о́ндїа ѥ҃же
[ѿ ламвн] оу҃вш соу́ща . въ кри́тѣ же
[ѩ҃дь м]ръскые ѣ҃ресн ѝзлю́вавша . ѝ по
[ма]ганнка себѐ наре́кша″ не възра

---

[66] Here there is a difference with DRIN where there is evidently an error: **прнїмтсе нам претнаа**, but B follows the original. The Lvov printed text agrees with B.

[67] A large part of the Greek text is missing here (ll. 472 ff.). The Greek and East Slavic printed texts agree with B.

[68] Starting from this line, the text reverts to the Greek original – J. Gouillard, ll. 171sq.

[жен]їе оу҆вы сп҃наго съмотре́нїа х҃ва"
[съ ра]звраще́нными того̀ прѣда́ми,
[и҆ съписан]ми . и҆ е҆диномоу́дрьники е҆го̀
[а҆на́ѳем]а": г҃ ~ [69]"Иже ѿноу́дь начи́наю
[щїи҆ но́]вое нѣ́кое и҆ска́нїе и҆ оу҆че́нїе не
[из]р҃чниномꙋ пл҃ьтскомꙋ съмо́тренїꙋ ѭ сп҃са
[на́]шего и҆ б҃а привъводи́ти . и҆ и҆ска́ти
[кои҆ о]бразо тъ б҃ь сло́во, , ч҃лчьскомꙋ въ
[м]ѣше́нїꙋ прие҆дини се ѭ и҆ прие҆тꙋю пл҃ь
[по] ко́емꙋ сло́вꙋ ѿб҃жи" и҆ словесы̀ стеѕа́
[тел]ными . е҆ство и҆ положе́нїе" ѿнже
[па]ч е҆стства съе҆дине́нїа двѡ́ю е҆ствꙋ
[б҃а] и҆ ч҃лка ѭ Сло́во тежь бити покꙋшаю
[щ]и҆ се, а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃ ~ "Иже б҃лгочь́ство
[ва]ти оу҆бѡ о҆бѣщавающи҆ се , е҆ллинскаа ж҃

► f. 10v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 190-203; DRIN, f. 192r-192v, Popruženko, p. 33, 35; Triodion 1664, f. р҃оѕ v – р҃оꙁ r)
ꙁло[чьстив]аа [прѣданїа православнѣи]
и҆ събѡ́рнѣи ц҃ркви и҆ ѡ д҃ша[хь ч҃лческихь]
и҆ н҃бси и҆ ꙁемли" и҆ и҆ныхъ ꙁ[данїи бестоу]
днѣ и҆лѝ па́че нечь́стивѣ [привъводещїихь]
а҆на́ѳема ~ а҃ ~ "Иже боу[юю вънѣшныхь]
любомоу́дрьцъ" г҃лемꙋ [прѣмꙋдрость]
прѣпочи́тающи" и҆ нас[тавникомь тѣхь]
послѣ́дꙋющи и҆ прѣхож[денїе бити]
ч҃лчьскымь д҃шамь въ и҆наа ж[ивотнаа]
и҆лѝ подобнѣ бесловѐснымь живо[тни]
си́мь погы́бати и҆ въ небыт[їе ѿхо]
дити прием[лю]щи" и҆ си́ми въс[кресенїе]
и҆ соу́дь ѭ и҆ коньчное пожи́[вшимь въꙁа]
нїе ѿмѣтающи" а҆на́ѳема [:~]
"Иже ве́щь беꙁначе́лнꙋ и҆ ви́дѡв[е и҆ съ]
беꙁначе́лнꙋ съдѣ́телю и҆ и҆ б҃оу

[69] Here begins the section against John Italus; this is indicated by a title in the printed Synodica but not in the manuscripts.

и҆ ꙗ҆́ко ѹ҆бо н҃бо и҆ ꙁемлѧ̀ и҆ [прочаа ꙁⷣа]
нїа" прⷭ҇но̀соѹщна со́ѹть и҆ беꙁ[нача]
лна . и҆ прѣбы́ваюⷮ҇ неи҆ꙁменна и҆ съ[про]
тивь ꙁаконопола́гаюⷮ҇ ре́кшомѹ [н҃бо]
и҆ ꙁемлѧ̀ мимо́идеⷮ҇, словеса̀ же м[оа не]
мимо́идѹть и҆ беꙁѹ́мно тьще[гл҃ѹ]
ють, и҆ бжⷭ҇т'внѹю кле́твѹ на св[ое прн]
во́деⷮ҇ гла́вѹ . а҆на́ѳема ~ а҃ ~ Гл҃ю[щїиⷯ]
ꙗ҆́ко е҆́ллин'стїи прѣмѹдръцѝ и҆ [пръвїе]

► f.11r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 203-216; DRIN, f. 192v-193r, Popruženko, p. 35; Triodion 1664, f. р҃оꙁ r)
[реⷱ҇ начел'никѡⷨ.][70] иже ѿ се́дмиⷯ҇ с҃тыиⷯ҇
[и҆ въселен'скиⷯ с]ъбѡ́ръ" и҆ ѿ въсѣⷯ и҆́же
[въ православны вѣрѣ] просїа́вшїиⷯ ѿц҃ъ, про
[клетїю прѣ]дани бы́ше . ꙗ҆́ко тѹ́жⷣи
[соборнїе ц]р҃кве" ꙁа е҆́же въ словесеⷯ тѣ́
[мрьꙁости]а и҆скьрънна и҆ꙁре́д'ства[71] · лѹ́
[ш'шиⷯ соⷣѹ по] мнѡ́гоѹ и҆ ꙁдѐ и҆ въ бѹ́ⷣ
[щемоѹ соⷣѹ] · б҃лгочь́стивыⷯ о҆ѹбо̀ и҆ право
[славныⷯ м]оѹ́жїи и҆́нако же по стра́сти
[чл҃чкои и҆лѝ] невѣ́дѣни съгрѣшившиⷯ ·
[а҆на́ѳема] ~ а҆ ~ "Иже съ вѣ́рою чи́стою
[прост]ѡⷨ и҆ въсѐдѹшноⷨ҇ срⷣцемъ . ꙗ҆́же
[сп҃а наш]его и҆ б҃га . и҆ прѣчⷭ҇тѣ то́го ро́
[жⷣьшои вл]ⷣцоѹ на́шѹ бцоѹ · и҆ про́чїиⷯ
[с҃тыⷯ и҆]ꙁре́днаа чю́деса неприе́млю
[щиⷯ нъ и҆ ноѹд]ещихсе о҆ѹка́ꙁы и҆ сло
[весы ѹхищре]нными, ꙗ҆́ко немо́щна
[обльгати и҆]лѝ по свое́мѹ мнѣ́нїю,
[равраща]ти тлъкова́нїеⷨ · и҆ по свое́мѹ

70 Here, there is a difference between DRIN and PAL ("heresiarchs" are mentioned in PAL and in the Greek and East Slavic printed texts); in B the text is damaged, so it is not evident which version was followed. Here, I give the DRIN text in brackets, but the exact phrasing used in B remains unknown.

71 In DRIN: скврьнна иꙁредитв. Here B is closer to DRIN than to PAL or to the Lvov printed text.

[нравѹ със]та́влѧтн, а҃на́ѳема ~ а҃́ ~
[᷾Нже е́л]ли[нⷭс]каа прохо́дещꙗ оу҃че́нїа .
[и҃ не за наказанїа ра]дн̀ сѝмн нака́зѹемѹ᷾ ·
[нъ и҃ слава᷾ нхь с]оу́етныѝ послѣ́дѹю
[щꙗ и҃] ѣ᷾ко и᷾стиннымь вѣ́рѹющихъ ·
[и҃ тако] тѣ́мь и҃звѣ́стно и᷾мѹщꙗ прн

► f. 11v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 216-232; DRIN, f. 193r-193v; Popruženko, p. 37; Triodion 1664, f. р҃оз r-v)

лежащꙗ . ѣ᷾ко҅ и҃нн[е ѡ҃вогда оу҃во тан]
ѡ҃во́гда же ѣ᷾вле́ннѣ [възводнтн на сїе]
и҃ оу҃чи́тн несвме́нно, а҃н[а́ѳема ~ а҃́ ~]
᷾Нже съ и᷾нымн ба́сньнымн [бледмн ѿ сѣ̀]
и҃ е᷾же на на̂ зда́нїе пр҃ѣтва́р[аютъ и҃ плато]
нскаа съпнса́нїа ѣ᷾ко и᷾стн[нⷭна прїе́млю]
щꙗ . и҃ ѣ᷾ко самосъста́внѹ[ю вещь ѿ вн]
дшвь въѡвраза́нтн се г҃лютъ [и҃ ѣ᷾вле]
ннѣ ѡ҃блъгаю̂ самовла́стн[ое съдѣтелѣ]
и᷾же ѿ невы́тїа въ вы́тїе [прнведшомѹ]
въса́чьскаа . и҃ ѣ᷾ко тво́рцѹ въ[сѣхъ начело]
и҃ коньцъ поло́жившомѹ вла́ст[ьнѣ и҃ вла]
дічьскы . а҃на́ѳема ~ а҃ ~ [г҃лющꙗ ѣ᷾ко]
въ конь́чно᷾ и҃ ѡ᷾бщѣ᷾ [72] въсѣ́кре[їемъ съ и᷾ны]
мн тѣ́лесѣ̀ чл҃цн въскр҃нѹ[тъ и҃ сѵ́днмн]
боу҃́тъ . а҃̀ не съ и́мещ[ꙗ въ сѣ᷾ жнтн по]
жи́ше . зань̀ сѝмъ рас[тлѣва́емомъ]
и҃ погы́вающꙗ᷾ . и҃ блѥ[дѹ᷾ тьщна и҃ сѵ́етна]
са́момѹ х҃оу҃ и҃ бц҃ѹ на́шемѹ · [и҃ ѵ҃ченнкомъ]
е҃го҅ оу҃чи́телѥ᷾ же на́шꙗ᷾ и҃ [наоучн]
вшꙗ᷾ . ѣ᷾ко съ и᷾мн же [пожи́ше чл҃цїн]
тѣ́лесы̀, съ тѣ́мн и҃ [сѵ́днмн бѵ́т҃ъ]
и҃ е᷾щѐ҅ и҃ вели́комѹ а҃[пр҃ѳлѹ па́влѹ ѣ᷾вестѣ́]
внѣ въ сло́вѣ [73] е᷾же ѡ҃ въскр҃[енїн простра]

[72] Here, there is a difference with PAL, but B follows the same tradition as DRIN; so does the Lvov printed text.

[73] Here, there is a difference in the word order compared with DRIN. The printed text of Lvov agrees with B.

инѣнше прит҃чамн и҆стннꙋ наоу[чнвшоу]

► f. 12r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 232-242, 248-249, 479-480; DRIN, f.193v-194r; Popruženko, p. 37, 39; Triodion 1664, f. р҃оꙁ v)
[и҆ и҆накомꙋдрьство]ующиⷯ, ꙗ҆́ко безꙋ
[мнѣ ѡ҆блнчнв]шꙋ · и҆́же оу҆бо си́цевыⷨ
[соупротнвь ꙁа]конно пола́гающиⷯ прѣда́
[нїемь и҆ оу҆ченїе]мь, а҆на́ѳема ~ а҆ ~
[прїе́млющиⷯ и҆] прѣда́ющиⷯ соуе́тнаа и҆ е҆́
[ллннскаа бледн]їа · ꙗ҆́ко ꙋбо прⷣѣбы́
[тїе е҆ⷭ҇ дш҃амь а҆] не ѿнесоу́щиⷯ въса̀ бы́
[ше и҆ прнведошеⷭ҇] · ꙗ҆́ко коньць е҆́сть
[мꙋцѣ и҆ оу҆ст]аменѥ́нїе пакы̀ тва́рн
[и҆ чл҃ⷭческиⷨ ве]щемь · и҆ си́цевымн словесы̀
[цр҃ⷭтво н]бⷭ҇ное раꙁⷣрꙋшаемо въса́ко и҆ прѣ
[ходн]мо въво́деть · е҆́же вѣ́чно и҆ не
[раꙁⷣрꙋ]ша́емо · Са́мь оу҆бо хс҃ʹ и҆ бь҃ на́шⷮ
[наꙋч]н и҆ прѣда́сть . и҆ въсеⷨѣ ве́тхымъ
[и҆ нов]ыⷨ пнса́нїемь мы̏ прѣе҆хѡⷨ · ꙗ҆́ко
[и҆ мꙋка] бесконь́чна . и҆ цр҃ⷭтво прⷭ҇носоу́
[щно снц]евымн же словесы̏ самⷯѣ
[себе погꙋблею]щиⷯ, и҆ дроу́гыиⷨ вѣчно
[моу ѡ҆соу]женїꙋ ходатае бы́вшнхь .
[а҆на́ѳ]ема ~ г҃ʹ ~[74] Наоу҆́ченноⷨ бы́вшемъ
[ѿ и҆н]о́ка ни́ла · и҆ въсеⷯѣ прнѡ҆бща́ю
[щиⷯ се тѣмь] а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃ʹ ~
[И҆́же не правѣ ст҃ы]хь оу҆чи́тель бж҃їе цр҃кве,
[бжⷭ҇твные гл]асы прие́млющиⷯ · и҆ ꙗ҆́же
[ꙗ҆́вѣ и҆ и҆ꙁ]ꙗ҆вле́нно въ ниⷯ, ст҃го дх҃а

► f. 12v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 480-495; DRIN, f.194r-194v; Popruženko, p. 39; Triodion 1664, f. р҃оꙁ v)
блⷣгтїꙋ реⷵ[ннаꙗ крнво скаꙁоватиⷤ]
и҆ раꙁвра́щеть нꙋдещ[иⷯ, а҆на́ѳема :~ г҃ ʹ ~]
Пре́емлющиⷯ и҆́стинннаго бг҃а [гд҃а и҆ сп҃ⷭа на]
шего і҆с҃ хр҃а̀ глⷭ҇а · е҆́же [ѿц҃ь мон волн мене]

[74] Here, ll. 243-246 from the Greek text are omitted.

е҇ [75]· гл҃ати се съ про́чїими т[лькованїи]
ст҃ыи ѿц҃ь · и по иже [вь немь чл҃чтвэ]
по емꙋ же и постра [ꙗко ꙗвестно]
въ мнѡгы бг҃од[ьхновенни словесе и .]
ст҃ї и ѡц҃и проповѣдаю · [еще и гл҃ющїи]
тоже х҃а по плъти св[оеи пострадати . вѣ]
чнаа пами ~ г҃ ~ П[омишлѣющїи и ве]
щающи ѡ[боженїа прїетїа прѣложе]
нїе чл҃чьскаго естьства в[ъ бж҃тво . а не]
моудръствꙋющи ѿ сам[ого съедниненїа]
бж҃твнаго ꙋбо достоинст[ва и величе]
ства, причестититсе тѣ[лесн гн҃ю. и по]
кланꙗти се еднинѣ[мь покланѣнїе . въ въ]
спрїемшимь то бз҃[ѣ словѣ и битїе]
еднночьтно · въкꙋпосла́ви[о, животво]
рно · равнославно бо҃у и ѡц҃ꙋ , и [ст҃мꙋ дх҃ꙋ.]
и въкоупопрѣстоли[о. а не оубо бити]
Єдиносоущи[о бг҃ꙋ . ꙗко ѿстꙋпити ет]
стьвны своист[вь. еже създаннаго.]
еже ѡписаннаго · и [прочїи иже въ чл҃ч]
ско естьствѣ хвѣ зр[їм]ы

► f. 13r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 495-508; DRIN, f. 194v-195r; Popruženko, p. 39, 41; Triodion 1664, f. ронг r)
[прѣстꙋпити и въ бж҃тва] соущьство, ꙗко ѿ сег
[въводити или] мъчтанїемь а не исти
[ною бити] гн҃ю въчлченїю и стртем[ь] ·
[или едино]рѡдааго бж҃твꙋ пострати ·
[ана́ѳе]ма ~ г҃ ~ Гл҃ющи, ꙗко пль гн҃ꙗ
[ѿ самого] съедннени̇а прѣвъзвысивши се ·
[и горѣ] въсакое мьсти прѣвыше лежи ·
[ꙗко ѿ] краинꙗго съедннени̇а въкоупо
[бж҃на] бывши · непрѣложно · неи
[зм]ѣни[о ·] несълїанно · и не прѣвратно ·
[за] еже по съставꙋ съедннени̇а . и нера

[75] John, 14:28.

зл[ѹчно] и҆ нерастрь́жно прѣбы́вающи
въ въспрїе҆мшимь тоу҃ б҃зѣ сло́вѣ .
равнославно то́мѹ почи́тает се . и҆ по
клан҄ае҆т се е҆ди́нѣмь покла́н҄анїе^мъ · [76]
и҆ на ц҃рькьвны^х и҆ бж҃ⷭт'вны^х сѣдить прѣстѡ́лѣ^х
[о҆ десною] б҃а и҆ ѿц҃а · ꙗ҆ко́же бжⷭ҇тва
[възвыше́нї] ѡ҆бога́тивши се · прѣ
[....]мѹвающимь свои́ство^м е҆́стьствь ·
[тѣми] вѣчнаа па́ме^т [77] ~ г҃′ ~ ѿла́гающи^х ст҃ы^х
[ѿц]҃ь гла^с҃ы и҆́хже ѿ състоа́ни пра́выи^х
[съз]да́нїи б҃жїе ц҃ркве възгла́снвши^х се ·
[кѵ́р]їла[78] · а҆мвро́сїа · а҆мфи
[лохїа [79] б҃гогл]иваго · льва па́пы ста́раа^го [80]
[ри́ма] и҆ про́чїи^х · е҆́ще^ж и҆ ꙗ҆́же[81] въселе́нскы^х

► f. 13v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 508-509, 517-529; DRIN, f. 195r-195v, Popruženko, p. 41; Triodion 1664, f. р҃он r)
съборъ дѣа́телнаа[82] [четвьртаго^ж]
г҃лю и҆ шестаго не лоб[ыза́ющи^м : а҆на́ѳема :~ г҃ ~][83]
Непрїе́млющи^х, и҆́стиннаг[о б҃а и҆ сп҃са на́]
шего і҆и҃ х҃а` гл҃а · е҆́же ѿц҃ь [мои воли]

[76] покла́н҄анїемъ is missing from DRIN; in general, from this point onwards, large differences between the two are evident. The Ruthenian (Lvov 1664) printed text follows B.

[77] There is a difference here compared with the DRIN text. The Lvov printed text agrees with B.

[78] There are differences compared with the commemorations in DRIN: there, Pope Leo is mentioned after Athanasius. In PAL, Athanasius of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria and Ambrose of Milan precede Pope Leo, which is more similar to B. In general, the similarity to PAL is greater in this part. Perhaps the name of St. Athanasius figured in B as well, because the damaged part of the sheet is large enough for it. The text in the Lvov printed book is: А҆ѳана́сї, Кѵрі́лла, А҆мвро́сї, А҆мфило́хї Б҃гогл҃и́ваго, Леѡ́на ... in agreement with the Greek printed text.

[79] The name of Amphilochius does not occur in DRIN or in PAL, but is present in the Greek original of the Synodicon – J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 77 l. 507. It also occurs in the printed text.

[80] "The Old" is missing from DRIN, but is present in PAL and in the Greek, Ruthenian and Russian printed texts.

[81] The word is not present in DRIN or in the Lvov printed text.

[82] Missing from DRIN. In the Lvov printed text: дэ‘не́.

[83] Here, the Greek text on ll. 510-516 is missing. The Greek, Ruthenian and Muscovite printed texts agree with B.

менѐ єⷭ҇ [84]· ꙗ҆коⷤ҇ по разли́чныⷯ [ѻ҆бразѡⷯ ст҃їн]
съ҃ и҆стлъковаше [85]· ѡ҆́вы ѹ҆[бо по то́го]
бжⷭ҇твꙋ г҃люще съ҃н рⷪ҇е[нь быти вино]
винаго радѝ є҆́же ѿ ѻ҆́ц҃а [того] рожⷣен[їа]
по є҆стьствь́ныиⷯ [свои]ствⷯѣ, пр[ѣп҃рїꙗтїа ѿ не]
го плъ́ти и съставльши [того бжⷭ҇твоⷨ][86]
Сн҃рⷪѣ́ [87] създа́[нїе] ѡ҆[писан]ое
[мрьтв]ное . и҆ пр[очее] єⷭ҇тьвные и҆ неѹ҆[корнїе]
стрⷭ҇ти · и҆́хже радѝ себѐ бо́лш[а ѿц҃а г҃ь]
рⷪ҇е́ · нⷭ҇ь тогдà г҃лютъ ꙗ҆́ко [такови разоумѣти се]
глⷭ҇а · є҆гⷣа по тън҄комꙋ пр[омишленїю ра]
зꙋмѣет҄ се пⷮ҇ль разлꙋ́чена [бжⷭ҇тва ꙗ҆́коⷤ]
а҆́ще не бѝ и҆ съе҆д[ини]ла [се и҆ не прїе҆мле]
щиⷯ та́ковии г҃ль є҆́ж[е по хоудомоу по]
мысле́нїꙋ раздѣлѥ́нїа · [ꙗ҆́коⷤ ѿ ст҃ыиⷯ]
ѿц҃ь̏ рⷪ҇е се тогдà, вънѥ́гⷣа ра[бота и҆ невѣ]
дѣнїе г҃лют҄ се · ꙗ҆́ко непр[їе҆млющиⷨ є҆дино]
б҃ж҄нои̏ и҆ є҆ди́ночьⷭ҇[тиѣн х҃вѣ пльти радѝ та]
ковыми гла́сы доса[жⷣати се г҃ле]
т҄ же по тън҄комꙋ [88] про[мислоу прїе҆ма]
ти се и҆ є҆стьствь́нымь св[оиствамь ꙗ҆́же]

► f. 14r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 529-546; DRIN, f. 199v; Popruženko, p. 41, 43, 53; Triodion 1664, f. р҃он r-v)
[и҆стинна сꙋщаа г҃нее пльти ꙗ҆же въ] съставль
[... того бжⷭ҇тва и не]раздⷣѣ́лнои
[прѣбивающа. и҆ сїа ꙋ҆бо] несъста́
[виⷯ и҆ льжи]ыхъ, ꙗ҆́же и҆ ѡ [не] съст҃авныⷯ
[и҆ и҆стинныⷯ] прѣда́ющиⷯ, а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃ ~

[84] John, 14:28.
[85] DRIN – сказаше.
[86] A difference compared with DRIN and a similarity to PAL. Also, a difference to the printed Triodion, which reads: “... плоти и ѵ̈постаси...”.
[87] DRIN and PAL – рекше. In the Lvov printed text – сн҃рѣчъ.
[88] DRIN – хоудомоу. In the Lvov printed text – то́нкомꙋ.

[....][89] и҆ нечьстивѣ ѿ бывшаго
[митропо]лита керькискаⷢ҇ (sic!), констанди́
[на] же блъгарьскаго, и҆́же и҆ ѿ него
[прок]лете бывшеⷨ҇, а҆на́ѳема ~ а҃ ~
[Єдин]ѣмоудръствꙋющїиⷯ҇ си́цеваа, а҆наⷴ҇ма ~
[90]бывшемꙋ мїтрⷪ҇ли́тꙋ керькѷрьскомꙋ,
[константиноу] же блъгарьскомꙋ · ꙁлѣ̀ и҆ нечъстивѣ
[наꙋчивша] ѻ҆ и҆́же и҆́стиннаго б҃а и҆ сп҃са
на́шего [і҆и҃ х҃а г]ла́сѣ · є҆́же ѿц҃ь мои̇ бо́лїи
[мене єⷭ҇][91] а҆ немꙋдрьствꙋющꙋ и҆ г҃люще ·
[ꙗ҆ко и҆ по и҆нѣ] оу҆бо бл҃гочъстивыⷯ҇ мы́слеⷯ҇
[прїемле̇тсе т]ь ѿ ст҃ыⷯ҇ бг҃они́сныⷯ҇ ѿц҃ь ·
[нъ̀ и҆ по самои] ѿ є҆диноро́днаⷢ҇ с҃на б҃жїа
[прї]ѥтои̇ ѿ ст҃ые д҃вы и҆ б҃це пльти[92]·
[и҆ по слов]ѻ съста́вленнои бжⷭ҇твѣ не съ
[мѣснѣ] по нераꙁдѣлнⷨ҇ѣ съє҆ди́нени,
[св]ои́ства и҆мꙋщои̇ по и҆́хже ѿц҃а
г҃ь бо́лша себѐ именова · въ є҆ди́ноⷨ҇ по
[кло]нении съ своимъ прие́тїемъ · ꙗ҆́ко
въкоупоб҃жьнꙋ и҆ є҆динославнꙋ, то́мꙋ же

► f. 14v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 546-561; DRIN, f. 199v, Popruženko, p. 53; Triodion 1664, f. р҃ои v)
ѿц҃ꙋ и҆ въсе[ст҃омꙋ д҃хꙋ съпокланѣеⷨ҇ и҆ съсла]
вимь · Кр.. [и҆щꙋщомꙋ же дльжно єⷭ҇]
раꙁꙋмѣ се [сїи гл҃аⷭ҇. є҆гⷣа ра]
ꙁꙋмѣет се г҃ь є҆динь състав[ь съєди́не]
нѣ и҆мꙋщи двѣ̈ єⷭ҇ствѣ [93]· нь [є҆гⷣа по]
тънкомꙋ промышле́нїꙋ[94] плⷮ҇ [прїемлетсе]

[89] The next several lines are not matched in PAL or DRIN or in the printed Triodion with Synodicon. A corresponding text occurs only in some copies of the Greek original of the Synodicon: J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 79 ll. 533-536.
[90] Here begins a text that matches the one in DRIN, f. 199v and f. р҃ои r (end of page) in the printed Synodicon in the Triodion.
[91] John, 14:28.
[92] This word is missing from DRIN.
[93] There is a difference compared with the words and word order in DRIN.
[94] DRIN – хꙋдои мысли. The Lvov printed text agrees with B.

разлꙋченна бж҇тва · и ꙗко в [нѣкаа коеко]
ждо ѿ чл҇кь̏ бы́ти позна́вает се [и сїа]
бг҇ословеснѣ́ншемꙋ дама́скинꙋ, [тог҇а еже]
по тъникомꙋ[95] примыслє́нїꙋ раз҇ѣлє́н[їе на]
оу̏чещꙋ · Єг҇а гл҇ѥтсе что҇ ѡ х҇вѣ въплъ
щени · не пр҇ѣставѝтелно ест҇ьвнаго
коего свои́ства · нь ꙗвѝтел'но ра́боты
или̏ нев҇ѣ́нїа · и невъсхотѣ́вш[а] послѣ
довати ст҇ымъ и въселе́нскыи҇ събѡ́рѡ҇мъ ·
четвъртомꙋ же и ше́стомꙋ · и̏же о҇ хъ
еди́ненны҇ несълїа́нно д[вое естества пра]
вѣ и бл҇гочьстивѣ прѣда́ше · и правосла
вїꙋ наоу̏чи́ше хв҇оу̏ цр҇квь · и си́це въ разли́
чные ѥ̏реси поплъ́зша се, ана́ѳема҇ ~ г҇́ ~
Въсѣ҇ единомоудръствꙋ́ющи҇ то́моу
кон'станди́нꙋ и̏же блъ́гар'скомꙋ · и [н]ѥо҇́
извръ́жени поболѣ́вши҇ и сѣ́тꙋющихь ·
не сръдолю́бїа ради̏, нь за еже се́го злочь́
стїемь съѿведе́нно҇ бы́ти, ана́ѳема ~ г҇́ ~

► f. 15r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 562-571, 753-760; DRIN- omm.; Triodion 1664, f. р҇он v- р҇о» r)
[ненаоуче]наго [ль]женно́ка сꙋебо́рнаа҇
[їѡ]а́нна ирїни́ка [96] · и и̏же ѿ нѥго съпи́
[с]а́ннаго на бл҇гочьт҇їе пи́санїа · и лобы́
[зающи҇же сї, ꙗ̏кѡ]сла́вещим' же и гл҇ющимъ ·
[не ради ѥ̏же въ] то́мь гѣ҇ на́ше҇ іу҇ хѣ҇, сп҇си́
[телѣ же и б]зѣ҇ · съста́вленном' же и съ
[единеномь] то́го бж҇твꙋ · нерастръ́
[женѣ же] . и неразде́лнѣ . и несълїа́ннѣ чл҇чь
[скыи сво]ѣ . ре́щи ѥ̏мꙋ ꙗко чл҇кꙋ съвръше́ннꙋ ·
[иже въ] свѣсще́нны҇ еѵ҇лїихъ то҇ гла҇, ѥ̏же
ѿць мои во́лїи мене̏ е҇ [97]· нь си́це по чл҇чь

[95] DRIN – хꙋдомꙋ. Here the text in DRIN is interrupted as a large part of the sheet is missing. The addition in brackets is based on PAL. The Lvov printed text agrees with B.
[96] In the printed Triodion with Synodicon, the name is given in translation: Іѡанноу Мирномоу.
[97] John 14:28.

[скомоу рещи] и҆ съ т҆о́мѹ, ꙗ҆́кѡ е҆га се́мѹ
[о҆бнаж]еннѹ ѿнѹ то бж҃ства · ꙗ҆́кѡ
[.... н]е би прие҆ди́нило се се́мѹ, прие҆то би
[....] и҆ ꙗ҆коже ѡ҆́бщее и҆ на́шее сн҃це
[при]ети[....]шаго, а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃ ~ [98]Щета́вше възгл҃ ~
[на събо]рище на чс҃тные и҆кѡ́ны · а҆на́ма ~
[Прием]лющи и҆́же ѿ бжс҃твнаа пиcа́нїа
[гл҃ы] е҆́же на и҆дѡ́лы · въ чс҃тные и҆кѡ
ны х҃а б҃а на́шего, и҆ ст҃ы е҆го · а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃ ~
Приѡ҆бща́ющи се въ ра́зѹмѣ, досажа́ющи
[и҆ бе]зче́стещи чс҃тные и҆кѡ́ны · а҆на́ма ~ г҃ ~
Гл҃ющи ꙗ҆ко бо́гѡвѡ хрїстїа́не и҆кѡ́намъ
прихо́де · а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃ ~ Гл҃ющи, ꙗ҆к
развѣ х҃а б҃а на́шего, и҆́нъ на и҆ба́ви ѿ и҆дѡ

► f. 15v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 760-764; Triodion 1664, f. р҃оѳ r)
л҆ские льсти, а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃ ~ Др[ъзающихъ]
гл҃ати събѡ́рнѹю цр҃ко́вь и҆́дѡлы н[ѣкогда]
прие҆ти · [99]ꙗ҆́ко въсѐ таи́н҆ство ѿра́ющ[и]
и҆ хрїстїа́нскои вѣ́рѣ досажда́ю[щи, а҆наѳема :~]
А҆́ще кто хрїстїано ѹ҆кори́тел҆н[ои ереси съ]
ща то́го · и҆ли въ тои жи́тїе [ѿметноувша]
ѿмъщае · а҆на́ѳема ~ г҃ ~ гла́с[....][100]
І҆ѡ́сифа и҆́же ѿ кри́та свща · геѡрг[їа,]
ки́рила, и҆ дїони́сїа · мѡѷсеа зо[графа,]
меѳѡ́дїа · малахі́ѹ · ѳеѡ́фїла · и҆ х[ари]
тона · ѳеѡ́рита · ника́ндра · и҆ е҆рі́нѹ [и҆мѣ]
нѹюмѹю пориии · митро́фана · ї҆ѡ[анн]

[98] Here begins a series of anathemata related to iconoclasm, which are missing from DRIN due to missing folia; only the first two anathemata are present in PAL (see М. Г. Попруженко, p. 64 No 67 and 68; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p.113). They are present in the printed Triodion with Synodicon. In the Greek original of the Synodicon, it is at ll. 752-764 in the J. Gouillard edition, p. 93.

[99] It should be noted there are differences compared with the Lvov printed Triodion with Synodicon: ꙗ҆́ко все ѹ҆твержде́нїе посрамл҆ющимъ.

[100] Here begins the quotation from the "Mount Athos letter" of 1345 related to the heresy of Irene Poriné (see the annexe by A. Rigo). It is absent from the Greek text published by J. Gouillard and from the printed Triodion with Synodicon.

кїа оу҃дръжа́ннаго · съ ѣдино́моу҃др[ьствоующи]
мн и҃мь въсѣ́мн · и҃же лю́тѵю и҃ мр[ьскоую]
масалїа́нскѵю е҃ресь оу҃ се́бе лъста́[внѣ]
и҃ злодѣ́нстьвнѣ съдрѣ́жѣ̀ [..а.....]
мръзча́нша и҃ зло҃чъстнвѣ [....]
и҃ тво́реть и҃ оу҃четь · бж҃твнѵ [....]е оу
нкѡ́ны дрѣ́ва и҃ бре́нїе и҃менѵю́ть · и҃ по
плю́ваю҃, и҃ безчѣ́стеть · и҃ съжи́заю҃ сїѣ̀ ·
и҃ въса́кы҃ѧ ѡ҃бразѡ҃ скврънеть и҃ растлѣ́ваю҃т ·
Сто҃е́же кр҃ще́нїе · и҃ въсѣ̀ с҃ще́нное прнче́ще
нїе · въсѣ̀с҃тго и҃ живото́ворѧщаго тѣ́ла
и҃ кръве г҃а на́шего і҃ѵ҃ х҃а̀ · ѿ тръпѣ́нїа
тво́е́го х҃ѣ̀ ц҃рю · не полъ́зно же и҃ сѵ́етно

► f. 16r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 573-575)

[101][прѣ́даю]щи и҃ оу҃чещи и҃ бж҃твное и҃ с҃пси
[тел]ное и҃ ч҃лколю́бное, е҃же плѣ́тїѵ съм҃
тренїе и҃ ꙗ҃вле́нїе е҃го҃ ѿмѣ́таю҃ . и҃ на
[аг҃глы нн]же҃ мръствы҃ въскр҃се́нїе и҃ме
[ноуютъ] въса́ко же скврън҆ство҃ и҃ мрѣ́зо
[сть]а҃ [.ка҃.] вели́кѵ добродѣ́тѣль дѣ́ла
[нї]е прле́жно. и҃ и́на прѣлютаа и҃ и҃сплѣ҃
[в]са́кого безво́жїа. Скврънноде́нствїа
[вьсакого и҃]прѣпѡ҃вс҆твїа прѣда́ю҃ . ꙗ҃же нетѣ́
[въ] пнсмен҆мн и҃лн҃ ѣзы́кѡ҃ . нѣ҃ ннже҃ са
мымь съмыслом҃ь, х҃рт҃їа́нѡ҃ бл҃гочѣ́
стнвы҃ѧ ѡ҃бно́снти съторъпнмо. и҃ мно́
гые и҃ные скврънны҃мн и҃хъ хытросло́вїн,
и҃ прѣльстїѵ растлѣ́ваю҃. поне҃ и҃ хы́тро҃
[мно]жьство и҃ тъщма́нїе вели́ко се҃ тво́
[ретж]е мно́гые ѣли́кы҃ ѡ҃цоу҃ сво
[емоу дїаволоу] прнве́сти. и҃ съ со́вою и҃ѡ҃нѣ҃
[погоубн]вю поря́нѵти про́пасть. а҃на҃ма ~ г҃′ ~
[Въсѣ́мь] масалїа́нъ . и҃ прнѣ́млющн҃ и҃ прно҃

[101] The additions in brackets here are not taken from one of the other manuscripts, as this text does not exist there, but are restored based on the Greek original.

бщающих се с҇мн҇ въвѣдѣнн . и мръскаа их҇
оучѣнїа прнемлющих . анаѳема ·:ѳ г҃ ~
[102]главы на акїн дїна ~ Варлаама и акї
ндина, и оучнннкы и прѣемннкы их.
[м]оудръствꙋющих и г҃лющих . просїавын
[ѿ] г҃а на бж҇твнѣмь его прѣѡбраженн свѣ҇т.

►f. 16v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 575-587; Triodion 1664, f. рѻѳ r)
ѡвогда оубо бытн ѡбразь [и тваръ][103]
прнвндѣнїе. въ малѣ ꙗвлюнь и ра[здроушшїн се]
абїе . ѡвогда же самое то соуществ[о]
б҃жїе . ꙗко въ та съпротнв[нѣншаа оумо]
врѣд'но и немощнаа ѿноудь себе [в'мѣта]
ющих . и се оубо арїева ненстов[аа поно]
шенїа . въ създаннаа и несъзданнаа
еднновж҇ство . и еднного б҃а расѣ[ка]
юще . Се же масалїанскым злочьст[їемъ]
съ ѡбносимн . бж҇т'вное соущьст[во]
виднмо бытн г҃люще . не исповѣдаю
щих же по б҃годъхновенномꙋ с҃тых б҃го
словїꙋ . и еже ц҃ркве б҃лгочьстнвн[омъ]
моудръствованїю . нниже зданїе [бытн]
бж҇твнѣншїн ѻнь свѣть . нн[же соущь]
ство б҃жїе . нь не сьздань[наа и ест҇твеннаа]
бл҃гть . и сїанїе . и дѣ[нство ѿ]
самого бж҇т'внаго соуще[ства нера]
здѣлнѣ пр҇но пронсходещее, а[наѳема, трнжды]
Еще тѣх моудръствꙋющих и г҃лнщ[их нн]
едино же дѣнство естъстьв'но имѣ
тн б҃оу. нь еднносоущьство бытн
тожде же и неразл҇ьстьвно ѿноудь не
пщꙋющим . еже бж҇т'вное соущьств[о]
и бж҇т'вное дѣнство. и нн еднн[о]

[102] From here on, the text is present in the printed Triodion – f. рѻѳ r.
[103] The additions here are based on the printed Triodion from Lvov, 1664.

Three manuscript folia are missing here.

► f. 17r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 687-691, 714-723, 692; Triodion 1664, f. р҃п v)
[104][Прⷣереченнаго же В]арлаама . съ своими ѥго ѥр[ес҄ми]
[и с]ъписан҄ми. и ѥже на правѹю наш
[вѣ]рѹ тъщегласїемь . низложившѹ же
[и проповѣдавшоу] ꙗко и вь сщ҃енны сихь по
[двизѣхъ и борба]хь и ѥже ѡ бл҃гочьстїи добле
сть бл҃женнѣ прѣставити се ѿ сего
[мир]а . и кь лоучьшемѹ и бл҃женномѹ
[ѡн]омѹ прѣминнѹти покои . вѣчнаа памѧть ~ г҃ ~
[105][Всѣ]мь иже ѡ православїи съподвизa
[ющи]мсе, присноспоминаемѹ и бл҃женномѹ
[се]мѹ цр҃ю . и оубо и по нихь и словесы и сте
[....]ан҄ми . съписанїем же и оученїемь .
въсакымь и словомь и вещїю . добле
[с]тьвнѣ цр҃кви прⷣѣстателемь бывшїихь
[Х]в҃ѣ . и лѹкавые оубо и мн҃ѡговид҄ные
ѥресы варлаамовы и акїндиновы .
и ѥдиномоудрьных ѡнѣмь, вь цр҃кваⷯ
инⷪ҇ ѡбливших и ѿврьгших въкоупѣ .
агг҃лскаа же и ѿчьскаа бл҃гочьстїа .
прѣданїа свѣтлопроповѣдавшимь .
и сихь ради зла слышещих ѿ злославных .
и ѡблъгаемомь и съдосаждаемомь сщ҃е
нны бг҃ословце, и бг҃оносным нашимь
ѿцемь и оучителемь, вѣчнаа памѧть ~ г҃
Григорїѹ ст҃ѣишемѹ митрополитѹ солѹн҄ скомѹ

► f. 17v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 692-706; Triodion 1664, f. р҃п v)
[ск]омѹ . иже съборⷩ[нѣ] въ цр[ькви велицѣи варлаа]

---

[104] Begins from G. l. 687. This is a commemoration of Andronicus III Palaeologus.

[105] The text from here to the penultimate line on this sheet is missing at this place from the printed Triodion. There, it continues directly with "To Gregory, the most holy metropolitan of Thessalonica..." This text corresponds to Gr. ll. 714-723, which, however, in the J. Gouillard edition, follows the beginning of the text about St. Gregory Palamas. Likewise, in the printed Synodicon this text occurs on f. р҃па r, after the commemoration of St. Gregory Palamas (on f. р҃п v).

ма же и҆ а҆кі́ндина . наче́лник[ѡвъ и҆ и҆з]
ѡ҆бре́татели но́вы͛ ѥ҆ресе́и, низ[ло]
жившомꙋ лꙋка́вою и҆ сънмице [дроужьствомъ][106]
ѥ҆стьствьное и҆ неразлꙋчное дѣ́иство
и҆ си́лꙋ бж҃їю . и҆ про́сто въса̀ въ соу́ть ѥ҆́сть
ствьнаа ст҃ые тр҃оице своиства. зданїе
дръзнꙋвшїи҆ рещи . нъ оу҆бо и҆ ѥ҆́же б[жс҃тва̀]
непристꙋпныи свѣ҃т въсїавыи на го[рѣ]
ѿ хв҃а . бжс҃т'во ꙋбо създа́нно и҆ пл[атонниче]
скые ви́ды . и҆ ѥ҆ллин'скые ба́сни, ѡ҆ н[ѥмъ]
привъвести начьнши҆ пакы҆ злѣ ц҃ркв[ѣ]
хв҃ѣ . и҆ ѡ҆ и҆стинны͛ и҆ непогрѣш'ныхь [ѡ҆бщїа же Хвы Црквн]
ѻ҆ бжс҃твѣ прѣда́нїи . прѣмоу́дрѣ[н'нѣ]
и҆ доблестъвнѣ ѕѣло̀ побо́рни[коу] вы
вшꙋ . и҆ съ пи́санми и҆ словесы . и҆ стеѕ
и҆ми . и҆ ѥ҆ди́нобжс҃тво . и҆ бг҃а ѥ҆д[ин]ог҃о
трїсъставна . дѣ́истьвн[на] хотѣ́
тел'на . въсеси́лна . несъзда́нна по въ
се́мꙋ, по бжс҃т'вны͛ пи́санїихь . и҆ оу҆бо
и҆ бг҃осло́вце и҆ ска́зателе си́хь пропов҃ѣ
давшꙋ · а҆ѳана́сїа вл҃ю · и҆ васи́лїа · грїго́
рїа · и҆ і҆ѡ҆а́нна · и҆ грїго́рїа · и҆ кѵ́рїла съ си҃мі ·
и҆ ма́ѯїма прѣмоу́драго · и҆ и҆́же ѿ да́ма
ска бг҃огл҃ниваго і҆ѡ҆а́нна · не тъкмо же,

► f. 18r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 706-709, 724-733; Triodion 1664, f. ҏпа r)

[но и҆ про́чїихъ ѻ҆ц҃ъ и҆] оучи́телю хв[ы ц҃ркви, и҆ ѻ҆бщи́теле,]
[и҆ споу́тника] и҆ съслꙋжи́телю . [и҆ тща́телна, и҆ съ]подви́
[жн]икꙋ вьсѣ҃ си́мь ꙗ҆́вльшꙋ се . и҆ словесы̀
[107][....]дѣлесы . и҆ ѥ҆́го ради҆ мнѡ́га ѡ҆злобле́
[нїа] злосла́вны͛ и҆ скръби по́дѥмшоу ꙗ҆
и҆ но́вомꙋ и҆сповѣ́дникꙋ по въсе́мꙋ пока́
[з]авшꙋ се, вѣчнаа па́меть :~ г҃ ~

[106] Here, the text in the printed Triodion differs from the one in the manuscript without deviating significantly in meaning. There are differences in the translation.

[107] Here, the text in the printed Triodion differs from the one in the manuscript. The text that goes as far as the next paragraph is absent from the Lvov printed Triodion.

[108]̓Исповѣдающиⷨ҇ ѐди́ного б҃а трисъста́
вна . въсеси́лна. не тъчїю несъзда́нна
[по] соу́щьствꙋ ѝ съставѣ́ⷯ. нъ҇ ѝ по дѣи́
ствꙋ. ѝ г҃лющиⷨ҇ проѝсходи́ти оу҆́бо бж҃ⷭ҇ⷮь
вьномꙋ дѣи́ствꙋ . ѿ бжⷭ҇твнаго соущъ
ства . проѝсходи́ти же нераздѣ́лнѣ.
проѝсхож҃дⷣе́нїемь оу҆́бо, не ѝзрⷪ҇ѐнно расꙋ
жⷣе́нїе прⷣѣста́влꙗющиⷨ҇ . а̀ е́же не ра
з҆дѣ́лнѣ, па́че ё҆стьстьвное показꙋю
щимь съѐдинне́нїе. ꙗ̀кⷪ҇ж ѝ с҃тыи ѝ въсе
ле́н҆скыи ше́стыи съборь ѝзрⷪ҇ѐ. вѣчнаа па́меⷮ҇ъ ~ г҃ ⁝ ~
̓Исповѣдающиⷨ҇ б҃а . ꙗ̀кⷪ҇ж по соу́щьствоу
несъзда́нна ѝ безначе́лна . С҃нце оу҆́бо
ѝ по дѣи́ствꙋ, безначе́лнꙋ ꙗ҆́вѣ оу҆́бѡ
по лѣ́тѣ прие҆́млюемꙋ, ѝ по бжⷭ҇т҆вноⷨ҇ꙋ
оу҆́бо соу́щъствꙋ, неприче́стна . ѝ не
ѿ҆б҆мы́слима ѿноу́дъ б҃а г҃лющиⷨ҇ . при
че́стна же того бы́ти достои́ныⷨ҇, по

► f. 18v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 733-746; Triodion 1664, f. р҃па r-v)
бж[ⷭ҇тв҆]номꙋ ѝ б҃готвори[омоу дѣиствоу,]
ꙗ̀кⷪ҇ж ц҃рко́внїи б҃гослѡ́вци рѣше [вѣ]
чнаа па́меⷮ҇ ·: ~ г҃ ´ ~ ̓Исповѣдающиⷨ҇ [про]
сїа́выи неѝзрⷪ҇е́нно свѣ́ть на горѣ̀ [гⷭ҇на]
прѣѡ̀бра́женїа . свѣ́тъ не пре[косновенныи]
бы́ти . ѝ свⷮ҇ѣ́ непрѣхо́диⷨ҇ [ѝ ѝзлїи́нїе]
неѡ̀бьмы́слимо бжⷭ҇т҆вные лꙋ́че ѝ славⷭ҇
неѝзрⷪ҇е́нна. ѝ бжⷭ҇тва сла́ва прѣсъврь
ше́нна . ѝ прⷣѣсъврьше́нна . ѝ безлѣ
тна с҃на сла́ва . ѝ цⷭ҇рство б҃жїе ѝ красо
та̀ ѝ҆стинна ѝ въжⷣелѣ́нна . ѻ̓ бжⷭ҇ть
виⷨ҇ѣ ѝ б҃лже́ннѣмь ё҆стьствѣ . ѝ ѐсть
стьвна сла́ва б҃жїа . ѝ бжⷭ҇тво̀ ѿ҆ц҃а ѝ
д҃ха , въ с҃нѣ ѐдинорⷣѡ҆́нѣмь ѡ̀бли́ста

[108] It begins here from G. l. 724 due to a displacement of the texts compared with the Gouillard Greek text.

юще . ꙗ҆кѡ҆ бж҃твнїи и҆ бг҃оно́снїи ѿц҃и
на́ши рѣше . а҆ѳана́сїе . васи́лїе ве́лиц҃ .
грїго́рїе бг҃осло́въ . і҆ѡ҆а́ннь ꙁлатоꙋ́сть .
и҆ і҆ѡ҆а́ннъ дамаскинъ . и҆ си҃ ради҆ [ѿ]
ꙁда́ньнь сла́вещи҃ бж҃твныи сїи҆ свѣ́ть .
вѣчнаа па́ме҃ ~ г҃ ~ Сла́вещи҃ свѣ҃ г҃нꙗ
прѣѡ҆бражени́їа, не съꙁдань оу҆бо прѣ
ѣ́нны ради҆ . а҆ не оу҆бо с[ен б]ы́ти . г҃лющи҃,
прѣсоуществнѡе бж҃їе соу́щъство.
ꙗ҆ко ѡ҆но́моу въса́ческы ѿноу́дь неви́ди
прѣбы́вающꙋ, и҆ неприче́стнꙋ . бг҃а бѡ

► f. 19r (=GR /Gouillard/ ll.746-752, 765-766, 801-803; Triodion 1664, f. рпа v)

[виде҆ никто] де҃ . ꙗ҆вѣ [же ꙗ҆коже и҆мать с]а [....]
[е҆ст҃твомъ] бг҃осло́вци се҃ рѣше . сла́вꙋ
[же па́че сеи]ь г҃лющи҃ е҆стьсть́внꙋ прѣсꙋ
[ществе́н]на соу́щьства . ѿ о҆но́го про
[дсꙋ]ещꙋю нераꙁдѣлно . и҆ ꙗ҆вле́ꙗемꙋю
[ч҃лкол]ю́бїа ради҆ бж҃їа, о҆чи́щенными
[оумо]мь . съ нею же сла́вою г҃ь на́шь и҆ бг҃ь
[пр] ї҆иде҃ въ вто́рое е҆го и҆ стра́шное при
шьствїе . соуди҆ жи́вы҃ и҆ мрьтвы҃ . ꙗ҆кѡ҆
[бг҃ос]ло́вци цр҃ко́внїи рѣше . вѣчнаа па́ме҃ ~ г҃ ~
[109][Въсемъ] е҆ретикъ а҆на́ѳема иж:ѳ по г҃ :~ Въꙁгласи
[110][...нь]не покла́нꙗет се г҃ꙋ на́шемꙋ і҆с҃ х҃ꙋ
[....]нѣ ѡ҆пи́саннꙋ по ч҃лчьствꙋ . да
боу́де҃ а҆на́ѳема :ѳ г҃ ~ Мнѡ́га лѣта
цр҃емь ~ г҃ ~ И҆ сла́ви҃ и҆хже и҆ма҃ ѡ҆вы́
чаи по врѣмь цр҃е . пото҃ а҆ще хоще҃ .
и҆ме҃ . прѣѡ҆с҃щенномꙋ и҆ въселе́нскомꙋ
патрїа́рхꙋ, мнѡ́га лѣта: и҆ па́кы . [111]

[109] The next two anathemata, preceding the commemorations of the emperors, are not present in the printed Synodicon within the Triodion.
[110] This line and the following correspond to Gouillard, ll. 765-766.
[111] The writing in red letters and one of the polychronia are absent from the Greek Synodicon and from the Ruthenian printed edition.

Мно́га лѣта ц҃р҃емъ. ~ г҃ ′ ~ Бѣ да съхра́нн҃
дръжа́вꙋ и҃хъ ~ бѣ цр҃тво и҆ да сми́рнть ·
въздгласи҆ ~ Нб҃ныи ц҃рю, Зємльныѥ на́ше
ц҃рѥ съхрани҆ ~ г҃ ′ . Мнха́нлꙋ правосла́ нн҃′
вномꙋ на́шемꙋ ц҃рю . и҆ ѳеѡ́рѣ с҃тѣи
є҆го҆ ми҃тр҃н, вѣчнаа па́ме҃ ~ г҃ :~
Васи́лїю. Константи́нꙋ . лъ́вꙋ , и҆ а҆леѯа́

► f. 19v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 803-816, 881-884; Triodion 1664, f. р҃па v)

др[ꙋ . хрнс]тофо́рꙋ, и҆ р[ѡманꙋ, конста]
нти́нꙋ . ромманꙋ . ннкіф[орꙋ . Іѡаннꙋ]
васи́лїю . и҆ констанди́нꙋ . р[ѡманꙋ.]
а҆ндро́ннкꙋ . мнхани́лꙋ . [константі́нꙋ. Ісаа]
кїю. а҆ле́ѯїоу . и҆ і҆ѡа́ннꙋ . ма[нꙋнлꙋ]
и҃же бж҃твны҃и и҆ а҃г҃гл҆скымь ѡ҃[бразомь]
пр҃ѣ҆менова́ннꙋ ма҃ѳе́ꙋ мѡнахꙋ [Ялеѯїю. Ісаа]
кїоу. а҆ле́ѯїоу . ѳеѡ́рꙋ . і҆ѡа́ннꙋ, [ѳе]
ѡ́доро҃у. бл҃гочьстнвы҃и и҆ пр҃но҆пам[ѧтнымь и прнснопомнна]
є҆мымь ц҃ремь на́ш҃и. и҃же нб҃но́[мꙋ ц҃р҃твїю]
земльнымь и҆змѣннвш҃и, вѣчн[аа нмь памѣть] вы҃′
҆Андро́ннкꙋ и҃же въ бл҃же́ннѣи ко[нчинѣ]
бы́вшꙋ пр҃но҆помина́емомꙋ бл҃г[ꙋьстн]
вомꙋ ц҃рю на́шемꙋ . и҃же бж҃т҆внымъ
и҆ а҃г҃гльскы҃и ѡ҃бразо҃ пр҃ѣ҆менованноу
а҆нтѡ́нїꙋ мѡнахоу҃ палеѡло́гꙋ . вѣчнаа
па́мять ÷ г҃ ′ ÷ Мнха́нлꙋ и҃же въ бл҃
же́ннѣи ко́нчинѣ бывшꙋ . пр҃но҆по҃ми҃
наемомꙋ бл҃гочьстнвомꙋ ц҃рю на́шемꙋ
палеѻло́гꙋ . вѣчнаа па́мять :~ г҃ :~ [112] вы҃′
※ Гер́манꙋ . тара́сїꙋ . ннкї́фо́рꙋ . и҆ ме҃ѳо́ мл҃о
дїꙋ . прі́снопоми́наемымъ и҆ бл҃же́нны҃ѧ҃ъ
патрїа́рхѡ҃ . вѣчнаа па́ме҃ ÷ по, г҃ :~

[112] Some of the commemorations from the Greek text and from the printed Triodion are missing from B, as are all commemorations of the *basilissai*. The commemorations of the patriarchs begin in Gouillard's Greek text, ll. 881 sq., and in the printed Triodion on f. р҃пв r.

᾽Ηγνάτϊος . φότϊος . στέφανѫ . ѝ ἀντѡ́нϊѫ . нн҃′
ннκόлаѫ . и҃ ἐѵ́ѳімϊѫ . стέфанѫ . трϊ′

► f. 20r (GR /Gouillard/ ll. 884-902, 927; Triodion 1664, f. ρ̅пв r- ρ̅пв v)
[фонѫ . Ѳеофѵла́ктѫ . полі҃ектѫ .]
[Ѧнтѡнϊος . Ннкол]аος . снсі́нϊѫ . сέргϊѫ . ἐѵ́ста
[тϊѫ . Ѧле]ѯ̑ϊος . минха́нлѫ . ἰѡ́аннѫ . кѡн᾽
[стантнѫ. Іѡаннѫ .] ....наго ко́ѯмѣ . ἐѵ́стра́тϊος . ннко́
[лаѫ . Іѡанноу.] лео́нтϊѫ . минха́нлѫ . ѳеѡдо́тѫ .
[Лоука]. минха́нлѫ . харі́тонѫ . ѳеѡ̑т̑ѫ .
[Ва]снлϊѫ . ннкі́тѣ . лео́ндϊος . досїѳе́ѫ .
мелέтϊος . пέтрѫ . геѡ́ргϊος . минха
и́нлѫ . ѳеѡ̑рѫ . ἰѡ́аннѫ . ма́ѯ̑ϊмѫ . ма
нѫи́нлѫ . меѳѡ́дϊѫ , прѣи҃менова́ннѫ ака́
кϊος мѡнахѫ . ге́рманѫ, прѣи҃менова
ннѫ геѡ́ргϊος мона́хѫ [113]. манѫи́нлѫ, прѣ
и҃менова́ннѫ ма̑ѳе́ѫ мѡна̑хѫ . правосла́
вны҃ патрϊа́рхѡ̑, вѣчнаа па́мєть :ѳ ҃г ÷
᾽Ярсе́нϊος и҃же въ бл҃же́нно҃ покон выѵшоу вы҃′
ст҃ѣ́ншомѫ ѝ пр҃нопомнна́емомѫ па
трϊа́рхѫ, вѣчнаа па́мє̑ ÷ г҃ ÷ ᾽Ішсн́ѳѫ .
ἀѳана́сїος . нсаі́н . ѝ и҃сі́дорѫ . пр҃но҃по
мнна́емымь ѝ бл҃же́нныи҃ патрϊархѡ̑ъ
вѣчнаа па́мє̑ ÷ г҃ ÷ [114]Ка́листѫ въ бл҃а
же́нн҃ѣ покоѝ выѵшомѫ . пр҃но҃помнна
емомѫ ѝ бл҃же́нномѫ патрϊа́рхѫ, вѣчнаа
па́мєть ÷ г҃ ÷ Фїло́ѳеоу ст҃ѣ́ншомѫ [115]
ѝ пр҃но҃помнна́емомѫ патрϊа́рхѫ , вѣчнаа
па́мє̑ ÷ г҃ ÷ Хрїстофо́рѫ . ѳеѡ́дорѫ .

[113] The commemoration of Patriarch Germanus / Monk George is absent from the Greek text of the J. Gouillard edition but is present in the Greek and East Slavic printed texts.

[114] Before Patriarch Callistus, the commemorations of Athanasius, Gerasimus, Isaiah, and Isidorus are missing; they are present in the Greek and East Slavic printed Triodia.

[115] The commemoration of Patriarch Philotheus is different in the Greek text (J. Gouillard, ll.902-905), and the following "Thessalonica" part (J. Gouillard, ll. 906-926) is not present in B. The commemoration of Philotheus in the Greek, Russian and Ruthenian printed Triodia is different. The following part is missing there. See also Rigo, "Il *Synodikon dell'Ortodossia* di Tessalonica", p. 216.

► f.20v (=GR /Gouillard/ ll. 927-929, p. 118 ll. 1-5, ll. 930 sq.; Triodion 1664, f. р҃пв v)

[Ѧгапїоу. Іѡ]аннȣ . [Николаоу. Илїоу.]
ѳеѡ҇рȣ . васи́лїоу . пе́трȣ . [Ѳеодосїоу. нї]
кѵ҇фо́рȣ и҆ і҆ѡ҆а́ннȣ . прі́сно[помина́]
емымь патрїа́рхѡ҇ а҆нтїох[їискимь]
вѣчнаа па́ме҇ ÷ г҃ ÷ Дамїан[ȣ. Васил]
лїоу . кѡнстанді́ноу . и҆ никѵ҇ф[орȣ. (Георгїоу)]
хрїстофо́рȣ . леѡ́ндїоу . и҆ сїсїнї[ȣ.]
васи́лїȣ . и҆ і҆ѡси́фȣ . михаи́лȣ . и҆ хри
стофо́рȣ . никїфо́рȣ . пандолео́ндȣ .
и҆ а҆леѯа́ндрȣ . козмѣ̀ , и҆ кѡнстанді́нȣ
ѳео́фанȣ . пе́трȣ і҆ѡ҆а́ннȣ . нїки[тѣ.]
лео́ндїоу . геѡ́ргїоу . нико́лаоу . [Іѡа]
ннȣ . и҆ нїко́лаȣ . православны҇ ми[тро]
полі́тѡ҇ , вѣчнаа па́меть :~ г҃ ÷
Ни́фонȣ и҆ і҆а́кѡвȣ въсѐѡ҆с҃ще́ннымъ
а҆р҆хїере́ѡ҇ е҆̏рнш҆скы҇ и҆ с҃тые горы̀,
вѣчнаа па́ме҇ ѭ:ѳ ~ С҃таа т҃ри́ца с҃и́ про вы́ш
сла́ви ÷ Си́хъ и҆̏же ѡ҆ бл҃гочьстии да҇
до съмрьти стра҇н҆ми же и҆ по́двигы
и҆ оу҆че́нїемь наказова́ти же се и҆ оу҆крѣ
плꙗти . и҆ подра҇́телѥ҇ бж҃т҆внаго и҆́
житїа да́же до конца̀ пока́зати се
на҇ б҃ви м҃лим҆ се ѭ ꙗ҆̏ко да спо҇обимсе
съ ни́ми наслѣ́дїа въ вѣчнои ѡ҆но́и и҆ не
прѣхо́димои жи́зни . Бл҃г҇тїȣ и҆ще

► f. 21r – The text becomes completely illegible. On the next several sheets, only a few separate words are legible, due to the severely deteriorated status of the manuscript.

CHAPTER IV

CONTENTS AND TEXT OF THE SYNODICON FOR THE SUNDAY OF ORTHODOXY BASED ON THE DRINOV MANUSCRIPT (NBKM 432)

Section I
Contents of the Synodicon based on the Drinov manuscript

As mentioned before, in *BAR Ms. sl. 307* the Synodicon is part of the Triodion and is located at the first Sunday of Lent, the Sunday of Orthodoxy, while in the Drinov manuscript, it is placed in the context of sermons by Damascene Stoudite and other authors. In the present chapter, I shall present the contents and the text of the Bulgarian Synodicon from the Drinov manuscript. The text of this chapter will be structured in the same way as the presentation of the manuscript from the Romanian Academy in the previous one, and repetition will be inevitable. The folia numbers of the respective text in other witnesses will be indicated in brackets. The abbreviation "G. ll." refers to the Greek original based on the Jean Gouillard edition, together with the respective lines in his publication; "B" is the abbreviation for the manuscript from the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest.

1. The Drinov copy of the Synodicon also begins with a preamble, or introductory part to the work, which has been much better preserved than in B[1] (DRIN f. 184r-187v_8; B: ff. 2r-5v_{22}; G. ll. 1-107). I shall again point out that this is part of the original text of the Synodicon, from the time of the Macedonian dynasty. The text presents the doctrine regarding the holy images and is in fact a homily to be read on the Feast of Orthodoxy.

a) DRIN, f. 184r-186r_5 (B, f. 2r-4r_{14}; G. ll. 1-60) is the preamble.

b) DRIN, f. 186r_6-187v_8 (B, f. 4r_{14}-5v_{22}; G. ll. 61-108) – commemorations on theological topics.

---

[1] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 141-142; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 3-15, #1-9; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 93-106.

2. Diptychs[2] (DRIN, f. 187v$_{8}$-188r$_{18}$; B: ff. 5v$_{22}$–6v$_{15}$; G. ll. 108-133). These are commemorations of various fighters for Orthodoxy against the iconoclast heresy during the Second Iconoclastic Period (815-843). The text in red letters on f. 187v$_{14-15}$, regarding the right hand pointing a finger where the commemorations are placed, is missing from B, PAL, the published Greek text, and the printed Triodia. Here the inclusion of the commemoration of St. Andrew of Crete is worth noting (DRIN, f. 188r$_{8-9}$; BAR, Ms. sl. 307, f. 6r – the last two lines), since he is not mentioned in PAL[3], neither in the Greek text as published by Jean Gouillard[4], nor in the Serbian and East Slavic Synodica. The commemorations of the Holy Martyr and Confessor St. Stephen the Younger and of St. Theophanes are present in DRIN (f. 188r).

3. Anathemata[5] (DRIN f. 188r$_{19}$-191v$_{16}$; B: ff. 6v-10r$_{7}$; G. ll. 134-179). These anathemata are extensive presentations of theological ideas deemed heretical, and the adherents of which are anathemised. Most of them are closely connected with iconoclasm, i.e., they are related to Christology, the idea of the Incarnation and the admissibility of its depiction. This feature relates to the initial purpose of the Synodicon. The anathemata follow the traditional order in the Greek original of variant *M* and do not pose any special question. It is only at the end of this part of the Synodicon that the anathemata are specified for particular persons, and not aimed at theological ideas.

a) f. 188r$_{19}$-191v$_{4}$ – anathemata related to theological topics. The part placed on f.188r$_{19}$-189v$_{12}$ follows exactly the six anti-iconoclastic anathemata from the text's initial Greek variant *M*. The following six anathemata (DRIN f. 189v$_{12}$-191v$_{4}$) do not match the structure of the Greek text of variant M. They are missing in that place from PAL and from the Serbian Synodicon, but are present in exactly the same form in B (f. 8r$_{5}$-9v$_{16}$). In this respect, DRIN is exactly like B, as has already been explained in the previous chapter. The similarity is also true with regard to the misunderstanding about the first of these anathemata. In

[2] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 142-149; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 15-19 / # 10; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 106-108.

[3] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 107 (see the variations under line 20).

[4] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 53.

[5] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 149-153; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 21-33 / # 11-24; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 109-114.

the printed Synodica (Greek and Slavic), these texts also follow in this place, as they do in B and DRIN[6]. It is remarkable that the texts are repeated in DRIN on f. $197v_{4-17}$ and on f. $198r_{12}$-$199r_{21}$. This is obviously due to an interpolation in the text. It is important to note that the repeated part is identical in content but differs textually, which indicates that a different translation has been inserted there. In the printed Synodica (Greek and Slavic), the text is not repeated. In fact, the anathemata are present in the Greek original according to the manuscripts that form the content of the text published by Jean Gouillard, but there they are located in a different part of the Synodicon; in Jean Gouillard's edition the first is on G. ll. 391-403, and the other four, on G. ll. 435-471. These are anathemata pronounced in connexion with the condemnation of Eustratius of Nicaea and Soterichus Panteugenus on the topic of Christ's Sacrifice.

b) f. $191v_{4-16}$ – personal anathemata against the heretics Anastasius, Constantine, Nicethas, Theodotus, Antonius, John, Paul, Theodore Gastes, Stephen Molites, Theodore Crithinus, and Leo Laloudius, which fully coincide with the names in the Greek original of the Synodicon and with the lists in PAL and B, as well as with the Serbian and East Slavic lists.

4. Anathema against Gerontius of Lampé, which is considered to mark the beginning of the Comnenian variant of the Synodicon[7] (DRIN f. $191v_{16-21}$; B, f. $10r_{7-14}$; G. ll. 180-184).

The chapters against John Italus begin after this anathema both in DRIN and in B; this location matches the original Greek text. By contrast, in PAL, several anathemata borrowed from the decisions of the Seventh Ecumenical Council of Nicaea are placed after the one against Gerontius of Lampé and before the chapter concerning John Italus (G. ll. 752-762)[8]. The same texts are found in the Serbian Synodicon, followed by anathemata against the Babuns,

[6] Checked according to the Greek edition of the Triodion from 1586 and the Ruthenian edition from Lvov, 1664. – f. ρο̃εν-ρο̃sν.

[7] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 15, 21-22 (the anathema appears in some variants M as well, but is finally adopted in *C*), 186-187; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 33 / # 25; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 114.

[8] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 115 (f. 9v).

typical only for the western Balkans and for this variant of the Synodicon[9]. In Petukhov's edition of the Russian text, the anathema against the heretical doctrine of Gerontius of Lampé is followed immediately by an anathema against Constantine, the ex-metropolitan bishop of Kerkyra [10]. It is hardly significant, and yet worth mentioning, that in some copies, this heretic is called "George of Lampé", not "Gerontius": such is the case in PAL[11]. I believe this is due to an error in the text from which the translation was made, or a mistake in copying. In any case, it betrays little familiarity with the person in question.

5. The chapters against John Italus[12]. (DRIN f. 192r-194r_4; B, ff. 10r_{14}-12r_{20}; G. ll. 185-246). Present here, as in B, are all the anathemata against the doctrine of John Italus. Certain components and displacements are missing from PAL, indicating a different structure of the text[13]. It is notable that G. ll. 243-246 are missing from B, while in DRIN they are on f. 195v_{12-17}, rather than here, in their "proper" location. This is the personal anathema against John Italus; its omission is typical for the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon, except for variants *Pk* and *Py* (in Gouillard's classification)[14]. The anathema is present in PAL, which confirms its affiliation to variant C, according to the observations of the French scholar.

6. The anathema against the monk Nilus of Calabria[15] (in DRIN, the text occurs twice, on f. 194r_{4-6} and f. 195v_{18-19}; B, f. 12r_{20-22}; G. ll. 247-249). It is undoubtedly connected with the preceding anathema as the monk Nilus of Calabria was considered the spiritual successor of John Italus, having come, like his teacher, from southern Italy. The second citation of the anathema (DRIN f. 195v_{12-17}) follows immediately after the personal anathema against

---

[9] *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 492$_{57}$-493$_{71}$.
[10] Петухов, *Синодик*, p. 35.
[11] Божилов, Тотоманов, Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 114$_{12}$ (f. 9r_{12}).
[12] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 188-202; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 33-39 / #26-35; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 115-122
[13] See the table in Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 183.
[14] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 190-192 note 57; A. Rigo, « Un nouveau témoin du *Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie P* : le manuscrit de la Sainte-Trinité de Chalki 34 », p. 75, 79, 82 ; A. Rigo, « Il *Synodikon dell'Ortodossia* di Lavra », p. 261.
[15] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 202-206; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 39 / # 36; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 123.

John Italus (DRIN f. 195v_{18-19}). The trial against Nilus of Calabria was held before 1094, but after the condemnation of John Italus.

After this anathema, a relatively large passage (G. ll. 250-395) is missing – partially, as in B; I refer the reader to the discussion there. In this case, it was a text that had been adopted in the practice of some local churches. At first, Jean Gouillard writes that this was some unidentified metropolitan bishopric, and further on, that it was a bishopric suffragan to Athens[16]. The anathemata in part G. ll. 395-478 are located elsewhere (immediately before the anathema against the former metropolitan bishop of Kerkyra, Constantine of Bulgaria); this subject will be addressed further on in my presentation.

7. The first Synod regarding the discussion about "My Father is greater than I"[17] (DRIN f. 194r_6-195r_8; B, f. 12r_{23}-13v_3; PAL: it is missing here, but seems to have been included later, as there are missing pages between f. 18 and 19 of PAL, and this text continues on f. 19r_1-19v_9; G. ll. 472-509). The Greek text located on ll. 472-478 is absent from DRIN. The Greek text located on ll. 505-509 is present in B but in DRIN (f. 195r_{4-8}) it has been slightly altered – not all names of Fathers of the Church are mentioned, but only St. Athanasisus and St. Pope Leo[18].

8. Second Synod concerning the theological dispute regarding the quotation "My Father is greater than I"[19] (DRIN f. 195r_9-195v_{12}; B: ff. 13v_3–15r_{16}; G. ll. 517-571). It should be noted that the beginning of the original Greek text (G. ll. 510-516) is not present in PAL, DRIN, nor B. The part of the Synodicon devoted to this theological controversy can be divided into the following components:

a) the beginning of the main part (G. ll. 510-532). Here, the text presented in DRIN covers precisely this part.

[16] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 60, 62.

[17] М. Г. Попруженко, Синодик, p. 39-41 / # 37-41 DRIN.; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 134-136. For an overview of the entire theological discussion (and not only the First Synod), see: J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 216-226.

[18] Regarding these additions to the basic text of the Greek Synodicon, see: J. Gouillard "Synodikon", p. 76-77 note 291.

[19] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*,. p. 41-43 / # 42 with variations in the text; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 123, 136-141.

b) the part against the ex-metropolitan bishop of Kerkyra (Corfù) Constantine, nephew of the archbishop of Bulgaria (G. ll. 533-561). This part is located in a different place in DRIN (f. $199v_{1-20}$) and will be addressed in more detail after presenting the inserted parts.
c) the part against John Eirenicus (G. ll. 562-571). It is not present in DRIN, but, together with the other two above-mentioned parts, is present in PAL and B. The absence of the part about John Eirenicus from DRIN is due to missing sheets in the manuscript.

9. The personal anathema against John Italus, followed by one against the monk Nilus of Calabria, which is a repetition (DRIN f. $195v_{12-19}$; B omm., f. $12r_{20-22}$; PAL f. $13a_{14}$-$13v_{5}$; G. ll. 243-246, 248-249). It has already been said that the absence of a personal anathema against John Italus is typical for variant P of the Synodicon; hence, its presence here needs to be explained. I would not, for this reason alone, doubt the affiliation of DRIN to variant P, because it is not an insurmountable obstacle: the anathema in question is occasionally present in later variants as well, such as the mentioned Py, which is a compilation – J. Gouillard specially points to its relation with DRIN[20]. Moreover, it seems to me that the location of the anathema in a different place is relevant, especially considering that it precedes the repeated anathema against Nilus of Calabria. I believe that it can be asserted that this is a later interpolation into the text, which generally is based on variant *P*, borrowed from another copy, which may have belonged to variant *C.* This is relevant for the present study as it helps identify the Greek *Vorlage* of DRIN.

10. Anti-Bogomil anathemata (DRIN f. $195v_{19}$ – $197v_{3}$; B: omm.; PAL: f. $13v_{6}$-$16r_{3}$; the Greek original of the text is not found in the edition of the Synodicon but in the edition of the epistle of Patriarch Cosmas[21]) – regarding the dissemination of the heresy in the Bulgarian lands, against Priest Bogomil, and regarding certain practices. In DRIN, these anathemata are inserted immediately after the repeated anathema against Nilus of Calabria

[20] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 34-35 (see end of p. 35). As I already mentioned, following the observations of Jean Gouillard et Antonio Rigo, we have at least two manuscript copies of variant *P* that arrived to us, containing the personal anathema against John Italus.

[21] J. Gouillard, « Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril : la lettre inédite du Patriarche Cosmas », *Travaux et mémoires*, 4, 1970, p. 361-374. Sur ce texte v. Iv. Božilov in: Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 31-33.

and immediately before the anathemata against Eustratius of Nicaea. They originate from the epistle of Patriarch Cosmas to the Metropolitan of Larissa[22]. In Popruženko's edition, they are in the same place as in the manuscript, located there due to the normal course of the text and not because of missing or displaced sheets[23]. In the latest edition of the text, critically prepared and based on PAL, not on separate manuscripts, these components are located in the same place as in this older copy.

11. Anathemata against the doctrine of Eustratius of Nicaea and Soterichus Panteugenus regarding Christ's Sacrifice (DRIN f. $197v_4$-$199r_{21}$ end; corresponding with the text in DRIN is the Greek text on lines G. ll. 395-403 и 424-471; missing are the beginning of G. ll. 388-394 and texts for use by the Lacedaemonian Church and the eparchy suffragan to Athens – G. ll. 404-423). The whole Greek text of this section in Jean Gouillard's edition is on lines G. ll. 388-471, but there it combines the condemnation of the two doctrines and the texts in general use, with texts intended to be used in specific local churches. These are texts that were in common use in the diocese of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and texts used only in individual eparchies: 1) anathemata against Eustratius of Nicaea[24] (G. ll. 388-423), the first part of them was in common use, the second, was used in the Lacedaemonian Church, and the third, in the eparchy suffragan to Athens; 2) anathemata regarding the controversy with Soterichus Panteugenus about Christ's Sacrifice[25] (G. ll. 424-471), which were in common use. These texts occur in PAL and DRIN, not in the same place as in the Greek original (i.e., before the first Synod regarding the Gospel text "My Father is greater than I") but immediately before the anathema against the former metropolitan bishop of Kerkyra, Constantine[26].

---

[22] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 123-127 (text), 29ff (regarding the loans from the epistle of Patriarch Cosmas).

[23] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 43-47, # 43-60 DRIN.

[24] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 206-210; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 128-129.

[25] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 210-215; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 129-135.

[26] These chapters (G. ll. 395-471) are present in the Palauzov (ff. $16r_4$-$18v_{21}$, # 54-59, ibid, p. 128-133) and Drinov (ff. $197v_4$-$199r_{21}$, М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. 47-53, # 61-66) copies of the Synodicon.

12. Anathema against the former metropolitan bishop of Kerkyra, Constantine, nephew of the Archbishop of all Bulgaria, part of the second synod on the topic of the quotation "My Father is greater than I" (DRIN f. $199v_{1-20}$; G. ll. 537-558; the ending of the DRIN text is missing due to lost sheets – it ends with the equivalent of G. ll. 552).

A number of folia are missing at this place. It is probable that there was a text here regarding the condemnation of John Eirenicus, but it is lost. It is also probable that the text about the condemnation of Barlaam and Akindynos was here (also lost). The anathemata that follow have no counterpart in the Greek original of the Synodicon.

13. Anathemata against predominantly dualistic heresies (DRIN f. $200r_1$-$200v_2$; PAL, f. $24r_{13}$-$25r_8$).

14. Commemorations and anathemata against heretics, magicians, and others, which have no counterparts in the Greek original of the Synodicon (DRIN f. $200v_{2-21}$; PAL, f. $25r_9$-$25v_{17}$).

15. Proclamation (DRIN, f. $201r_{1-2}$; PAL, f. $25v_{18-19}$).

16. Commemorations of Roman emperors (DRIN, f. $201r_{3-16}$; PAL, f. 25v20-26v9; G. ll. 768-778, 801-809 partially).

17. Commemorations of empresses (DRIN f. $201r_{15}$-$201v_{15}$; PAL, f. $26v_{10-22}$; G. ll. 858-880 partially).

18. Commemorations of Bulgarian tsars and ecclesiastics (DRIN f. $201v_{16}$-$202v_2$; PAL, omm.)

18. A tale about the Council in Tărnovo of AD 1211 (DRIN, f. $202v_3$-$203v_4$; PAL, f. $28r_1$-$29r_4$).

19. Eulogies and commemorations of Bulgarian tsars and boyars (DRIN f. $203v_4$-$203v_{20}$; there are no precise parallels).

Section II
Text of the Synodicon based on the Drinov copy (NBKM 432)

In the present chapter, I offer a diplomatic edition of the text of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy according to the Drinov manuscript, No 432 from the Collection of the National Library Sts. Cyril and Methodius in Sofia. The structure of the text and the abbreviations are the same as in the presentation of manuscript B.

► f. 184r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 1-16; B, f. 2r-2v$_2$)

СЇИѠДИ҃ ПРѡЧиТАЄ҆ ВѢ ПрьВѫ҃ НЄ҆Л҃ П0҃Ты :

ѥ҆ Є҆ ѕстáвлен'но ѿ бг҃носны҃ ѿць н҃шй҃ ѡ҃ бл҃ ·: (in the right margin, under the line: вйкѡ҃)

Дльжноѥ къ бѫ҃ лѣпноѥ бл҃годарéнїе. въ нжѥ
дн҃ь въспр҃їехѡ҃ бжїю цр҃кѡ҃, съ ѕаконéнїѥ҃
бл҃гочт҃на прѣдàнїа. и҃ разорéнїѥ҃ злóбы злочт҃їа ·:
Пр҃҃чскый послѣдствующе г҃лѡ҃. àпл҃ьскымь же (in the right margin: ний҃)
вѣцан'ми приводúими. и҃ є҆г҃лскы҃ї҃ повѣда-
нїѥ҃ прилагающе се. Ѡбновлéнїа, дн҃ь праꙗ҃нѕѥ҃.
'Исаїà бо҃ ѕбо҃ р҃е҃, Ѡбнáвлѧти сѐ Ѡстровѡ҃ къ бѫ҃.
йжѐ ѿ ѣзы҃ї҃ нàвлѧѐ цр҃квы. сѫ҃ же цр҃квы не ѥ҆
хрáмѡ҃ прóсто ѕдáнїа и҃ свѣтлостѝи. нъ йже въ ний҃
бл҃гочт҃вы҃ испльнéнїе. и҃ имѝ҃ Ѡны҃ бг҃вы пѣнмї
и҆ славословленми ѕгажа҃ют. àпл҃ь же самоѐ сѐ҃
поѕчаѐ. въ Ѡбновленїи жизнѝ ходѝ҃ повелеваѐ҃.
и҃ àщѐ кто Ѡ х҃ѣ нова҃ тва́, Ѡбнавлѣет сѐ, гд҃на
же словесà. прр҃чкое нàвлѣюща ѕстрóенїе. бы҃ш҃
р҃е҃ Ѡбновáенїа въ їер҃л҃мѣ. и҃ зѝма бѣ. йлѝ мї-
сльнàа. въ нѭ҃ їѭдéйскы҃ ѣзы́кь на Ѡбцѝ҃аго сп҃а
ѕбїйúствнїе пѡ҃визаю҃ще ѕвре же и҃ съмѕщéнїа.
йлѝ҃ йже телеснàа чювствà въздѕшны҃ї҃ прѣложенїѥ҃.

► f. 184v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 16-29; B, f. 2v$_3$-3r$_5$)

на ст҃óдено҃ прѣтвараѐ. бы҃ ѕбо бы҃ и҃ на н҃à зúм҃
немала. нъ нàже по йсти́ велúкїе злóби ѝзлúваю҃
сѵровствò. нъ проц҆вте на҃ бл҃ты бжїе пр҃ѣлѣтно҃
пролѣ́тїе. въ нже бл҃годарéнїе êже ѿ бл҃гы҃ жетвѝ
бг҃овы съниДóхѡ҃ се сътвóрити. нàко да ѕбò р҃е҃ ѱалм҃..
Лѣ́то и҃ весн8 тѝ съ҆ѕà нà помѣни сїа ·: 'Ѳѝ ѕбò по-
носивший҃ г҃вы врáгы҃. и҃ сегò ст҃ое поклонéнїе
ѥ҆ въ ст҃ы҃ йкóна҃. Ѡбе҃чéстивший҃. възетѡ҃
же и҃ възви́шенно҃ би́вше҃ нечьстїѥ҃, нѝзвръже
си҃ йже чю́десе҃ бъ҃. и҃ ѿ шетанїа ѿстѕпна́го
въ пр҃ь нѝзложѝ. ни҃ бò прѣзрѣ гла҃ въпїющи҃ къ
немѕ ·: Помѣнѝ г҃и понóшенїе вра҃ твои҃. ѥ҆ съ- (in the left margin: вш҃)
др҃ь въ нѣдрѣ мое҃ мно́гы҃ ѣзы҃. йже поноси́ше (in the left margin: ний҃)

вразѝ твоѝ г҃и. е҃ поносѝше ѝзмѣненїе х҃а
твоего̀: Ѝзмѣненїе ꙋбо е҃ хв҃о, ѝже съм҃ти
е҃го ѝскꙋпленнѝ бившѐ. ѝ вѣровавше томꙋ,
ѝ слово проповѣданїа ѝ їкѡнны ѝзображенїе.
ѝмже великое съмотренїа дѣло, ѝзбавленнїи
познавает сѐ. кр҃тѡ же, ѝ ѝже прѣже кр҃та,
ѝ по кр҃тѣ ст҃ртмѝ ѝ чюсе. ѿ нѝ же ѝ е҃же того

► f. 185r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 29-43; B, f. $3r_6$-$3v_7$)
ст҃рте по҃бїе въ а҃плы, ѝ ѿтꙋ въ м҃ни прѣходѝ.
ѝ тѣмѝ даже до ѝсповѣдни ѝ п҃они нисходѝ:
Сѐ ꙋбо поношенїе ѝ посѝше (!) вра҃зи г҃ни. е҃ж
поносише ѝзмѣнїемь х҃а его̀. помѣнꙋ б҃ъ
нашь ѝже свои м҃рїемь ꙋм҃ле бивае. ѝ м҃рте-
ними е҃го м҃лбами прѣкланѣе. е҃ще ѝ а҃пльски
ѝ въсѣ ст҃ый ѝже съ нимь досажени бише. ѝ
съꙋничижише на ѝкона. да ꙗко пострàше
пльтїю сице ꙋбо ꙗко е҃ по҃бно. ѝ еже на
ч҃тнїе ѝкон҃и томꙋ съпрїѡбщет сѐ досаже-
нїе. сьдѣла послѣдѝ е҃га въсхотѣ д҃нь. ѝ
сьдѣа второ̀. ѝже врьши прьвѣе. прьвѣѐ
ꙋбо по мнол҃ѣнѣмь (!) нѣкое врѣмени ст҃ый
ѝконь ꙋничиженїа ѝ бесчестїа. възвра-
ти се бл҃гочтїе въ себе. н҃нꙗ е҃же е҃ вторoè
мало не въ три десете лѣтїи ѡзлобленїа.
съврьши недо҃тоинѝ на злолютныи свобо-
женїе. ѝ скрьбны ѝзбавленїе бл҃гочтїа
пакы проповѣданїа. ѝ ѝконнаго покла-
нѣнїа ꙋтврьженїа. ѝ ѝже въса приносещи

► f. 185v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 43-56; B, f. $3v_7$-$4r_6$)
на с҃пнїа пра҃зни съ. на ѝкона бо видѝ. е҃ на
ра вл҃чние ст҃ртѝ: Кр҃тъ. гробь. ада ꙋ- (in the left margin: вш)
мрьцьвлꙗема ѝ плѣнѣема̀. м҃ничьска
стра҃нїа. вѣнце самоѐ то̀ с҃пенїе. е҃же прь-
ви нашь по҃вигоположите. ѝ по҃вигода-
те҃. ѝ вѣнчатель посрѣ земле сьдѣла.

Сїє дн҃ⷭ҇ь трьжьство̀ праⷣꙁнꙋеⷨ. въсеⷨ мл҃тваⷨї (in the left margin: нⷤи)
и҆ мл҃енїеⷨ. въкоупе ве҃ⷭлеще҃ⷭ. и҆ съраⷣꙋюще се,
ѱлⸯми въꙁиваеⷨ и҆ пе҃ⷭнми: Кто҃ б҃ъ вел҃ⷦ ꙗко б҃ь (in the left margin: ве҃ⷧ гла҃ⷭ | до. г҃ⷲ.)
на́шь. г҃ⷲ. Ты̀ е҆сѝ б҃ъ наⷲ творей чюдеса еди҃ⷩ,
ѻ҆у҆корите҃ⷧ твоеѐ сла́вы, ꙋничижи҃ⷧ есѝ. смѣлѡ҆ⷷ
на твоѝ ѻ҆браꙁ и҆ дрьꙁостѝвїе҆. страшли́вїе
бѣжещиⷯ покаꙁаль е҆сѝ. нъ̀ ꙋбо̀ и҆же въ б҃а
бл҃годаре́нїе и҆ вѣⷣчнаа ꙗже на съпротиво́борниⷯ
побѣ́давїⷱ иⷯ. а҆̀ ꙗже на и҆ко́ноборⸯце по҃ⷣвиѕиⷤ
и҆ боре́нїа. дрꙋго сло́во, и҆ словописанїе про-
странⸯнѣи́шеѐ, ꙗвиⷮ ꙗко въ ꙋпокоениⷤ нѣкоеⷨ.
пꙋсти́ннѡⷨ прѣшьствыⷱ. въ ѿдрьжа́ни ми-
сльна і҆ера҃ⷭма бы̀вше. мѡѷсыискыⷨ нѣкыⷨ
по҃ⷣбїеⷨ. паче҃ⷤ бж҃ⷭтвныⷨ повелѣнїеⷨ. ꙗко̀же

► f. 186r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 56-72; B, f. $4r_6$-$4v_{10}$)
стльпꙋ нѣко́емꙋ ѿ вели́кїиⷯ каме҃ⷩ сътворе́нномꙋ.
и҆ къ по҃ⷣетїю писа́нїа ꙋправле́нномꙋ, братниⷨ
ср҃ⷣцамь бл҃госло́вленїа. ꙗже дльжна сꙋⷮ и҆же
ꙁако́нь хране́щеⷨ. и҆ клеⷮвы и҆ми́же се́бе ѿблоⷲжи.
и҆же ꙁа́кѡⷨ (!) прѣстꙋпаю́щѐи, праве҃ⷣно҃ⷤ и҆ дль́жно
непщевахѡⷨ написати. тѣⸯмже гл҃емⸯ си́це ⁖
Иж҃е пльтьскоѐ б҃а сло́ва прїшьствїе словѡⷨ, и ꙋсти, (in the right margin: въꙁгла҃ⷲ)
и҆ ꙋмѡⷨ писанїеⷨ же, и҆ и҆конамѝ и҆сповѣдꙋющиⷨ, вѣчна памет :~ (in the right margin, under the line: г҃ⷲ)
Вѣдещиⷨ х҃ва̀ е҆ди́ного и҆ то҃ⷢжⷣе съста҃ⷡ. е҆же въ сꙋщь-
ствѣⷯ раꙁвьствноѐ. и҆ то́го е҆же съⷣꙁанноѐ. и҆ и҆же нѐ-
съⷣꙁанноѐ. виⷣмое и҆ невиⷣмоѐ съмрт҃ное и҆ бесмрт҃но҆ⷷ.
о҆писанноѐ и҆ неѻ҆писанⸯное, и҆ бж҃ⷭтвномꙋ ꙋбо сꙋщⸯ-
ствꙋ. несъⷣꙁанⸯное и҆ семꙋ по҃ⷣбна прикла҃ⷣющїиⷨ.
чл҃ⷭчкмꙋⷤ е҃ⷭствꙋ и҆ и҆наа̀ и҆ ѻ҆писанно̀е и҆сповѣдаю́щиⷨ.
и҆ слово҃ⷨ и҆ ѻ҆бразⷬи вѣчна паме҃ⷮ ⁖ г҃ⷲ Вѣрꙋющїиⷨ
проповѣдꙋющїиⷨ сїире҃ⷡ бл҃говѣствꙋющїиⷨ. слове-
са въ пи́смене҃ⷯ. вещиⷤ въ ѻ҆браꙁеⷯ. и҆ въ еди́нꙋ о҆боиⷨ
съвршаа́ти се полⸯꙁꙋ гл҃ющїиⷨ. и҆же сло́вопроповѣ-

да́нїеⷨ. и҆ е́же ѻ҆бра́зѣ и҆́стинѣ и҆звѣще́нїе вѣ́чна памеⷮ҃ : г҃ⷳ.
"И҆́же сло́воⷨ ѻ҆свѣща́ющїиⷨ ѹ҆стнѝ. та же послѹща́тел҄

► f. 186v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 72-88; B, f. $4v_{10}$-$5r_{11}$)
сло́воⷨ вѣ́дещїиⷨ же и҆ пропоⷣвѣ́ющїиⷨ, ꙗ҆́ко чⷭ҇тниⷨⷶ
и҆кона́ми тако́жⷣе. ѻ҆свеща́ю́т се ѹ҆бо̀ ѻ҆́чи̑
зрѐщїиⷯ. възводи́т жеⷭ҇ тѣ́ми ѹ҆́мь къ бе҃зѹмїи,
ꙗ҆́коже и҆ бжⷭ҇твниⷨⷶ хра́мѝ. и҆ сщ҃енниⷨⷶ сѹдове,
и҆ и҆́нныⷨⷶ сщ҃енниⷨⷶ и҆ ст҃ыми съсѹди вѣ́чнаа̀ памеⷮ҃ ·: (in the left margin: г҃ⷳ)
Вѣ́дещиⷨ ꙗ҆́ко же́злъ и скри́жаⷧ҇. кивоⷮ҃ и҆ свѣщⷮ҃никⷦ҇,
и҆ тра́пеза. и҆ кадилⷩ҇ица. въсѐ ст҃ѹю пропи-
соваше и҆ проѻ҆бразо́ваше дв҃ѹ и҆ бцⷣѹ ма́рїю, и҆ ꙗⷦ҇
сїа проѻ҆бразо́вахѹ ѻ҆нѹ. нѐ быⷭ҇ же ѻ҆̑на сїа быⷭ҇ же
ѿроко́виⷰ, и҆ прѣбива́еⷮ҃ по бгⷪ҇роже́ни дв҃аа,
и҆ тоⷢ҇ раⷣ па́че ѿрокови́цѹ тѹ̀ и҆кона́ⷨⷶ пишѹщиⷨ.
и҆ ѻ҆бразова́нми сѣн҄но пи́шѹщиⷨ вѣ́чна па́меть :~ (in the left margin: г҃ⷳ)
"И҆́же прⷪ҇ⷭ҇ро́чкаа вⷣѣнїа. ꙗ҆коⷤ҇ само́е бжⷭ҇тво, сїа и҆ѡ҆́браⷥ..
и҆ проѻ҆бразоꙩва, вѣ́дещїиⷨ и҆ прїемлю́щїиⷨ, и҆ вѣрѹ-
ющїиⷨ ꙗ҆коⷤ҇ прⷪ҇ⷭ҇ркїи ли́кь вѣдѣ́ше и҆сповѣ́даше,
и҆ е́же а́плⷭ҇ы въ ѻ҆ц҃е достизаю̀щей, писанноеⷤ
и҆ ненеписанноⷭ҇е прѣданїеⷨ ѹ҆крѣплꙗ́ющїиⷨ. и҆ сеⷢ҇ раⷣ
ѻ҆бразѹ́ющїиⷨ ст҃аа и҆ почи́тающїиⷨ вѣ́чна па̀меⷮ :~ (in the left margin: г҃ⷳ)
Разѹмѣ́ющїи мѡѵ́се́ю гл҃ющѹ. вънемлите сеⷻ.
ꙗ҆ко въ дн҃ь въ нже гл҃а гⷬ҇ б҃ъ въ хоривѣ на горѣ глаⷭ҇,

► f. 187r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 88-101; B, f. $5r_{11}$-$5v_{12}$)
гл҃ы вы̀ слы́шасте. поⷣбїа́ же не ви́дѣте. и҆ вѣде-
щїиⷨ ѿвѣщати пра́вѣ. а҆́ще лиⷤ ви́дѣхѡⷨ чт҃ѡ
и҆́стиноюⷤ ви́дѣхѡⷨ, ꙗ҆коⷤ громоⷡ сн҃ь наⷭ҇ наѹчи̑ ·: (in the right margin: ви҃ⷲ)
"Є҆́же бѣ̀ и҆спрь́ва, е҆́же слы́шахѡⷨ. е҆̑же ѹ҆зрѣхѡⷨ. еⷤ
видѣхѡⷨ ѻ҆́чима наши́ма. и҆ рѹкы наше ѻ҆сеза́ше,
ѻ҆ сло́веси живо́тнѣⷨ, и҆ сїа̀ свѣ́теⷣлствѹемь :~
'И па́кы ꙗ҆коⷤ дрѹ́зы сло́ва ѹ҆че́ници. и҆ съ ниⷨ ꙗ҆́дохѡⷨ. (in the right margin: ни҃ⷤ.)
и҆ съ ниⷨ пи́хѡⷨ. нѐ прѣжⷣе стрⷭ҇ты тъкмо н҃ъ и҆ по̀
стрⷭ҇ти и҆ въскрⷭ҇нїи. и҆́же ѹ҆бо ра́зьнⷭ҇ствовати ѿ б҃а,
ѹ҆крѣ́пленныⷨ е҆̑же въ законѣ завѣща́нїеⷨ. нѐ же
въ блгⷣти ѹ҆че́нїе. и҆ е́же въ ѻ҆ноⷨ ѹ҆бо невиⷣмоѐ. въ-

се же и̑ вїмо и̑ ѻсе́жимѡ̀. и̑ се́го ра̑ видѣ́нна. и̑
ѻсѣзанна̀а, на и̑кона̑ пишѹ́щ҃е и̑ покланѣ́ющим҃ се
вѣ́чна па҃мѐ ·: г҃ вѣ́гла̑но ·: Прр҃ци ꙗ̑ко̑ видѣ́вш҃.
а̑пл҃ы ꙗ̑ко̑ на҆ѹ́чи́ше. цр҃квы ꙗ̑ко̑ пр҃ѣть, ѹчи-
теле ꙗ̑ко̑ пр҃ѣ́ш҃ѐ. въселе́нна ꙗ̑ко̑ съ еди́но
мѹдрьстве́ова. бла҃ть ꙗ̑ко̑ въсїа. и̑стїннаа̀
ꙗ̑ко̑ ѹказа́ се, лъ́жа ꙗ̑ко̑ прогна́на бы҃. пр҃ѣ-
мѹдро̑ ꙗ̑ко̑ дрьзнове́нїе пр҃їе̑. хс҃ ꙗ̑ко̑ пода̑,
си́це мѹдрьствѹ́҃е. си́це гл҃емь. си́це проповѣ́да҃е

► f. 187v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 101-116; B, f. 5v$_{12}$-6r$_{12}$)
хр҃а̑ и̑сти́нна́ ба҃ наше́го. и̑ т҃о̑ ст҃ыѣ̀: Въ словесѣ̀ по- (in the top margin: ни̑)
читаю҃щ҃е. въ писанны̑, въ разѹ́мѣнни̑, въ жрьтва̑
въ цр҃ква̑, въ и̑кѡ́на̑. ѿво́мѹ ѹбо̀ ꙗ̑ко ба҃ и̑ вл҃цѣ
покла̀нѩющ҃е сѐ и̑ четѹ́щ҃е. ѻвѣ̀ѣ ѿбщ҃а́го ра̑
вл҃кѹ. ꙗ̑ко того бли́жнеѣ раба́ы почетаю҃щ҃є
и̑ е̑же по любвѝ покланѣ́ніе въ҆а̑ющ҃е ·: ’Сы̀ вѣ́ра (in the left margin: въ҆а҃)
а̑пл҃каа. ’Сїѝ вѣ́ра ѿч҃ьскаа: сїѝ вѣ́ра правосла҃а̑нїѝ.
Сі҃ѝ вѣ́ра въселе́ннѹю ѹтврьдѝ: Къ сі҃́, и̑же бл҃го-
ч҃т҃їа проповѣ́ники, бра҃скы̑ и̑ ѡц҃ѣлюбе́но. въ
сла́вѹ и̑ ч҃т҃ь бл҃гочт҃їю ѻ нем҆же по҆виза́ше се,
въсхвалѣ́҃е и̑ гл҃емь: Гер’ма҃́, тара́сїю, никѵфо̀р҃ (in the left margin: ви҃, ма҃,)
і̑ мефо́дїю. и̑же и̑ст҆нною҆ а̑рхїереѡ҃ бж҃їи́. и̑ пра-
вославїа҃ забрала҃ѡ҃ и̑ ѹчителе́мь вѣ́чна̀а па҃мѐ. (in the left margin: г҃)
Възве́изаи̑ десною ръкою҆ и̑ показѹ́и прьствмь̀
по ѻбичаю҆ вѣ́чна̀а па҃мѐ ·: ~Игна́тїю, фо́тїю.
стефа́нѹ. а̑нто́нїю, и̑ нико́ла҃ ст҃е́и́шїим҃
и̑ православи́и҃ патрїа́рхѡ҃, вѣ́чнаа пам҃е́ть: г҃,
Въса ꙗ̑же на ст҃їе патрїа́рхїи. герм҃а́на, тара́сїа,
никѵфора. и̑ мефо́дїа, игна́тїа. фо́тїа. сте́фа̑,
а̑нфо́нїа, и̑ нико́ли, пи́санна҆ѧ̀ и̑ли гла҃нна҆ѧ̑ анате-
ма :~

► f. 188r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 116-135; B, f. 6r$_{12}$-6v$_{17}$)
Въса̀ ꙗ̑же чр҃е́зь цр҃ковна́го пр҃еда́нїа, и̑ ѹче́нїа
и̑ въѻбраже́нїа ст҃їи̑ и̑ пр҃инопомина́емїи̑ ст҃ы̑
ѡц҃ъ но́вовъве́нна҆а̑. и̑ли по сі҃ съдѣ́ѩти се

хоте́щаа҆́, а҆натема .г҃ⷳ. Стефа́нꙋ прѣпⷣ҇бнꙋ (in the right margin: вⷭ҇егла҃ⷭ)
мⷪ҇нкꙋ, и и҆сповⷣ҇ѣникꙋ вѣчнаа паме҃ⷮ ⁖ г҃ⷳ. Є҆ѵ҆ѳїмі́ю. Ѳеѡ́фі́лꙋ, (in the right margin: ни҃ⷤ)
и҆ е҆мїлїанꙋ. прⷭ҇нопоминаемиⷨ и҆сповⷣѣникѡⷨ вѣчна м҃ⷮ (!) ⁖ (in the right margin: г҃ⷳ)
Ѳе҆ѡфі́лактꙋ. петрꙋ. мѵ҆хаїлꙋ. і҆ѡсі́фꙋ. бл҃же-
ниⷨи мїтрополитѡⷨ. вѣчнаа̀ памеⷮ: А҆́дре̑ю (in the right margin: а҃)
прѣпⷣ҇бно мⷪ҇никꙋ и҆сповѣдни́кꙋ, и҆́же въ криⷮⷷ вѣчна̀ⷣ паⷨⷢ :~ (in the right margin: а҃)
І҆ѡа́нꙋ нико́лаꙋ, и҆ геѡ́ⷬгїю, трїбг҃атиⷨ и҆сповⷣѣни́-
кѡⷨ. і҆ а҆́рхїепⷭ҇кпѡⷨ. и҆ въсⷨ҇ѣ тѣмь е҆диномꙋдрь-
ствовавшиⷨ е҆пⷭ҇кѡпоⷨ вѣчнаа̀ паме́ть ⁖ (in the right margin: г҃ⷳ. вⷭ҇егл҃ⷭ.)
Ѳеѡⷣрꙋ въсепрѣпⷣ҇бно́мꙋ, и҆гемонꙋ стꙋди́ⷮскоⷨ, вѣчна̀ⷣ : (in the right margin: г҃)
І҆са́кїю чю҆дотворцꙋ і҆ѡа́нїкїю прⷪ҇рчьственомꙋ вѣчна̀ⷣ : (in the right margin: г҃ ни҃ⷤ)
И҆ла́рїѡнꙋ прѣпⷣ҇бномꙋ а҆рхима̀ндритꙋ и҆гꙋменꙋ
далмⷮ҇скомꙋ. вѣчнаа̀ паме҃ⷮ : Сѵ҆меѡ́нꙋ прѣпⷣ҇- (in the right margin: г҃)
бнѣи́шомꙋ стлъпникꙋ вѣчна̀ пама҃ⷮ ⁖ Ѳеѡ́фанꙋ (in the right margin: г҃)
прѣпⷣ҇бнѣи́шомꙋ и҆гꙋме́нꙋ велі́каго се́ла, вѣчна па҃ⷨ :~ (in the right margin: г҃ | ни҃ⷤ)
Сїа̀ ꙗ҆коⷤ бл҃гⷭ҇вленїа ѿчⷭ҇ка, на наⷭ҇ сн҃ы, ревнꙋю-
щи ⷯтѣ бл҃гочⷭ҇тїю прѣходеⷮ. такоⷤ и҆ клеⷮвы,

► f. 188v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 135-149; B, f. $6v_{18}$-$7r_{16}$)
ѿц҃едосадителе. и҆ влаⷣчны ⷯ заповѣди прѣзиратн
постизаю҆ⷮ, ⷨтѣ же ѡ҆б….ѣ въси̇. е҆ли́ко бл҃го-
чⷭ҇тїа и҆спльненїе …. сиⷨ клеⷮвꙋ. е̑и же̇ са́-
ми се́бе поⷣложи́ше принесеⷨ ⁖ И҆́же словоⷨ
ꙋбо̀ пльтьское̇ съмо́тренїе б҃а сло́ва прїе́-
млющїиⷯ. зрѣти́ жеⷭ на и҆конаⷯ не трьпещиⷯ
и҆ се́го раⷣ г҃лн ꙋбо̀ при́имати̇ ѡ҆бразꙋющииⷯ,
и҆ ве́щїю же сⷭ҇пенїа наше́го ѿмѣтаю҆́щїиⷯ се.
а҆на́ѳема ⁖ И҆́же г҃лꙋ неѡ҆писа́ннаго зле̇ (in the left margin: г҃ⷳ)
прилагающиⷯ се. и҆ сего раⷣ не хоте́щииⷯ на
и҆конаⷯ писати. и҆же прїи́скрьннѡⷨ наⷨ пльти
и҆ крьви̇ при̇ѡ҆бщив҇шаго се хⷭ҇а и҆стинна б҃а на-
шего. и҆ ѿсꙋⷣ мьчтатели покаꙁꙋющиⷯ се ана̀-

ѳема̀ ⁖ Иже про҇рчскаа̀ ѹбо видѣнїа. а҇ще и не (in the left margin: г҇)
хотеть прїемлю́щїи҇. ꙗвле́нна̀ ꙗ҆же си҇м
ѡбразова́нїа ѿ чю́деси. и҇ прѣже҇ въплъще-
нїа сло́ва, не прїе́млющїи҇. н҇ъ и҇ли самоѐ
то̀ непости́жное и҆ неви҇мое сѹщьство̀;
ꙗ҆вити се видѣвши҇, тьщесловѹю҇, и҆ли҇ ѡбра-
з… сїа и҇стинны. и҇ н҇зьѡбраже́нїа ꙗвити се

► f. 189r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 149-162; B, f. $7r_{16}$-$7v_{16}$)
зрещи҇. съслагаю́щи҇ се. ѡбрази҇ написовати въчл҇вѣ-
чившаго се слова. и҇ ежѐ ѿ на҇ то́го стр҇ти, непр-
ѣмлющи҇ а҇наѳема: г҇ Иже слы́шещи г҇а ꙗк҇ а҇ще
вѣро́вали бы́сте мѡ҆ѵ҇сеѡ҆вы. вѣровали ѹбо бы-
сте мн҇ѣ, и҇ прочѐе. и҇ ежѐ про҇рка ва҇ въздвигнѣ҇,
г҇ъ б҇ъ нашь ꙗко ме́не, мѡ҆ѵ҇сею гл҇юща разѹ-
мѣющїи҇. та же гл҇ю прїе́ти ѹб҇о про҇рка
бл҇ть. и҇ въсемирноѐ сп҇енїе. ꙗ҆ко видѣнь
бы҇ ꙗко съвлъ́кы поживе. ꙗко стр҇ти и҇ недѹги.
и҇сцѣле́нїа вещи҇ши҇, и҇сцѣли. ꙗко распе́т се.
ꙗко погребе́нь бы҇, ꙗко, въскр҇е, ꙗко въса̀
за ны̏ пострa҇ и҇ сътво́ри. и҇же ѹ҆бо̀ сїа̀ въсѐ-
мирнаго сп҇енїа дѣла. на и҇кона҇ зрѣти не
трьпещи҇ и не поклающи҇ (!) се сїи҇ а҇наѳема ⁖ г҇
Прѣбивающи҇ въ и҇ко́ноборско҇и ѣресї. паче҇
хр҇тоборно́мѹ ѿстѹплени. и҆ ни моѵ҇сеискы҇
зако́ноположенїе҇. къ сп҇енїю своѐмѹ въ-
звести хотещи҇. нѝ а҇пл҇кы́ми ѹчен҇ми
ѡ҆блит҇ати се бл҇гочт҇иимь произволещи҇. нѝ
же ѿчьскы́ми поѹчен҇ми настàвлѣе́мїи̇

► f. 189v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 162-170, Попруженко, p. 18-19 §16, 395-396; B, f. $7v_{16}$-$8r_{14}$)
прѣльсти своеѐ ѿвратити се. покарающии҇
ни же съгл҇сию ѣже по въсей въселеннѣи цр҇кв
б҇жїи. повинѹющи҇ се. нь ѣдиноѭ се́бе їѹде́н-
ской, и҇ елин҇ской че́сти п҇ложьши҇ ꙗже бо̀
непоср҇ѣствнѣ ѡнѝ на прьвоѡбра́зное хѹле҇

и̑ есѝ се́го ѻбразо́̾, въ самоѐ то̀ ѻбразѹемое
дрьзо́сти не сти́дет сѐ. и̑же ѕбо невъзвр̀-
тнѣ прѣль́стїю сею̀ съдрьжимїи̑. ѝ къ въ-
сакомѹ слове́си бж҃твно́мѹ и̑ дх҃овномѹ̆
ѵче́нїю ѕши зать́кнѹвшѝ. ꙗко ѹже про-
чее съгнивши̑. и̑ ѻбща́го тѣлесе цр҃квна̑.
и̑ ѿсѣкшѝ се́бе ана҆ѳема ·: а҃· Въводещѝ
ѻ неи̑ ре́нно́мѹ плътьскомѹ съмотре́нїє.
гс҃ ба҃ и̑ сп҃а нашѐ і҃с х҃а҃. тъщеглїа нѣка́,
и̑ глю҃щїи̑ и̑лѝ мѹдрьствѹю҃щѝ, покланѣ-
ти се чл҃тво х҃ѵ̀. непри́ст҃пно́мѹ бж҃т-
ѵ̀ рабскы̀. и̑ рабо́тѹ пр҃носѧщною̀ и̑мѣтѝ.
ꙗко соу҆ществнѹ и̑ нео҃ложнѹ ана҆темà:
Иже не въсакїи̑ говѣнїѐ прїемлющїи̑. е̑же по
промишленїю ра҆зрѣленїе къ ꙗвленїю,

► f. 190r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 396-403, 435-441; B, f. 8r$_{14}$-8v$_{13}$)
тѣ́чїю таи́нства и̑же въ х҃а҃ съте́кшѝ се нѐ-
и̑зре́нно̀ дво҃ю е҃ствѹ. и̑ въ нѐ несъліанно и̑ не-
ра҆зрѣ́лно съвъкѹпльшѝ се. и̑ъ злѣ прїе́млю-
щихь таковое ра҆зрѣле́нїе. и̑ глю҃щиѝ прїе-
тїе нѐ е҃т҃вомь тѣ́чїю и̑но̀. и̑ъ и̑ сано̀, ꙗко
слѹжи́ти бг҃и. и̑ слѹжи́н…ие прино́сеть
рабскò. и̑ чт҃ь по҃бною ра҆зае҃ть ꙗко дльгь,
ꙗкѡ̀ слѹжебни дѹ́си, и̑же бг҃и работаю́ще
слѹжещеѝ рабскы. и҆ ѻсѡ̀ прїетїе. а҆рхїе́рѣ
велика би́ти ѵчи́тель. а҆ не ба҃ сло́ва ꙗко
би҃ чл҃кь. ꙗко си́цевы̀ е҆дино́го х҃а҃. гс҃ нашѐ,
и̑ ба҃ ра҆зрѣшѣти дрьзающѝ по съставѹ ана҆ѳемѣ̀ :~
Глю҃щѝ ꙗкѡ̀ въ вр҃ме миросп҃ителнїе ст҃ѣ
гс҃ и̑ ба҃ и̑ сп҃а ш҃его і҃с х҃а҃ прине́сенною̀ ѻ нашѐ
сп҃ени ѿ не́го жрь́твѹ. ч҃тнаго его̀ тѣла и̑
крь́ве. ꙗко а҆рхїерею по чл҃чскомѹ на҃ ра҆ди
бившо́мѹ ѕбо̀ тьже̑ и̑ бг҃ъ жрь҃ и̑ жрьтва,
по великомѹ въ бг҃ословнѣ григо́рїю. при́не
не ѕбо тъ̀ и̑ бг҃ и̑ ѻц҃ѹ. нѐ прїет же ꙗко бг҃ъ
съ ѡц҃е́мь. тъ̀ са҃ е҆ди́нородънѣ. и̑ дх҃ь ст҃ыи,

► f. 190v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 441-454; B, f. $8v_{13}$-$9r_{11}$)
ꙗко си́ми ѿтѹжⷶаюци҃ самогⷪ҇ ба҃ сло́ва. и҆
є҆ди́носѹ́щнаго, и҆ єди́нославнаго семѹ ѹтѣ-
шите́лꙗ дх҃а. бг҃опо҆́бнаго є҆диночⷭ҇тїа же
дⷪ҇стойнста (!) а҆на҆ѳⷨе҇ ⁖ Иже на къжⷣоприно- (in the left margin: ⷲ҇г)
симоѝ жрьтвѹ, ѿ прѣемши҃ ѿ хⷭ҇а. бжⷭ҇тних҃
таиⷩ҇ сщ҃енноде́иства. не прїемлю́щїи҃
ст҃ѣи трⷪ҇ицїи прино́сити се. ꙗко съпротиⷡ҇
вѣщаю́щи҃ ѿсѣ҃ сщ҃енн҃ы и҆ бжⷭ҇твниⷨ ѿцеⷨ҇.
васїлїю же и҆ златогл҃ывѡⷨ, и҆мже съглашаюⷮ҇
и҆ про́чїи бг҃оносны ѿц҃и. въ своиⷯ҇ словесеⷯ҇
же и҆ съписанн҃ы а҆на҆ѳⷨе҇ ⁖ Иже̑ слы́шещи҃ ѹбо
и҆ еже̑ ѿ тоⷢ҇ прѣда́ннаго. бжⷭ҇твн҃ы таиⷩ҇ сщ҃е-
нноде́иства. гл҃ющѹ се҃ творите въ мое
въспоми́нанїе. не прїемлю́щи҃ же правѣ
въспоми́нанїе. нъ дрьза́ющїи҃ гл҃ати,
ꙗко пона́влѣеть мьчта́телно и҆ ѡбразно̀,
є҆же на чⷭ҇тнеⷨ крⷭ҇тѣ ѿ сп҃а нашего̀ принесе-
нною жрьтвѣ. своеⷢ҇ тѣле же и҆ крⷡ҇ь. въ
ѡбщѹю чл҃чкаго є҆ⷭ҇тва и҆збавѹ же и҆ ѡцѣ-
щенїе. ꙗже на къжⷣо дн҃ь прино́сима жртва.

► f. 191r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 454-469; B, f. $9r_{12}$-$9v_{12}$)
ѿ и҆же бжⷭ҇твнаꙗ сщ҃еннодѣ́иствѹющи҃ таи́н-
ства, ꙗкоⷤ҇ сп҃ь на́шь и҆ вл҃ка въсѣ прѣдаⷭ҇ и҆ сеⷢ҇.
раⷣ҇ и҆нѹ бы́ти сїю ѿ и҆же и҆ зачела сп҃омь съвр-
шенїе възводеⷮ҇. и҆ къ ѡнѡⷨ мьчтателно и҆ ѡ-
бразно възно́симѣ. ꙗко и҆сть́щающи҃, є҆же
страшнаⷢ҇ и҆ бжⷭ҇твнаго сщ҃еннодѣ́иства таиⷩ҇-
ство. и҆мже̑ бжⷭ҇твнїе жи́зни зало̀ прїемлеⷨ҇.
и҆ сїа̀ бжⷭ҇твно́мѹ ѡц҃ѹ наше́мѹ, і҆ѡаннѹ прѣмⷹ҇-
дромѹ и҆ златогл҃ивомѹ и҆з꙼ꙗснѣю́щѹ
є҆же жрьтвы непрѣмѣнное. въ многы҃ вели-
каго павла гл҃еⷯ҇ тльковани а҆на҆ѳе́ма :~ (in the right margin: г҃)
Иже врѣменнаꙗ растоа́нїа ѡ прїмирени члвч-
скаго є҆ⷭ҇тва, къ бжⷭ҇твномѹ и҆ бл҃женномѹ є҆ⷭ҇твѹ.
живона́чел꙼нїе и҆ въсенетлѣн꙼нїе трⷪ҇ице, ѹми-

шлѣющи҃й и҆ пр҃ївъводещи҃й. и҆ пр҃ьвѣе ѕ҆бо единоро҆̀номѕ с҃ ⊙ц҃вѕ҃ зако́нополагаю҆̀. ѿ само́го пр҃и҃-
т се на҆̀ пре́тнаа. послѣди же б҃ѕ҃ и҆ ѿц҃ѕ҃ и҆ въ с҃по҆́
ст҃р҃ти с҃па̀ х҃а̀. и҆ раздѣлнаю҆̀ нераз҃ѣлна҆̀на҆̀, бж҃т-
вни҃ и҆ бл҃жнны҃ѧ ѿц҃е҆̀. съмотре́нїа таи҆н҆ствѡ҆̀
въсако, прими҆̀ на҆̀ сѐ ѥ҆ди́норо҆̀номъ҆̀, ѕ҆вещи҃,

► f. 191v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 469-471, 171-183; B, f. 9v$_{13}$-10r$_{14}$)
и҆ собою҆̀ и҆ въсѐ б҃ѕ҃ и҆ ѿц҃ѕ҃. послѣдова́телно҆̀
въсакоѝ пр҃ѣст҃мѕ и҆ живо́творе́щомѕ дх҃ѕ҃.
нако тѣщїи҃ и҆ска́нїи и҆ непо҆̀бны҃ѧ ⊙бр҃ѣтателѧ̀,
а҆на҆ѳе҆̀ ·: ⁘Ана́сѳасїа. ко́стан҆дїа, и҆ никита (in the left margin: г҃)
и҆же пр҃и҃ савр҃ѣ начелѧ̀ствѕвѧ̆щи҃й ѥ҆ресмѝ. нако
нѐ сц҃е҆нны҃ѧ .. и҆на, и҆ наставни҃ погибѣлиѝ
а҆на҆ѳе҆̀ ·: ⁘ѳеѡ҆̀та ан҆ѳо́нїа. і҆ѡа҆̀, и҆же дрѕгь (in the left margin: г)
дрѣ́гѕ ходатае҆̀ злы҃ѧ. и҆ дрѣ҆ дрѕга пр҃їемни́к
злочт҃їю а҆на҆ѳе҆̀ ·: Павла҆̀ и҆же въ савла҆̀ ѡ҆вра- (in the left margin: г҃)
ш҆аго сѐ, и҆ ѳеѡ҆̀ра нарицаѐмагѡ́ га́ста. и҆
стефана моли́та. е҆ще҆̀ и҆ ѳеѡ҆̀ра крити́на.
и҆ лалѕдїа леѡ́нда. и҆ къ си҃ а҆ще кт҃о ре҆̀нни҃
по҆̀бнь злоѝчт҃їемь. какова́ любо а҆ще бѕдет҃
пр҃ѝчта, съсло́вїа, и҆ли сана коегѡ̀, и҆ли начи-
нанїе проходе, си҃ въсѣ̀ пр҃ѣбивающи҃й въ
своѐ злоѝчты а҆на҆ѳе҆̀: Геро́ндїа, и҆же ѿ ла҆̀бѝ… (in the left margin: г҃)
ѕ҆бо сѕща. въ критѣ же ѩ҆̀дь мрскїе ѥ҆реси
и҆зблю́ва҆̀ша, и҆ помазан҆ника сѐ нарек҆̀ша
на възра҆̀женїе ѕ҆вѝ с҃пнаго съмотренїа хв҃а.
съ развращенни҃ѧ т҃о пр҃ѣданмѝ, и҆ съписанмї,
и҆ ѥ҆диномѕдрьники ѥ҆го. а҆на҆ѳема ·: (in the left margin: г҃)

► f. 192r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 185-197; B, f. 10r$_{14}$-10v$_{14}$)
⁘Иже ѿнѕ҃ начинаю҆̆щи҃й но́во нѣкоѐ и҆ска́нїе
и҆ ѕче́нїе, нѐи҆зр҃ен҆нѡмѕ пль҃тьскомѕ съмотре-
нїю. с҃па нашегоѝ и҆ б҃а привъводи҃. и҆ и҆скати
кои҃ ⊙бра́зѡ҆̀ тъ б҃ъ сло́во, чл҃вѣческо́мѕ
въмѣше́нїю пр҃їеди́ни сѐ и҆ пр҃їетноѝ пль҃
по коѐмѕ сло́вѕ ⊙б҃жи. и҆ словеси стезат҃е-

нимѝ. є҃ствꙋ и̑ положе́нїе, ѻ̑ и̑же паче є҃стѣ̀
съѣди́ненїа двоѭ̀ є҃ствꙋ ба҃ и̑ чл҃ка слово
тѣ́ бити покꙋшаю́щїй се а҆на҃ма :~ ˜Иже
бл҃гочт҃вовати ꙁбо̀ ѻ̑бещавающи̑ се. є҆лиѝ-
скаѧ̀ же злочт҃ываѧ̀ прѣда́нїа, православ҃-
нѣи и̑ съборнѣи цр҃квы, ѻ̑ дш҃а҃ чл҃чкы̑, и̑ нб҃ы
и̑ землѝ. и̑ны̑ зданїи. бестꙋднѣ и̑ли паче
нечт҃ивѣ привъводещї̑ а҆на҃ма ·: ˜Иже бꙋю̀ (in the right margin: ҂ а҃)
вънѣшны̑ любомꙋдре̑. гл҃емꙋю прѣмꙋдрѻ̑ пр҃ѣ-
почитаю́щи̑ и̑ наставникѡ̑ тѣ̀ послѣдꙋющи̑.
и̑ прѣхожєнїе бити чл҃чкы̑ дш҃а҃. въ и̑наа̀ живо́-
наа. и̑ли по҃бнѣ бесло́весны̑ животны̑ симь
погиба́ти. и̑ въ небѝтїе ѡ҃ходити прїемлю́щи̑
и̑ сѝ въскр҃енїе и̑ сꙋ̀ и̑ коньчноѥ̀ пожившѝ
въз҃анїе ѡ҃мѣтающи̑ а҆на҆ема :~

► f. 192v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 198-210; B, f. 10v$_{15}$-11r$_{14}$)
˜Иже ве́щь безначе́лнꙋ и̑ вид҃ове. и̑ събезна́че-
челнꙋ (!) съдѣтелю и̑ бг҃ꙋ, ꙁчеть. ꙗ҆ко ꙁбо нб҃о
и̑ землѣ, и̑ прочаа̀ з҃а҃нїа пр҃носꙋщна҃ сꙋ̀ и̑ бе-
значе́ѧна и̑ прѣби́ваю̀ неиꙁмѣнна. и̑ сꙋпро-
тивь зако́ноположаю̀ рекѣ́шомꙋ̑. нб҃о и̑
землѣ ми́моидѣ̀ словеса҃ моа не мимоидꙋ̀
и̑ безꙋмно́ тьщегл҃ꙋю. и̑ бж҃тною̀ клѣ́вꙋ
на своѥ̀ приводѣ̀ главы а҆на́ѳемѣ̀ ·∴ Гл҃ющї̑ (in the left margin: а҃)
ꙗ҆ко елиѝнсци прѣмꙋдрьци. и̑ прьвїе р҃е̑ на-
челѧникѡ̑. и̑ иже ѡ҃ седмѝ ст҃ы̑ и̑ въселенскѝ
съборь. и̑ ѡ҃ въсѣ̀ и̑же въ пра́вослáвы вѣрѣ.
просїаве́шѝ ѡ҃ц҃ъ. проклетїю прѣдани биш̑
ꙗ҆ко тѫ́жи събо́рнїе цр҃квы. за еже въ сло-
весѣ̀ тѣ̀ мрьзо́стна и̑ скврьнна и̑ꙁ рѣди́ тѣ̀…
…лꙋш҆ши сѣ̀ по мно́гꙋ и̑ ҃е, и̑ въ вѣ̑цемꙋ сѣ̀,
бл҃гочт҃вы̑ же ꙁбо̀ и̑ правосла́вны̑ мѫжѝ,
и̑нако́ же по ст҃ры чл҃чкоѝ и̑ли не вѣны
съгрѣшивши̑ ана́ѳема ·: ˜Иже съ вѣрою и̑ чт҃ïю (in the left margin: а҃)
простѡ̑ и̑ въседꙋшнѡ̑ с҃рцемь ꙗ҆ ст҃па наше̑
и бг҃а, и̑ прѣт҃ѣи тѡ̑ рожьшои вл҃чце нш҃е и̑ ц҃є҃ (in the left margin: чт҃ъ́й)

► f. 193r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 210-224; B, f. $11r_{14}$-$11v_{13}$)
и̂ про́чїи ст҃ы́и. и̂зре́нїѧ҆ чюде́са не прїе́млю-
щи́и. нъ и̂ ꙗ҆дещи́и се ꙗ҆ка́зи и слове́си ꙗ҆хищ҃р-
нними. ꙗ҆ко немощно ⷭ҆бле́гати. и̂ли по
своемꙋ мн҃ѣнїю разврацати тлькова-
нїе҃. и̂ по сво́е́м҃ нр҃а҃вꙋ съставлѣти а҆на҆ѳе́ма ·: (in the right margin: а҃.)
᷾Иже е҆лиⷭ҆скаѧ҆ проходе́щїи ꙗ҆че́нїа. и не за на-
казанїа ра᷿҃ сими наказꙋемꙋ҃. нъ и̂ слава҃ и̂х҆
свѣтни́и послѣдꙋ́ющи́и. и̂ ꙗ҆ко и̂стинно҃
вѣрующи́и. и̂ тако тѣмѝ ꙗ҆ко и̂звѣстно҆ и̂-
мꙋщи́и прилежещи́и, ꙗ҆коже и̂нїе, ⷭ҆вое҆а
ꙗбо таи̂. ⷭ҆вое҆а же ꙗ҆вленна҆ въздводити
на сїе, и̂ ꙗчи́ти несꙋ́мено а҆на҆ѳе́ма :~ (in the right margin: а҃)
᷾Иже сн҃ни́ми и̂ бесни́ми бледмѝ. ѿ сѐ҆ и̂ е҆́ же҆ на
на҆ зна҆нїе прѣтва́ра҆ю҃. и̂ плато҆́ска҆ѧ҆ съписа-
нїа҆. ꙗ҆ко и҆́стин҃на прїемлю́щи́и. и̂ ꙗ҆ко са-
мосъставною҆ вещь ѿ вид҆ѣ҃ въⷭ҆бразо́ити се
гл҃ю҃, и̂ ꙗ҆вленнѣ ⷭ҆бльга҆ю҃, самовластноѐ
съдѣтелѣ. и̂же ѿ небитїа въ би́тїе прїѣ́шо-
мꙋ въса҆ ч҃ка҆а҃. и̂ ꙗ҆ко творцꙋ въс҆ѣ҃, на҆́ло и̂
конець положи́вшомꙋ҃ власнѣ и̂ ва҆́чкы а҆на҆ма :~

► f. 193v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 225-239; B, f. $11v_{13}$-$12r_{14}$)
Гл҃ющи́и ꙗ҆ко въса҆ ко҆́нчнꙋ҃ и̂ ⷭ҆бщени́е҃ въ-
ск҃ренїе, съ и̂нѣмѝ тѣлесѝ чл҃щїи въск҃рнꙋ
и̂ сꙋди́ми бꙋ́ть, а҆ не съ и̂ми҃ въсе҃ жи́ти пожи́и,
занѐ си́ расталѣва́емо҃ и̂ погибающи́мь. и̂ бле-
дꙋ҃ тьща и̂ сꙋе́тна҆. само́мꙋ. х҃ꙋ и̂ бг҃ нашемꙋ҃ и̂ ꙋ-
ченико҃ его и̂ ꙋчите҃м же ꙗ҆ши́и. си́це наꙋчивши́и, ꙗ҆ко
съ и̂ми҃ пожи́ше чл҃щїи тѣле́си съ тѣмѝ и҆
сꙋдими бꙋ́ть, и̂ ещѐ҆ и̂ вели́комꙋ а҆пл҃ꙋ па́вл҃ъ
ꙗ҆вестꙋ́внѣи же ѿ въск҃ренїи словѣ, простра-
ннѣише прїтча҃ᵀᵀ ⁿ исти́нꙋ наꙋчивше́ꙋ. и̂ и̂нако
мꙋдрьствꙋ́ющїи, ꙗ҆ко безꙋмнѣ ⷭ҆бичивше
и̂же ꙋбо́ си́цевы́ сꙋпроти҃ зако́нь полагающи́и
прѣданї́е҃ и̂ ꙋченї́е҃ а҆на҆ѳе́ма ·: Прїемлющи́и и̂ (in the left margin: а҃)
прѣдающїи свѣтна҆ѧ҆ и̂ е҆лиⷭ҆ска҆ѧ҆ бле́нїѧ҆,

ꙗко 8бо пр҃ѣбытїе є҆̀ дш҃а̀. а҆ не ѿ несщи҆̀
въса бише и҆ прїве́дошѥ̀. и҆ ꙗко конць є҆̀ мщ҃ъ,
и҆ 8стамене́нїе паки твари, и҆ чл҃чки҆̀ вещ҃ѐ
и҆ сице́вими словесѝ. ц҃р҃тво бн҃ое раз҃8шаемѡ (!)
въсако и҆ прѣходимо въводѣ̀. є҆же вѣчно и҆ нераз҃р҃8-
шаемѡ̀ са҆̀ 8бо х҃с҃̀ бъ̀ на҆̀ 8чи и҆ прѣда̀. и҆ въсѣмь,

► f. 194r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 239-242, 248-249, 479-490; B, f. 12r$_{14}$-12v$_{16}$)
вет҆хїми и҆ новѝ писанїе҆̀ мѝ прѣехѡ̀, ꙗко и҆ м8ка
бесконе҆чна, и҆ ц҃р҃тво пр҃нос8щно̀, сицевимѝ
слове́си самъ̀ се́бе пог8блѣющїѝ. и҆ др8гїиѝ
вѣчном8 ходатаѐ бив҆шѝ. ана҆̂ма ·҃· На8ченно҆̀ (in the right margin: а҆̃)
бившѥ̀ ѿ ино́ка ни́ла и҆ въсъ̀ прїѡбщ҃а́ющ҃и҆ се
тѣ̀ ана҆̂ма ·҃· г҃. ˜Иже не правъ̀ ст҃ы҆̀ на8чите҆̂
бж҃їе цр҃квы. бж҃тв҃нїе гла́си прїемлющ҃и҆. и҆
ꙗже ꙗвѣ и҆ изы҆ꙗ҆́влене́нно въ ни҆̀. ст҃го дх҃а бл҃тїю
р҃е҆̂ннаѧ҆̂ кри́во сказоватѝ и҆ развращати н8дещ҃и҆̀ ана҆̂м ·~
Прїемлю́щ҃їѝ и҆стин҃наго ба҃ г҃а и҆ сп҃а нашего, (in the right margin: г҃)
ї҃н҃ хр҃а гла҆̂ є҆же ѿц҃ь мои҆̀ болѝ мене є҆̂, гла҃ти҆̂ съ про-
чїими тльковањ҃ѝ ст҃и҆̀ ѿц҃ь и҆ по и́же въ нем҃̀
чл҃ч҃твѣ. по є҆м8же и҆ постра҆̂ ꙗкѡ҃ ꙗвественно въ
многы҆̀ бг҃одьхно́венны҆̀ словесѣ҆̀ и҆̀. ст҃ы ѡц҃и
проповѣд8ють. є҆щ҃е҆̀ и҆ гл҃ющ҃їѝ. тогоже҆̂ хр҃а
по пльти своеѝ постра҆̂ти. вѣчнаа҆̀ пам҃е҆̂ ·҃· (in the right margin: г҃,)
Помишлѣ҆ю́щ҃їѝ и҆ вещающ҃и҆̀. ⷭбоженїа прїетїа.
прѣложенїа чл҃ч҃каго є҆̂ства въ бж҃тво. а҆ не
м8дрьств8ющ҃їѝ, ѿ самого съединенїа бж҃тв҃н-
го 8бо̀ до҆̂тои́нства и҆ величества, причестити се

► f. 194v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 490-502; B, f. 12v$_{16}$-13r$_{15}$)
тѣле́си гн҃ю. и҆ покла҆нѣ́ти се є҆̂динѣмь покл҆̀-
нѣнї҆́е. въ въспрїемшѝ то̀ бз҃ѣ сло́вѣ и҆ би́тїе
є҆̂ди́ночт҃но. вък8посла́вн8, жи́вотво́рно.
равносла́вно б8 и҆ ѡц8 и҆ ст҃м8 дх҃8. и҆ вък8по-
прѣстоло́но. а҆ не 8бо би́ти є҆̂ди́нос8щн8 б8,
ꙗко ѿст8питѝ є҆̂ствны҆̀ свои́ствь. є҆же съ-
ѯ҆̂ннаго. є҆же ѿ писан҃наго. и҆ про́чїи҆̀ иже.

въ члчкѡ̑ є̑ствѣ хр̑товѣ зрїмы̑. пр̑ѣствпити̑,
и̑ въ бж̑тва сѫщьствѡ҆ ѭко ѿ сего̀ въводи́ти
и̑ли мьчтанїе̑ а҆ не и̑сти́ною̀ бы́ти гн̑ю̀ въчл̑вѣ-
ченїю и̑ ст̑тѣ̑. и̑ли е̑ди́норо̑наго бж̑твѹ постра̑-
ти а҆на̑ма ·: Гл̃ющїи̑ ѭко пль̑ гн̑ѭ ѿ само́го
съе̑диненїа пр̀ѣвъзвисивъ̀ши се. и̑ го́рѣ въса-
коѐ мьчтати пр̀ѣвише леже́ци. ѭко ѿ кра-
и̑наго съе̑дине́нїа. въкѹпобж̑на бив́шы.
непр̀ѣло́жно. неи̑змѣнно̀. несъла̀ї̑нно
непр̀ѣвратно. за е̑же по съста́вѹ съе̑дине́нї҃
и̑ неразла́чно и̑ нерастр̀ы́жно пр̀ѣбива́ю̑щи.
нъ въспрїе̑мши̑ тѣ̀е бз̃ѣ сло́вѣ. равнославно
то҃ почитает сѐ, и̑ покланѣет сѐ е̑дине̑

► f. 195r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 502-509, 517-524; B, f. 13r$_{15}$-13v$_{17}$)
ѝ на цр̑кѡ̑ и̑ бж̑твнѣ̑ посаж̑ена пр̀ѣстолѣ ѻ̑
десною̀ ѻ̑ц҃а ѭко бж̑тва сла́вою̀ ѻ̑богащь-
ши се хра́нимѡ̑ свои́ствѡ̑ е̑ствь̀ вѣчна҃а памет ·: (in the right margin: г̃)
Ѡ̃мѣтающи̑ ст̃ы̑й ѿц҃ъ гла́сы̀. е̑же ѻ̑ съставл̑-
ни правы̑ бж̑їе цр̑кве догма̑т и̑зг̃лагнны̑ а҆ѳа́на́сїе̑
бг̃wг̃лывы̑ львѡ̑ па́пѫ̑ стараишѣго рима,
и̑ прочїи̑. и̑ ещ̑е̑ и̑ въселе́нскыи̑ събор̑ѣ̑ четвр̀-
таго̑ г̃ле и̑ шестаго не пр̀їемлющи̑ а҆наѳема: (in the right margin: г̃)
Не пр̀їемлю́щи̑ и̑стин҃наго ба̑ и̑ сп̃а наше̑ і҃ѵ̀ х̃а
гла̑. и̑же ѿц҃ъ моѝ бо́ли ме́не е̑. ѭко̑ по ра-
злични̑ ѻ̑бразѡ̑ с̃тїи тъ̀ ска̑же. ѡ̃вы̀ 8бо̀ по
то́го бж̑тв8 глю̑це тъ̀ р̑е̑нь би́ти, ра́ди ви́ни
е̑же ѿ ѻ̑ц҃а того рожд̑енїа. ѡ̃вы̑ пр̑ѣ̑ пр̀їетїє
пр̑ѣ̑ тьсты́вны̑ (!) свои́ствь ѿ не́го пльты и̑ съ-
ставнїе того бж̑тво̑. рекше съ҆ѣннѫ̑ ѻ̑писа-
ннѫ̑ мры́твнѫ̑ и прочее е̑ствнїе и̑ не8корнїе
ст̑р̀ти. и̑же ра̑ себе болша ѻ̑ц҃а г̃ъ р̑е̑. нь тог̃а
г̃лю. такови разѹмѣти се гла̑ е̑г̃а по тынко̑м
промишленїю разѹмѣет се пл̑ть разл8че-
н҃на бж̑тва. ѭко̑ а҆ще не би и̑ съеди́нила се. и̑ не

► f. 195v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 525-532, 243-246, 248-249, J. Gouillard,

« La lettre du Patriarche Cosmas », p. 369_3 suiv.; B, f. $13v_{17}$-$14r_5$, omm.,)
прїемле́щїиⷨ таковѝ г҃ль и҆же по́ хꙋдомⷹ
помислꙋ раꙁ҇ⷣѣле́нїа ꙗ҆коⷤ҇ ѿ с҃тыиⷯ ѿ҃ць,
реⷱ҇ се тоⷢ҇ⷣа е҆ⷢ҇ⷣа и҆ работа и҆ невⷣ҇ѣнїе г҃лет се,
ꙗ҆̀ко не прїемлющїиⷨ е҆ди́нобожной и҆
е҆ди́ночьстнѣи х҃вѣ пльти раⷣ҇ таковыⷯ
гласѿⷡ҇ досаⷣ҇жати се. г҃лет же по хꙋдомⷹ
помѝслꙋ прїема́ти, и҆ естѐственаа свои́-
ства ꙗ҆̂же и҆стинⷢ҇на сꙋщаа г҃нее пльти
ꙗ҆̂же въ съставѣ того бⷤ҇ⷭтва, и҆ нераꙁ҇ⷣѣ-
лнѣ прѣбивающа. и҆ сїа ꙋ҆бо несъставниⷯ
и҆ льжниⷯ ꙗ҆̀коже и҆ ѿ несъставниⷯ и҆ и҆стинныⷯ
ꙋ҆четь а҆на҃ѳеⷨ: Иже свѣне хрїстїанскїе и҆ пра- (in the left margin: в҃ лѣⷮ҇ ҂ѕфҁ |
мⷰ҇ мⷬ҇ г҃і і҆ неⷣ҇, е҃.
| тоⷢ҇ⷣа сїа е҆ресь | възниче)
вославнїе вѣры. вънесенаа ѿ і҆талі́искаго
і҆ѡа̀нна и҆ причести́вшиⷯ се ѿ того па́гꙋбы
ꙋ҆чениⷦ҇ его̀ е҆ллинскыⷨ же и҆ и҆новѣрниⷨ велѣ-
нїеⷨ и҆ ꙋчєнїеⷨ. и҆же съборнѣи̇ и҆ непорочнѣи̇
правовѣрныиⷯ вѣрѣ противнѝ сꙋⷮ анаѳеⷨ̀. г҃ⷳ.
Наꙋченныⷯ ꙁловѣрно ѿ мни́ха ни́ла въⷭ҇ⷯѣ. и҆
приѡбщившїиⷯ къ ниⷨ а҆на҃ѳема :~ Понеⷤ҇ въсе-
лꙋкавїи на́шь вра́гь. по въсеи̇ бльга́рстѣи̇

► f. 196r (= GR J. Gouillard, « La lettre du Patriarche Cosmas », N[a] 9, 10, 11, p. 371_{49}-372_{56}, omm.)
ꙁе́мли. мани́хеи́скꙋю е҆реⷭ҇ раꙁ҇ⷢсѣꙗ смѣси-
въ сїю съ масалїанскою̀. и҆же таковѣи е҆ре́-
си наче́лникы, а҆на́ѳема ·: По́па б҃гоми́ла
и҆же при петрѣ ц҃ри бльгаⷬ҇стѣмь. въспрїе-
мшаго манихеискѫ̀ѫ̀ сїю е҆ресь̀ и҆ въ бльгаⷬ҇-
стѣи ꙁемлѝ разсѣа́вшаго. къ сиⷨ же и҆ се прї-
рекшаго. ꙗ҆̂ко въ привидѣни х҃с б҃ъ нашь
ѿ ст҃ꙋю б҃цꙋ марїю роди се. и҆ въ приви́дѣнѝ
распеⷮ҇ се. и҆ ѡбж҃еннꙋю пльⷮ҇ възне́се и҆ на възⷣ҇ꙋ-
сѣ ѡста́вы. рекшѝ и҆ то́го бывшеи̇. ни́нѣ
сꙋщїи ꙋче́ниⷰ҇. и҆ а҆пⷭ҇лы нареⷱ҇нїи а҆на҃ѳема ·:

῎И въсѐ иже въ ѐреси тоеі. и ѡбичаи и и нощи и
събранїа и таинства. и неполезна и ѹченїа.
и ходещи съ нимї анаѳема ⁖ Любещи се съ нимї.
и съ нимѝ въ разѹмѣ ꙗдѹщи и пїющи. и дари
ѿ ни въземлющи ꙗко ѐдиномислньи тѣ ана ⁓
῎Иже ȋѹнїа мца кд днь на рожьство ȋѡанна
кртлѣ творещи вльшвенїа. и плодѡ вла-
ченїа. и еликаа въ тъ нощь скврьнаа творе
таинства и еллинстѣи слѹжбѣ побнаа ана ⁓

► f. 196v (= GR : J. Gouillard, « La lettre du Patriarche Cosmas », N[a] 1, 2, 3, omm., 4, p. 371$_{29\text{-}38}$)

῎Иже сатанѹ видимѣи твари творца нари-
чещи бити. и иконѡма нарицающи дьже-
ве и градѹ. и въсемѹ исходещѹ ѿземе анам ⁖
Глющїи адама и ев'вж сатана създаан аѳем ⁓
῎Иже мѡѷсеа бговидца. и илїж ѳезвитѣ-
нина. и прочеѐ стые пррки, и патрїархїи.
и ꙗже ѿ ба тѣ сщен'наа писанїа. ѿметаю-
щи и глющи ꙗко сатанина сѹ и ѿ того
движаемїи съписаше ѐже съписаше и ꙗж
рекоше ѡ хѣ. и не хотеще нѹжею глашѐ
и сего ради иже ѐлико въ ветсѣ законь кн-
ги написан'нїе. и елико въ не въсїавшеѐ
стїе пррки ѿмѣтающее бгомили. анам ⁖
Глещеи ꙗко жена зачинаѐ въ чрѣвѣ съ дѣло-
ванїе сатанинѡ. прѣбиваѐт же ѿтѹдѡ
сатана неѿстѹпно даже до рожьства
младенцѹ. стїим же крщенїемь не мощи
ѿгнанѹ бити. нъ млтвою тъкмо и посто
глющи ѹбо тако ана ⁖ ῎Иже кртителю
ȋѡаннѹ рѹгающи се и глющи ꙗко ѿ сатани

► f. 197r (= GR : J. Gouillard, « La lettre du Patriarche Cosmas », Nª 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, p. $371_{38\text{-}49}$, $372_{56\text{-}57}$, omm.)
ѥ҇ той и҆ еже въ во́дѣ кр҃щенїе. и҆ се́го ра҇д
воднаго ѿвращают се. и҆ без во́ди ѥ҆дино́
рекше ѻ҆ч҃е на́шь кр҃щает се. а҆на́ѳема ⁘
Иже въ цр҃ква҇х сщ҃енны҇х и҆ бж҃твнї҇х пѣнїи вьсѣ,
и҆ само́го до́мꙋ бж҃їа. ѥ҇ж ѥ҇ цр҃квы ѿвра́щаю-
щи се. и҆ тко҇м ѻ҆ч҃е нашь на приключивши҇м се
мѣстѣ гл҃ющи҇х пѣти а҆на҇ѳ ⁖ Иже ст҃ꙋю
и҆ сщ҃енною слꙋжбꙋ. и҆ вьседр҃жителское стро-
ѥ҆нїе ѿмещꙋщи҇х и҆ рꙋгающи҇х се. гл҃ющи҇х ꙗ҆ко
сатанина сꙋ́ть и҆зьѻ҆брѣте́нїа. а҆на҇ѳе́ма:
Иже прїче́стїе чесна́го тѣла г҃а наше́го
і҃с х҃а ѿмещꙋ҇т и҆ рꙋгаю се. ꙗ҆ко вьсего ѥ҆же ѿ
х҃ѣ і҃сѣ г҃и наше҇м. нашего ради бившаго сь-
мотре́нїа таинство ѿмѣтающе҇с а҆на҇ѳ ⁖
Иже ѿмѣтаю҇т се покланѣнїа чт҃наго и҆ жи-
вотворе́щаго кр҇ста. и҆ ст҃ын҇х и҆ сщ҃енный҇х и҆-
кѻ́нь. ана҇ѳ ⁖ Иже прїемлющї҇х котѻ́раго
ѿ сицевы҇х ѥ҆рети҇к въ ст҃ꙋю бж҃їю цр҃к҇в прѣ-
ж҇де и҆сповѣданїа и҆҇х. и҆ про́клетїа вьсеѐ ѥ҆ре҇с
ꙗ҆ко҇ж ре҇ч нно бы҇с. а҆на҇ѳ ⁖ Василїа врача

► f. 197v (= GR : omm., Gouillard ll. 395-403, 424-426)
и҆҇ж въ ко҇н стан҆тинѣ градѣ. вьсѣ́авшаго сїю̀ трь-
ѻ҆каа́ннꙋю бо́гомрьскою̀ ѥ҆ре́сь, при алекс҇ѯи
правосла́вни҇м цр҃и комни́нѣ. а҆на҇ѳема̀ ⁖
Иже не вьсац҇мѣ бл҃гоговѣ́нї҇е прїемлющї҇х ѥ҇ж
по сьмотре́нїю ра҇зѣле́нїе кь показа́нїю ѥ҆ди-
номꙋ и҆ного ѥ҇сства̀. и҆же въ х҃ѣ сьше҇дши҇х се ѻ҆бо҇х ї
ѥ҇сствь̀. и҆ въ не҇м несмѣсно̀ и҆ нера҇зѣлно сьеди-
нени҇х. нь прїемлющи҇х таковоѐ ра҇зѣле́нї҇е
и҆ гл҃ющи҇х пльтѝ нѐ ѥ҆стьство тьчїю и҆но̀ нь
и҆ достои́нство̀. и҆ ꙗ҆ко слꙋжи҇т б҃ꙋ и҆ слꙋженї҇е
приноси҇т ра҆бско̀, и҆ ч҇ть ключи́мꙋю ѿдае҇т
ꙗ҆кѻ́же дльгь и҆ ꙗ҆коже слꙋже́бны д҃сы, н҆-
же б҃ꙋ слꙋже́ще и҆ и҆же жрьтвꙋ приносещей

ꙋаболѣпно. и҆ ꙋа҃ сей пльти, а҆рхїерѐа велїк҇
биты ꙋчещи а҃ не б҃а слова е҆г҃а бы҃ чл҃къ. тѣмж҇
ꙋа҃ таковы҇ е҆диного х҃а г҃а нашѐ и҆ б҃а ꙋаꙁдѣлѣти
дрьꙁающїи҆ съставнѣ, а҆на҆ѳема; г҃ ⁖ Вънесена
и҆ гл҃анна ѿ михаила бившаго ꙋчителѣ протег..-
дика и҆ маистора риторѡ. и҆ ѿ никꙋ҆ѳора
ꙋчителѣ а҆п҃лꙋ василакїа, дїакѡ҃ и҆же

► f. 198r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 426-442)
въ кѡстантинѣ градѣ ст҃ые б҃жїе великїе цр҃кве
и҆мже и҆ митрополи҃ драчьскыи е҆ѵ҆стаѳїе по-
слѣдова, и҆мже пр҃ѣстатель бѣше съписанїе
сотири҃ дїаконь тоеже цр҃кве. и҆же и҆ нар҃ень
бѣше патрїархь быти б҃жїа града велїкїе а҆нтио-
хїе, нар҃еныи пандевгенось и҆ еще и҆ дрꙋгаа ѿ
тогоже сотириха въведеннаа и҆ съписанїе и҆ ꙁа҃н-
наа, ꙗ҆же ѿ ни҃ послѣже проклетаа и҆ ѿврьженна
же, и҆ събравшїи се ст҃ыи съборь повелѣнїю мано-
ила православнаго великаго цр҃ѣ порфироген-
та и҆ самодрьжца грькѡ҃ кѡмнина. ѿврьже и҆ про-
клетїю прѣда҃, анаѳема. г҃ ⁖ Гл҃ющїи҆ ꙗ҆ко ꙗ҆же
въ врѣме мироспн҃їе ст҃рты г҃а и҆ б҃а и҆ сп҃а нашего
і҆҃ѵ х҃а принесенаа ѡ҆ наш҃ спсен҃и ѿ него жрьтвѣ
чтнаго (!) его тѣла же и҆ крьве ꙗ҆ко а҆рхїереи по
чл҃чтвꙋ на҃ ꙋа҃ бивь. ꙗ҆ко ꙋбо т҃ъ и҆ б҃ъ и҆ жрець,
и҆ жрьтва по многомꙋ въ бг҃ословы григѡрїю,
принесе ꙋбо самь б҃ꙋ и҆ ѡ҆ц҃ꙋ, нѐ прїет же ꙗ҆ко
б҃ъ съ ѡ҆ц҃е тѣже е҆динор҃ны и҆ дх҃ь ст҃ыи. тѣм҇
ꙋади сего ѡ҆ тꙋжающи҃ тогоже б҃а слова. и҆ едино-

► f. 198v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 442-455)
сꙋщнаго и҆ е҆динославнаго томꙋ ꙋтѣшител҇
дх҃а, бг҃олѣпнаго ꙋавночьстїа же и҆ сана а҆наѳем ⁖ (in the left margin: г҃)
И҆же е҆же по въсег҃а приносимꙋю жрьтвꙋ ѿ прѣем-
щїи҆ ѿ х҃а б҃жтвный таинь сщ҃еннодѣистїе (!),
не прїемлющїи҃ ст҃ѣи трѡ҆ици приносити се.
ꙗ҆ко съпротивь гл҃ещи҃ ѿсꙋдꙋ сщ҃енны҃ и҆ б҃ж-

тво҃и҆ ѡц҃е҃ васїлїю же и҆ ꙁлатоглаго҃ивомѵ, и҆м҆
же съгласѹють и҆ про́чїи бг҃оносны ѡц҃и въ свои҆
словесе҃ же и҆ съписани҆ а҆на҆ѳе҃ ·: Слышы́щїи҆
ѵбо сп҃а со҆ и҆же ѿ него прѣданнѡ҃ бж҃твны҆ таи҆н҆
сц҃е҃ннодѣиствїи. гл҃ющаа сѣ твори́те въ
мое въспомина́нїе. не прїемлющїи҆ же пра-
вѣ въспомина́нїе. нъ҃ дрьжа́ющїи҆ и҆ гл҃ющїи҆,
а҆ко со҆бнавлѣе҃ по привидѣнїю и҆ со҆бра́ꙁнѣ,
и҆же на ч҃тны к҃рть ѿ сп҃а нашего прине
на жры́тва егова тѣлесе же и҆ кры́ве, въ ѳбь-
щее чл҃ьскаго е҃ства и҆ꙁбавленїе же и҆ оцѣ-
щенїе. а҆же по въсе҃а приносима жры́тва
ѿ и҆же бж҃твнаа сц҃е҃ннодѣиствѹющи҆ та-
иства (!), а҆коже и҆ сп҃ь на́шь и҆ вл҃ка въсѣхь

► f. 199r (= GR : Gouillard ll. 456-471)

прѣда҃. и҆ ра҃ сего и҆нѣ бити тъ҃ и҆же и҆ꙁначе́ла спа…
…ѡ҃ съврьшеною҆ въноше҃. и҆ ѿтолѣ мьчтателнѣ
ѡбразнѣ приноси́мѵ, тѣмже и҆стьщаваеть
страшнаго и҆ бж҃твнаго сц҃е҃ннодѣи́ствїа таи́-
нство и҆мже бѹщеѣ жизны со҆бр҃ченїе прїемле҃,
та же и҆ бж҃тве́номѵ ѡц҃ѵ нашемѵ і҃ѡа́н҆нѵ прѣмѵдро-
мѵ и҆ зла́тоглаго҃ивовѹ и҆ꙁыѧвлѣ҆ющѵ жрьтвы непрѣ-
ложнѹе, и҆ едино и҆ тъ҃же быти гл҃ещѵ въ мно́гы҆и
великаго павла г҃ль сказанїи҆. ана҆ѳе҃ ·: ⁘Иже лѣтѝ (in the right margin: ҂г҃)
разсто́анїа со҆ примирени чл҃ка́го е҃ства. проти-
вѵ бж҃твно́мѵ и҆ бл҃же́номѵ е҃ствѵ живоначе́лнїе
и҆ въсенетлѣн҃нїе тр҃ро́и҃це примишлѣющи҆ и҆ въво-
дещи҆. и҆ прьвоѣ ѵбо е҆диноро҃но́мѵ сло́вѵ ꙗко́нопо-
лагаю҆ ѿ само́го прими́рити на҃ прїетїа. послѣ-
же же бвы и҆ со҆ц҃ѵ въ сп҃нѣи стр҃ты вл҃кы х҃а҃. и҆ ра-
ꙁ҃вле́ють нераꙁ҃вленаа бж҃твный и҆ бл҃женный
ѡц҃ь. ра́ди съмотренїа таи҆нства въсѣкого
примирити на҃ съ собою҆ бѵ҃ и҆ ѡц҃ѵ, послѣдован-
нѣ же въсѣко҆н прѣс҃ты҆ и҆ животворещи҆ дх҃ѡ,
тѣ҃ а҆ко сѵетѣ и҆скателе и҆ ꙁычьскы҆и мѵдрова́нн҆..
і҃зо҃брѣтателе ана҆ѳема ·: ҂г҃ :∽

► f. 199v (= GR : Gouillard ll. 537-552; B, f. $14r_{11}$-$14v_{10}$)
Бы́вшаго митрополита кекыⷬ҇скаго констант…
бльгаⷬ҇скаго ꙁлѣ̀ и҆ нечьстивѣ наꙋчи́вшаⷢ҇ ѿ и҆с-
тиннаго б҃а и҆ сⷭ҇па нашего і҃ѵ х҃а гласѣ. и҆жѐ ѿц҃ь
мои̇ болы ме́не е҃ⷭ, и҆ не мꙋдрьствꙋющꙋ и҆ гл҃ю-
щꙋ, ꙗ҆ко и҆ по и҆нѣⷯ ꙋбо бл҃гочьстивыⷯ мислеⷯ
прїемлѐт се тъ ѿ ст҃ыиⷯ и҆ бг҃оносниⷯ ѿц҃ь. н҃ъ
и҆ по самои ѿ едино́роⷣнаго сн҃а б҃жїа прїетоѐ
ѿ ст҃ые дв҃ы и҆ бц҃е. и҆ по сло́вꙋ съста́вномꙋ бжⷭ҇-
ствꙋ. несмѣснѣ по нераꙁⷣѣлнѣⷨ съединени
свои́ства и҆мꙋщои̇ ѿ нихже ѿц҃а г҃ъ болшⷣ
себе и҆мено́ва. и҆же въ единѡⷨ поклонени
съ своею̀ пльтїю ꙗ҆ко е҆дино́бж҃ною̀ и҆ еди-
нославною̀ самомꙋ ѿц҃ꙋ же и҆ прѣст҃мꙋ дх҃ꙋ,
съпокланѣеⷨ и҆ съсла́виⷨ и҆щꙋщомꙋ же дльжно
е҃ⷭ раꙁꙋмѣва́ти сїи глⷭ҇а. е҆гⷣа раꙁꙋмѣвает се
г҃ъ е҆динь съста́вь. съеди́ненѣ ѿбои̇ и҆мещⷢ
е҃ⷭствѣ. н҃ъ е҆гⷣа по хꙋдои̇ мисли пльть прїем-
лет се раꙁлꙋчена бжⷭ҇тва. и҆ ꙗ҆ко нѣкаа̀ коего-
жⷣѡ ѿ чл҃кь поꙁнавает се̇. и҆ сїа бг҃ословеснѣ-
и҆шомꙋ дамаскынꙋ тогⷣа еже по хꙋдомꙋ

Un unknown number of folia is missing after f. 199.

► f. 200r (= GR omm.)
Гл҃ющїиⷯ ꙗ҆ко не прїемлеⷮ б҃ъ чл҃ка кающа се ѿ
своиⷯ грѣсⷯѣ, а҃на҃ѳеⷨ ⁖ Нарицещиⷯ ми́родрьⷤца (in the right margin: г҃ⷲ)
быти дїаво́ла а҃на҃ѳеⷨ ⁖ Не и҆сповѣдꙋю́щїиⷯ сн҃а б҃жїа (in the right margin: г҃ⷲ)
твоⷬ҇ца н҃ⷭбе же и҆ ꙁемлѝ а҃на҃ѳеⷨ ⁖ Не вѣрꙋю́щїиⷯ (in the right margin: г҃ⷲ)
і҆ѡа́ннꙋ крⷭ҇тлю и҆ про́чїиⷨ въсѣмь прⷪ҇ркѡⷨ и҆же
быше проповѣдни́ци ст҃ѣи трⷪ҇ици а҃на҃ѳеⷨ ⁖~ (in the right margin: г҃ⷲ)
Не прїемлю́щиⷯ ст҃ое причещ́енїе ꙗ҆ко самжж
пльть и҆ кⷬ҇вь, х҃вꙋ̀ сꙋщꙋ, а҃на҃ѳеⷨ ⁖ Не кланѣющиⷯ (in the right margin: г҃ⷲ)
се ст҃ыиⷨ мощеⷨ и҆же раꙁли́чнѣ бжⷭ҇твною̀ бл҃гⷣть
подавающиⷨ и҆ въсѣⷨ и҆же вѣрою къ ниⷨ при-
ходещиⷨ а҃на́ѳеⷨ ⁖ Не кланѣющиⷯ се чⷭ҇тномꙋ и҆ жи- (in the right margin: г҃ⷲ)
вотворещомꙋ крⷭ҇тꙋ. и҆лѝ ст҃їе лѵⷮргїе хꙋлещиⷯ

и̑ въсѣ цр҃квнїе пѣсны, ана҆ѳе̑ ·: ᷑Иже с҃тїе б҃жїе (in the right margin: г҃)
цр҃квы про́сти храми нари́чеши въ ни̑ же въсе
хр̂тїанство со҆щает се и̑ со҆бнавлѣет се и̑ б҃жїе и̑-
ме славит се, ана҆ѳе̑ ·: ᷑Иже с҃тый цр҃кв҃а̑ е҆пк̂їїа̑ (in the right margin: г҃)
же и̑ мона́стире̑ и̑ и̑ный прочїи̑ цр҃ква̑ достоа́нїа
пр҃ѣда́наа же ѿ бл҃говѣрный ц҃рей и̑ бг҃боазнивїи̑
христїань ꙁапечѣтлѣннаа ꙁлати́ми печа́тьми,
и̑ простимы писа́ньми со҆кшающїи̑ се ра҆ꙁрѣшити

► f. 200v (= GR omm.)
и̑ ѿтрыгнѫти что ли́бо ѿ нѫже къ б҃ѣ въꙁло́женый
а҆на҆ѳе̑ ·: Въсѣ̑ дрьже́щїи̑ пра́восла҆вною вѣ́рѣ (in the left margin: г҃)
ѫ҆срьдно же и̑ чи́стѣ и̑ а҆рхїерее̑ и̑мѫщи̑ ꙗ҆ко прї-
и̑мещи со҆бразь г҃а нашего і҃в х҃а̑ по г҃ню гла́сѫ
ре̂ннѣмѫ въ і҃е̂р҃лїи, сла́шаею̑ ва̑, ме́не сла́-
ша̂е. и̑ па́кы, е҆ли́ка а҆ще свежете на ꙁемлѝ
и̑ прочѣ̀а. и̑ прїемлю́ще т҃ѣ бл҃вѣ̂нїа съ ѫ҆срь-
дїе̑ и̑ топлою̀ вѣрою̀ и̑ ꙁапрѣщенїа и̑ боещи̑ се. (in the left margin: г҃)
вѣчнаа паме̂ ·: ᷑Иже каковѣ̀м либо ѫхи́щре-
нїемь, и̑лѝ былїемь и̑лѝ чѣродѣа́нїе̑, и̑ли со-
ба́нїе̑. и̑ли вльхвова́нїи вражїимы. и̑лѝ со-
травою̀ покѫсит се врѣди́ти ц҃рѣ пома́за-
ника г҃нѣ, тако́ваго̀ ана́ѳема ·: ᷑Иже вльхво- (in the left margin: г҃)
ванїѡ̑ и̑лѝ со҆бланїѡ̑ и̑лѝ ча́родѣа́нїѡ̑ нѣкы.
и̑ли прори́цанїѡ̑ се́бе въдающи̑ ана҆ѳема ·:
Въсѣ̑ болѣро̀ малый же и̑ вели́кїи̑. і҃ерѳ̑ же
и̑ чрь́нце̑ и̑ въсе́мѫ наро́дѫ. и̑же съ бл҃гопоко-
рени̑е̑ въсѣкѫ прїаꙁнь чи́стѫ и̑ пра́вѫ хране- (in the left margin: г҃)
щїи̑ къ ц҃рю же и̑ а҆рхїерѳ̑, вѣчнаа память :~
Въ҃сѣ̀ и̑же тате̑ и̑ ѕвїица̑ и̑ ꙁаводникѡ̑ и̑ про-
чїи̑ такѡвїи̑ пособствѫщїи̑ а҆на҆ѳе̂м ·: г҃.

► f. 201r (= GR : Gouillard ll. The Byzantine part of the diptychs is based on the Greek text of the Synodicon but it does not correspond to it completely.)
(in the upper margine of the page: въꙁгла҃ потѡ̑ рекѫ̂ по тр҃и̑ сїе̑,)
Х҃с̂ побѣда. Х҃с̂ ц҃р̂твѫ̂е̑. Х҃с̂ радѡ̂ и̑ вѣра хр̂їа̂ска

сп҃и г҃и вѣрж хр҃тїа҃ска :~ Кѡнстантїинѹ ве-
ликомѹ ц҃рѹ и мт҃ри его еленѣ ст҃ый равноап҃лнїи
прьвый хр҃тїанскїи ц҃ре вѣчнаа паметь :~ (in the right margin: ш҃г)
Ѳеѡдѡсїѹ велыкѡмѹ ц҃рѹ. їѡнсрїю ц҃рю. и Ѳеѡ-
сїю малѡмѹ. Васїлїю ц҃рѹ. Кѡнстантинѹ ц҃рѹ.
Алеѯандрѹ ц҃рѹ Хрїстѡфѡрѹ ц҃рѹ. Рѡманѹ ц҃рѹ,
Кѡнстантинѹ ц҃рѹ. Романѹ ц҃рѹ. Нѵкїфѡрѹ ц҃рѹ,
Їѡаннѹ ц҃рѹ. Васїлїю ц҃рѹ. Константинѹ ц҃рѹ. Рѡ-
манѹ ц҃рѹ. Мѵхаилѹ ц҃рѹ. Константинѹ ц҃рѹ. Мѵ-
хаїлѹ ц҃рѹ. Їсакїю ц҃рѹ. Кѡнстантинѹ ц҃рѹ. рѡманѹ
ц҃рѹ мѵхаилѹ ц҃рѹ. андрѡнїкѹ ц҃рѹ. никїфорѹ
ц҃рѹ. исакїю ц҃рѹ. алеѯїю ц҃рѹ. грьчьскїи ц҃ремь.
иже съ ѕемный и небесное ц҃рство наслѣдоваш їм .
вѣчнаа памѧт :· ц҃рце грьчьскїи. Плакилѣ ц҃рци вели-
каго ц҃рѣ ѳеѡсїа. пѹлхерїн. еѵдѡкїи. ѳеѡфанѣ
ѳеѡдѡрѣ. еленѣ. ѳеѡфанѣ. ѳеѡрѣ. ѕѡи. екатерїнѣ,
еѵдѡкїи. марїи. иринѣ. православни царицам
грьчьскыи, вѣчнаа памѧть :~
Ѳеѡдѡра великаа и ст҃аа ц҃рца. иже иногда помраче-

► f. 201v

нѹ православною вѣрѹ. ѳеѡфилѡм мѹжем ей,
по смр҃ти его ѿ въсей въселенїе събравши
патрїархїи. и архїерей въсе. и чрьнце ст҃ые
ѿ въсѣхь страньт. събѡрь великый въселенскї
сътвори. темнѹю и мрачнѹю и непрїазьн-
нѫю ересь иконоборц ѿгнавши. съ въсѣмї
еретикы прѣжде бывшимїи. именованнимї
ѕде. повелѣ съ въсѣм ст҃ым съборѡм по въсѣ лѣта
проклинати и въ вѣчное ѡсѹжденїе. патрїархї
же и въсесщ҃енны цр҃квны чинь. ц҃ре же и кне-
ѕе посовствѹющее по православнѣи вѣрѣ,
имже сѹт написана имена въ книгах ст҃ыих.
ѹстави и ѹтврьди въ ст҃ых ц҃ркваx. въспомї-
натї их въ вѣчное въспоминанїе и въ хвалѹ
б҃гѹ творцѹ. Той бл҃говѣрнѣи ц҃рци вѣчнаа памѧт :·
начело бльгарскый ц҃рем: Борисѹ прьвомѹ

цр҃ꙋ бльгарⷭ҇комꙋ наре́ченномꙋ въ ст҃ѣмⷨ҇ кр҃ще-
нїи ми́хаиль. и҆же бльга́рскый рѡ҆ⷣ къ бг҃о-
раꙁꙋ́мїю ст҃ый кр҃щенїеⷨ҇ привеⷣшоⷨ҇ вѣчнаⷣ паⷨⷮ҇ ·:
Сїме́ѡнꙋ сн҃ꙋ его̀. и҆ петрꙋ цр҃ꙋ ст҃мꙋ внꙋ́кꙋ е҆го,

(crossly in the left margin: Сиї трипоⷧ҇иⷮ҇ чрьвеⷭ҇тїи. Неѡфиⷮ҇. калинї ꙁахарїа :~)

► f. 202r
плѣнимиръ. бори́сꙋ. рома́нꙋ, само́илꙋ. радо́миꙋ
гаврїилꙋ. влади́мирꙋ. влади́славꙋ древнїиⷨ҇ бл҃гаⷬ҇-
скїиⷨ҇ цр҃еⷨ҇, и҆же съ ꙁе́мльниⷨ҇ нбⷭ҇ное наслѣдова́ше црⷭ҇тво.
вѣчнаа паме҃ⷮ: Ма́рїи древней црци бльга́рской,
вѣчнаа паме҃ⷮ ·: Ки́рилꙋ фило́софꙋ и҆же бжⷭ҇твноѐ
писанїе ѿ грьчьска́го е҆ꙁы́ка на бльга́рскый
прѣложи́вшомꙋ и҆ просвѣщ҆шомꙋ бльгаⷬ҇скїи
рѡ҆ⷣ ново́мꙋ дрꙋго́мꙋ а҆пⷧ҇ꙋ, въ црⷭ҇тво миха́ила
и҆ ѳеѡ҆ⷣры правосла́внїе црце мт҃ре его̀ и҆же бжⷭ҇твнꙋю
црквь ст҃ымѝ и҆кона́ми ꙋкрасившиⷯ҇ и҆ право-
славїе ѹ҆твьрди́вшїихь вѣчнаа паме́ть ·:
Меѳо́дїю бра́тꙋ его̀ а҆рхїепⷭ҇кꙋ моравы панон-
скыѐ. ꙗ҆ко и҆ то́мꙋ мно́го потрꙋжⷣшꙋ се ѡ҆ словѣн-
скыиⷯ҇ кни́гаⷯ҇. вѣчна ꙋⷨ҇ паме҃ⷮ ·: Климентꙋ ѹ҆ченикꙋ
е҆го е҆пⷭ҇кꙋ вели́кїе мора́ви и҆ ꙋ҆ченикѡⷨ҇ его̀ савѣ
и҆ гораꙁдꙋ, и҆ наꙋмꙋ ꙗ҆ко мно́го и҆ тѣⷨ҇ потрꙋжⷣшїиⷨ҇ се
ѡ҆ слове́нскыиⷯ҇ книгаⷯ҇ вѣчнаа и҆мь паме́ть :~
Ї҆ѡ́аннꙋ а҆сѣнꙋ цр҃ю бл҃гꙋнꙋ свобо́жⷣшомꙋ ѿ
рабо́ты грьчьскїе бльга́рскый рѡ҆ⷣ вѣчнаа ꙋⷨ҇ паⷨⷮ҇ ·:
Ѳеѡ҆ⷣрꙋ на́рⷱ҇нно́мꙋ петрꙋ братꙋ его и҆ цр҃ю, и҆ калоꙗ́ню,

► f. 202v
цр҃ꙋ братꙋ его̀ и҆жѐ многы побѣ́ди покаꙁав-
шомꙋ на гр҆ькыⷤ҇ и҆ фрꙋ́гы, вѣчна̀а и҆ⷨ҇ паме҃ⷮ ·:
По сиⷯ҇ ꙋбо̀ ꙗ҆ко прѣемь црⷭ҇тво сестричи́щь
тѣⷯ҇ бл҃гочьстивѣ́иши цр҃ь бориль, въꙁ-
ниче ꙗ҆коⷤ҇ нѣ́коѐ трь́нїе ꙁло́е трьклетаа
и҆ бг҃омрьⷤ҇скаа̀ бо́гомилⷭ҇скаа е҆ресь̀, е҆ю́,
наче́лникь ꙗ҆вы́ се тогⷣа сквьрнѣишїи поⷫ҇
бо́гоми́ль съ своими ꙋ҆ченыки. ꙗ҆ко́же

ѝноѓа а҃нны҃ ѝ а҃мрвїѝ ѝже мшӱсеѡвы
противе́ще се, ѝ́же на҃коже нѣцїи влы́цѝи
тежа́цїи неще́дно расхїщаа́х҄ѫ хв҃о ста́дѡ
за не́го же кр҃ь свою҃ пр҃чтвю ѝзлїѧ̀. Сїѝ́хь
ѫбо҃ на҃ко ѫвѣдѣ бл҃гочьсти́вѣи́шїи ц҃рь бо҃-
риль, бж҃твный҃ жела́нїе҃ ражег҃ сѐ. по́сл҃
събра́ти и҃ по въсеѝ о҃бла́сти своеѝ на҃ко҃
нѣкы плѣве́ли въ сно́пи. ѝ по́велѣ съни́-
ти се събо́рѫ. Съшы́ш҃ же се ѫбо а҃рхїе́рее҃
въсѣ҃. Сщ҃еннїкѡ҃ же ѝ ѝнѡ́кѡ҃. є҆ще же ѝ
въсѣ҃ болѣрѡ҃. ѝ мно́жьство мно́го про́нар҃е-
ннаго наро҃да. на҃ко ѫбо҃ сы҄ въс҄ѣ съшы́ш҃ се

(crossly in the left margin: МиТропо҃ Лов҃е́кы. Логг҃ї. мела́тїе. кӱпрїа҃. сӱмеѡ҃. ѝ др҃ѫ сӱмеѡ҃ :~)

► f. 203r

ѫвѣд҃ѣ ц҃рь, а҃бїе҃ съ свѣтлою҃ багрѣницею҃ ѝзшь҃,
сѣ́де въ ѝже́ тоѓа е҆диною҃ ѡ҃ вели́кїй ц҃рк҃ве҃.
ѝ съборѫ сѫдѫ ѝ сѫдѫ, пр҃ѣсѣдѣ́щѫ, повелѣ
при́вести нечьстїа҃ саа҃теле. ѝ не а҃бїе҃ тѣ҃
напрасно҃ запрѣ́ти, нъ съ вели́кою҃ хитростию,
т҄ѣ҃ ѕло́вы. ре́кь тѣ҃ въсѣкь҃ стра҄ ѡ҃ се́бе ѡ҃ри-
нѫти ѝ съ дрьзно́вен҃ї҃е҃ гла҃тѝ хѫлное҃ т҄ѣ҃ ѫче-
нїе. Они҃ ѫлови́ти ц҃рѣ҃ ѝ ѝже съ ни҃ сказаше
по дробнѫ въсѐ злословнѫю҃ ѝхь е҆ре́сь, ц҃рь
же ѝ ѝже съ ни҃ мѫдри҃ї҃ъ въпро́си тѣ҃ на мно́зѣ
ѡ҃вѣтоваю҃щїи҃ ѡ҃ бж҃твныхъ҄ писанїи дондеже҃
ѳличи́ше злославное҃ т҄ѣ҃ мѫдро́ванїе. Они҃
на҃коже ри́бы безгла́сны стоещѐ, недомѣнї҃е҃
ѡ҃ въсѫдѫ съдрьжи́ми бѣ́хѫ. бл҃гочьсты́вїи же
ц҃рь сы҄ посрамлѐны до коне́ца видѣвь, ѝ дїа-
вола па҃ша се ѝ низло́жена х҃а҃ же величае́ма,
радо́сти ѝспльни се. ’И повелѣ т҄ѣ҃ блюстѝ ѝ
т҄ѣ҃ ѝ ѝже ѡ҃ ны҄ прѣльще́нный҄. ’На҃ко ѫбо҃ Они҃
сїа҃ е҆́вше҃, па́кы притеко́ше къ съборнѣѝ
ц҃рк҃вы. а҃ ѝже положив’шомѫ да҃шѫ свою҃,

► f. 203v

ꙁа слове́снаго ста́да х҃а б҃а и҆ с҃па на́шеⷢ. и҆ свою̀
кръⷡ҇ пролїа́вшаго ꙁа рѡⷣ҇ бльга́рꙿскаго црⷭ҇тваа̀.
и҆ прѣмѣнившꙋ на нбⷭ҇нѣмь ꙁемльное црⷭ҇тво,
вѣчнаа памеⷮ҇ ⁖ Геѡⷬ҇гїю тертерїю старомꙋ.
бл҃гочьⷭ҇ти́вомꙋ цр҃ꙋ вѣчнаа̀ паме́ть :~
Шишманꙋ бл҃говѣрномꙋ цр҃ꙋ вѣчна̀ памеⷮ҇ :~
Ѳеѡⷣ҇рꙋ свеⷮ҇славꙋ бл҃гочьстивоⷨꙋ цр҃ꙋ вѣчна паⷨ :~
Геѡⷬ҇гїю терꙿтерїю бл҃гочьстивоⷨꙋ цр҃ꙋ вѣчнаа̀ :~
Страци́ми́рꙋ деспо́тꙋ. и҆ радославꙋ. и҆ димїтрꙋ
братїаⷨ є҆го̀ вѣчнаа памеⷮ҇: Михаи́лꙋ бл҃гочьсти-
вомꙋ цр҃ꙋ вѣчнаа памеⷮ҇ ⁖ Їѡаꙿннꙋ степа́нꙋ
цр҃ꙋ с҃нꙋ бл҃гочьсти́ваго цр҃ѣ миха́ила вѣ́чнаа :~
Си́мь ꙋ҆бо правовѣрниⷨ. и҆ бл҃гочьстивїиⷨ. при-
сно́памеⷮ҇ниⷨ правосла́вныⷨ цр҃еⷨ. бг҃охра́нимⷶⷢⷪ
сто́ла бльгарь́скаго црⷭ҇тва мимошеⷣ҇шиⷨ.
и҆ по ре́дꙋ въсѣ ꙋ҆страша́ющиⷨ. и҆ попеченїи и҆ⷨꙋ-
щиⷨ ѿ хрⷭ҇тоиме́нитиⷯ лю́деⷯ порꙋченїиⷯ и҆мь бг҃ѡⷨ
є҆ли́ко по силѣ є҆ди́но нѣкоє̀ небрѣже́нїю
прѣда́но быⷭ҇. а҆ще и҆ начи́наемо̀ и҆мѝ, нъ҃ не дѡ́
нца (!) съвръша́емой. є҆же и҆ не и҆справле́но и҆

CHAPTER V

COMMEMORATIONS OF THE UPHOLDERS OF ORTHODOXY IN B AND DRIN

Section I
The emperors

Considering the commemorations of the Orthodox, the first names to be presented are those of the Byzantine *basileis* that appear in both manuscripts containing the text of the Synodicon at the focus of the present study. The current chapter presents these commemorations in the form of a table, which also includes a column dedicated to the names in the Greek text of the Synodicon in the generalised forms presented by Jean Gouillard. It is especially important to stress the chronological point at which the lists of commemorated *basileis* end, which differs in DRIN and B. The Bucharest manuscript mentions Michael IX Palaeologus and continues up to his son Andronicus III Palaeologus, while the Drinov manuscript ends with Alexius I Comnenus. They would probably have followed their respective Greek *Vorlage* and this discrepancy between them might raise questions regarding their translations. The table offered here will present a clearer view of the information.

Greek	***DRIN***	***BAR Mss. sl. 307***
St. Constantine and Helena[1]	St. Constantine and Helena	
	Theodosius (I)	
	Honorius	
	Theodosius (II)	
	----[2]	

[1] Saints Constantine and Helena are present only in some of Greek copies (*Cpq* and *Cr*^{l}).

[2] In PAL, Marcian is mentioned: Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 149$_{7}$ (f. 26r$_{7}$).

Michael (III) and Theodora	----	Michael (III) and Theodora
Basil (I)	Basil (I)	Basil (I)
Constantine	Constantine	Constantine
Leo (VI)	---	Leo (VI)
Alexander	Alexander	Alexander
Christopher	Christopher	Christopher[3]
Romanus (I Lacapenus)	Romanus (I Lacapenus)	Romanus (I Lacapenus)
Constantine (VII)	Constantine (VII)	Constantine (VII)
Romanus (II)	Romanus (II)	Romanus (II)
Nicephorus (II Phocas)	Nicephorus (II Phocas)	Nicephorus (II Phocas)
John (I Tzimiskes)	John (I Tzimiskes)	John (I Tzimiskes)
Basil (II)	Basil (II)	Basil (II)
Constantine (VIII)	Constantine (VIII)	Constantine (VIII)[4]
Romanus (III Argyros)	Romanus (III Argyros)	[Romanus][5]
Michael (IV)	Michael (IV)	[Michael]
Constantine (IX Monomachus)	Constantine (IX Monomachus)	
Michael (VI)	Michael (VI)	----
Isaac (I Comnenus)	Isaac (I Comnenus)	----
Constantine (X Doucas)	Constantine (X Doucas)	----
Romanus (IV Diogenes)	Romanus (IV Diogenes)	----
Andronicus (?)	----	Andronicus[6] (?)
Michael (VII Doucas)	Michael (VII Doucas)	Michael (VII Doucas)[7]

[3] He, together with Constantine (son of Leo VI) and Michael IX Palaeologus, were *symbasileis* who did not become rulers yet have been given places on the Synodicon list – J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 259.

[4] The following names up to Andronicus are missing from the printed Triodion, which is thus similar to B.

[5] The names given in square brackets [ ] are illegible due to damage of the sheets.

[6] Unidentified person, probably the brother of Michael VII Docas.

[7] Preceding this Michael, the printed Triodion cites the name Romanus.

----	Andronicus (?)	----
Nicephorus (III Botaneiates)	Nicephorus (III Botaneiates)	-----
Isaac (Comnenus?)	Isaac	Isaac
Alexius (I Conmenus)	Alexius (I Comnenus)	Alexius (I Comnenus)
John (II Comnenus)	----[8]	John (II Comndenus)
Manuel (I Comnenus, monk Mattheus)	----	Manuel (I Comnenus, monk Mattheus)
Alexius (II Comnenus)	----[9]	[Alexius]
Issac (II Angelus)	----	Isaac (II Angelus)
Alexius (III Angelus)	----	Alexius (III Angelus)
Theodore (I Lascaris)	----	Theodore (I Lascaris)
John (III Doucas Vatatses[10])	----	John (III Doucas Vatatses)
Theodore (II) Doucas (Lascaris)	---	Theodore (II) Doucas (Lascaris)[11]
Michael (IX Palaeologus)	----	----[12]
Andronicus (II, monk Antonius)	----	Andronicus (II, monk Antonius)

[8] In PAL, there is a commemoration of John II Comnenus: Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 150_4 (f. $26v_4$).

[9] In PAL, there is a commemoration of Alexius II Comnenus: Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 150_5 (f. $26v_5$).

[10] Or "Batatses".

[11] It is absent from the printed Triodion with Synodicon.

[12] The name of Michael VIII Palaeologus is certainly omitted from the text, and this absence is not due to damage of the sheet but is a matter of *damnatio memoriae*, the dogmatic, ecclesiastic-political and ethical reasons for which are not difficult to guess – J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 259. It should be noted that the name Michael follows that of John in the printed Triodion with Synodicon. Probably the name of Michael IX (Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, p. 383; *PLPZ,* # 21529) is mentioned before that of his father Andronicus II because he died earlier.

----	----	Michael (IX) Palaeologus [13]
Andronicus (III Palaeologus)	----	----[14]
John (VI) Cantacuzene[15]	----	----
John (V) Palaeologus	----	----
Andronicus (IV) Palaeologus	----	----
John (VII) Palaeologus (monk Joseph)	---	----
Manuel (II) Palaeologus	----	----

It may be said there are few differences between the lists up to the name of Alexius I Comnenus. The lack of some names is noteworthy. Thus, in the Greek copies, the mention of the Saints Constantine and Helena is rare, which is why Jean Gouillard did not include them in the basic text of the Synodicon[16]. They are mentioned only in some copies: in *Cr*^{1} they head the list, before Michael III, and in *Cpq* the list of *basileis* is preceded by eulogies for them (as in the Bulgarian Synodicon) as well as for Emperor Justinian I and Eudoxia[17]. A missing name is that of Marcian, a noteworthy ruler who presided over the Council of Chalcedon and was canonised. This omission seems strange and difficult to explain; in my opinion, it is due to an error, an omission in copying

[13] Together with Constantine (son of Leo VI) and Christopher, this is the name of one of the three *symbasileis* who did not rule but nevertheless are commemorated in the Synodicon – J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 259.

[14] Andronicus III Palaeologus (Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, p. 384-386; ΕΠΛΒΙΠ, τ. B', p. 184-186; *PLPZ* # 21438; *EPLBHC*, vol. 1, p. 251-252), although absent from this list, is still present elsewhere in B, where he has a separate commemoration in connexion with the Palamite controversy: Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 91 (f. 17г).

[15] Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, p. 393-398; *PLPZ*, # 10973. John VI Cantacuzene was commemorated in the printed Triodion with Synodicon.

[16] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 96_{801}.

[17] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 96 note 318.

rather than to "his substitution" by his wife Pulcheria[18]. I believe the absence of commemorations of early emperors from the Synodicon (or more exactly, from most of its copies) should be attributed not to disregard for these persons, but to a focus in the initial text on the overcoming of the iconoclast crisis – its final resolution in 843. That is when the work was created and that is when the feast at which it was to be read in public was established. The inclusion of other heresies, anathemata and commemorations subsequently expanded the work's objectives, but the initial version left traces. One of these traces is this list of commemorations of *basileis* containing mostly rulers from the period starting with Michael III[19] and his mother Theodora.

The two commemoration lists of *basileis* in the Serbian translation of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy largely duplicate the first part of the lists presented here. In the text of the Trinity (*Troitski*) manuscript[20], the names of Romanus II and of the unidentified Andronicus do not occur. After Michael VII, the list goes directly to Manuel I Comnenus, followed probably by his son Alexius II, whose name is illegible due to damage of the sheet. Then Andronicus I Comnenus appears, followed by Isaac Angelus and Alexius Angelus. Noticeable here is the absence of the *basileis* after Constantine VIII. The Plevlja list ends with Alexius III Angelus. In the Zagreb manuscript of the Synodicon[21] Romanus II is mentioned, but Constantine VIII and Romanus III Argyros are missing, and after Michael IV, there is no mention of Constantine IX Monomachus and Michael VI. The list ends with Michael VII Doucas. Thus, especially at the end of the list, a large difference emerges between the Serbian Synodicon and the other three. In fact, it becomes evident that the Serbian variants of the Synodicon end at a comparatively early time in history (11th – 12th century, like DRIN) and are quite different from the Bucharest manuscript (BAR Mss. sl. 307).

---

[18] *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 434 (and she is not "his mother", as mistakenly written in the book).

[19] Michael III (842-867): Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, p. 220-224; *PMBZ*, # 4991 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=4991) – 11. 03. 2021; P. Varona Codeso, *Miguel III (842-867). Construcción histórica y literaria de un Reinado*, Madrid, 2009.

[20] Вл. Мошин, „Сербская редакция Синодика (Тексты)", *Византийский временик*, т. XVII, 1960, p. 304.

[21] Вл. Мошин, „Синодик (тексты)", p. 346. It should be noted that Jean Gouillard defines this copy as similar to group *Mjkn* and reflecting a revision dating to the years 1118-1134 – J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 21.

The table shows a large degree of overlap between the standard Greek version of the Synodicon and the version contained in the Bucharest manuscript. The Bulgarian text of DRIN offers a different list and hence one should not pay too much attention to the differences at the beginning – it simply starts from a different point. Noticeable is the absence of Leo VI the Wise from the Bulgarian text (PAL and DRIN). The identity of the Constantine who is mentioned immediately after Basil I can be debated. The hypothesis has been expressed that this is Constantine VII, but that is untenable because it does not explain why this emperor is invariably placed before his father in other texts, while in the Bulgarian text, his name is present although his father's name is absent. I suggest that the commemoration probably refers to Constantine[22], the eldest son of Basil I, who was declared *symbasileus* with his father in 869, one year before Leo VI the Wise assumed that position.

It should be noted that Michael V Calaphates is missing from all variants of the Synodicon examined here, because of a *damnatio memoriae* due to political developments in the Empire[23].

An unidentified Andronicus appears before Michael VII Doucas in the Greek text and in the Bucharest manuscript. In the Serbian variants of the text, he is entirely missing, while in both Bulgarian variants, PAL and DRIN, he comes after Michael VII. This seems to be due to an error – some oversight made in translating or copying; still, it testifies to some connexion between the two Bulgarian manuscripts on the one hand and the more closely interconnected Bucharest manuscript and Greek text on the other. The main question is whether any importance should be attached to this fact. The person in question is worth commenting on. I do not think it is possible to establish his identity. Jean Gouillard has suggested that this Andronicus could be the brother of Michael VII Doucas[24]. The different order of the names of Michael and Andronicus within the different manuscripts does not seem to have any particular importance, especially since Andronicus cannot be identified[25].

---

[22] *PMBZ,* # 4005 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=4005) – 11. 03. 2021.

[23] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. II, 1366.

[24] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 96 note 321; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 331, note 120. It seems more unlikely that the reference is to Andronicus I Comnenus.

[25] This person, like the respective one in the Greek and Bulgarian texts, should be the brother of Michael VII Ducas – J. Gouillard, « Synodicon », p. 97_{806} (v. p. 96 note 321); Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 35, 53, 331 note 120; *PBW*: http://

In the Drinov manuscript, the list ends with the name of Alexius I Comnenus[26], the founder of the dynasty. The dynasty enters the field of attention of the copyist only with its first representative. The Palauzov copy of the Synodicon ends the list of emperors with Alexius II Comnenus[27]: his father Manuel I and his uncle Andronicus I are not mentioned. Regarding the latter, this could be considered some kind of *damnatio memoriae*[28], but as for the former the cause remains inexplicable to me. In any case, it is a clear indication that the list ends with the Comnenian dynasty, while the list in the Greek Synodicon continues, as does the one in the Bucharest manuscript. This raises the question about which manuscript belongs to which of the Greek variants. It may be said with certainty that PAL is a Comnenian variant of the Synodicon. This has usually also been assumed regarding DRIN, but one should take into account that there are sheets missing from that manuscript, and precisely in places where the commemorations or anathemata of the Palaeologian age ought to be present. They are present in the Bucharest manuscript, which thus certainly belongs to variant P.

---

pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Andronikos/62/) – 11.03.2021. The mention of his name is, nevertheless, problematic, especially as he is placed before his brother in B and in the Byzantine Synodicon, which is strange but recurrent. Still, despite this displacement (probably for specific reasons), the reference is not to different persons, as the context remains the same or similar. Whether he is indeed the brother of Michael VII Ducas is a different matter. In the printed Triodion with Synodicon, this name is present in the list of commemorations, which is quite similar to the one in the Bucharest manuscript – f. ρ̃ια v. The case is similar in the printed Greek Triodion with Synodicon – f. 82r. It seems to me impossible due to the *damnatio memoriae* to identify him with the emperor Andronicus I Comnenus, 1183-1185 (*PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Andronikos/1/ – 11.03.2021; Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, p. 331-333; ΕΠΛΒΙΠ, τ. Β', p. 180-182; *EPLBHC*, vol. 1, p. 243-244; S. Neocleous, "*Tyrannus Grecorum*: The Image and Legend of Andronikos I Komnenos in Latin Historiography", *Medioevo Greco*, 12, 2012, p. 195-284)

[26] *PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Alexios/1/ - 11.03.2021; *ΕΠΛΒΙΠ*, τ. Α', p. 233-236; *EPLBHC*, vol. 1, p. 153-155; P. Lachowicz, "The Family Strategy for Purple – Comparing the Methods of Andronikos I and Alexios I Komnenos of Constructing Imperial Power", *Studia Ceranea*, 9, 2019, p. 301-317; Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, p. 313-318.

[27] *PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Alexios/2/ - 11. 03. 2021; ΕΠΛΒΙΠ, τ. Α', p. 236-237; *EPLBHC*, vol. 1, p. 156-157; Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, p. 329-330.

[28] His name is usually missing from the Synodicon, it is encountered only in some provincial variants (the so-called *Cklmo*) – see J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 96 note 323.

In this respect, it is worth mentioning the commemoration of Emperor Andronicus III Palaeologus (on the first lines of f. 17r – the beginning is missing due to lost preceding sheets = G. ll. 683-691)[29]. The presence of this emperor and the fact that he is mentioned here raise no problem inasmuch as he assumed an Orthodox stance during the Palamite controversies, and moreover, there is no reason for *damnatio memoriae* in his case. This special commemoration is important primarily as a marker of the affiliation of B to the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon. In PAL, the commemoration is evidently absent, and in DRIN, it would have been located on the sheets that are now missing. Considering the last emperors of the list – John V Plalaeologus, John VI Cantacuzene, Andronicus IV, John VII and Manuel II – their presence is problematic not only in the Slavic translations. This is due to the complicated religious and political situation during the last century of the Empire: internal controversy in the Palaeologian dynasty and ecclesiastical policy toward Rome, which sometimes was connected with the internal controversies. Some of these late emperors only appeared in certain local recensions of the Synodicon, for example Manuel II Palaeologus and John VII Palaeologus are present in the recensions of Thessalonica, a city to which they had firm connexions[30].

Section II
The Byzantine empresses

A special place is devoted to the empresses (*augoustai, basilissai*) in the different variants of the lists in the work under study. Here, a table is presented with the names of the Byzantine empresses present in the Byzantine/Greek Synodicon and those mentioned in the Drinov manuscript. There is no such list of empresses in the Bucharest manuscript. The only empress mentioned there is Theodora, mother of the *basileus* Michael III – who helped to end the second iconoclastic period[31].

---

[29] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. $89_{683\text{-}691}$; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 91.

[30] A. Rigo, "Un nouveau témoin du *Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie* P", p. 76, 78-80, 83, 85-86; Rigo, "Il *Synodikon dell' Ortodossia* di Tessalonica", p. 197; A. Rigo, "Il *Synodikon dell'Ortodossia* di Lavra (1400 circa)", p. 260, 269.

[31] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 95 (f. $19r_{22\text{-}24}$), v. note 71.

Byzantine Synodicon	***Drinov copy***
-------	Placilla (Plakila)
-------	Pulcheria
Eudocia (Ingerina)	Eudocia
Theophanò, saint	Theophanò
Theodora	Theodora
Helena	Helena
Theophanò	Theophanò
Theodora	Theodora
Zoë	Zoë[32]
Ecatherina	Ecatherina
Eudocia	Eudocia
Mary	Mary
Irene	Irene
Irene	-------
Irene	-------
Mary	-------

The list of Byzantine empresses poses no special questions related to the Slavic translations (Bulgarian, East Slavic and Serbian) of the Synodicon[33]. They are present in it by tradition due to their inclusion in the original text. Nevertheless, some differences attract attention. The most important of these are the first two names, which are not included in the original text.

"Plakila, tsaritsa of the great tsar Theodosius" is Aelia Flavia Flacilla, wife of Emperor Theodosius I and mother of the emperors Arcadius and Honorius as well as of a daughter who died in infancy, named Aelia Pulcheria[34]. She is not present in the Greek original of the Synodicon, neither in its translation and should not be confused with her homonymous niece who follows in the list.

[32] Followed once again by Theodora in PAL.
[33] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 37-38.
[34] *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, I, 341-342.

Pulcheria is Empress Aelia Pulcheria[35], granddaughter of Aelia Flacilla, daughter of Emperor Arcadius, sister of Emperor Theodosius II and wife of Emperor Marcian, with whom she ruled. This was one of the most remarkable women in the history of the Empire. Together with her husband, she practically initiated and conducted the Council of Chalcedon (8 October – 1 November 451 AD), which helped to define Orthodoxy, but which also left a deep scar on the body of Eastern Christianity. The presence of Pulcheria in the commemoration of empresses should not raise any theological or historical questions, apart from the fact that the lists both of emperors and of empresses usually begin after the time of the victory over the iconoclastic heresy. I do not believe it necessary to over-interpret this difference and will only say that the inclusion of Aelia Flacilla and of Aelia Pulcheria in the list probably stems from some unknown Greek original and is not a Bulgarian innovation.

Special attention is given in the Synodicon to Empress Theodora[36], mother of Emperor Michael III, which is quite understandable as the original text of the work was written precisely for the triumph of Orthodoxy in AD 843, restored by an act of these rulers[37]. Her commemoration is present both in the Palauzov manuscript, where only its beginning survives due to missing sheets (f. $26v_{20\text{-}22}$), and, in full, in the Drinov manuscript (f. 201r-201v). In the Byzantine Synodicon, there is no separate commemoration of Empress Theodora amongst the empresses, but she is mentioned with her son Michael III at the head of the polychronia of the emperors[38]. While the other empresses, listed before Theodora, are mentioned only by their names, in her case there is a full presentation of her works and merits to Orthodoxy. Thus, it may be

---

[35] K. G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses. Women and Imperial Domination in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1982, p. 48-78; *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, II, 929-930; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. III, 1757-1758.

[36] *PMBZ,* # 7286 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=7286) – 11.03.2021; P. Karlin-Hayter, « Restoration of Orthodoxy, the Pardon of Theophilos and the *Acta Davidis, Symeonis et Georgii* », *Byzantine Style, Religion, and Civilisation: In Honour of Sir Steven Runciman*, ed. E. Jeffreys, Cambridge, 2006, p. 361-373; Varona Codeso, *Miguel III*, passim; A. Timotin, *Visions, prophéties et pouvoir à Byzance. Étude sur l'hagiographie méso-byzantine (IX-XI siècles)*, Paris, 2010, p. 143-149; K. Kotsis, "Empress Theodora: A Holy Mother", *Virtuous or Villainess: The Image of the Royal Mother form the Early Medieval to the Early Modern Era*, ed. C. Fleiner, E. Woodacre, London, 2016, p. 11-36; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. III, 2037-2038.

[37] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 150-151.

[38] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. $93_{768\text{-}769}$.

said that she is placed outside the general list of commemorations. This list is placed before she is mentioned, even though it presents empresses that follow her chronologically. It is noteworthy that Eudoxia Decapolitissa is omitted, the wife of Michael III, but this seems due to the fact of his more important connexion to his mother Theodora, who contributed to the restoration of Orthodoxy in 843, when the emperor was still a child. Subsequently, years later, Eudoxia had fallen into oblivion[39].

The following names in the list are well researched and raise no questions: Eudoxia Ingerina was a beautiful Scandinavian woman, wife of Basil I and mother of Emperor Leo VI the Wise[40]; Saint Theophanò, wife of Emperor Leo VI (she died in 897)[41]; Theodora, wife of Emperor Romanus Lecapenus[42]; Helena Lecapena, daughter of Romanus and wife of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus[43]; Theophanò, wife of the emperors Romanus II and Nicephorus II Phocas, and also mistress of Emperor John Tzimiskes (she died in 969)[44]; Theodora is either the wife of Emperor John Tzimiskes and daughter of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and Helena Lacapena or the empress Theodora, daughter of Emperor Constantine VIII[45]; Zoë (978-1050),

---

[39] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 260.

[40] *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/1, #1632, 520-522 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=1632) – 11. 03. 2021; L. Garland, S. Tougher, "Eudocia Ingerina, Wife of Basil I", *De Imperatoribus Romanis. An Online Encyclopedia of Roman Rulers*: http://roman-emperors.sites.luc.edu/EudInger.htm – 11.03.2021; *ΕΠΛΒΙΙΙ*, τ. ΣΤ', 328-329; *EPLBHC*, vol. 2, p. 413. I find it unlikely that this was Aelia Eudocia, ΕΠΛΒΙΙΙ, τ. ΣΤ', 325-326; *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, II, 408-409, called Athenais, the beautiful wife of Emperor Theodosius II; she died in Jerusalem on October 20, 460. (see Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 332 note 126). The order of the mention of Pulcheria is not an important problem, but such an identification could not explain why the list of empresses begins with her in the Byzantine original of the Synodicon – see J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 101_{858}, 260.

[41] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. III, 2064; *PMBZ,* # 28122 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=28122) – 11. 03. 2021; М. Петрова-Танева, *Помощница на царете: св. императрица Теофана в южнославянската традиция*, Sofia, 2018, 335 p.

[42] *PMBZ,* # 27602 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=27602) – 11.03.2021; Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, Sofia, 1997, p. 249.

[43] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. I, 502, vol. III, 1806; *PMBZ,* # 22574 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=22574) – 11.03.2021.

[44] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. III, 2064-2065; *PMBZ,* # 28125 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=28125) – 11.03.2021.

[45] In some copies and variants of the Synodicon, the name Theodora is repeated after the Zoë who is next in order. Given this repetition, I am more inclined to assume the former was

empress[46], is the daughter of Emperor Constantine VIII and wife of the emperors Romanus III Argyros, Michael IV and Constantine IX Monomachus; Ecatherina, empress, daughter of the Bulgarian tsar John Vladislav and wife of Emperor Isaac I Comnenus, who ended her life as the nun Xenia[47]; Eudoxia Macrembolitissa, empress, wife of the emperors Constantine X and Romanus IV Diogenes[48]; Maria of Alania, daughter of the Georgian ruler Bagrat IV and wife of Michael VII Doucas and of Nicephorus III Bonatiates [49]; Irene Ducaena (1066-1123), wife of Emperor Alexius I Comnenus[50]. In the edition of the Synodicon of Tsar Boril the assumption is stated that this may alternatively be the empress Irene Sarandapechaina (752-803), wife of the Emperor Leo IV and mother of Constantine VI, together with whom she conducted the last ecumenical council, in Nicaea[51]. The ground for this suggestion is that she

---

the wife of John Tzimiskes (*PMBZ,* # 27604 http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=27604) – 11.03.2021. Where there is no repetition, however, the assumption would definitely have to be in favour of Theodora (984-1056), empress and daughter of Emperor Constantine VIII (*Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. III, 2038). I will note here that in DRIN the name Theodora is not repeated after that of Zoë, but it is repeated in PAL, as well as in the Greek original: J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. $101_{858\text{-}859}$; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. $150_{15\text{-}16}$ (f. $26v_{15\text{-}16}$).

[46] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. III, 2228; Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, p. 281-282.

[47] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. II, 1011-1012; *PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Aikaterine/101/ – 11.03.2021; Ив. Божилов, *Българите във Византийската империя*, Sofia, 1995, p. 248-249 № 165; *ΕΠΛΒΙΠ*, τ. Α', 164-165; *EPLBHC*, vol. 2, p. 164-165.

[48] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. I, 739-740; *PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Eudokia/1/ – 11.03.2021; L. Garland, *Byzantine Empresses: Women and Power in Byzantium, AD 527-1204*, London, 2002, p. 168-179; A. Vratimos, « Eudokia Makrembolitissa: Was She Implicated in the Removal of Her Husband, Romanos IV Diogenes, from Power? », *REB*, 71, 2013, p. 277-284; ΕΠΛΒΙΠ, τ. ΣΤ', 330-333; *EPLBHC*, vol. 2, p. 414-415.

[49] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. II, 1298; *PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Maria/61/ – 11.03.2021; L. Garland, S. Rapp, "Mary "of Alania": Woman and Empress between Two Worlds", *Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience, 800-1200*, ed. L. Garland, Aldershot, 2006, p. 91-123.

[50] *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. II, 1009; *PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Eirene/61/ – 11.03.2021; *ΕΠΛΒΙΠ*, τ. ΣΤ', p. 255-256; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180)*, Cambridge, 1993, p. 201 sq.; Станковић, *Комнини у Цариграду*, p. 229-233.

[51] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 332 note 137. About her, see *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. II, 1008-1009; *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/1, #1439, 454-459; Ив. Божилов, Ив. Билярски, Хр. Димитров, Ил. Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, p. 200-201; *ΕΠΛΒΙΠ*, τ. ΣΤ', 249-254.

is followed on the list by Theodora, mother of Michael III. I think this view should be corrected and rejected even as a supposition, in view of the fact that Theodora is not on the list (she is mentioned only together with her son Michael III in a different context) and in consideration of the evident matches with the Greek original of the text. In the Byzantine Synodicon, Maria of Alania is followed by three consecutive empresses named Irene, and then by other empresses, who are not present in the manuscripts under study here.

Section III
The Patriarchs

1. The list of the *Ecumenical patriarchs* is quite short in the two Bulgarian copies of the Synodicon (PAL and DRIN), but quite long in B. This is due to the fact that the list strictly follows the Byzantine models and presents a Mount Athos model and a Constantinople model of the work. Here, I offer a table that might lend a bit more clarity:

Greek	***Serbian***	***BAR Mss. sl. 307***
Germanus (I)[52]	Germanus	Germanus
Tarasius[53]	Tarasius	Tarasius
Nicephorus (I)	Nicephorus	Nicephorus
Methodius (I)	Methodius	Methodius
Ignatius (I)	Ignatius	Ignatius
Photius	Photius	Photius
Stephen (I)	Stephen	Stephen
Antonius (II)	Antonius	Antonius
Nicholas (I) Mystokos	Nicholas	Nicholas[54]
Euthymius (I)	Euthymius	Euthymius
Stephen (II)	Stephen	Stephen
Tryphon	Tryphon	Tryphon

[52] After him, the iconoclasts Anastasius, Constantine II, Nicethas I, and Paul IV are omitted due to *damnatio memoriae*.

[53] After him, the iconoclasts Theodotus I Casiteras, Anthony I, and John VII Grammaticus are omitted due to *damnatio memoriae*.

[54] Patriarch Nicholas (I) Mystikos is the last name on this list in DRIN.

Theophylactus	Thedophylactus	Theophylactus
Polyeuctus[55]	Polyeuctus	Polyeuctus
Antonius (III)	Antonius	[Antonius]
Nicholas (II)	Nicholas	Nicholas
Sisinnius (II)	(S)isinnius	Sisinnius
Sergius (II)	Sergius	Sergius
Eustathius	Eustathius	Eustathius
Alexius (I)	Alexius	Alexius
Michael (I)	Michael	Michael
Constantine (III)	Constantine	Constantine[56]
John (VIII)	John	[John]
Cosmas (I)	Cosmas	Cosmas
Eustratius	Eustratius	Eustratius
Nicholas (III)	Nicholas[57]	Nicholas
John (IX)		[John][58]
Leo		Leontius
Michael (II)[59]		Michael
----		Theodotus[60]
Theodotus		
Luke		[Luke]
Michael (III)		Michael

[55] Basil I Scamandrenus is omitted, probably because he was condemned for violating the canons and for plotting against the basileus.

[56] In BAR Mss. sl. 307 he is mentioned after his successor John (VIII), an order that also occurs in the printed Triodion.

[57] Nicholas III Grammaticus (1084-1111) is the last-mentioned patriarch of Constantinople both in the Trinity (Troitski) and in the Zagreb manuscripts of the Synodicon; in the Zagreb text, the list of patriarchs of Antioch begins directly (this is indicated at the end of the rubric) – see Вл. Мошин, „Синодик (текст)", p. 305, 346.

[58] This John is missing from the printed Triodion.

[59] Five patriarchs are missing after this name from the Greek Synodicon: Cosmas Atticus, Nicholas Mouzalon, Theodotus, Neophyte, and Constantine Chilarenus. They were deposed or withdrew from their positions, and the names of some of them are present only in some witnesses to the Synodicon.

[60] This is Patriarch Theodotus II (1151-1153), mentioned in the Greek text only in *Ck* (= Cod. 7 Collegii graeci in Urbe).

Chariton	Chariton
Theodosius (I)	Theodotus[61]
Basil (II)	Basil
Nicetas (II)	Nicetas
Leontious	Leontius
Dositheus	Dositheus
----	Meletius
----	Peter[62]
George (II)	George
John (X)	----
Michael (IV)	Michael
Theodore (II)	Theodore
	John
Maximus (II)	Maximus
Manuel (I)	Manuel
Methodius (II), monk Acacius	Methodius (II), monk Acacius
----	Germanus, Monk George[63]
Manuel (II), monk Mattheus	Manuel, monk Mattheus
Germanus (II), monk George[64]	
Arsenius[65]	Arsenius
Joseph (I)[66]	Joseph[67]

[61] Is this an error, i.e., is he the same person (Theodosius I)?

[62] This Peter and the Meletius preceding him appear only in P (the Palaeologian Synodicon) and have not been identified – see J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 103 note 353.

[63] The places of Germanus and Manuel are switched in the printed Triodion.

[64] The place of Patriarch Germanus II is changed in the Greek text of the Synodicon (he should come before Patriarch Methodius II), because he is given a personal commemoration.

[65] Some names are missing after him: Nicephorus II, Germanus III.

[66] After him, Patriarch John Beccus and Patriarch Gregory of Cyprus.

[67] The patriarchs Arsenius and Joseph are included in PAL, at the beginning of f. 36r; the preceding sheets are missing from the manuscript.

Athanasius (I)[68]	Athanasius
Gerasimus[69]	----
Isaias[70]	Isaias
Isidore (I)	Isidore
Calistus (I)	Calistus
Philotheus (Kokkinos)	Philotheus[71]
Macarius	
Nilus	
Antonius (IV)	
Калист (II)	
Mattheus (I)	
Euthymius (II)	

In line with the original purpose of the Synodicon, its list of commemorations of ecumenical patriarchs begins with prominent iconodules; in the Greek text, the list then continues from St. Patriarch Ignatius onwards. The text has been well studied by Jean Gouillard and it is not necessary here to linger on it in detail[72]. The absence of certain commemorations from the list is for reasons related to various theological, disciplinary or political oppositions that are clarified in the French edition of the original text. I would remark that, while in calmer times the inclusion in the order occurs without problems, this routine is understandably lost at more delicate moments of the history of the Orthodox Church. This was the case in the 12th century and again in the second half of the 13th century, times of internal conflicts and very strained relations with the Roman Church due to the Union established at the Second Council of Lyons (1274). During the second half of the 14th century, after the final victory of the hesychasts-Palamites, the list once again follows the order of the ecumenical patriarchs, most of whom adhered to hesychasm.

[68] Missing after him: patriarchs John XII, Niphon I and John XIII.
[69] This Gerasimus is not commemorated in BAR Mss. sl. 307, but comes after Athanasius in the printed Triodion.
[70] The following Patriarch John XIV is omitted due to *damnatio memoriae*.
[71] The listing ends with Philotheus Kokkinos in BAR Mss. sl. 307 and in the printed Triodion.
[72] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 260-261.

In the Serbian Synodicon, the list of ecumenical patriarchs ends much earlier. The beginning is identical to the familiar Greek original and its Bulgarian translation, but the ending is quite different. Neither of the two Serbian lists goes beyond the end of the 12th century – one of them ends with the reign of Michael VII Doucas, and the other, with that of Alexius III Angelus (or perhaps with Alexius IV Angelus or Alexius V Mourtzouphlus, which is much less likely). The list of patriarchs ends even earlier, and the last one is Patriarch Nicholas III Grammaticus (1084-1111). The Serbian copies of the Synodicon belong to the Comnenian version and the brevity of the list of ecumenical prelates poses no special problem there. It is determined by the Greek original of the translation.

It may be said there are no serious differences between the Greek Synodicon and the one in the Bucharest manuscript, so the same observations apply to both. Some names have been presented in a different order, which can be concretely explained. There are also some omissions, but based on them it cannot be stated that there is a serious difference.

Basically, the list of commemorations of ecumenical patriarchs in B indicates a dating of the manuscript's protograph to the 1360s – 1370s. Philotheus Kokkinos[73] was ecumenical patriarch three times precisely during the period in question: 1353-1354, 1354, 1364-1376. This was the age of hesychasm and of disputes regarding the Roman Church, and the time of the creation of the Palaeologian variant (more precisely, one of the versions of the Palaeologian variant) of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy. Dating the text to the time when Philotheus Kokkinos was patriarch could be combined with data about the diocese of Hierissos, which shall be considered shortly.

In fact, the basic problem arising in relation to the list of patriarchs is its rather early end in the Bulgarian copies of the Synodicon. In saying this, it should be taken into account that the Bucharest manuscript is basically a Byzantine version in Slavic. In many respects, it functions in a similar way in the printed editions of the work where it is likewise within the Triodion. It does not contain any local particularities that might connect it with a specific

[73] *PLPZ*, # 11917; M.-H. Congourdeau, "Deux patriarches palamites en rivalité : Kallistos et Philothée", in *Le Patriarcat œcuménique de Constantinople aux XIVe-XVIe siècles : rupture et continuité*, Paris, 2007, p. 37-53.

Orthodox Balkan nation. Based on this, the long list of ecumenical patriarchs there should not be surprising.

But why is the list short in the Bulgarian copies?

To begin with, it should be said the Synodicon in fact has two lists of ecumenical patriarchs, one of which follows the initial variants of the work and usually ends with Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos[74], while the other follows the second list of commemorations of emperors and empresses. Some Greek versions repeat the first four (or eight) patriarchs from the first list in the second list (Germanus, Tarasius, etc. – see G. ll. 881 sq.), but in other witnesses these names are not mentioned again, to avoid repetition[75]. Precisely this second list is missing from the Bulgarian variants or only its ending is present. Obviously, the list was present in PAL, where its end survives, concluding with Patriarch Joseph I (1266-1275, 1282-1283)[76], designated as martyr because of his opposition to the Union of Lyons. The preceding sheets of the manuscript are missing, and this may explain why the list is so short. In any case, Patriarch Joseph is followed by a series of Bulgarian prelates which concludes the list. It should be noted that some sheets are also missing after the commemoration of Empress Theodora, mother of Michael III, i.e., after f. 26v PAL.

The situation is similar in DRIN – the manuscript's text ends completely on f. 203v, with the list of Bulgarian tsars from the 14th century, which would normally be followed by the list of patriarchs.

2. In connexion with the patriarchal commemorations, attention should be devoted to the commemoration of the *patriarchs of Antioch* in the Bucharest manuscript. They are also mentioned in the Greek and Serbian Synodicon but not in the Bulgarian witnesses, nor in the Russian and Ruthenian ones. This list is traditionally absent from the Macedonian variant (M) of the Synodicon, except in the versions made for the Patriarchate of Antioch itself, to which

[74] *PMBZ,* # 25885 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=25885) – 11.03.2021; M. Vaiou, "Nicolas Mystikos", *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History*, ed. D. Thomas, A. Mallet et alii, vol. 2 *(900-1050)*, Leiden-Boston, 2010, p. 169-183; B. Moulet, *Évêques, pouvoir et société à Byzance (VIIIe-XIe siècle*). *Territoires, communautés et individus dans la société provinciale byzantine*, Paris, 2011, p. 202-205.

[75] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 102 note 349.

[76] *PLPZ*, # 9072; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. II, 1073; P. Gounaridis, "La Canonisation du patriarche Joseph", *Βυζαντινά Σύμμεικτα*, 17, 2005, p. 239-253; F. Tinnefeld, "Das Schisma zwischen Anhängern und Gegnern des Patriarchen Arsenios in der orthodoxen Kirche von Byzanz (1265-1310)", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 105/1, 2012, p. 143-166.

the names of their patriarchs were added later, probably in the 11th century (manuscript *Mi*)[77]. I present it in the following table for greater clarity:

Greek	***Serbian***	***BAR Mss. sl. 307***
Christophe	Christopher	Christopher
Theodor	Theodore	Theodore
Agapius	Agapius[78]	[Agapius]
John	John	John
Nicholas	Nicholas	[Nicholas]
Elias (Elijah)	Elias	[Elias]
Theodore	Theodore	Theodore
Basil	Basil	Basil
Peter	Peter	Peter
Theodosius	Theodosius[79]	[Theodosius]
Nicephorus	Nicephorus	Nicephorus
John	John	John[80]
Luke		
Athanasius		
Theodore		
Cyril		

The text of Serbian Synodicon as contained in the Trinity (Troicki) manuscript[81] presents the names of the patriarchs of Antioch separately, as in the Greek version. In the Zagreb manuscript their names have been combined with those of the ecumenical patriarchs, with an explanation at the end that the list includes both categories: **приснопамет҆ныимъ патриар҆хомъ Констан҆тина града, и антиѡхиискыимъ: вѣчнаꙗ память**.[82] In the new edition by T. Subotin

[77] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 15, 19.

[78] Sic! He is designated as „Агафию" (Dat.) in the Serbian Synodicon: in the Trinity and the Zagreb manuscripts (in the edition of V. Mošin) as well as in the new edition by T. Subotin Golubović.

[79] In the Troitsa copy, Theodosius is mentioned before Peter.

[80] The list ends with this John in BAR, Ms. Sl. 307 and in the printed Triodion with Synodicon.

[81] Вл. Мошин, „Синодик (текст)", p. 305.

[82] Вл. Мошин, „Синодик (текст)", p. 346.

Golubović, they are presented in a separate list, without indication that they were heads of the Antiochian see[83].

All three lists begin approximately in the middle of the 10th century with Patriarch Christopher (960-966)[84], who suffered martyrdom during the reign of Emperor Nicephorus Phocas, a time when the Empire won back Antioch. The lists continue up to a time no later than the end of the 12th century. It may be said they are practically identical, except that the Serbian Synodicon and the one of Bucharest terminate with the name of John, while the Greek one adds four more names. In fact, the difference is not very significant, as in most of the Greek witnesses the lists also terminate with John[85]. The additional names are added only in some versions: thus, Luke and Athanasius are present only in *Cno* и *Py*, Py also adds the famous canonist Theodore Balsamon (titular patriarch of Antioch, 1189-1195)[86], while Ce adds the name of Cyril, dating from the end of the 12th century[87].

Section IV
Metropolitans and other Church dignitaries

1. The various heroes of Orthodoxy, including many with episcopal rank (metropolitans, archbishops and bishops), will not be discussed here in much detail. They are traditionally present in the Synodicon from its creation in the 9th century onward. The text was conceived as a condemnation of heresies and heretics and a glorification of Orthodoxy and the Orthodox.

---

[83] *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 495 (6_{1-3}).

[84] *PMBZ*, # 21277 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=21277) – 11. 03. 2021; M. Boudier, "La mémoire des Patriarches dans l'Église melkite. Le cas de Christophore d'Antioche (X[e] siècle)", dans *Les vivants et les morts dans les sociétés médiévales. XLVIII[e] Congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public (Jérusalem, 2017)*, Paris, 2018, p. 43-58.

[85] *PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Ioannes/4003/ - 11. 03. 2021; K.-P. Todt, *Region und griechisch-orthodoxes Patriarchat von Antiocheia in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit und im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge (969-1204)*, Wiesbaden, 1998, p. 702-721; B. Martin-Hisard, "Le patriarche Pierre III d'Antioche (1052-1057), son pseudo-successeur Jean IV/Denys et le géorgien Georges l'Hagiorite († 1065)", *Nea Rhomè, Rivista di ricerche bizantinistiche*, 4, 2007, p. 177-215.

[86] *PBW: https://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/160549/* - 11.03.2021*; Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. I, 249.

[87] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 105 note 364.

I would like to draw attention to a list in B that remains the least clear of all lists in that witness, as well as in the Greek text. I am referring to *several metropolitans* whose sees are not explicitly mentioned. I would propose a comparison with the original list, first published by Vitalien Laurent and appearing also in Jean Gouillard's edition under Number XII and the general title "*Sedes metropolitana ignota*"[88]. In the Greek Synodicon, this text is present only in some of the manuscripts belonging to it's the Palaeologian variant[89]: *Pkrtvy* and in *Taurin CCCXXXVI*. The names of these unknown metropolitans are missing from the Serbian Synodicon, where the list of Antiochian patriarchs is followed by the formula for conclusion[90]. This is to be expected, as this Slavic variant may be classified as C and is considerably earlier than variant P. The presence of this list in the Bucharest manuscript certainly suggests that it was translated from a Palaeologian-type source. Here is the list:

Greek	***Printed Triodion with Synodicon***	***BAR Mss. sl. 307***
Damianus	Damianus	Damianus
Basil	Basil	Basil
Constantine	Constantine	Constantine
Nicephorus	Nicephorus	Nicephorus
George	-------	damaged sheet
----	------	Christopher
Leo	Leo	Leontius
Sisinnius	Sisinnius	Sisinnius
Basil	Basil	Basil
Joseph	Joseph	Joseph
Michael	Michael	Michael
Christopher	Christopher	Christopher
Nicephorus	Nicephorus	Nicephorus

[88] V. Laurent, "La liste épiscopale du Synodicon de Monembasie", *Echos d'Orient*, 32, 1933, p. 131; J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 118_{1-5}.

[89] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 30, 282-283.

[90] Вл. Мошин, „Сербская редакция Синодика (Тексты)", *Византийский временник*, т. XVII, 1960, p. 305, 346-347.

George	George	----
Pantoleon	Pantoleon	Pantoleon
Alexander	Alexander	Alexander
Cosmas	Cosmas	Cosmas
Constantine	Constantine	Constantine
Theophanes	Theophanes	Theophanes
Peter	Peter	Peter
John	John	John
Nicetas	Nicetas	Nicetas
Leo		Leontius[91]
George	George	George
Nicholas	Nicholas	Nicholas
John	John	John
----		Nicholas

This list is not present in PAL neither in DRIN. In the case of PAL, a possible explanation is its affiliation to variant C. Regarding DRIN, I believe the absence is unintentional, due to missing sheets which contained this text, rather than a conscious decision related to its Bulgarian context, or its Greek *Vorlage*.

There are no indications about the sees to which the mentioned persons were attached; they are simply defined as "Orthodox metropolitans". They are located between the Monembasia list and the list for Tropaea in Calabria. The differences between the two variants are small – a Christopher and a Nicholas (the last name in the list) are missing from Greek text, and a George from the Bucharest manuscript; it should be noted these differences do not seem to be due to differences between the original witnesses. The variations Jean Gouillard provides do not suggest such a cause. Different other explanations could be provided, including a copying error.

Despite the considerable number of hypotheses suggested regarding its identification, this list remains unclear. Vitalien Laurent[92] devotes special

[91] Missing from the printed Triodion.

[92] V. Laurent, "La liste épiscopale du Synodicon de Monembasie", p. 129-161.

attention to it, as does Jean Gouillard in his edition of the Synodicon[93]. Some of the names near the end of the list (Nicetas, Leo, George, Nicholas) could be identified based on the successive metropolitans of Nicaea between 1120 and 1185, and even the earlier ones, based on Theophanes and Cosmas (1025-1050), but this has not been proven convincingly. Other names are reminiscent of Athenian metropolitans, but there is not enough data to enable undisputed identifications. Another aspect to keep in mind is that these might be metropolitans of diverse dioceses who took part in making some important decision and were placed in a separate list not defined on a territorial basis.

The identification of the prelates is not very significant within the present study, part of which is the aim to define the character of the (regrettably) much damaged manuscript. The presence of this list is completely sufficient to confirm once again its affiliation with the Palaeologian Synodicon (variant P in Gouillard).

2. *The bishops of Hierissos* are mentioned at the end of the commemorations, in the accessible and legible part of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest. Overall, the commemorations in this manuscript do not provide significant information regarding its localisation. The only exception is, immediately following the list of unidentified metropolitans, the mention of the small diocese of Hierissos. The Greek, Slavic and Romanian printed Synodica, contain a list of metropolitans of Patras at this place in the text. This list helps to localise the versions: for the first Venetian edition, the editors used a manuscript belonging to variant *P* and designated for Patras[94]. Thus, this list localises the origin of the text. In the Bucharest manuscript, Niphon and Jacob, most holy prelates of Hierissos and Mount Athos are commemorated [95]. Again, this passage provides some concrete parameters – spatial and temporal – defining the Synodicon variant of the Bucharest manuscript.

The bishopric of Hierissos and its prelates are not mentioned by name in any of the known variants and versions of the Synodicon, neither Greek nor Slavic. This is understandable inasmuch as the see was not particularly important. However, the bishopric is well documented due to its geographical

[93] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 282-283.
[94] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, Sofia, 2013, p. 98-111.
[95] BAR, Ms. sl. 307, f. 20v.

location on the Chalkidiki peninsula and its close relations with Mount Athos. The small city of Hierissos is first mentioned in the oldest extant document from Mount Athos – the sigillion of Basil I dating from 883.[96] In 943, the border regions of Mount Athos, and the monastic peninsula itself, were within the diocese of Hercula, which was a suffragan diocese of the Thessalonica metropolitan see. The city of Hierissos was first mentioned as an episcopal centre in 982, and the see was evidently established between 943 and 982, most probably in 972.[97] Even after that, however, Mount Athos was not under the authority of the bishops of Hierissos, inasmuch as, in accordance with its privileges, the monastic republic was directly dependent on the *basileus*, although during different epochs, the struggle between the monks and the ecclesiastical authorities wavered between the predomination of one side or the other. After the catastrophe in 1204, the situation weighed in favour of the diocese, and it was then (first documented circa 1240) that the local bishops were titled not only ἐπίσκοπος Ἱερισσοῦ, but ἐπίσκοπος Ἱερισσοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Ὄρους – a title which has not been recorded before the invasion of the Latins but which became widely used from the middle of the 13th century onward[98]. A closely related formula occurs in the Bucharest manuscript: **Ннѵ́фонꙋ и̓ і̓а́кѡвꙋ въсѐѻ̓с҃щє́ннымъ / а̓рхїере́ѡ҃ є̓рнш͑скы҃ и̓ с҃тыє горы̀, / вѣчнаа па́ме҃.** The cathedral city is mentioned but so is Mount Athos, precisely in accordance with the established practice mentioned above.

I would like to draw attention to an element that is essential for our study: the text mentions "the prelates of Hierissos and Mount Athos", without specifying their ecclesiastic episcopal ranks. This can be explained. The phrase refers to two prelates: Bishop Niphon and Metropolitan Jacob, who, as a matter of fact, was the only metropolitan of Hierissos during the Middle Ages[99]. Thus, the prelates of an ecclesiastic province that was traditionally a bishopric are presented in the text by the more general term of "prelates (*archierei*)", because their rank – bishop or metropolitan – differed in different

[96] D. Papachryssanthou, "Histoire d'un évêché byzantin : Hiérissos en Chalcidique", *Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance*, 8, 1981, p. 374.

[97] D. Papachryssanthou, "Histoire d'un évêché byzantin : Hiérissos en Chalcidique", p. 374.

[98] D. Papachryssanthou, "Histoire d'un évêché byzantin : Hiérissos en Chalcidique", p. 376 sq.

[99] I shall discuss them separately; here I will only say that in the 16th century, Hierissos was again elevated to the rank of metropolitan bishopric: D. Papachryssanthou, "Hiérissos, métropole éphémère au XIVe siècle", *Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance*, 4, 1970, p. 401 note 53.

cases and at different times. Such a case was not exceptional: it also occurs in Greek official documents. An example is the synodal act of September 1350, in which Patriarch Callistus designates the prelate of Hierissos as "ὁ ἱερώτατος ἀρχιερεὺς Ἱερισσοῦ"[100]. The term is correct and can be used for all persons of episcopal rank – patriarchs, metropolitans, archbishops and bishops. It was used in this way, in situations where there were reasons not to mention the concrete rank within the category of bishops. The question might be raised of whether this substitution has some hidden meaning, or whether it was this simply a continuation of an established practice in the Greek language? Evidently, the practice was due to the different ranks of the two prelates referred to in the Bucharest manuscript of the Synodicon, the metropolitan rank in Hierissos being incidental and an exception here. In this case, the use of the general term coexists with a direct indication of the metropolitan dignity of the prelate of Thessalonica[101]. These terms indicate a specific political-ecclesiastical situation that testifies to a similar attitude to the see of Hierissos, temporarily raised to the rank of metropolitan bishopric, as the attitude reflected in the document of the Synod of Constantinople and of Patriarch Callistus. Thus, with all due reservations justified by the dearth of sources, it may be suggested that the original of the Bucharest text was created in the same, or similar, ecclesiastic-literary environment.

As for the names of the two prelates, it should be noted that they are familiar from different documents: Bishop Niphon[102] immediately followed Metropolitan Jacob[103] as head of the diocese. Niphon held the see of Hierissos in the 1320s and 1330s: the first certain data about him are from May 1325, and in January 1323, the bishop there was his predecessor Theodosius; the last information about him dates from October 1330, but he evidently continued to be head of the see some time after that[104]. Niphon is not a particularly notable prelate, at least not in the sources. His presence in the Synodicon, while his

[100] Fr. von Miklosich, Ios. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca sacra et profana*, vol. I, *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani MCCCXV-MCCCCII*, Vienna, MDCCCLX, No CXXXIII, p. 296.

[101] D. Papachryssanthou, "Hiérissos, métropole éphémère au XIVe siècle", p. 405-406 et note 79.

[102] *PLPZ*, # 20626.

[103] *PLPZ*, # 92063; D. Papachryssanthou, "Hiérissos, métropole éphémère au XIVe siècle", p. 395-410; Iv. Biliarsky, "The Synodicon of Orthodoxy in BAR Ms. Sl. 307 and the *Hagioreticon Gramma* of the Year 1344", p. 104-105; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологивият Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 43-47, 50 sq.

[104] D. Papachryssanthou, "Histoire d'un évêché byzantin : Hiérissos en Chalcidique", p. 391-392.

predecessors are left unmentioned, might be accidental or could be attributed to the restless epoch and the theological disputes that flared up precisely then. He may have taken some part in these disputes, resulting in his mention in the commemorative part of the work. Of course, the other commemorated person, Metropolitan Jacob, is of much greater importance and has a stronger presence[105]. He probably occupied the see shortly after 1334 and remained there as bishop and metropolitan until his death at the end of 1366. His role and importance may be described in political terms: he was a representative of the Byzantines and of the power of the Empire, which at that time was strongly shaken in the region due to its occupation by the Serbs. Jacob served as a counterweight to the power of Tsar Stephen Dušan and later of John Ugleša; he supported the Greek-speaking population of the Chalkidiki peninsula at the time of the Serbian domination. It is believed that Hierissos was raised to the rank of metropolitan bishopric while he occupied the see due to his achievements and significance. The influence of Metropolitan Jacob on Mount Athos was enormous and real, not merely claimed. There are many extant data about his activity as an arbiter and judge in the affairs of the Hagiorite monastic community, and in ordainment there. He possessed his own *kathisma* in Karyes and certainly participated in the spiritual life of the Holy Mountain and in its organisational affairs as a defender of Orthodoxy. At the same time, he served as a counterweight to Serbian influence, exercised through the Protaton and the internal Hagiorite institutions.

The commemoration of these two prelates should be viewed and conceived in the context of their own environment and time. In short, there are three points to stress here . *First*, there was the Serbian presence in Eastern Macedonia (region of Serres, Chalkidiki and Mount Athos), which made the region – then under the direct rule of Skopje or of the Serres Principality – a contact zone between Slavs (the Serbian elite and authorities and the local Bulgarian population) and Byzantines. This was a very fruitful milieu for the translation and compilation of various literary works, including the Synodicon. *Second*, Mount Athos was certainly of enormous importance for the general Orthodox unity typical of the hesychast period and of the second half of the 14th century in general. Related to this, it is important to once again underline the influence,

[105] About him: D. Papachryssanthou, "Hiérissos, métropole éphémère au XIVe siècle", p. 395-410; D. Papachryssanthou, "Histoire d'un évêché byzantin: Hiérissos en Chalcidique", p. 392-393.

and even power, of Metropolitan Jacob over the monastic republic, which was normally averse to accepting the authority of bishops on its territory. The *third* point is the situation of the time: a period of intense struggle against heresies and for the establishment of hesychasm, which was also a factor in the reception of the text.

After the commemorations of Niphon and Jacob, no other prelates who occupied this see are mentioned; this is not due to damaged text, as the manuscript continues without any lacks. No such names were present in this section of the commemorative part of the Synodicon, which justifies the conclusion that the text was written soon after the decease of Metropolitan Jacob. This fact dates the protograph of our source to the time after 1366, and provides a good reference point for further research.

Section V
Commemorations of rulers, ecclesiastic dignitaries and secular dignitaries related to Bulgaria, in the Drinov manuscript

1. *Dyptichs with names of Bulgarian rulers*. They are present both in the Palauzov and Drinov list. We shall focus on the latter, which is part of the topic of this study. Here are the names commemorated in the text:

Drinov manuscript

Boris-Michael, khan
Symeon
Peter
Plenimir
Boris
Roman
Samuel
Gabriel Radomir
Vladimir
[John] Vladislav
John Assen Belgoun
Theodore Peter
Kaloyan
Boril
George I Terter
Šišman

Theodore Svetoslav
George II Terter
Michael [III Šišman Assen]
John Stephen

Soon after Tsar John Stephen, the list is cut short, due to the missing end of the manuscript. The names of the empresses are also lost, except for Maria, wife of Tsar John Vladislav[106].

The commemoration list begins with Khan Boris-Michael, the baptiser of Bulgaria, which indicates that only Christian rulers are included, which is to be expected. After him, the order continues without any important deviations from history; it follows at first the Preslav tsars from the Krum dynasty and list the rulers from the Cometopouloi dynasty. In the former dynasty, the name of Vladimir-Rasaté is omitted due to *damnatio memoriae*. Of the sons of Comes Nicholas, the four brothers David, Moses, Aaron, and Samuel, who began the fight against the Empire in Western Bulgaria, only Samuel is mentioned. This could be due to an attempt to erase the commemorations, but it could also be because the others were not perceived as genuine rulers at first, before the youngest brother came to the throne. In this respect, it is worth indicating the mention of Roman, the second son of St. Tsar Peter, whose position as tsar was controversial, since he was a eunuch. He is present in the list but many researchers reject the possibility he was actually a ruler in his condition – that would be inconsistent with the general concept of power in the Byzantine world[107].

There are two names that diverge from the list of known rulers: Plenimir and Vladimir. The mentioned prince Plenimir is not known from any other source and his presence in the Synodicon is strange; but an explanation for it has been proposed. In his commentary, which combined information from the Synodicon with that from the Dioclea Chronicle and several Byzantine authors, Ivan Dujčev suggests that Plenimir was a son of St. Tsar Peter who died young and is not much present in the sources, but who nevertheless found

[106] Ив. Божилов, *Българите във Византийската империя*, p. 249-250, № 167.
[107] Ив. Божилов, *История на средновековна България*, т. II, *Християнска България*, Sofia, 2017, p. 169.

a place in the Synodicon commemorations[108]. As for Vladimir, he could only be St. John Vladimir, the Serbian prince who became king of Zeta and son-in-law of Tsar Samuel, as the husband of the latter's daughter Theodora-Kosara. He suffered a martyr's death at the hands of Tsar John Vladislav, his brother-in-law[109].

The list of rulers of the First Empire is followed by a commemoration for the Seven Saints (Saints Cyril and Methodius and their disciples), which will be discussed later on in this presentation.

The list of tsars from the Second Empire begins with the three brothers who restored the Empire: Belgun-John I Assen, Theodore-Peter and Ioannitsa-Kaloyan. They are followed by their nephew Tsar Boril (the son of their sister), and by a narrative about the council convened by Boril on February 11, 1211, an event related to the creation of the Bulgarian Synodicon. It has been proposed that the text on the last line of f. 203r and lines 1-2 on f. 203v represents the ending of an eulogy to Tsar Constantine Teich Assen. Its beginning, including the name of the ruler, is missing[110]. This assumption cannot be established beyond doubt, but it seems acceptable. The structure of the commemorations of the tsars contains an element which is difficult to explain: the absence of the names after Tsar Boril and up to Tsar George I Terter, especially the omission of Tsar John II Assen, and the story about the establishment of the Tărnovo Patriarchate. This absence is due to missing sheets in the manuscript. Ivan Božilov discusses the omission of names of tsars from the commemoration list of the Synodicon[111], but the question raised here, regarding the absence of names after Tsar Boril and up to George I Terter, is not answered, as I. Božilov views the commemoration lists in DRIN and PAL together, and in the latter copy, the names of some tsars are present: John II Assen, Koloman I, Michael II Assen (however not as a tsar), and Constantine Teich Assen. Attempts to answer the question have been few and unsatisfactory. I shall only suggest that

---

[108] Ив. Дуйчев, „Българският княз Пленимир", *БЪЛГАРСКО СРЕДНОВЕКОВИЕ. Проучвания върху политическата и културна история на средновековна България*, Sofia, 1972, p. 153-160.

[109] Божилов, *История на средновековна България*, т. II, *Християнска България*, p. 179. For him see the recent book of Veneta Savova: В. Савова, *Песни за св. Йоан Владимир. Изследване и издание на словесната традиция за свети Йоан Владимир*, Sofia, 2018, 356 p.

[110] M. G. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, p. 81 note 3.

[111] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 50-51.

the names could be missing due to the protograph of the Drinov manuscript of the Synodicon: to missing sheets there, or another aspect of this unknown source manuscript. The list in DRIN ends with John Stephen, which is easily explained due to missing sheets. Still, it has to be pointed out, that after his name there is an unfinished text (interrupted by the end of the sheet) that seems to reinforce, as in a conclusion, the glory and piety of the Bulgarian tsars and their care for the people entrusted to them (DRIN, f. 203v$_{13\text{-}20}$). It can only be surmised how the text continued, which is best avoided.

The name Šišman, mentioned after Tsar George I Terter and before Tsar Theodore Svetoslav merits further discussion. I shall support the view that this name refers to the ruler of Vidin and father of Tsar Michael III Šišman Assen[112]. He was practically an independent ruler of the northwest lands and had enough self-confidence and influence in Bulgarian society to be included, albeit imprecisely, in the list of Bulgarian tsars. His son became ruler and restored the Assen dynasty to the throne but kept his father's family name Šišman, which would remain in the family up to Tsar John Šišman, in whose time Bulgaria fell under Ottoman rule.

As mentioned already, of the names of tsarines, only that of Maria, wife of Tsar John Vladislav, is present. As the names of empresses follow those of tsars, their absence from the Drinov manuscript of the Synodicon is due to missing sheets at that point. The list is much fuller in the Palauzov manuscript, and includes the names of Helena, mother of John Assen; Anna, the nun Anisia; the other Anna; Irene, mother of Tsar Michael II Assen and daughter of Theodore Comnenus; Maria, wife of Tsar George I Terter; Kyra Maria; Euphrosina, wife of Tsar Theodore Svetoslav; the two wives of Tsar John Alexander, both named Theodora; Kyra Thamara, wife of Emir Murad I; Kyra Maria, wife of Tsar John Šišman, as well as many daughters and mothers of tsars. Regrettably, it is not possible to know how the topic was treated on the lost sheets of DRIN.

2. *Commemorations for the Seven Saints (Sts Cyril and Methodius and their disciples).* As I pointed out, they are placed between the rulers of the First and the Second Empire.

---

[112] Ив. Божилов, *История на средновековна България*, т. II, p. 410-411, 415-430; Ив. Божилов, *Фамилията на Асеневци (1186-1460). Генеалогия и просопография*, Sofia, 1985, p. 119 sq.

The commemoration of St. Cyril (f. $202r_{5-11}$) is placed immediately after that of Empress Maria, wife of Tsar John Vladislav. This means it follows the imperial part – certainly a very honourable place. Next is the commemoration of St. Methodius (f. $202r_{12-14}$), archbishop of Great Moravia, who is mentioned as the creator of Slavic literature. The holy brothers Cyril and Methodius were not Bulgarians and had nothing to do with the Bulgarian state. Their mission was to spread the Gospel – as requested by the prince of Great Moravia and ordered by the Byzantine emperor. That is why the names of Michael III and his mother Theodora – the restorers of Orthodoxy and of the veneration of icons – are mentioned in this context: it was in their time that the holy brothers were sent to the Central European Slavs. It is also written about Cyril that he translated the Greek books "into Bulgarian". Given the general attitude of reverence for the holy brothers from Thessalonica, this is not surprising. I shall only point out that this text indicates full awareness of the Byzantine origin of the mission to Great Moravia and also the ideological importance of the veneration of Saint Cyril and Saint Methodius in Bulgaria.

The next commemorations are of St. Clement of Ochrid, designated as bishop of Great Moravia, of St. Sabbas, St. Gorazd and St. Nahum (f. $202r_{14-18}$), who also took part in the creation of Slavic books. This certainly confirms the veneration for the Seven Saints and testifies to its importance, which – I would say – includes its political significance.

3. *Commemorations of tsars' relatives and high dignitaries*

Because of missing folia at the end of the Drinov manuscript of the Synodicon, only three names have remained in the dyptich for commemoration of various dignitaries: Despot Stratsimir and his brothers Radoslav and Dimiter (f. $203v_{9-10}$). It thus presents the family of Tsar John Alexander. Despot Stratsimir was his father, and Radoslav and Dimiter were his uncles. In the Palauzov manuscript of the Synodicon, Kera Petritsa, the mother of Tsar John Alexander has also been mentioned, which certainly testifies to the special attitude to the parents of this ruler. The despot and his wife Kera Petritsa are known from other sources as well[113], including a letter of Pope Benedict XII to her in her quality of mother of the tsar. The tsar's father ruled over territories in

[113] About him, see Ив. Божилов, Фамилията на Асеневци, I/28, p. 136-139; Ив. Билярски, Институциите на средновековна България. Второ българско царство *(XII-XIV* век*)*, Sofia, 1998, 67-69.

southern Bulgaria, south of the Balkan Mountains, in the region around Krăn (which had for decades been under the separate rule of the representatives of the Smilets dynasty or of the Terter dynasty); his mother, who survived her husband, entered a monastery as nun Theophanò (Theophana).

Of Despot Stratsimir's two brothers, Dimiter is not known from other sources. The name Radoslav poses some problems when the text is viewed in light of other obituary lists. Thus, in the Boyana and Poganovo lists, the name Stratsimir occurs twice, the second time probably referring to Tsar John Stratsimir, but the first might designate Despot Stratsimir, father of John Alexander. His brother has in that list been referred to as a certain Vladislav, placed before Tsar John Stephen, who is the last-mentioned ruler of the region in the Poganovo obituary register[114]. How can the data from the two lists be reconciled with the difference in the names of Radoslav and Vladislav? I have pointed out elsewhere that the question cannot be definitely answered[115]. Probably the similar sounding names were copied incorrectly in the texts. Based on this assumption, preference should be given to the variant of the name attested in the Synodicon, which is a far more official work. In any case, it should be noted that Radoslav/Vladislav in question must have been a person of sufficiently high rank, in the time of Tsar John Stephen, to be included in the commemoration lists.

The mention of the family of the father of Tsar John Alexander provides indications regarding the dating of the initial Bulgarian text. This commemoration must have been included in the text at the time of his or his sons' reign, to account for the special regard shown there for this family. The older copy of the Synodicon contains many more commemorations of secular dignitaries, which are presented and commented on in the latest edition of the text[116].

---

[114] Й. Иванов, „Поменици на български царе и царици", in: Й. Иванов, *Избрани произведения*, т. I, *Литература, история, фолклор*, съст. Б. Ангелов, Sofia, 1982, p. 146, 148; Ив. Билярски, „Погановския поменик", *Годишник на Софийския университет, Център за славяно-византийски проучвания „Акад. Ив. Дуйчев"*, т. 84-85 (1990-1991), p. $56_{26,36}$.

[115] Ив. Билярски, *Институциите на средновековна България*, p. 69.

[116] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 167-168, 314, 356.

The Palauzov text also includes a large number of Bulgarian ecclesiastic dignitaries: patriarchs, metropolitan bishops, etc.[117] Some of the named metropolitans are those of Preslav, Cherven, Loveč, Sredets/Sofia, Oveč, Dorostorum; after the mention of each name, some empty space is left on the sheet. These names will not be studied in detail, as they are not present in the manuscripts under study. I should draw attention to the fact that DRIN contains is a list of metropolitans of Loveč on f. 202v[118], as a note in the outer margin, added perpendicularly to the lines. The addition was made in the hand of the writer of the main text. It is important to note that this list is identical to that of the metropolitans of Loveč in PAL. It includes the following prelates: Longinus, Meletius, Cyprian, Symeon, and another Symeon[119]. How can the addition of this list be accounted for? A possible explanation is the strong connexion of the DRIN manuscript to the city of Loveč. As mentioned before, the addition was made in the hand of the copyist, which establishes that it is contemporaneous with the manuscript. There is another added list, containing the metropolitans of Cherven[120]. It is unknown whether there were more lists on the missing pages of the manuscript.

[117] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 67-69, 169-174, 315-316, 356-358.

[118] See the text at the respective place here! Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, p. 79.

[119] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 172.

[120] See the text at the respective place here (f. 201v)! М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, p. 75

CHAPTER VI

HERESIES AND HERETICS

In discussing the heresies and the heretics which feature in the Synodicon, it is important to remember that the work was compiled specifically to mark the triumph of Orthodoxy over iconoclasm, and that it continued to develop as a liturgical text by presenting to the Church community the struggle against later deviations from dogma. That is why heresies and heretics are so amply presented in the text. A large part of these references has been borrowed from the Byzantine Synodicon. However, the work did not have a stable content but continued to develop through additions to the text. The additions made from the 9th to the 15th century concerned new deviations from dogma or references to local particularities. The Synodicon was never thought of as finally completed, and variants abound throughout its transmission. In the present chapter, I shall give an overview of the different heresies and deviations from Orthodox dogma within the Synodicon, with special focus on the two Slavic manuscript which attest to variant *P*. This focus defines the structure of the chapter, which is divided into several sections. The first presents the heresies borrowed from the original Greek text, while the subsequent sections deal with additions connected with the specific local situations, e. g. in Bulgaria (the Council of 1211 or the anathemata from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas) and on Mount Athos.

Section I
Condemnations and anathemata borrowed from the Byzantine original of the Synodicon

The major part of the anathemata against heresies and personally against prominent heretics is borrowed from the Byzantine original of the text. Thus, the original presentation and the subsequent additions follow in chronological order.

1. Of course, the first place belongs to the anathemata *against iconoclasm and the iconoclasts*: this was the purpose for which the original work was compiled. Both manuscripts which are the focus of the present study contain

an introductory homily that presents the Orthodox doctrine of the veneration of icons, followed by anathemata against iconoclasm and the iconoclasts. In the preceding chapters of this book, I have already remarked that the personal anathemata against individual representatives of this heresy coincide in B and DRIN as well as in the Byzantine original. Remarkably, included for anathematisation in the Synodicon are only the names of clergy, not of iconoclast emperors. This is different in the Georgian Synodicon, where the list of personal anathemata begins with Leo III, Constantine Copronymus, and Leo V of Armenia, as well as all enemies of the holy icons[1]. The names are clearly presented and arranged in separate anathemata. First mentioned are the iconoclast ecumenical patriarchs from the 8th century, the time of the first iconoclast period under the Isaurian dynasty (explicitly mentioned): Anastasius I (730-754)[2], Constantine II (754-766)[3] and Nicetas I (766-780)[4]. Following them are the ecumenical patriarchs of the second iconoclast period: Theodotus I Melisenus (815-821)[5], Anthony I Cassymatas (821-837)[6] and John VII Grammaticus (837-843)[7]. They are followed by heretics who did not belong to the high-ranking clergy but were obviously very diligent in maintaining

[1] *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 419-420.

[2] *Oxford Dictinary of Byzantium*, vol. I, 86; *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/1, # 285, 95-96 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=285 – 11.03.2021); R. J. Lilie (Hgb.), *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit (Germanos I. – Nethodios I. /715-847/)*, Berliner byzantinische Studien, Bd. 5, Frankfurt am Main, 1999, S. 22-29; *EPLBHC*, vol. 1, p. 218.

[3] *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/2, # 3820, 526-530 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=3820 – 11.03.2021); Lilie (Hgb.), *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit*, S. 30-44; Marjanović, *Creating Memories*, p. 214-225.

[4] *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/3, # 7954, 544-548 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=5404 – 11.03.2021); Lilie (Hgb.), *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit*, S. 45-49.

[5] *Oxford Dictinary of Byzantium*, vol. III, 2054; *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/2, # 3820, 526-530 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=7954 – 11.03.2021); Lilie (Hgb.), *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit*, S. 148-155.

[6] *Oxford Dictinary of Byzantium*, vol. I, 124-125; *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/1, # 550, 175-178 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=550 – 11.03.2021); Lilie (Hgb.), *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit*, S. 156-168; *EPLBHC*, vol. 1, p. 310.

[7] *Oxford Dictinary of Byzantium*, vol. II, 1052; *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/2, # 3189, 322-327-530 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=3199 – 11.03.2021); Lilie (Hgb.), *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit*, S. 169-182; Sénina, "Notices", p. 318-324; Сенина, "Иоанн Грамматик ", p. 102-112.

doctrinal deviations and persecuting the Orthodox: Paul[8], Theodore Gastes[9], Stephen of Molites[10], Theodore Crithinus[11] and Leo Laloudius[12].

As mentioned, the personal anathemata connected with the iconoclastic heresy raise no questions inasmuch as the Slavic text fully coincides with the Greek. The situation is slightly different in regards to anathemata on theological topics, which do not precisely follow the Greek original in the manuscript tradition published by Jean Gouillard. Right after the six anathemata, another six are included, borrowed from the condemnations related to Christ's Sacrifice. The question can be raised whether there was a particular theological reason for this displacement in the structure. In any case, it must be mentioned that these texts occur in the same form in the printed Triodia, and were supposed to appear in the same way in the Russian manuscript (Synodal №667), where a space was left empty for them.

---

[8] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 149 sq.; *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/3, # 5855, 544 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=5855 – 11.03.2021); Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Synodicon*, p. 322 note 36. Paul was a heretic relevant to the iconoclast age. He is designated as Saul, which gives us reason to think he was a persecutor of Orthodox people, as St. Apostle Paul was before becoming a Christian. It has been surmised he might be the ecumenical patriarch Paul IV, but this seems hardly probable to me (regarding this patriarch, see Lilie (Hgb.), *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit*, S. 50-56). In the Georgian Synodicon, he is listed immediately after Patriarch John Grammaticus, and is called Paul Isaurus (*Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 419-420).

[9] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 149 sq.; *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/4, # 7681, 467 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?target=PMBZ18928 – 11.03.2021); Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 322 note 37. A little-known heretic from the second iconoclast period.

[10] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 149 sq.; *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/4, # 7071, 259 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?target=PMBZ18295 – 11.03.2021); Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 322 note 38. A little-known heretic from the second iconoclast period. Like the preceding one, he is mentioned only in the Synodicon and in a homily by Michael Cerularius.

[11] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 149 sq.; *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/4, # 7675, 463-464 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?target=PMBZ18921 – 11.03.2021); Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 323 note 397. Deacon and economos of the Great Church; later, Archbishop of Syracuse. Convicted at the Council of 869-870, he was a heretic from the second iconoclast period.

[12] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 149 sq.; *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/3, # 4437, 49 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?target=PMBZ15600 – 11.03.2021); Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 323 note 40. A little-known heretic who lived in the second iconoclast period. He is mentioned only in the Synodicon and in a homily by Michael Cerularius.

2. The same anti-heretical current includes several anti-iconoclastic anathemata added to the text at a somewhat later time as a return to the basic topic of the work. These anathemata are present in the Bucharest and Palauzov manuscripts of the Synodicon, but are absent from the Drinov manuscript, probably due to lost sheets and the missing ending of the text. In B, these anathemata are placed after the condemnation of John Eirenicus and before the chapters against Barlaam and Gregory Akindynus; in PAL, they are after Gerontius of Lampé and before John Italus. Their location is evidently different. In the Gouillard edition of the Greek Synodicon, the anathemata are placed after the eulogy to St. Gregory Palamas (which follows the condemnation of Barlaam and Akindynus and precedes the commemoration of basileis). In the printed Synodicon, they are located after John Eirenicus and before Barlaam and Gregory Akindynus, as in the Bucharest manuscript. This confirms the closeness of B to the printed Synodicon, which is an important observation for the present study.

The text itself is borrowed from the anathemata pronounced at the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Second of Nicaea), and confirmed or expanded at the Council of Constantinople (869-870), which for the Roman Church is the Eighth Ecumenical Council[13]. It represents a kind of return to the initial purpose of the work, albeit in a later age. Thus, in the P variant the anathemata are included towards the end, in the part related to the Palamite controversies. Precisely this part is lacking from DRIN, and it may be supposed that the missing anathemata were written on the missing folia there.

3. The anathema against Gerontius of Lampé should be presented separately, as it does not belong to any concrete group of condemnations, though it does not deal with a particularly serious problem in the doctrinal deviations from Orthodoxy. It has been suggested that Gerontius of Lampé is remembered chiefly due to the fact he was anathemised in the Synodicon, otherwise he would have been forgotten[14]. He was born in Anatolia, somewhere between the territories of Pisidia and Phrygia, in the second half of the 11th century

[13] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 92 note 308.

[14] J. Gouillard, "L'hérésie dans l'Empire byzantin dès origines au XIIe siècle", *Travaux et mémoires*, 1, 1965, p. 314; J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 186-187; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 383; *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*, Bd. I/2, #2312, 42 (http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/scripts/browse.xql?id=2312 – 11.03.2021).

and was probably convicted earlier than John Italus. He preached in Crete and declared himself a messiah. In fact, very little is known about him.

4. *The teaching of John Italus* created a much greater problem for the Church and made a more thorough impact on the religious life of Byzantine society. That is why it is a significant part of the Synodicon's variant C and is present as such in both lists under discussion here. John Italus was a remarkable Byzantine philosopher[15], who was born in southern Italy (circa 1025), moved to Constantinople around the middle of the 11th century and studied under Michael Psellus, inheriting his position as *Consul (hypatos) of philosophers.* Although he is usually considered an Aristotelian, John Italus was condemned for Platonism, as reflected in the anathemata against him in the Synodicon. He was the first philosopher to be convicted for his ideas by the otherwise tolerant Orthodox Church, which insisted that the ideas of pagan thinkers should be used only for pedagogical purposes, and did not approve direct citation and praise for these philosophers. John Italus had problems early on, at the council in 1076-1077, which rejected most of his ideas and not him personally. He was convicted at the council of 1082, presided over by the sebastocrator Isaac Comnenus, brother of basileus Alexius I, and spent the rest of his life in a monastery. The main accusation against Italus was of paganism and applying prohibited methods to the interpretation of theological topics.

The Synodicon includes ten anathemata related to the condemnation of the philosopher, all of which are present in both Slavic manuscripts discussed here. The text of the personal condemnation of John Italus is not included, although it occurs interpolated elsewhere in DRIN. I should draw attention to a phrase rarely encountered in Greek Synodica (in copy Cc of the Gouillard classification) relevant to Bogomilism[16]: "To priest Bogomil, who, under Peter, the tsar of Bulgaria, created and spread this Manichean heresy in the cities of our land, anathema". This proclamation has been placed in DRIN between the third and the fourth anathema against John Italus, in the chapter about the transmigration of souls, the resurrection of the dead and the Final Judgment, which is followed by the chapter about eternal matter without beginning or

[15] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 188-202; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. II, 1059-1060; Г. Каприев, *Византийска философия. Четири центъра на синтеза*, 2 ed. София, 2011, p. 278-280; *PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Ioannes/66/ – 11.03.2021; A. Rigo, "Giovanni Italo", p. 62-67; Kraft, Perczel, "John Italos", p. 659-720.

[16] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 58 note 264; the Greek text on p. 59, in the variations given in the footnote.

end, related to the Creation. I believe the inclusion of the anathema against Bogomil is not accidental, although the philosophy of John Italus must not be confused with any sort of dualism. In fact, the rejection of his teaching concerns the very narrow, explicitly indicated, use of pagan Hellenic philosophy, which might induce people – out of ignorance or purposely – to question fundamental dogmas of the Church.

5. The condemnation and anathema against the monk *Nilus of Calabria*[17] is connected with the condemnation of John Italus, whose spiritual successor he was. His condemned doctrine is related to Christological questions and the divinisation of nature in the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. Nilus of Calabria is condemned personally, like his followers, without a detailed presentation of his erroneous theological ideas.

6. Related to the preceding two are the condemned teachings of *Eustratius of Nicaea*[18]. In fact, only two anathemata against his doctrine are present (G. ll. 3915-403), added to the initial anti-iconoclastic section and repeated in DRIN after the anti-Bogomil anathemata and before the condemnation of Constantine, the former metropolitan of Kerkyra.

Eustratius of Nicaea was a disciple of John Italus; according to the text of his condemnation, he renounced his teacher's errors and became an "ecumenical teacher" (*oikoumenikos didaskalos*) and metropolitan of Nicaea. An outstanding philosopher and theologian, a commentator of Aristotle, he took part in many controversies against Pietro Grossolano, the Armenians, and other deviants from dogma. He is considered a representative of "nominalism" in Byzantium, as he thought universals were "names". At the Council of 1117, he was condemned on Christological questions, specifically, the difference between the Embodied Word and the Lord Jesus Christ. It should be noted that only one of the anathemata against his doctrine is included in the two manuscripts under consideration, probably due to the lack of topical importance for Slavic environments.

---

[17] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 202-206; *PBW*: http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk/person/Neilos/15001/ – 11.03.2021; Garsoïan, « L'abjuration du moine Nil », p. 12-27; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Synodicon*, p. 323 note 44.

[18] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 206-210; *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. I, p. 755; *ΕΠΛΒΙΠ*, τ. ΣΤ', P. 368-369; EPLBHC, t. II, p. 442-443; Каприев, *Византийска философия*, p. 280-283.

7. The controversy regarding the *Sacrifice of Christ*, and the condemnation of Michael[19], protekdikos and magister of rhetoricians, Nicephorus Basilakes[20], Eustathius[21], metropolitan of Dyrrhachium and Soterichos Panteugenus[22], deacon of the Great Church and titular patriarch of Antioch. They were likewise intellectuals from the time of the great cultural flowering in the 11th – 12th century, who discussed the Sacrifice of the Lord and the Redemption in philosophical terms. They were condemned at the councils of 1156 and 1157 in Constantinople, where six anathemata were pronounced. The dispute had evidently excited Byzantine society and is strongly present in the Synodicon. Notably, all these anathemata were included in the two Slavic manuscripts under study here.

8. The controversy regarding the Gospel expression "My Father is greater than I/*Pater maior me est*" (John 14:28). This was a theological dispute touching on Trinitarian and Christological issues and on some emerging differences from the Roman Church and its dogmas. The dispute has been considered as unnecessary at the time, yet it was one of the most significant 12th-century controversies reflected in the Synodicon. Perhaps part of the importance of the issue is due to the personal involvement of the *basileus* Manuel I Comnenus, who convened two synods and did his best to assert and promote their decisions, which were part of his general pro-Latin cultural attitude, clearly reflected during that age.

8. 1. The first synod on the issue of "*Pater maior me est*" [23] was held in March 1166. The emperor managed to impose his stance, received the signed consent of the bishopric and introduced the necessary formulas in

[19] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 210 sq.; Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 279 sq., 325 sq., 438 sq.; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 324 note 47.

[20] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 210 sq.; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 279 sq., 325 sq.; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 324 note 48.

[21] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 210 sq.; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 279 sq., 325 sq.; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 324 note 49.

[22] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 210 sq.; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 279 sq., 325 sq.; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 324 note 50.

[23] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 216-221; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 287-288.

the Synodicon (which was read on the Sunday of Orthodoxy, on Mach 13, 1166) and in the Credo read on various occasions. In the following month, he published a special act giving the decisions the power of law, and even inscribed them on a sign in the Great Church St. Sophia. The text, which is added to the Synodicon, comprises six chapters (a description of the event, three anathemata, and two commemorations) that hold an important place in the text – G. ll. 472-509. The first chapter (G. ll. 472-478), which contains strong praise for Manuel Comnenus, is absent from the Bulgarian Synodica. The last chapter (G. ll. 505-509) is present in DRIN in a modified form. I do not think the theme was of topical importance for Bulgaria.

8. 2. The second synod[24] (or rather the several sessions) on the same topic was held in January-February 1170, after the death of Patriarch Luke earlier that winter. The new patriarch was unable to control the situation and opponents of the decisions of 1166 voiced their stance against them. The most outspoken were Constantine, ex-metropolitan bishop of Kerkyra (Corfù) and John Eirenicus, Abbot of St. Nicephorus Monastery at Batala, on the coast of Asia Minor. They were anathemised together with their adherents, and the decisions of the 1166 synod were explicitly confirmed.

The decisions related to this renewed controversy can be divided into three parts: a general and basic part, a part about the condemnation of Constantine of Kerkyra, and one about John Eirenicus. All three parts must have been included in B and DRIN, but the last of these (about the condemnation of John Eirenicus) was obviously located on the missing sheets at the end of the work. The other two parts are present, but the beginning of the text (G. ll. 510-516) is missing from some of the Bulgarian copies.

9. The last condemnation of this section is that of Barlaam and Gregory Akindynos, borrowed from the Byzantine original of the Synodicon. The text stems from the Palamite controversies, one of the most important religious events in the Empire during the last century of its existence. It is exceptionally important, though it raises no problems in research on the Synodicon in the Slavic context. This condemnation, of course, is a basic marker for classification under variant *P* of the work. Unfortunately, it is present only in the Bucharest copy, but it may safely be asserted that in DRIN it was located on the missing folia at the end of the Synodicon.

---

[24] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 221 sq.; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos*, p. 288-289.

Section II
The Council of Tărnovo of 11 February 1211 AD

A remarkable event took place in Tărnovo on 11 February 1211, one that not only had a strong impact on the religious history of Bulgaria but also occasioned the creation of the Bulgarian Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy, the topic of this book. The two Bulgarian manuscripts of the work, Palauzov and Drinov, contain descriptions of this council, which complement each other. Understandably, the description of the Council is not included in the Bucharest Synodicon. This highest ecclesiastic forum of Orthodoxy was held at a difficult time in the history of the Bulgarian state, between critical events that preceded and followed it. Four years earlier, there had been a change of ruler, under less than clear circumstances. Although I do not believe it can be established beyond doubt that Tsar Kaloyan died a violent death, his decease nevertheless destabilised the state and led to internal clashes due to the lack of an established order for legitimating the new holder of the throne. Tsar Boril managed to assert himself, but the situation remained delicate, not least because of a series of unsuccessful military and foreign policy moves. The section of the Synodicon under consideration here deals with the spread of a heretical movement that certainly had a negative effect on the situation. This may have been the main reason for convening the Council, although there may have been some additional political motives.

Vassil Zlatarski subjects his explanation of the anti-heretical council to his general theory of the nature of the state, politics, nation, and culture of medieval Bulgaria, which has left persistent clichés in historiography even unto this day. Specifically in this case, he notes "the doctrine itself [of the Bogomils] carries a national character [and] has always been connected, in addition to the economical, also to the social-political condition of the people"[25]. Probably this is precisely the stance that explains the unhealthy love for these heretics on the part of Bulgarian historians, reflected in writings about them, especially at the time of the totalitarian communist regime. In the context of the present study, it suffices to state that V. N. Zlatarski rejected the thesis according to which the Bogomils had taken part in the restoration of the Bulgarian state, but he did relate the flourishing of the heresy to Tsar Boril's

[25] В. Н. Златарски, *История на българската държава през средните векове*, т. III, *Второ българско царство. България при Асеневци (1187-1280)*, Sofia, 1940, p. 297.

"usurpation of the throne" (an invention) and to the fight between two parties in Bulgarian politics during the Second Empire[26]. One of the parties was called the "Cuman" (or anti-dynastic and anti-Assen party of Tsar Boril), the other was the "Bulgarian" (formed by the supporters and children of Tsar John I Assen). Subsequent theories follow this reasoning and are not particularly worthy of attention. In any case, this view attributes the council only to internal political causes: the council was "the best means [for Tsar Boril] to rid himself of his political enemies". V. N. Zlatarski also ascribes other aspects exclusively to internal political struggle, ignoring the religious dimensions, such as the non-mention of the prelate Archbishop Basil or of the Union with Rome, and the absence of certain high-ranking persons from the Council (?)[27]. Again, these views have been repeated in subsequent scholarship.

Although the negative attitude to Tsar Boril is permanently embedded in Bulgarian historiography, Zlatarski's extreme view has been corrected more than once. Ivan Dujčev, in a brief article, sees the historical context and testimonies of the Synodicon differently: he rejects the notion of Tsar Boril's "usurpation" (and the murder of Tsar Kaloyan in general) as well as the supposed purpose of the 1211 Council and alleged relations with Rome[28]. D. Angelov devotes considerable attention to the Council and the events preceding it and following after the restoration of the Bulgarian state; he presents his discussion in the framework of his view on Bogomilism and its role in Bulgarian history[29]. The most recent study on the topic is by Ivan Božilov, who not only focuses on the Synodicon but generally rethinks the historical context of Tsar Boril's reign, the convening of the Council and the creation of the work in question[30]. Above all, he adduces convincing reasons to reject the thesis that the throne was usurped through a non-existing order of inheritance. His argument entails the denial of the existence of "Cuman" and "Bulgarian" parties and of their supposed role in the struggle with the heretics. Božilov presents a clear picture of the internal political environment of the events, which seem to have been characterised by a conflict with the Latins in

[26] Златарски, *История…*, т. III, p. 296-299.

[27] Златарски, *История…*, т. III, p. 300-303.

[28] Iv. Dujčev, "Das Synodikon von Boril als Geschichte und Schrifttumsdenkmal", *Byzantinobulgarica*, VI, Sofia, 1980, S. 115-124.

[29] Д. Ангелов, *Богомилството в България*, Sofia, 1969, p. 438-454.

[30] Божилов, *Фамилията на Асеневци*, p. 69-77 (№ I/6); Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 21-23, 25-26; *Божилов, История…*, т. II, p. 338-341.

Constantinople and rapprochement with Theodore I Lascaris, a situation that provides a good basis for understanding the nature of the Council. Evidently, developments in the Church cannot be constantly explained purely by political considerations, although these played a role, especially as religion formed the foundation of identity and legitimacy of power.

In fact, I believe that the Council of 11 February 1211 is best understood simply as an anti-heretical council, with the purpose of overcoming an internal problem. Refraining from the search for hidden causes there is no longer a need to construct complex combinations. In addition, it seems that the heresy was indeed spreading, which occasioned the condemnation of its representatives. But the event raises some important questions to address: what was the nature of the Council and what influence did it exercise on the narrative about it?

After the reign of Tsar Kaloyan, Bulgaria and the Bulgarian Church were in union with Rome; thus, the question can be raised whether the source presents the practice of the Roman or of the Orthodox Church. The Synodicon[31] ascribes the merit of convening the Council and the related events entirely to Tsar Boril: the spread of the heresy occurs during his time, he convenes the Council, he sends people throughout the country to gather the weeds, he cunningly exposes the heretics, he punishes them and he orders the translation of the Synodicon, and finally he closes the Council. The secular power certainly plays a leading role in this ecclesiastic forum. Neither the Pope, nor the Roman Church are mentioned in the text. Equally absent is the prelate of Bulgaria, Archbishop Basil, who seems not to have participated in the Council. In fact, none of the prelates has been mentioned by name: they are only mentioned as participants in the Council and there is no commemoration of them immediately after the story. The Council is called "Orthodox" and is included in the list of Orthodox councils. The tsar has also been designated as "Orthodox". The lack of reference to the Roman Church certainly raises the question of whether there was a noticeable withdrawal from the Union with Rome at the time of Tsar Boril. This would be possible in the context of this ruler's military activity and foreign policies, although it has not been explicitly indicated.

It may be assumed that the qualification of the tsar and the Council as "Orthodox" served as a device for glorification, and the word is not used to indicate a contrast with "Catholic". Moreover, it should be kept in mind that

[31] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 153-157, 310-312.

the oldest copy of this text dates to the 14th century, about a century and a half after the event. During this time, the text had been changed through additions and corrections, and it is not to be excluded that references to the Pope and Archbishop Basil were simply erased from the text as a result of *damnatio memoriae*. There is no data about the exact development of the work in the course of its transmission history before the first available manuscript. In fact, I believe that the strongest argument in support of the Orthodox character of the Council is the translation and implementation of the Synodicon. This is explicitly indicated in the story: the Council was held on the Friday of Quadragesima Sunday, and the reading of the Synodicon was meant to take place on the Sunday of Orthodoxy. The book, and especially the act concerning its purpose, gives a clear sign of the affiliation to Eastern Christianity. The Synodicon was never used in the West, and even its printing in Italy during the Ottoman period of the Balkans, raised indignation in Catholic circles and necessitated a revision and republication of the text[32]. The appearance of the work in Bulgaria, at the tsar's order at that, and the implementation of its public reading in liturgy on the first Sunday of Lent, do not testify to dependence on Rome – on the contrary.

There is yet another matter that should not be overlooked: the organisation as such of the Council against the Bogomils, which is strongly reminiscent of the condemnation of Basil the Healer (Vrač) in Constantinople at the time of Alexius I Comnenus. Ivan Božilov draws attention to this in the latest edition of the Synodicon[33]. Anna Comnena's tale about the trial of the Bogomil Basil is the main source for the latter event[34], although the trial is also mentioned by Euthymius Zigabenus, Michael Psellus and some chroniclers and canonists of that time. The emperor's daughter, a remarkable writer, describes the trial and punishment of the Bogomil Basil the Healer and his followers in detail[35]. In brief, Basil preached in Constantinople, followed by his twelve disciples, called

---

[32] L. Allatius, *De libris et rebus ecclesiasticis Graecorum dissertationes et observationes variae*, Parisiis, 1646, п. 143-193; E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des Grecs au XVIII^e siècle,* vol. I, Paris, 1918, № 162, p. 198; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Synodicon в славянски превод*, p. 99.

[33] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 32-33, 38-39 note 32.

[34] *ΕΠΛΒΠΠ*, t. Δ, п. 272-274.

[35] Anne Comnène, *Alexiade*, t. III (l. XI-XV). éd. B. Leib, Paris, 1943, p. 218_{28}-228_{29}; a translation of the text in Ив. Божилов, *Византийският свят*, p. 623-628. Вж. и Д. Ангелов, *Богомилството в България*, p. 391-400.

"apostles". Due to the harmful influence of the heresy, the *basileus* Alexius I decided to take the matter into his own hands, ordered that Basil be found, and invited him to a conversation. Basil was suspicious, but after the emperor treated him to a meal and predisposed him, Basil revealed his doctrine, hoping to win the ruler over on his side. Unfortunately for Basil, Alexius had ordered a scribe to hide behind the curtain, who wrote everything down. Subsequently, the *Synkletos* and a Synod were convened, which condemned Basil and his disciples. The former was burned at the stake, and those of his followers who refused to repent spent many years in jail.

The tale contains the same ingredients as the account of the Tărnovo Council of 1211: the spread of a heresy, an invitation by the ruler, who cunningly predisposes the heresiarchs to present their doctrine, the trial, the condemnation and the punishment of the disseminators of the false doctrine. Of course, Anna Comnena's more detailed account is also more ample in its presentation of the dogmatic deviations in question, but a common schema is visible.

Would there have been a common influence? If so, of what kind and how was it exerted? Were the two accounts written according to a *topos*? Or perhaps similar conditions entail similar solutions to the problem?

Ivan Božilov raises many of these questions and asserts that no true answer has been found. Of course, this is because no answer can be found without new sources, and it is highly improbable such will be found. It seems very unlikely that the work of Anna Comnena was known in Bulgaria at the time of Tsar Boril. It seems difficult to prove whether or not people in Bulgaria knew about the reprisals against heretics carried out by Alexius I, and specifically his condemnation of Basil the Healer. Could such knowledge have been acquired through the *Dogmatic Panoply* by Euthymius Zigabenus? This question will be addressed, within a study and publication of the Slavic translation of this book which is currently in preparation. One of the solutions proposed by Ivan Božilov appears attractive. He has suggested that the mode of acquiring information about a heresy by deceiving the person under investigation was determined by the similar contexts of these investigations, which were carried out within highly motivated, fanatical and closed societies.

None of these solutions can be positively rejected or affirmed, but I would propose a direction for thought. The Council was devoted to the fight against heresy, which was a serious threat to the unity of societies in the Balkans

during the Comnenian and post-Comnenian ages. In a sense – and especially if it really testifies to a return to Orthodoxy after the Union with Rome – the Council demonstrated loyalty to Orthodoxy through the fight against deviations. In any case, the translation of the Synodicon and its introduction into liturgical practice demonstrate such loyalty. The sequence of actions of Alexius I Comnenus in the fight against heresies can be assessed in this context. It cannot be determined how information about these actions reached Tărnovo, but it is not to be excluded that those events from Constantinople were known in the Bulgarian capital. There are other paths of testimony, which we shall not be able to trace individually; one of these is related to the anathemata in the text that are specific only to this Bulgarian variant of the work.

Section III
Anathemata against Bogomils and anathemata from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas

1. In PAL, the account of the Council of 1211 is followed by an anathema that seems derived precisely from this event (it is not present in DRIN). The anathema is against the "thrice accursed Bogomil and his disciple Michael" and against Theodore and Dobré, Stephen and Basil and Peter, against the rest of his disciples and the like-minded[36]. It is obviously aimed at the founder of the heresy and his immediate disciple Michael, who seems to be separated from the rest of the followers, and against teachers and leaders contemporaneous with the Council. What is the best explanation for the absence of this anathema from DRIN? It is not due to a lacuna in the text; the end of the story about the events in 1211 is simply greatly abridged. A completely undisputable answer cannot be provided, but I believe that the absence may be due to a decreased interest in the Council by the time this later manuscript was made. The Bulgarian witnesses to the Synodicon mutually influence each other, or rather, they have a common original, but the texts coincide only partially, especially as the two belong to different variants of the work.

2. One of the elements which PAL and DRIN have in common, in contrast with the Byzantine original and all other Slavic manuscripts and printed editions, is the inclusion of anathemata from the letter of Ecumenical Patriarch

[36] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик,* p. $157_{8\text{-}17}$ (f. $29v_{8\text{-}17}$).

Cosmas (1075-1081) to the metropolitan of Larissa in Thessaly. The merit of identifying this text as the source of some of the anathemata in the Bulgarian Synodicon belongs to Jean Gouillard, who published the text about half a century ago[37]. The letter in question is an instruction by the archbishop of the eparchy regarding the pronouncement of anathemata against the Bogomil heretics throughout the Bulgarian land and, beyond that, throughout the western parts of the Empire in general, to which this plague had spread. The anathemata and themes, and/or persons they concern, are duly enumerated, serving as a convenient source for the Bulgarian Synodicon[38].

What kind of letter is it? According to Jean Gouillard, it was a form included in the circular letter (encyclical) by the ecumenical patriarch to all eparchies or at least to those of the western regions of the Empire[39]. For his part, Ivan Božilov believes this was a personal letter of the patriarch to the metropolitan of Larissa, motivated by curiosity concerning the heresy problem in the eparchy[40]. I believe it was certainly a form included in the encyclical, which explains how the text reached the compiler of the Bulgarian Synodicon: it was available in the eparchies of the western Byzantine territories, including Bulgaria, then under Byzantine rule. There could have been a Slavic translation of the text, since this language was in use in the Church, but there is no evidence to raise this statement above the level of speculation.

The text did not enter the Synodicon unchanged: it was revised and restructured. Importantly, it was included solely in the Bulgarian Synodicon. The text is not present in other Slavic variants or in the Greek Byzantine copies. In my opinion, this is due to the specifically anti-Bogomil theme of the Council of 1211. Very probably, it was included on the occasion of the composition of the Bulgarian variant of the Synodicon, a result of that Council.

This is the first Greek text that mentions the priest Bogomil as founder and spreader of the heresy. He lived at the time of St. Tsar Peter, but left a long-lasting trace in collective memory. Unfortunately, the text contains no personal data and there is some uncertainty as to which of the two patriarchs

[37] J. Gouillard, "Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril : la lettre inédite du patriarche Cosmas", *Travaux et mémoires*, vol. 4, 1970, p. 361-374.

[38] J. Gouillard, "Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril : la lettre inédite du patriarche Cosmas", p. 371_{28}-372_{57}.

[39] J. Gouillard, "Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril : la lettre inédite du patriarche Cosmas", p. 364, 373.

[40] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 31.

named Cosmas it refers to: Cosmas I (1075-1081) or Cosmas II Atticus (1146-1147)[41]. The former seems more likely, not only because the rule of Cosmas II was very brief and he left the see under particular circumstances, being accused of connexions with the Bogomils. The main argument in the choice of identification is a difference between the Bulgarian Synodicon and the patriarch's letter: the anathema against Basil the Healer, who had sown the seeds of the Bogomil heresy in Constantinople under the Orthodox Tsar Alexius Comnenus[42]. If the letter had come from the pen of Patriarch Cosmas II Atticus, such an omission would be inexplicable. The trial of Basil, however, took place after the pontificate of Patriarch Cosmas I, which explains the lack of anathemata against that heretic. The cited anathema from the Bulgarian Synodicon also testifies to a growing interest in the anti-heretical, and specifically anti-Bogomil, theme, and shows that the condemnations in it were enriched not only by the letter of Patriarch Cosmas. Generally speaking, the presence of these anathemata in the text written in Bulgaria indicates that the Comnenian policy of restricting and eliminating deviations from dogma was being continued in the Empire.

The other anathema, in addition to those from Patriarch Cosmas's letter in the Bulgarian Synodicon, is clearly related to the rejection of the dualist heresy. It refers to excommunicating those who assert that a woman conceives with the aid of the fiend, who remains in her womb until the birth of the child and cannot be expelled through Holy Baptism but only through prayer and fasting[43]. The message of the anathema is clear: it rejects the negative attitude to the flesh, the body, and, in this case, childbirth, viewed by the dualists as the imprisonment of the soul within the material body. The sacrament of Holy Baptism is also rejected, while fasting and prayer are affirmed, viewed as action against the flesh. Thus, the anathema is distinctly part of the anti-dualist struggle.

The next large group of anathemata and commemorations aimed primarily against dualist beliefs is located in the Drinov manuscript on f. 200r-200v (the whole sheet). In PAL these anathemata are more numerous than in DRIN,

---

[41] J. Gouillard, "Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril : la lettre inédite du patriarche Cosmas", p. 363; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 31.

[42] See here DRIN: f. $197r_{20}$-$197v_{3}$; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 127_{20}-128_{3} (PAL: f. $15v_{20}$-$16r_{3}$, DRIN: f. $197r_{20}$-$197v_{3}$).

[43] See here: DRIN: f. $196v_{14\text{-}19}$; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 125_{20}-126_{7} (PAL: f. $14v_{20}$-$15r_{7}$, DRIN: f. $196v_{14\text{-}19}$).

because in the latter, the sheets preceding f. 200 are missing. These anathemata have no counterparts in the Greek Synodicon, nor are they borrowed from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas. They are a continuation of the anti-dualist controversy in PAL and DRIN.

Thus, these observations warrant the conclusion that the anti-dualist theme (both the story of the Council of 1211, the anathemata from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas and other anti-Bogomil anathemata), and other common features, indicate an indisputable connexion between the two Bulgarian manuscripts and place them in the same context. The connecting factor between the two manuscript was probably a shared protograph, part of which was inserted into the DRIN text. It should be noted, however, that the anti-Bogomil theme was not unique to Bulgaria, nor necessarily implies that the heresy was a problem in the Bulgarian environment in the early 13th century. Without excluding the possibility that the heresy had spread, I believe that the theme was developed in continuation with the efforts of the Comnenus dynasty, and of the Byzantine authorities in general, to overcome heresy. The Council, and the Synodicon it produced, opened the way for the inclusion of Bulgaria in the context of the age and the assertion of power in the Empire. At the same time, these events led to a deterioration of the Empire's relations with the Roman Church.

Section IV
The Athonite General Assembly of 1345 and the conviction of the group of Irene Porenè

1. Perhaps the most characteristic section of the Bucharest Synodicon is that concerning the decisions of the General Assembly of Mount Athos against heretical monks (ff. $15v_{8}$-$16r_{21}$). Antonio Rigo identified and commented on the Greek text, within his articles dedicated to the topic of the hesychast and Bogomil monks on Mount Athos[44]. He also published the Greek text from the manuscript in the Vatican Apostolic Library (Ms. Vat. Gr. 604 ff. 11r-12v) entitled *Hagioretikon gramma* (or *Tome of Condemnation*), dated to 1345.[45] I

[44] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivole agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, Firenze, MCMLXXXIX.

[45] A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale atonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili (ms. Vat. Gr. 604 ff. 11r-12v)", *Cristianesimo nella storia. Ricerche storiche, esegetiche, teologiche*, 5 (1984), p. 475-506.

express my gratitude that he proposed to republish the Greek text as an annexe to this book, so it can be consulted directly. Many of the problems posed by the text have been resolved by the Italian scholar, so here I shall limit myself to generalising and systematising his results in relation to the study of its Slavic translation.

Foremost, I would like to compare the two texts and look for connexions between them[46]. Antonio Rigo had access to the text in BAR, Ms. sl. 307 even if he is not a specialist in Slavic studies and has not offered a textological analysis. A comparison of the two texts demonstrates that the Bucharest text, containing the anathemata after the list of names of heretics, is a precise translation of the contents of the *Hagiorite Tome of Condemnation* published by Rigo. A parallel examination will illustrate this:

(f. 15v-16v) ӥже лю́тꙋю и҆ мр[....] /масаліа́нскꙋю ересь оу҆ се́бе лъста́[....] / и҆ ꙁлодѣ́нстьвнѣ съдрьже҃ [..а......] / мръꙁча́нша и҆ ꙁло̀чъстнвѣ [....] / и҆ тво́реть и҆ оу҆четь • бж҃твнꙋ [....]е оу҃ нкѡ́ны дрѣва҃ и҆ бре́ніе ӥменꙋють • и҆ по / плю́ваю҃, и҆ безчь́стеть • и҆ съжнѕаю҃ сі́е • / и҆ въса́кы҃ ѡ҆браꙁо҃ скврънеть и҆ растлѣваю҃ • / Ст҃оеже кр҃щеніе • и҆ въсѐ сщ҃е́нное прнче́щ҃еніе • въсѐст҃го и҆ жнвотво́рещаго тѣла / и҆ кръве г҃а на́шего і҆у҃ х҃а • ѿ тръпѣніа / твоего х҃е ц҃рю • не полъꙁно же и҆ сꙋетно / [....]щн и҆ оу҆чещн и҆ бж҃твное и҆ сп҃сн /тел҃ное и҆ ч҃лколю́бное, ӗже пльтіꙋ съм҃/треніе и҆ ꙗ҆вле́ніе его̀ ѿмѣ́таю҃ . и҆ на / [....]жѐ мрътвы҃ въскр҃се́ніе ӥме / [....] въса́ко же скврън҆ство̀ и҆ мрьꙁо / [....]а҃ [.ка҃] велн́кꙋ добродѣ́тѣль дѣла / [....]е прнле́жно. и҆ ӥна прѣлютаа и҆ и҆спль҃ / [в]са́кого безбо́жіа. Скврънноде́нствіа / [....]прѣпѡ҃бс҆твіа прѣда́ю҃ . ꙗ҆же неть́ / [въ] пнсмен҆мн и҆лн̀ е҆ꙁыкѡ҃ . нь ннжѐ са / мымь съмысломь, хр҃тіа҆нѡ҃ бл҃гочь́/стнвы҃ ѡ҆бно́снтн сътръпнмо. и҆ мнѡ́/гые ӥные скврънным́н ӥхъ хы́трослѡ́віи, /и҆ прѣльстіꙋ растлѣ́ваю҃. поне҃ и҆ хытро҃ / [....]жьство и҆ тъща́ніе велн́ко се҃ тво́/[....]е мнѡ́гые е҆лн́кы҃ ѡ҆цоу҆ сво /[....]прнве́стн. и҆ съ со́бою ѿнѣ҃ /[...н]ꙋю порн́нꙋтн про́пасть. а҆на҃ма ~ г҃ ~ / [....] масаліа҆нъ . и҆ прне́млющн҃ и҆ прнѡ҆/бщающн҃ се сн҃ въвѣдѣнн . и҆ мръскаа н҃ /оу҆че́ніа прне́млющн҃ . а҆на́ѳема҃ •: г҃ ~ /

The corresponding Greek text can be found in the Annexe, together with an English translation[47].

---

[46] I have devoted a special article to these questions: Iv. Biliarsky, “The Synodicon of Orthodoxy in BAR Ms. Sl. 307 and the *Hagioreticon Gramma* of the Year 1344”, *The Balkans and the Byzantine World before and after the Captures of Constantinople, 1204 and 1453,* ed. Vl. Stanković, Lanham-Boulder-New York-London, 2016, p. 103-115

[47] See here A. Rigo, “The Tome of Condemnatio…”, ll. 21-40 (Greek text). See also the previous publication: A. Rigo, “L’assemblea generale atonita del 1344 su un gruppo di

The two texts are identical and it seems to me that either the Slavic was translated from this Greek paragraph or the two share a common archetype. In any case, the dependence on a Greek original is unquestionable. Only a small number of deviations can be identified. One difference is that in the Greek letter, the heretics are referred to as "Bogomils" (Πογομύλοι – l. 24), while in the Slavic text, they are "Messalians". The same designation ("Messalians") has been used at the beginning of the second anathema, while the Greek text reads "all (of them)" (πᾶσι – l. 39). There is no mention in the Slavic text of "angels" (l. 43) in connexion with the resurrection of the dead; but this could be due to damage of the paper.

The part about the expulsion of the heretics from Mount Athos and the interdiction for them to enter the peninsula (ll. 41-44) is missing from the Bucharest manuscript. The explanation for this is simple: the Greek original of the text – and even more so, its Slavic translation – were composed after the events of 1345, and the expulsion was no longer of topical importance for the writers. Many more arguments could be adduced, but this simple explanation is enough for the purposes of the present study.

The historical context of the creation of the Greek manuscript from which B was translated, was characterised by theological controversy centred on hesychasm and its opponents as well as on the struggle against various heretical and sectarian views and practices in the Empire, on Mount Athos, and, later, in Bulgaria. This can be observed based on the information about the condemnation of Barlaam and Gregory Akindynus and of the sect of Irene Porinè by the General Assembly of Mount Athos, and the commemoration of the prelates of Hierissos. The first two representatives of the anti-Palamite group are well known and figure as an essential element of the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon. Until now, the events of 1345 on Mount Athos were known only from the Vita of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo and from the *Hagiorite Letter* (Ἁγιοριτικὸν γράμμα) published by Antonio Rigo[48]. Other sources provide less insight into the events. The Bucharest manuscript of the

monaci bogomili (ms. Vat. Gr. 604 ff. 11r-12v)", p. 505 ll. 31-56.

[48] See here the annexe and A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale atonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili (ms. Vat. Gr. 604 ff. 11r-12v)", p. 504-506; В. Н. Златарски, „**Житїе и жизнь преподобнаго отца нашего Ѳеѡдосїа, иже въ тръновѣ поснuуьствовавшаго, съпнсано свѣтѣишимъ патрїархомъ Ковстантина града кuръ Калистѡмъ**" (henceforth, cites as: "Житие и жизнь..."), *Сборник за народни умотворения и народопис*, 1904, кн. II/XX, p. 19 sq.; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, *Житиеписни творби*, Sofia, 1986, p. 452 sq.

Synodicon and the *Hagiorite Letter* present the group accused of heresy and provide an interesting picture of the religious disputes of that time.

The General Assembly of Mount Athos, held in 1345, at the height of the controversy about hesychasm and the condemnation of the anti-Palamites, has a direct bearing on these events. Although the concrete topic of the General Assembly were the so-called Messalians (or Bogomils), the practices of this group initially served as a basis for the reproaches addressed by Barlaam of Calabria and Gregory Akindynus, who accused the hesychasts of maintaining various heretical beliefs and strange practices. Subsequently, the Hagiorite monks responded by condemning the Messalians of Mount Athos; this condemnation has found a place in the cited special act and in the Bucharest manuscript of the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy. It was also reflected in the writing and promulgation of a particular Τόμος ἔγγραφος, which is no longer available, but some information about its contents can be obtained from the *Hagioretikon gramma* and from the Bucharest manuscript of the Synodicon[49].

The accusations against the hesychasts have been mentioned in some texts written by Barlaam of Calabria, in the letters of Gregory Akindynus, and in the anti-heretical works and the *Byzantine History* of Nicephorus Gregoras. These three authors evidently belonged to the anti-Palamite group, which was not uniform: their respective accusations against the Palamites and their alleged contacts with the Messalians/Bogomils are quite different. Barlaam focuses on the hesychast doctrine and criticises its possible ties to heretical doctrines[50]. For their part, Gregory Akindynus and Nicephorus Gregoras launch personal attacks focused on the alleged or real connexions between the leaders of the hesychasts and the heretics called Messalians or Bogomils. There are also some differences, however, between Gregory and Nicephorus. Probably because Palamas was his spiritual father, Gregory Akindynus refrains from attacking him, restricting his criticism instead to Patriarch Isidore Boucheiras[51]. In his letter to the metropolitan of Monembasia, he informs that, while in Thessalonica, Joseph of Crete had stayed at the home

[49] A. Rigo, « L'assemblea generale atonita », p. 480.

[50] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 39-103, 221-222.

[51] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 151, 221 ff., 232-233. *PLPZ*, # 3140. I would like to suggest the recently published book on Patriarch Isidore Boucheiras: A. Rigo, *1347 Isidoro patriarca di Costantinopoli e il breve sogno dell'inizio di una nuova epoca* (= *Wiener byzantinische Studien*, Bd. XXXI), Vienna, 2020.

of Isidore, and directly accuses the latter of ties to the heretical group of Irene Porinè[52]. This was a serious accusation that created suspicion regarding the ties between hesychasts and heretical Messalians/Bogomils. For his part, Nicephorus Gregoras aimed his reproaches directly at Gregory Palamas, claiming that the latter was at the centre of contacts and collaboration between hesychasts and heretics[53]. In either case, the anti-Palamite group was evidently trying to accuse its opponents of sympathising with the heretical sect that was condemned in 1345 – as stated in the "Hagiorite Letter" and the Synodicon from Bucharest. It is difficult to establish whether this sympathy was based in fact or whether the Messalian/Bogomil reference was simply a stock accusation thrown at any opponent in a theological dispute. It is clear that the condemnation of the Thessalonica-Mount Athos heretics from Irene Porinè's sect coincided with the dismissal of Isidore Boucheiras from the see of Monembasia and the excommunication of Gregory Palamas; moreover, the Messalians/Bogomils were active in the same territory[54]. It has already been observed that there were accusations of personal ties between members of the two currents, charges that were probably not entirely groundless: it is certainly not to be excluded that in the Orthodox world of the 14th century – that boiling pot of ideas – certain individuals, misguided in their spiritual searches, may have simultaneously belonged to different and even opposed schools. Be that as it may, I do not think a close connexion between the hesychasts and the Messalians/Bogomils can be established. Despite the strange silence of Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos and Gregory Palamas on the issue, quite clearly some hesychasts took an active part in condemning the heretics both on Mount Athos and in Tărnovo[55]. The future Patriarch Callistus I presided over the trial of the Mount Athos heretics, and in the Bulgarian capital, their conviction was brought about with the active participation of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo, another disciple of Gregory of Sinai[56].

---

[52] *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, Greek Text and English Translation by A. Constantinidis Hero, Washington D. C., 1983, nr. 52, ll. 55-75.

[53] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 224 sq., 232-233.

[54] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 235 sq., 257 sq.

[55] В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 19 sq.; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 452 ff.; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 269 sq.

[56] The information about these events comes from the Vita of St. Gregory written by the same Patriarch Callistus – В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 19 sq.; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 452 sq. See also Ангелов, *Богомилството в България*, p. 500-508.

In fact, it is worth sketching the subsequent history of a part of the heretical group that was active in Tărnovo. Evidently, after their condemnation and expulsion from Mount Athos, some of the followers of Irene Porinè headed for Bulgaria, where it was possible for them to continue their activity. These events are known from Patriarch Callistus's Vita of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo, where the author explicitly mentions the name of the (pseudo-)nun of Thessalonica and recalls the group's condemnation and expulsion from Mount Athos[57]. The only members of this group mentioned by name in the *Hagioretikon gramma* and in the Bucharest Synodicon are Cyril Bossota, with his associate Lazarus and his disciple the priest Stephen. As pointed out above, their direct connexion with the Athonite heretics is explicitly stated. It is said that Lazarus walked about naked in the city and behaved like *a fool for Christ*, while Cyril preached and sowed the seed of his heretical ideas[58]. The ideas in question included iconoclasm, rejection of holy objects including the Cross as well as various orgiastic practices involving drunkenness and the consumption of foul food. These heresies seem to have been accepted by some of the clergy, as Patriarch Theodosius himself was described as "unknowledgeable" and "miscomprehending", which should be interpreted as a suspicion cast on him. Invited to come and help, St. Theodosius of Tărnovo initiated a council, at which he challenged the heresy of Cyril Bossota, Lazarus, and the priest Stephen. In the Vita these heretical ideas have been presented as of the dualist kind, as evident by the heretics' attitude to food, matrimony, the holy images, and the explicit accusation regarding their belief in the dual principle of the world[59]. The council condemned the group, and the lives of its members took various courses: Lazarus returned to Orthodoxy, but Cyril Bossota and the priest Stephen remained adamant in their convictions and were sentenced by the tsar. Their faces were branded and they were expelled from Bulgaria.

The data in the Vita of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo are remarkable in many ways. It certainly shows how the spiritual life and theological controversies in Bulgaria were linked to the context of the age, marked by religious searches, not all of which remained within the borders of Orthodoxy. The question may

[57] В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 19-20; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 452-453.

[58] В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 20; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 453.

[59] В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 21-22; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 454-455.

be raised of how relevant is the information provided in the Vita regarding the group's heretical ideas and practices at the time they were on Mount Athos? I believe that the conclusion that there was a connexion with old practices on Mount Athos cannot be lightly rejected. The same counts for the relevance of the information contained in the Vita regarding the time they spent on the Holy Mountain. On the other hand, it is not to be excluded that Cyril and his adherents developed the ideas of Irene Porinè in a different direction and gave them a different emphasis.

No doubt, the accusation of being connected with Irene Porinè's heretical sect was used in the context of the theological controversies of that time. The label "Bogomil" or "Messalian" was used as an ideological weapon during the Late Middle Ages, and historiography has demonstrated that many of the accusations at that time conformed to such a pattern. There are no reasons to assert that the hesychasts were "Messalians" or "Bogomils"; nor can Irene Porinè's followers be qualified as one or the other with complete certainty. Nevertheless, I find it necessary to present a systematic overview of the theological accusations against them, at least as stated in the Bucharest Synodicon, in order to complete the commentary on the source published here.

First of all, I should present an overview of the anathemata pronounced against them according to the text in this copy of the Synodicon:

a) Iconoclasm[60] (BAR Ms. Sl. 307, f. 15v, l. 18-21). Iconoclasm is one of the most typical accusations against heretics during the post-iconoclastic age. It is viewed as "the heresy of heresies". As for the Bogomils, and more generally the various neo-Manichean or neo-Gnostic sects, they are well reflected in the sources, and the information there ultimately accords with what is known about their doctrine. Although the accusation of iconoclasm was typical, and seems to be a cliché, it should be emphasised that the accusations against the heretics formulated in the *Hagioretikon gramma* and in the Bucharest Synodicon fully overlap: they are said to call the holy icons mere wood and mud, they spit on them, defile and burn them (BAR Ms. sl. 307, f. $15v_{20-21}$)[61].

[60] A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 486-487; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 198-200, 248-254; В. Н. Златарски, „Житаие и жизнь...", p. 21-22; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 455.

[61] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", p. 246, ll. 26-27; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 504-505 (especially ll. 35-37).

b) Rejection of the sacrament of Baptism and of the Eucharist (BAR Ms. sl. 307, f. $15v_{22-25}$)[62]. Antonio Rigo discusses this point in connexion with its reflection in the *Hagioretikon gramma*; he points to some older parallels with this characteristic accusation against the dualists[63]. In fact, practically the same words of condemnation are used against the heretics in both texts, which testify to a direct connexion between them.

c) Rejection of the Incarnation (BAR Ms. sl. 307, f. $16r_{1-3}$)[64]. This is certainly a typical accusation against dualist heresies, based on their rejection of the flesh.

d) Rejection of the resurrection of the dead (BAR Ms. sl. 307, f. $16r_{3-5}$). This is an accusation dating from the same age; it is attested in the *Mount Athos Letter* and in other sources of that epoch. It is again based on the rejection of the flesh, but it seems to have been a very widespread accusation at that time[65].

e) They perform vile acts and use crafty words (no precise description), which leads to the abyss (BAR Ms. sl. 307, f. $16r_{5-8}$). Comparing the text of this manuscript of the Synodicon with the dogmatic and moral accusations reflected in the *Mount Athos Letter* of the General Assembly of the monastic community in 1345, the latter has further accusations: of violating the fasts, of consuming unclean food (meat from dead animals and animals not considered edible in a Christian environment), of sodomy and homosexuality, of orgiastic rituals, using unclean material in the Eucharist (the teacher's use of urine for giving communion to his disciples), etc. A. Rigo gives a detailed overview of these accusations, as present in the *Mount Athos Letter*, in his book on the controversy related to the heresy that began in Thessalonica, passed through Mount Athos, and later reached Tărnovo[66]. Notably, similar accusations are found in the Vita of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo, although the concrete practices,

---

[62] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 26-27.

[63] A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 486; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 200; В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 22; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 455.

[64] Regarding these accusations of the General Assembly of Mount Athos, see Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 27-30. See also A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 486; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 190 ff.

[65] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 31; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 486; Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 201.

[66] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 193-198.

as far as they can be identified, seem to have been quite different: there, special emphasis is placed on the defence of matrimony as a sacrament[67].

f) At the beginning and the end of the text, they are accused of Messalianism[68].

Anathemata are pronounced against the following persons (see BAR Ms. sl. 307, f. 15v):

a) Joseph of Crete[69]. Very little is known about his life, beyond his place of origin. He was from the island of Crete, as evident from his appellation. He and his follower George of Larissa were teachers in the sect and held a higher position than the others (except for Irene Porinè). He lived for a while in Thessalonica, where he participated in Irene's heretical group; according to the accusation by Gregory Akindynus, he was connected with Isidore Boucheiras. Then he went to Mount Athos and lived in the Great Lavra St. Athanasius. He was one of the adepts who introduced Irene's heresy into the monastic community. Thus, the Great Lavra became the centre of the heresy on Mount Athos, from there it spread. He was condemned by the Hagiorite General Assembly and expelled from Mount Athos.

b) George of Larissa[70]. He was one of the teachers and initiators of the heretical group on Mount Athos; that is why he is placed second on the anathema list of names. He was a monk in the Great Lavra as early as the 1340s. A native of Thessaly, he was from the city of Larissa, according to texts by Nicephorus Gregoras. It is documented that he was twice in Thessalonica before going to Mount Athos. In that city, he probably lived in the same monastery as Joseph of Crete, under whose influence he joined the sect. At the trial held by the General Assembly, he repented, as has been recorded in his extant confession. Nevertheless, he was expelled from the monastic republic, having been first branded with a mark of heresy as a warning to others.

c) Cyril, mentioned in the anathema of the Bucharest Synodicon, is probably Cyril Bossota, known from the *Hagioretikon gramma* and the Vita

---

[67] В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 19-22; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 452-455.

[68] Precisely as the same in the Vita of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo: В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 19 и 22; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 453 и 455.

[69] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", p. 247, ll. 45 sq.; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 484; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 156 sq., 178 sq.

[70] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", p. 247, ll. 45 sq.; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 483 ff.; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 135 sq., 178 sq., 221 sq.

of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo[71]. He was a monk in the Great Lavra and was tried and expelled from Mount Athos for practicing and spreading heresy. After that, he seems to have moved to Tărnovo, where he continued his activity, according to Patriarch Callistus's Vita of St. Theodosius[72], where he is mentioned together with his companion Lazarus and his disciple, the priest Stephen. The testimonies about him in the Vita are quite similar to the accusations in the *Mount Athos Letter*, but with a different emphasis, such as Adamite practices, the rejection of the sacrament of matrimony, self-mutilation, preaching poverty, and some other practices. The heretics rejected the holy icons and the Cross, and apparently did not accept the established practices of the Church. At the council, St. Theodosius explicitly accused the group of dualism. It should be pointed out that the Vita primarily connects Lazarus with sacrilegious acts, while Cyril is presented more as a theoretician and spreader of heretical ideas. He was condemned at the Council in Tărnovo, together with his companion and his disciple. Patriarch Callistus writes that Lazarus repented and remained contrite to the end of his days, while Cyril Bossota and the priest Stephen were adamant in their heretical views, so the tsar sentenced them, branded their faces, and expelled them from Bulgaria.

d) Dionysius, assumed by Antonio Rigo to have been a monk in the Great Lavra, cannot be identified from other sources, other than merely being mentioned in the *Hagioretikon gramma* and in the Bucharest Synodicon. It seems A. Rigo hesitates whether to identify him as the monk of the same name, also from the Lavra, brother of the *papas* Niphon, who was expelled from the monastery in 1359 together with five of his followers for causing trouble and provoking conflicts [73]. This is all the information available, except that the General Assembly decided that he was part of the heretical group.

e) Moses the Zograph[74] is named together with his vocation – he was probably a painter and iconographer. The fact is hardly consistent with the

[71] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 57; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 484; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 144-145, 149, 172-178, 179 sq., 269.

[72] В. Н. Златарски, „ Житие и жизнь...", p. 19-22; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 452-455.

[73] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 56; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 183 note 93.

[74] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 56-57; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 484; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 178 sq.

iconoclasm of which the heretics were accused, and which might have been a stock reproach in theological controversy at that time. Antonio Rigo assumes that he was a monk in Chilandari Monastery or in Chilandari's *pyrgos* at the seashore, but makes this conclusion conditional on the identification of Methodius with the *bashta* mentioned in the *Hagioretikon gramma*. If this identification is accepted, Moses was quite probably of Serbian origin.

f) Methodius[75] is identified by A. Rigo as the *bashta* in the *Hagioretikon gramma*, who is also the brother of Theophilus, a monk living most probably in the Great Lavra. The Italian scholar is inclined to believe that he was the spiritual father[76] of Chilandari or of Chilandari's *pyrgos* at the seashore. This was a relatively high position in the Athonite hierarchy, which testifies not only to the personal status of Methodius but also to the high positions the heretics had reached. Moreover, it may be considered that the possible influence of the *bashta* went far beyond the limits of Mount Athos and had political dimensions, insofar as the person holding this position was also the spiritual father of the Serbian kings. Of course, such identification implies the Serbian origin of Methodius, which is probable even apart from his position, as the Slavic word *bashta [father]* points to a South Slavic origin. It should be said the word is more typical for the Bulgarian language than for Serbian, although it was in use there as well[77].

g) Malachias[78] should be identical with the homonymous heretic indicated in the *Hagioretikon gramma* as the *ecclesiastikos of Iviron,* indicating which monastery he came from. Malachias occupied a comparatively high position in one of the highest-ranking monasteries of Mount Athos. Nothing else is known about him. The Acts of Iviron from 1328 to the early 16th century,

---

[75] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 56; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 178 ff. especially p. 179 note 79, where M. Živoijnović, in a correspondence with his Italian colleague, states the identification can only be hypothetical.

[76] M. Živoijnović, "The spiritual father of the monastery of Chilandar", *XVI. Insternazionaler Byzantinistenkongreß*, Akten II, 2/*JÖB* 32/2 (1982), p. 247-256.

[77] *Български етимилогичен речник*, т. I, Sofia, 1971, p. 37; *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика*, књ. I, Београд, 1959, p. 356-357 (the first indicated meaning is "father", the second is "elder relative", and the third, which I want to emphasise, is "elder in the Chilandari Monastery").

[78] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 59; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 483, 485; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 144-145, 173-174, 178 sq.

published after A. Rigo's book, include two monks called Malachias, but one was a hieromonk in 1419 and the other was *kathegoumenos* in 1501 and 1503.[79]

h) Theophilus[80] was a monk from the Great Lavra, brother of the so-called *bashta* (the latter probably being identical with the Methodius mentioned in the anathema). This means that he was also probably of Serbian origin. Nothing more is known about his life after his condemnation by the General Assembly of Mount Athos.

i) Chariton[81] is poorly represented in the sources. He was a monk in the Great Lavra and belonged to the heretical group of Joseph of Crete. He was condemned by the Athonite General Assembly in 1345.

j) Theodoritus[82] is mentioned in the Bucharest Synodicon and in the *Hagioretikon gramma*. According to one hypothesis, he is identical with the homonymous heretic cited in the Vita of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo, but this has been contested and can only be considered a speculation. I believe that they were two different persons. Regarding the Theodoritus cited in the Synodicon and the *Hagioretikon gramma,* nothing more is said than the accusation that he belonged to the sect of Irene Porinè. In the *Vita of Saint Theodosius*, the other Theodoritus is accused of different deviations, which have been described in more detail. He is presented as a monk who came to Tărnovo from Constantinople under the guise of a doctor but began to sow the heretical ideas of Barlaam and Gregory Akindynus.[83] Through wizardry and soothsaying, he enticed not only the simple-minded people but especially the eminent and the famous. A particularly curious and specific accusation against Theodoritus was that he exhorted people to bow before an oak tree

---

[79] *Actes d'Iviron*, t. IV (= *Archives de l'Athos*, t. XIX), éd. J. Lefort, N. Oikonomidès, D. Papachryssanthou, V. Kravari, H. Métrévéli, Paris, 1995, p. 235.

[80] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 58-59; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 485; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 144-145, 173 sq. 178 sq.

[81] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 58; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 485; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 144-145, 173 sq., 178 sq.

[82] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 56; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 484; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 125 note 85, 144-145, 173 sq., 178 sq.

[83] В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 19 line 3-20; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 452.

and make bloody sacrifices to it – sheep and lambs – in order to be healed. Thus, large numbers of people in the capital city, distinguished citizens amongst them, were impelled to commit evil deeds. The rituals as described seem to echo semi-pagan practices, which are not known from other sources. It is inconsistent with the claim that Theodoritus was linked to the heresy of Barlaam and Akindynus, for whom there is no information indicating a connexion with pagan practices. This suggests that at least one of the two accusations was a cliché meant to strengthen the other. Be that as it may, in the Vita, Theodoritus is presented separately and not in the group of Irene Porinè; this gives me reason to reject the identification of the person mentioned in the Synodicon. The Vita of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo tells us only that Theodoritus's heresy was exposed by the saint, the misguided were brought back to the ecclesiastic tradition and the seducer was covered in eternal shame and expulsed. No mention has been made of a trial or involvement of the secular authorities in the expulsion.

k) Nicandrus[84] is mentioned not only in the Bucharest Synodicon but also twice in the *Hagioretikon gramma*. He belonged to the Athonite heretical group and was condemned and anathemised together with the others. Nothing more is known about him.

l) Irene Porenè[85] is designated as a "nun", the founder of the sect and initiator of its orgiastic practices in Thessalonica, where she certainly dwelled in the 1330s. She was still in that city at the time the General Assembly of Mount Athos convicted the heretics in 1345. She is considered to have been a central figure among the Messalians/Bogomils and a teacher of Joseph of Crete. Interestingly, the Vita of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo devotes particular attention to her; she is clearly placed at the head of the sect, although her activity is not connected with the Bulgarian capital.

m) Metrophanes[86] is the only heretic mentioned solely in the anathemata of the Bucharest Synodicon. He was one of the convicted Athonite heretics, but the extant sources no not reveal more than this.

---

[84] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 55; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 144-145, 173-174, 179 sq.

[85] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 61; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 484; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 181 sq.; *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, nr. 52; В. Н. Златарски, „Житие и жизнь...", p. 19-20; *Стара българска литература*, т. IV, p. 452-453.

[86] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 144-145, 179.

n) Joannicius Kekratimenos[87] is mentioned both in the Bucharest Synodicon and in the *Hagioretikon gramma.* Unfortunately, nothing more can be said about him, except for the obvious fact that he belonged to the group of heretics convicted by the General Assembly of the Hagiorite monks in 1345.

Compared with the other testimonies found in the Bucharest Synodicon, the information regarding the General Assembly of Mount Athos and the conviction of the heretical group of Irene Porenè is interesting, above all from a purely historical point of view. They are not unique for this heresy, but are among the few testimonies that give information about the group, adding a drop of knowledge about the spiritual life in the Balkans on the eve of the Ottoman conquest. Significantly, this account confirms that the unity of Orthodox nations was growing stronger at the end of the Middle Ages. This tendency was related to the theological controversies of that time and obviously involved not only the followers of religious tradition but also the heretical currents within it.

[87] Annexe here – A. Rigo, "The Tome of Condemnation of the Holy Mountain", ll. 61; A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale athonita", p. 483; A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 135 sq., 156 sq.

CHAPTER VII

THE BUCHAREST AND DRINOV MANUSCRIPTS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE HISTORY OF THE SYNODICON. THEIR AFFILIATION TO THE VARIANTS AND THEIR INTERCONNEXIONS.

1. The Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy in Slavic countries: interconnexions and relations.

All the authors who have hitherto written about the Bulgarian Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy proceed from the view that there is continuity between the different witnesses to the texts: that is basically why the designations "Boril's Synodicon" or "Tsar Boril's Synodicon" are used. In this book, I proceed from the opposite view: that the texts are different and can be arranged and classified as such. Nevertheless, I do not assert that there is no connexion between them. On the contrary, at times obvious signs of influence can be detected, or even loans, from and within different categories of variants. I should say at the start that there is some logic to the traditional view of historians, despite its romantic side. The Synodicon is one and the same work, so there is inevitably some tradition in the text throughout the versions in spite of their temporal and geographical differences. However, over-emphasising the common origin of the witnesses to the text of the Synodicon, prevents noticing and classifying their differences. The present study concerns itself exactly with that aspect, documenting and studying these differences.

Only the Byzantine original can serve as a basis for arranging the various "Bulgarian" manuscripts of the Synodicon. In connexion with this, it has to be remembered that the Synodicon is a complex work that continued to develop throughout the process of its transmission history. Its development continued from the 9th to the 15th century, and it should be kept in mind that the differences are not only across time but across locality as well. This means that, in addition to textual development through additions of various theological discussions and their solutions, there are also additions made by different churches and dioceses. The added material has been placed mainly within the commemorative part. There are also additions dealing with specific

theological debates reflecting issues relevant to congregations in a specific country or territory.

From the time of Jean Gouillard until the present, it has been assumed that there are three variants of the Synodicon, which the French scholar designated according to the names of the ruling dynasties: Macedonian (variant *M*), Comnenian (variant *C*) and Palaeologian (variant *P*). In this system of classification, M refers to the initial variant from the time when veneration of icons was restored and the first additions were made. It was consolidated in the 10th century and presents the various theological arguments of the venerators of icons: the visions of the prophets, the image of the Holy Mother of God, the Incarnation, etc.[1] The first additions were made during the decades after 843 and concern mainly the commemorative part; there were also retrospective mentions of iconoclasts in condemnations from the 8th and 9th centuries. The Comnenian variant (*C*) begins with the anathema against Gerontius of Lampé, which may serve as a marker but raises no special theological problems. The additional text characteristic of this variant is practically consolidated around the great philosophical-theological controversies of the 11th – 12th centuries: the condemnation of John Italus and then of Nilus of Calabria, the controversies over the Passion of Christ and the expression "*Pater maior me est*"[2]. For its part, the Palaeologian variant (*P*) is consolidated around the last great flowering of theology connected with hesychasm and the disputes between Palamites and Barlaamites in the 14th – 15th centuries[3]. The diptych in the Synodicon is certainly interesting, especially for historians, but it is not what distinguishes the variants, although it enables dating the copies.

The first version of the Bulgarian Synodicon was made in connexion with the Council held in Tărnovo in 1211; hence, not coincidentally, the work is designated by the name of Tsar Boril. It has retained its structure and is certainly a Comnenian variant (*C*), although it contains additions made to the commemorations and anathemata during the second half of the 14th century. These additions consist of anathemata against Gregory Akindynus, Barlaam of Calabria, and Prochorus Cydones, which reflect the hesychast controversy but do not coincide textually with the chapters against the hesychasts in the Greek

[1] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 119 sq.
[2] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 183 sq.
[3] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 239 sq.

variant P of the Synodicon[4]. Another late addition is the text against Fudul and his teacher Pyropoulus[5]. They are known from Gregory Tsamblak's *Eulogy to Euthymius*, which testifies that the two lived in the second half of the 14th century[6]. Though these elements concern the Palamite controversy, this fact does not change the characterisation of PAL as a variant C of the Synodicon. Hence, the focus is not on the Palauzov manuscript, but on the Drinov and Bucharest manuscripts, their affiliation and the connexions between them.

First the other extant Slavonic manuscripts need to be taken into consideration, witnesses from Serbia and the Eastern Slavs. It has already been mentioned that the Serbian Synodicon was produced in the early 13th century and has no direct relation to the Bulgarian text[7]. They are linguistically different and there are no mutual dependencies. The Russian text of the manuscript from the Synodal collection 667 belongs to a P variant and would be interesting to use for comparison, especially with the Bucharest manuscript. The same can be said about the printed Synodica from Kiev, Lemberg/Lvov, and Moscow. These printed editions are very important, because they were the first to create a stabilised norm of the Synodicon's content, a norm that would be reproduced for a considerable period of time. This content – in Greek – is known to have originated in the diocese of the city of Patras in the Peloponnesus and, from there, was translated into Slavic and Romanian. That is why it is particularly important to find some elements in it that are similar to the older Slavic witnesses, such as the one from the Synodal collection № 667 and the Bucharest manuscript.

2. Connexions between the Palauzov manuscript and DRIN and B.

I would say there is nothing specific connecting the Palauzov and the Bucharest manuscripts of the Synodicon. Of course, in all cases, the witnesses

---

[4] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 177_{10}-178_{6} (ПАЛ, f. $27r_{10}$-$27v_{6}$).

[5] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. $178_{7\text{-}20}$ (ПАЛ, f. $27v_{7\text{-}20}$), p. 317, p. 336 notes 201and 202, p. 358, p. 377 notes 201 and 202.

[6] E. Kałużniacki, *Aus der panegyrischen Litteratur der Südslaven*, Wien, 1901, S. 46; П. Русев, Ив. Гълъбов, А. Давидов, Г. Данчев, *Похвално слово за Евтимий от Григорий Цамблак*, Sofia, 1971, p. 184 (§ 40,2); Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 48-49.

[7] *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 474-475.

represent the same work, and they were translated from Byzantine versions which included the Comnenian age as additions made at that period are present in both, but there are no specific additions or other characteristics in one of these manuscripts that are also present in the other. I have already pointed out that the Palauzov manuscript represents variant *C*, and the Bucharest witness variant *P*. The orthographies of the two manuscripts are different, and so are the textual convoys of the work and their places of origin.

A comparison between the Palauzov and Drinov manuscripts of the Bulgarian Synodicon is of greater interest for the present study. The most important markers of mutual influence and overlap between these two Bulgarian manuscripts can be divided into two groups: the *first* group of markers connects the witnesses with the original translation of the text into Slavic and its implementation as an outcome of the Council of 1211. The *second* group contains the commemorations of the Bulgarian rulers and ecclesiastic and secular dignitaries. The first group comprises a historical narrative and texts related to Church dogma; the second is historical-commemorative. The commemorative purpose of the Synodicon is of essential importance; that is why among the Eastern Slavs, the term "Synodicon" is also used in the sense of "commemoration/prayer list". The purpose of the work is generally to maintain identity, especially in the political sphere, and hence to legitimate the rulers. This is one of the reasons for the translation and implementation of the text in Bulgaria at the beginning of the 13th century.

The narrative about the Council held on February 11, 1211 certainly connects PAL and DRIN, because it is present only in these two witnesses. The comparison demonstrates that they contain the same text, with some linguistic differences, caused by different transmission processes. The textual differences are located at the beginning and the end of the story. The beginning is missing from PAL, obviously due to the loss of sheets from the manuscript. The end is missing from DRIN, which in this case is not due to the absence of a sheet. The copyist of DRIN skipped a relatively large part of the text, which includes the end of the story of the Council of 1211 and the commemorations of the rulers from Tsar Boril to Tsar Constantine Asen. The end of the commemoration of the last-mentioned tsar has been left included.[8] Intentional omission seems improbable. It is not known whether this lacuna was caused

[8] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, p. 81 note 2 to § 94; Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 155 note 78.

by a mistake, or due to the loss of sheets from the source manuscript (or an earlier manuscript somewhere in the chain of transmission). In all cases, the same story about the Council in Tărnovo against the Bogomils has been included in both manuscripts. This testifies either to a dependence of DRIN on PAL (less likely) or (more likely) a shared dependence on an unknown, lost manuscript. Apart from the narrative about the Council of 1211, the anti-dualist anathemata placed in PAL on f. $24r_{13}$-f. $25v_{8}$, and in DRIN on f. $200r_{1}$-f. $200v_{16}$ should also be taken into consideration, although not thematically, but in textual-topographic terms. They precede the commemorations of the Bulgarian rulers, unlike the story of the Council which is located within the framework of these commemorations, in the part about Tsar Boril. Thus, this section in DRIN forms a united whole (from which fragments are missing) that could be considered to have been taken from somewhere else and inserted into the text.

Another indication of similarity is the presence of anti-dualist anathemata borrowed from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas in both manuscripts. The compiler of the initial text seems to have found them necessary in connexion with the anti-Bogomil theme of the Council of 1211 from which the Bulgarian Synodicon originated. These anathemata also have the characteristics of a later insertion into the Byzantine original, as they immediately follow the obviously added personal anathema against John Italus and the repeated anathema against Nilus of Calabria. These two texts were also taken from somewhere else, together with the anathemata from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas. That "somewhere else" may have been a witness to the Synodicon belonging to variant *C*, in which the personal anathema against John Italus is usually included, in contrast to variant P from which it is usually missing.

These observations undoubtedly suggest some important ideas about the history of the textual composition of the Bulgarian Synodicon and increase understanding of the relations between B and DRIN.

3. Connexions and relations between the Bucharest and Drinov manuscripts of the Synodicon

The manuscript of the Synodicon from Bucharest strictly follows the Byzantine tradition and cannot be identified as related to any Slavic country. Its language is Slavic, written according to the Resava orthography typical of the Balkans in the Late Middle Ages. Hence, it is completely different from the

Drinov manuscript, which is Bulgarian. The indication of the latter's Bulgarian affiliation is the story of the Council of 1211 and some of the commemorations and anathemata it contains. These two manuscripts are the focus of the present study, being of utmost interest as the only extant South Slavic witnesses to variant P, representing a late version of the Byzantine Synodicon. There are many aspects to the mutual connexions and relations between the two texts: linguistic on the one hand, and substantial and structural-textual on the other. The next two sections will partially present each of these aspects separately.

3. 1. Observations on some linguistic particularities of the two manuscripts

It should be said first that both manuscripts were written in the Resava orthographic norm, which was prevalent in the Balkans during the early period of Ottoman rule[9]. At that time, the Tărnovo orthographic norm, usually associated with the time and name of Patriarch Euthymius, was used almost exclusively in Moldavia. It should be emphasised that the Resava orthography cannot be classified on a national basis, as it was very typical for different Balkan Slavic nations, mainly the Serbs and Bulgarians, in the Late Middle Ages. This feature is certainly a basis of similarity between the two manuscripts, but it could be attributed to their historical context, as both were written in the 16th century. As I am not a linguist, I would not want to enter a territory that lies outside my specialty and will refrain from detailed analysis.

Nevertheless, I shall present data on the textual similarity, which M. Tsibranska and I defined in a joint article dealing with several particular lexemes related to established theological concepts found only in the Bucharest and Drinov manuscripts[10]. I am referring to several composites which were used to translate Greek terms having as their first element ὁμο-. In the Slavic translation preserved in the manuscript copies, this first element is expressed with **вѣкѕпо-**, and not the usual **ѥдино-**. That form was very well established because of the term ὁμοούσιος / **ѥдиносѫщьнъ**, which was discussed and sanctioned at the First Ecumenical Council in Nicaea (325 AD).

[9] A.-M. Totomanova draws a distinction between the language/orthography of the two manuscripts (A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 173). According to her, DRIN contains clear traces of a Bulgarian protograph, while B strictly follows the Resava norm.

[10] Ив. Билярски, М. Цибранска-Костова, „За един композитен тип и за Палеологовия вариант на славянския Синодик в Неделята на Православието", *Palaeobulgarica*, XXXVI, 2012, 1, p. 51-65.

The concrete linguistic forms found in the manuscripts are: **вѣкѹпобожьнъ** (from the Greek ὁμόθεος)[11], **вѣкѹпопрѣстольнъ** (from the Greek ὁμόθρονος)[12] and **вѣкѹпославьнъ** (from the Greek ὁμότιμος)[13]. These are obviously calques from Greek, but it should be noted that they are not present in this form in PAL, which is older than DRIN and B. A concrete comparison can be made in the case of **ѥдиноб҃ожьнъ**/**вѣкѹпоб҃ожьнъ**: in PAL, the Greek composite word ὁμόθεος is translated with the Slavic composite **ѣ҆диноб҃ожьнъ**[14]. The other two terms do not have an equivalent in PAL, for unknown reasons. They are not present in the Serbian or Russian variants of the text either. In general, it can be observed that these specific forms are present only in B and DRIN.

In the above-mentioned joint article, we raised several questions regarding these lexemes, and endeavoured to supply answers. Of course, the most important question is the meaning of the substitution: why did such a well-established theological concept have to be substituted by a different calque that conveys the same meaning. Very importantly, the substituted form is strongly dependent on the term "consubstantial" (ὁμοούσιος), established by the First Ecumenical Council in Nicaea at the proposal of Emperor Constantine the Great, and included in the Symbol of Faith, whereby it has become a norm. Without lingering on the details of our research, I shall say that we found no specific theological reason for the substitution of one lexical form for the other. They have the same meaning and convey no specific nuances that would justify the change. Still, the question remains as to why the substitution was made; the answer might shed some light on the composition of the different manuscripts or translations of the Synodicon.

Thus, the particularly close relation between the Drinov and Bucharest manuscript will be further established. As indicated, there are three of these particular lexemes in DRIN and four in B, since one of them is repeated (**вѣкѹпоб҃ожьнъ**). Three of them coincide in B and DRIN, while the fourth has

---

[11] BAR, Ms. sl. 307, f. 13r, 14r; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, (= Български старини, кн. VIII), Sofia, 1928, p. 39 (DRIN, f.194б); Палаузов препис f. 19г – **ѥдиноб҃жна**; J. Gouillard, "Le Synodicon de l'Orthodoxie: edition et commentaire", *Travaux et mémoires*, 2, 1967, p. 77, line 499 – ὁμόθεος.

[12] BAR, Ms. sl. 307, f. 12v; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, p. 39 (DRIN, f.194v); J. Gouillard, « Synodicon », p. 77, line 492 – ὁμόθρονον.

[13] BAR, Ms. sl. 307, f. 12v; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, p. 39 (DRIN, f.194v); J. Gouillard, « Synodicon », p. 77, line 491 – ὁμότιμον.

[14] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов синодик*, p. 133_{7-8}.

a match in PAL in the lexical form ѥдино-. They all correspond to the Greek text's ὁμο- as an element of the composite. After making these observations, the next issue to examine concerns the possible similarities or differences in the text of the Synodicon in the printed Triodion, which also contains the variant P of the work. The comparison shows that, at least in the case of the composites in question, formed through the first element вѫкоупо-, there is no overlap between the two manuscripts and the printed editions of the Triodion from Kiev, Lemberg/Lvov, and Moscow that contain the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy. This particular issue complements many other differences between the two manuscripts and the printed text. The cumulation of differences leads to the conclusion that this was a different translation. The opinion has already been offered in scholarly literature[15], that the Ruthenian or Russian translator of the Synodicon within the printed Triodion had access to the Drinov text. At that time, the Bucharest manuscript was unknown. Nevertheless, it must be concluded that, even if he was familiar with the Drinov text, or the Bucharest one, or, most likely, their protograph, he made a new translation based on the printed Greek Triodion of 1522, and did not copy or rework the existing Slavic text.

Thus, going back to the composite words using the elements "ѥдино-" and "вѫкоупо-", the above observations incline me to think that, even if there were no specific theological reasons for the substitution of the composite models in the two manuscripts, the existence of overlaps indicates the closeness of the texts. The nature of this closeness might refer to identical translations, to mutual dependence, or to shared dependence on a third, no longer extant, source. There is no doubt that the presence of the lexemes in question permits distinguishing between the text and the translation. We thus reach the conclusion that the text of the Bucharest manuscript is similar at least in some of its lexical particularities to that of the Drinov manuscript. This fact permits asserting that it represents is the same translation of at least part of the work, or that a third model has influenced the texts in question in DRIN and B. An examination of the other elements will provide an idea about the similarities and differences between the two manuscripts.

[15] Е. В. Петухов, *Очерки по литературной истории Синодика*, Санкт Петербург, 1895, p. 68-69; М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик*, p. CXIII - CXVIII.

3. 2. Connexions and mutual dependence in content and structure between B and DRIN

3. 2. 1. This section will begin by discussing the various *differences between the two copies.* As pointed out, the content of DRIN evidences its Bulgarian character, while B follows the Byzantine model. I should make the preliminary remark that both manuscripts suffered damage. A considerable number of folia are missing from both, and in the Bucharest manuscript parts of the text are illegible. Due to this, a fully comprehensive comparison cannot be made.

The first difference, certainly a striking one, and which I mentioned earlier, is the absence of all textual elements that might connect B with Bulgaria. There is no story about the Council of 1211, no anathemata from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas, no anathemata against the primarily dualist dogmatic deviations, and no commemorations related to Bulgaria. While the Bulgarian Synodicon may be considered a local version, all the markers of locality are missing from the Bucharest Synodicon, which evidently originated on Mount Athos (a very ecumenical location). In this context, the other significant difference will be pointed out, referring this time to an absence from the DRIN text. From this Bulgarian variant, the whole history of the Athonite General Assembly of 1345 and the condemnation of the heretics around Irene Porenè is missing. The omission includes the citation, almost word by word, of the text from the *Tome of Condemnation*, which is included in the manuscript from the Library of the Romanian Academy. The letter is certainly connected with the Palamite controversy and dates to the same age, accounting for its insertion in that part of the text; but these sheets are missing from DRIN. I do not believe this text was ever present in DRIN. They are markers of a different local affiliation than the one to which DRIN belonged. The same may be said about the commemoration of prelates of Hierissos in B. This commemoration is an indication of locality that is absent from DRIN and probably had never been part of it.

The case is different with regard to a part that does not localise a manuscript but indicates the epoch in which it originated and the respective variant (*M*, *C* or *P*) to which it belongs. Thus, the whole typically Palaeologian part related to the hesychast controversy (the sections devoted to Barlaam and Akindynus, and to St. Gregory Palamas) is absent from DRIN, which may be due to the

loss of manuscript sheets. If that possibility is assumed, it can be claimed that DRIN also represents the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon.

A significant difference between the two manuscripts is the presence of the personal anathema against John Italus in DRIN (f. $195v_{12-17}$). This is considered to be an indication of affiliation to variant C of the Synodicon, inasmuch as the anathema is usually absent from the Palaeologian variant, although some witnesses contain it, for instance, *Pk* and *Py* (by the Gouillard classification)[16]. This difference should be considered jointly with the anathema against Nilus of Calabria, which occurs in two places in DRIN: on f. $194r_{4-6}$ and again on f. $195v_{18-19}$. The repetition also explains the presence of the personal condemnation of John Italus. After the second synod devoted to the controversy about the Gospel citation "My Father is Greater than I", a section has been inserted which comprises the personal anathema against John Italus, the anathema against Nilus of Calabria, and the anathemata that follow these, borrowed from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas. They stand somehow unnaturally within the body of the Synodicon text and were probably taken from a different source, belonging to the *C* variant, and inserted into this P variant. Their inclusion first happened not in DRIN but in its source manuscript.

3. 2. 2. Even more important are the *connexions and similarities* between the Bucharest and Drinov manuscripts, for they enable tracing the construction of the Slavic version of the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon. The similarities consist of elements that have no textual and/or structural parallels in other witnesses, and in some cases neither in the Greek text. Here they will be examined one by one.

A. Commemoration of St. Andrew of Crete (B, f. $6r_{24-25}$; DRIN, f.$188r_{8-9}$). The commemoration of St. Andrew of Crete is present in both B and DRIN, but is missing from the others as well as from the Greek text of the Byzantine Synodicon as published by Jean Gouillard. It is also absent from the printed Synodica within the Triodion, from Greek ones and from the Slavic and Romanian editions translated from them. Hence, this commemoration is a distinctive feature of these two manuscripts and certainly connects them to each other. It should also be said that in B, there are two commemorations, for the confessors Theodore and Theophanes (f. $6v_{12-13}$)[17], that are not present

[16] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 190-192 note 57; A. Rigo, "Un nouveau témoin du *Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie P*: le manuscrit de la Sainte-Trinité de Chalki 34", p. 75, 79, 82.

[17] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовия Синодик в славянски превод*, p. 75.

anywhere else, not even in DRIN. Anna-Maria Totomanova believes these names may refer to St. Theodore Studite and St. Theophanes the Confessor, although the latter two are also mentioned shortly before and immediately after the commemorations in question, which makes such identification very problematic. Whatever the case, Totomanova points out, importantly, that this is the only structural difference between B and DRIN at the beginning of the text[18].

B. An anti-Armenian text from PAL, which is not present in B or in DRIN or in the Byzantine versions of the work (PAL, f. $5v_{5-8}$, the text on f. $5v_{20-22}$ is similar to it)[19]: this is a polychronion for converts to Orthodoxy who have never shared the "foul" Armenian heresy. The text is evidently connected with the anti-Armenian anathema which also occurs only in PAL (§90, f. $24r_{10-12}$)[20]. This text is interesting as a mark of the manuscript's affiliation, as it testifies to the problem related to Armenian heretics in Bulgaria which was significant in the first half of the 13th century, and probably disappeared later on. The absence of this text from DRIN is a feature it has in common with B.

C. Six anathemata borrowed from the section about the condemnation of Eustratius of Nicaea and the controversy over Christ's Sacrifice; they are placed in the anti-iconoclastic part of the Synodicon (B, f. $8r_5$-$9v_{16}$; DRIN, f. $189v_{12}$-$191v_4$, G. ll. 391-403, 435-471). It seems that the anathemata in question were inserted not for any special theological reasons but in accordance with the source text of the copyist and/or translator. This structure is found in B and DRIN, and in the printed texts – Greek, Slavic and Romanian – of the Synodicon within the Triodion[21]. It seems that the structure of the Russian manuscript from the Synodal collection 667 was meant to be the same. F. $25v_6$-$26r_8$ contain the first of these anathemata and the beginning of the second (the two aimed at Eustratius of Nicaea, for common use), after which the rest of the page (f. 26r) and the following (f. 26v) have been left empty[22]. In my opinion,

[18] A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 171.

[19] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. $108_{5-8,20-22}$.

[20] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 145_{10-12}; A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 166.

[21] Checked according to the Greek edition of the Triodion from 1586 and the Ruthenian edition from Lvov, 1664 – f. ρο̃εν-ρο̃σν.

[22] I would like to express my gratitude to my colleague and friend Radu G. Păun, who provided me a digital copy of GIM Syn. 667. See also the publication of the text: Петухов, *Синодик*, p. 33 (* footnote). This feature is not mentioned in the latest edition by K. Maksimovič – *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 515.

this space was reserved for the anathemata in question but for some reason they were never written there. As pointed out, I do not think that there were any special dogmatic or disciplinary reasons for this addition, characteristic of B and DRIN, and it probably derives from their source(s). The fact that this series of anathemata occurs amongst the Slavic Synodica only in B and DRIN, and amongst the Greek witnesses to the text is found mainly (if not exclusively) in the printed editions, supports the view that these attestations of the Synodicon form a united set, all belonging to the Palaeologian variant of the work.

I would also like to draw attention to a persistent misunderstanding related to the first anathema of this series (B, f. $8r_{5-11}$; DRIN f. $189v_{12-18}$). As mentioned, it is absent from PAL and from the Serbian Synodicon, along with the rest of the anathemata from this series. In contrast, it occurs in the Russian Synodicon[23], with interesting consequences. This part of the work, although it was included in the edition by E. Petukhov, has been omitted from the new edition prepared by K. Maksimovič[24]. He does not explain the omission, but I presume he has some (regrettably, unknown) reasons not to include it. In any case, I do not think the omission contributes to the usefulness of K. Maksimovič's study or the importance of the published text. Still, it should be pointed out that the anathema is present in the printed editions of the Synodicon: it exists in the printed Greek text within the Triodion and in the Slavic and the Romanian edition, which derived from it[25]. It has been argued that the anathema did not form part of the ordinary contents of the Byzantine Synodicon. Mikhail Popruženko published the text based on precisely the palaeotype Greek text[26]. E. Petukhov also published that Greek text, stating he had taken it from the Vienna manuscript[27], which means the "manuscript from the Viennese Imperial Court Library, *Theolog. Graecus № CCCVII*"[28]. This Russian scholar does not include a description of the manuscript in his study. It is a parchment manuscript dating to about 1300, containing texts

[23] Е. В. Петухов, *Синодик*, p. 32-33, f. $26v_6$-$26r_6$.
[24] К. Максимович в: *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica,* vol. IV/1, p. 515.
[25] It is present in the Greek edition of the Triodion, 1586, and in the Ruthenian from Lvov, 1664 – f. ρο͠ε v, as well as in the Romanian edition from Buzău, p. с͠в.
[26] М. Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, p. 18-19, p. 27 note 2.
[27] Е. В. Петухов, *Синодик*, p. 32-33 note 1.
[28] Е. В. Петухов, *Синодик*, p. 5.

which can be dated to between 1143 and 1157[29]; Jean Gouillard classified this witness to the Synodicon under *Cb*: a Comnenian variant from unknown metropolitan dioceses. The text contained in this manuscript is noteworthy for the episcopal commemorative list and five anti-dualist anathemata[30]. In her latest article, probably following E. V. Petukhov and M. G. Popruženko (both of whom published on the topic before Gouillard's edition had appeared), A. Totomanova again points out that the text of this anathema can be found in Popruženko's edition § 16[31]; she practically repeats the above-mentioned thesis, probably due to some oversight. In fact, there is a misunderstanding here, since the text is published in Gouillard's edition[32]. Thus, the entire section devoted to the condemnation of Eustratius of Nicaea (meant for general use) is available, except for the first brief anathema that mentions his treatise against the Armenians (G. ll. 388-390).

D. Here is another particularity of the arrangement in B (and maybe also in DRIN). The seven anathemata, borrowed from the definitions of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, Nicaea, against the iconoclasts and included in PAL (f. $9r_{21}$-$9v_{20}$) immediately after the anathema against Gerontius of Lampé, are placed in B after the anathemata against John Eirenicus (B, f. $15r_{16}$-$15v_{7}$)[33]. In the Byzantine Synodicon as published by Gouillard, they are presented separately (G. ll. 752-762). It should be noted that, PAL seems to hesitate: on f. $22r_{14}$-$22r_{20}$ it repeats the anathemata in question (those located on f. $9r_{21}$-$9v_{5}$, or §20-21 in the Popruženko edition), but then continues with Simon Magus and Kukuvrik Manent[34]; there is no damage to the manuscript that might explain this order of anathemata. Regrettably, it is unknown whether these texts were in the same place in DRIN, due to missing sheets. Importantly, in the Greek printed Synodicon, and in the Slavic editions and Romanian edition from Buzău that are consecutively dependent on that Greek source, the anathemata from the Seventh Ecumenical Council follow after those against

[29] H. Hunger, W. Lackner, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, 3,3: *Codices theologici 201-337*, Vienna, 1992, p. 383-389, No 307.

[30] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 22-23, notes 114-116.

[31] A.-M. Totomanova, "Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 183.

[32] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 69-71 ll. 391-394.

[33] A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 167.

[34] About this very strange name see: А.-М. Тотоманова, „За една парономазия в Бориловия Синодик", **Словѣса прѣчюдная**. *Юбилеен сборник в чест на проф. Иван Буюклиев*, Sofia, 2012, p. 36-42.

John Eirenicus, exactly as in B[35]. In Gouillard's edition, this section begins with a general anathema against all heretics[36], which is placed last in the printed Synodica. This is the most significant difference between the printed Synodica and B, where the general anathema is missing. These observations, however, are relevant here as another testimony to the similarity between the redaction in the Bucharest manuscript and that in the printed editions of the Synodicon. It may be suggested that DRIN contained the same or similar text on its lost sheets.

4. Dating and localising the creation of the Greek source and of the translations in B and DRIN

When discussing the localisation and dating of the extant texts, three separate issues should be distinguished, namely those related to: 1) the Greek source of this translated text, with its transmission history (as the text grew with various additions); 2) the Slavic translation which formed the protograph for the subsequent transmission; 3) the time and place of creation of the manuscripts BAR Ms. sl. 307 (B) and NBKM 432 (DRIN). The last question has been addressed in the section devoted to the study of the manuscripts. In the following discussion, I shall discuss the preparation of the Bucharest version, because – as will become clear – the DRIN version seems to have been derived from it. That is why I shall treat the Bulgarian Palaeologian version separately.

4. 1. Creation of the version from BAR Ms. sl. 307 (B).

4. 1. 1. As for the *Greek original of the Synodicon variant contained in B,* there are several reference points for dating it, based on the content of the commemorations of the ecumenical patriarchs and the basileis. Particularly significant are the commemorations of St. Gregory Palamas († 14 November 1359, canonised in 1368) and of Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos († 1379), which provide a *terminus post quem* for the dating of the latest identifiable addition to the text of the Synodicon.

---

[35] Checked according to the Greek Venetian edition from 1586, the Kiev edition from 1640 – p. т҃мд, the Lvov edition from 1664 – p. р҃ои v – р҃оѳ r, the Romanian edition from Buzău, 1700 – p. с҃з-с҃и.

[36] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 93_{752}.

Various questions remain regarding the significant difference between the commemorations of the patriarchs on the one hand and those of the basileis on the other. Here, the most subtle issue is how to explain the absence of a commemoration of Andronicus III Palaeologus, who was closely connected with the controversy over the Tabor Light, the victory of the hesychasts and the condemnation of Barlaam of Calabria and Gregory Akindynus. Such was the merit of this emperor that his commemoration became an element of the presentation of this dogmatic dispute[37]. It should be observed that Andronicus III Palaeologus is mentioned at the end of the chapters against Gregory Akindynus (G. ll. 583 sq.). Part of this text is present in the Bucharest Synodicon, although its beginning, containing the name of the basileus, is missing due to loss of sheets between f. 16 and f. 17. Gouillard explicitly points out that, because of this duplicated commemoration of Andronicus III, the second mention is occasionally omitted[38].

The absence of other *basileis* or *symbasileis* from the time of the long (nominal or actual) reign of John V Palaeologus can probably be explained by considering the particular relations between the dynasty and the court, and taking the years of their deaths into account. Most probably they died after the creation of the initial text of the source in question. John VI Cantacuzene (monk Joasaph) died on June 15, 1383, and John V Palaeologus on February 16, 1391. Thus, it may be said that based on these commemorations, the text can be dated to between 1379 (the decease of Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos) and 1383 (the decease of John Cantacuzene, monk Joasaph). However, it has to be established whether this dating is not contradicted by the commemorations of the prelates of Hierissos, the last mentioned of whom is the metropolitan Jacob († 1366). The bishop after him was David, about whom the last information, dating from 1371[39], does not indicate the year of his death. This information is contained in a rather sharp letter from Philotheus to David, in connexion with the uncanonical condemnation of a priest from the eparchy. The next bishop of Hierissos was Isaac, the earliest information about whom dates from 1378.[40] Thus, even before the death of the patriarch, there was a change of bishops, and the question might arise why the death of Bishop David is not mentioned,

[37] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 240-242.
[38] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 98-99 note 328.
[39] D. Papachyssanthou, "Un évêché byzantin", p. 393.
[40] D. Papachyssanthou, "Un évêché byzantin", p. 393-394.

if it occurred before that of Patriarch Philotheus. Several answers may be proposed. First of all, it is not known when Bishop David died. The change of the holder of the see does not necessarily imply the death of a bishop – he may have been dismissed or punished, he may have withdrawn, or he may have been raised to a higher rank (which is evidently not the case here). Also, the name of the patriarch may have been added to the commemorations at a later date, in an especially reserved place in the original, or in some other way. In any case, I do not think that this inconsistency should be regarded as of decisive importance. At most it challenges the year of 1379 as the last possible date and moves it forward to 1366.

In his edition, Jean Gouillard defines several redactions of the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon[41]. According to him, the initial version of variant P must have been created in connexion with the condemnation of the anti-Palamites around Barlaam of Calabria and Gregory Akindynus in 1351 and the glorification of Andronicus III and the defenders of Orthodoxy. This version has not been preserved. Jean Grouillard organises the subsequent redactions chronologically into four groups: 1) 1368-1376 – after the canonisation of St. Gregory Palamas and before the death of Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos, during whose pontificate the witnesses belonging to this redaction were written; 2) 1383-1391 – from the death of John Cantacuzene (monk Joasaph) until the death of John V Palaeologus; 3) 1421-1425 and 4) 1439. The last two groups are not relevant for the present study, as they cannot serve to identify the parameters of B. Should Gouillard's division be accepted? And if so, to which redaction would B belong? It seems that B can be located between the first and the second group, because it commemorates Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos but not John Cantacuzene. This very fact might challenge Gouillard's system, or at least it demonstrates that it should be applied with some flexibility, including in-between variants. In this case, B can be classified within the first redaction, but with a modification, in the form of the addition of the name of Patriarch Philotheus, which was made after his death.

I believe that the various contradictions may be explained by referring to the additions made to the text at different points throughout its transmission process. Thus, the first variant is Palaeologian, but strongly influenced by the added texts related to the events on Mount Athos in 1344-1345 and the condemnation of the heretics around Irene Porenè and Joseph of Crete.

[41] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 29-35.

These events explain the explicit mention of the prelates of Hierissos in the commemorations – it is a local addition to the text. However, the events on Mouth Athos thus commemorated took place after the creation of the Greek source from which B derived, for variant P is strongly dependent on the general solution to the controversy over hesychasm and the condemnation of Barlaam of Calabria and Gregory Akindynus. Hence, I believe the initial text of the Greek source should be dated to the mid-1360s because of the included condemnation of the Barlaamites, and the commemorations of St. Gregory Palamas and Jacob, the metropolitan of Hierissos. This specific text was formed with the common Palaeologian variant as its base, to which the parts from *Hagioretikon gramma* and the commemorations and anathemata connected with it were added. I think it is very likely that the commemoration of Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos is a later addition to this text, and should not be used to date the initial variant.

The question arises whether this conclusion does not contradict the stated claim about the great importance of the inclusion of the story about the General Assembly and the condemnation of heretics in 1345. I would give a negative reply to this question inasmuch as it seems to me impossible that this specific text of the Synodicon could have been written before the final condemnation of Barlaamism and the Barlaamites. At the same time, the problem noticed here can be resolved by localising the creation of witness B. It was not compiled immediately after the events on Mount Athos in 1345. Although it was written more than a decade or two later, it was written precisely on Mount Athos, where the memory of the events was still very fresh. This conclusion is indirectly confirmed by two other observations. The first concerns the fact that controversies over heretics (Bogomils or others) had already been influenced by the mutual accusations between Barlaamites and Palamites and thereby became, more or less, part of the hesychast controversy debating the possibility of seeing the Tabor Light. The memory of the condemnation of Irene Porenè's group continued to be a topical issue in connexion with these theological disputes. In addition, it should be remembered that the same group continued to cause commotion after the events of 1345, as some of its members relocated to Tărnovo. The second observation concerns the presence of the commemoration of the prelates of Hierissos, and especially of Metropolitan Jacob. As has already been demonstrated, he was strongly engaged in the events connected with the General Assembly at Mount Athos in 1345, which

he personally chaired, taking an active part in the discussions. Hence, I believe there is an obvious and strong connexion between his commemoration and the dogmatic section related to the Messalians in the Bucharest witness to the Synodicon. As Metropolitan Jacob passed away in 1366, this and the canonisation of St. Gregory Palamas (1368) could be important reference points for dating the initial Greek text written at Mount Athos[42].

4. 1. 2. The Bucharest manuscript does not contain indications which can serve to date the Slavic translation which formed its protograph. B, at least what survives of it, does not contain specific Slavic additions (Bulgarian or Serbian) that could aid the discovery of the time of creation of its protograph. Nor can the linguistic and orthographic particularities be of assistance, as they reflect the situation at the time of copying, in the 16th century, not of the protograph.

At the same time, it should be kept in mind that 14th century was an age of very strong Slavic (mainly Serbian) presence on Mount Athos and in Eastern Macedonia, which cannot fail to have had some significance. Certainly, some of the heretics condemned by the Athonite General Assembly were Serbs and one of them (Cyril Bosota) may have been a Bulgarian. The Slavic presence was strong not only among the heretics but also among the Orthodox monks who condemned them. That is why I believe it may be suggested that, after it was written in Greek on Mount Athos, the text under study was translated there into Slavic not long (probably immediately) after the creation of the original. Nevertheless, it is not to be excluded that some time passed after the creation of the initial Greek text, during which some additions were made to the work (for instance, the commemoration of Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos and others) before it was translated into Slavic. In saying this, I mean that the additions were certainly made to the Greek original and not to the Slavic translation. There are no reasons to think otherwise. Here, of course, it has to be remembered that, due to the significant damage to the manuscript, what exist is not the entire text of B, and it is unknown what the missing parts contained. The available data, however, do not indicate any specific Slavic additions to the text.

[42] The Hagiorite origin of the protograph of B is also confirmed by certain linguistic and orthographic particularities of the text – A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 173.

The question of why was the translation made cannot be answered with absolute certainty, but some suggestions can be made. It may have been made for the special needs of the monastic republic of Mount Athos and its multi-ethnic population. In three monasteries there, the monks were predominantly Slavic; these were centres, respectively, of Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian culture. In addition, there were Slavic monks in nearly all monasteries. The strong presence of monks from Wallachia and Moldavia, countries where the official language of the Church and state was Slavic during that age, should not be overlooked either. The latter fact could explain why the text was transported north of the Danube, where the only extant manuscript survived.

The last question to address relates to the insertion of the Synodicon text within the Triodion. Was this the work of the Slavic translator/copyist or were these texts already combined in the Greek original? A single definitive and well-argued answer cannot be found. Neither of the two possibilities is to be excluded, but it seems to me more likely that the Greek source contained both, and was translated completely. This means that, at Mount Athos, a Triodion was prepared, in which the service for the first Sunday of Lent included the whole text of the Synodicon. Subsequently, the complete manuscript was translated into Slavic for use in the liturgy. An indirect confirmation of this hypothesis is the fact that the Synodicon within the Triodion was disseminated in provincial Greek manuscripts, mainly in dioceses suffragan to Athens.

I think it can be claimed with considerable certainty that the manuscript of the Synodicon within the Triodion found in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest represents the first Slavic translation of the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon. It was made soon after the Greek text was written in line with variant *P*, and most probably on Mount Athos, and was subsequently dissemination among Orthodox Slavs and Romanians.

4. 2. The creation and the variant classification of the Drinov manuscript of the Synodicon

Jean Gouillard classified the work into three variants and he proposed the main parameters that define the affiliation of a manuscript to one of them. These are the criteria that I shall try to apply to the two Slavic manuscripts under study here. Gouillard draws attention to two general features that determine his classification: the dogma reflected in the text and the added

historical-commemorative part[43]. However, he explicitly emphasises that it is quite possible that names were added to or excluded from later witnesses to an earlier variant in order to update the commemorations and anathemata. Thus, it is obvious that in PAL, and it seems in DRIN, names were added to the text – especially Bulgarian ones, but also Wallachian and Moldavian. It is impossible to use these additions to determine the *terminus post quem*, since the variant remains an earlier one based on its dogmatic part and the translated commemorations and anathemata. In the latest edition of the Bulgarian Synodicon, Ivan Božilov emphasises that the text was constructed through continuous additions[44].

4. 2. 1. Concerning the dating of the protograph of the Bulgarian Synodicon contained in DRIN, it should be pointed out that the text contains nothing specific that might suggest a date, except the commemorations. The last mentioned Bulgarian ruler there is Tsar John Stephen; this points to an uncertain *terminus post quem* in the early 1330s. The following sheets are lost, and it must be assumed that the commemorative part continued and covered several more decades.

A few more words should be said about the language of the manuscript and the structure of the text, as well as about its relation to other known Slavic witnesses to the Synodicon. Due to their gradual formation with additions throughout their transmission process, the Slavic witnesses to the Synodicon cannot be easily classified as "pure" representations of one of the Greek variants M, C, and P. In fact, it is difficult even among the Greek witnesses to find entirely "pure" representatives of the variants. Until recently, the general opinion was that all the South Slavic copies known, judging by the preserved fragments, belonged to the Comnenian variant (*C*), some having later additions from the Palaeologian age[45]. Here, I should assert that the Bucharest manuscript is the first recognised witness to the South Slav Synodicon that must be indisputably classified as variant *P,* due to the presence in it of texts related to the hesychast controversy.

4. 2. 2. In order to determine the affiliation of DRIN to one of the variants *M, C* and P, the process of its creation must be reconstructed.

---

[43] J. Gouillard, "Synodikon", p. 9.

[44] Ив. Божилов, А.-М. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов Синодик*, p. 52.

[45] Of course, the printed East Slavic texts within the Triodion (those from Kiev, Lemberg/Lvov, and Moscow) are obviously variant P.

I should immediately point out that DRIN belongs to variant *P* and was changed through additions, since it (and/or its protograph) is directly dependent on the protograph of the Bucharest manuscript[46]. Basically, the translation was made from a variant *P* that was most probably created on Mount Athos and that had no ethnic elements; it was used to construct the Bulgarian version of the later Synodicon. A Bulgarian version came into being as texts related in some way or other to Bulgaria were inserted into this Slavic translation from Mount Athos[47]. Earlier in my presentation, I mentioned some (probably not all) linguistic and textual – both structural and substantial – elements that connect the texts in B and DRIN. Particularly notable is the presence of the commemoration of St. Andrew of Crete (which is exceptional as it occurs only in these two witnesses) and of the anathemata against Eustratius of Nicaea and the controversy over Christ's Sacrifice. These are important markers of the connectedness between the two manuscripts, and between them and the printed Synodica.

For their part, the elements differentiating them, which DRIN shares with PAL, can be considered as later insertions. An example of such an element relates to an historic event, the story about the Council of 1211 and the commemorations and anathemata related it. Other examples are some dogmatic components, for instance, the anathemata against the dualists borrowed from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas. Insertion can also explain the presence of the personal anathema against John Italus, which is not a characteristic feature for a variant P. This is also how the repetition of the anathema against Nilus of Calabria should be explained.

I would say that the variants and affiliation to variants are determined by the dogmatic part, and not so much by the commemorative sections, to which additions can easily be made throughout the transmission process of the text. Unfortunately, the most important marks of affiliation to the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon – namely, the condemnation of Barlaam and Gregory Akindynus and the commemorations of Andronicus III and St. Gregory Palamas – are not evident in DRIN, as they would have been located at the end

[46] A.-M. Totomanova (A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 172-173) believed that DRIN is a new translation of the Synodicon that is based on variant *P*, which is partially preserved in the Bucharest copy, to which parts of PAL have been added. This view partially matches my conclusion in this study.

[47] Anna-Maria Totomanova reaches a similar conclusion in her article (A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", p. 172-173).

of the work, which is missing. The proposal should be made that the missing end of the work did indeed contain his text. Apart from this material lacuna, all the other essential elements of a variant *P* can be found in DRIN.

Can anything be contributed to the discussion regarding the localisation of the protograph of the Bulgarian Palaeologian Synodicon? Quite probably, it was written in Bulgaria or on Mount Athos in a Bulgarian milieu, as the newly created text corresponded to the needs of Bulgarian society and of the state. It was certainly written before the Ottoman conquest, when the commemoration of tsars was relevant. Of course, given the lack of direct evidence, not more than assumptions with some degree of probability can be offered. The localisation of the construction of the text, however, is not so important. More essential is the assertion that there was a Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon, created, and probably translated, on Mount Athos and subsequently adapted to Bulgarian requirements.

CONCLUSION

The Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy was written in connexion with the revival of the veneration of icons in 843 AD and continued to grow by additions made throughout its transmission over the course of until the end the remaining history of the Empire, from the 9th to the 15th century. As the text was appropriated to the needs of different epochs, countries, and dioceses, individual surviving witnesses to the text differ considerably from each other. It was exactly due to these differences, the result of the appropriation of the Synodicon to specific situations, that the work was able to fulfil its basic functions, which were liturgical, dogmatic, canonical and disciplinary. The text was meant to be read during the divine service on the First Sunday of Lent. Its purpose was as to announce the triumph of Orthodoxy, to proclaim the polychronia and commemorations of the just, to condemn deviations from the true faith, and to anathemise heretics. Only by undergoing changes was the text able to remain relevant, taking account of the changing theological discussions and their results as well as the local particularities of the individual churches and dioceses.

Jean Gouillard classified the Greek witnesses to the text of the Synodicon into three variants, which he named chronologically based on the ruling dynasty of the respective periods as Macedonian (*M*), Comnenian (*C*) and Palaeologian (*P*). Within each variant significant differences between witnesses to the text occur, especially in the commemorative parts of the work. Until recently, it was believed there was no South Slavic manuscript witness to the Synodicon belonging to variant *P*. The Serbian translation belongs to variant *C*, as does the translation made after the council convened by Tsar Boril in Tărnovo on 11 February 1211 (reflected in manuscript PAL). Thus, the only Slavic witnesses classified under the Palaeologian variant were the Russian Synodicon and the printed mostly Ruthenian editions of Slavic texts from Kiev, Lemberg/Lvov and Moscow. The situation changed completely after the publication of Ms. sl. 307 from the Library of the Romanian Academy, which is certainly Palaeologian. Comparison with that witness enabled the classification of the Drinov manuscript of the Bulgarian Synodicon under the same variant

category[1]. The publication of the Bucharest manuscript has certainly opened new perspectives for research on the sources, and the conclusions I reached have been confirmed by other studies[2].

The present book offered the publication and comparative study of the texts contained in these two manuscripts, the only to South Slavic manuscripts of the Synodicon version P. It also provided insight into the history of the translation and dissemination of the text, as well a discussion of the mutual influence between the two manuscripts and their relation to other witnesses (both manuscripts and printed editions) to the Synodicon. The main results are as follows.

There is no uncertainty about when and where the Greek version of the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon was created. It was inspired by the resolution of the hesychast controversy and the condemnation of the anti-Palamites, headed by Barlaam of Calabria and Gregory Akindynus, in 1351. This was certainly a very important event for the Empire and was appreciated as such, for it was reflected in the Synodicon; the so-called "Palaeologian variant" was consolidated around it. The work must have been created in Constantinople. Its characteristic additional features, the anathemata against Barlaam and Gregory Akindynus and the commemoration of St. Gregory Palamas and the basileus Andronicus III, were meant to be used throughout the Empire. As the work circulated, regional versions developed out of the common text. One of these versions was created on Mount Athos and included some local Athonite discussions about various deviations, and the results of the controversies. An important event in connexion with this occurred on Mount Athos around the middle of the 14th century: a group of heretical monks united around Irene Porenè were condemned by the monastic republic's General Assembly in 1344. This event is reflected in the *Mount Athos Letter,* or „Ἀγιορετικὸν γράμμα" (*Hagioretikon gramma*), preserved in a manuscript and published by Antonio Rigo[3]. The circumstances of these events, the

[1] Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, Sofia, 2013.

[2] Ив. Билярски Ив., М. Цибранска-Костова, „За един композитен тип и за Палеологовия вариант на славянския Синодик в Неделята на Православието", *Palaeobulgarica*, XXXVI, 2012, 1, p. 51-65; A.-M. Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", *Studia Ceranea*, 7, 2017, p. 165-226.

[3] The text is published here as an annexe by Antonio Rigo. See also: A. Rigo, "L'assemblea generale atonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili (ms. Vat. Gr. 604 ff. 11r-12v)", *Cristianesimo nella storia. Ricerche storiche, esegetiche, teologiche*, 5, 1984, p. 475-506.

anathemata against the heretics in question, and the commemorations of the Orthodox (in fact, of the prelates of Hierissos, especially Metropolitan Jacob) were fully or partially included in the Synodicon to express respect for the faithful and awareness of the significance of deviations from dogma, practice or canon. Thus, in the second half of the 1360s, an Athonite version of the Synodicon was composed, which included the basic texts of the Palamite controversy as well as the earlier disputes dating from the 1340s. Evidently, elements of the diptych section were subsequently added to this version in connexion with the decease of some of the participants in the events. The Bucharest manuscript constitutes a testimony to this initial version (in a Slavic translation).

Probably soon after it was created, the Greek work was translated into Slavic. This was the first translation of the Palaeologian variant of the Synodicon. Probably made on Mount Athos, such a translation seemed to have been necessary in the context of the ecumenical and multi-ethnic character of the monastic republic. This translation reached Bulgaria, although it is not sure how exactly this happened. In any case, due to the importance of Athonite literary produce and its dissemination throughout the Orthodox regions, it is not surprising for a work to have been translated on Mount Athos, and subsequently reaching Bulgaria. Bulgarian hesychasm was certainly under strong influence of Mount Athos, as was the literary production of Tărnovo. One of the text's possible paths to Bulgaria is connected with the spread of Irene Porenè's heresy to the Bulgarian capital, as some of its adherents, after being expelled from Mount Athos, arrived there. In Tărnovo they were again condemned and sentenced to expulsion, this time with the active participation of St. Theodosius of Tărnovo. This certainly proves the strong motivation to end the scandalous heresy that had come from Mount Athos and taken root in Tărnovo.

After its arrival in Bulgaria, the translation of the Synodicon was reworked and adapted to the needs of Bulgarian society. This was done by supplementing the completely Byzantine, ethnically neutral, text with parts relevant to Bulgarian history and heresies specific to Bulgaria. Inserted foremost was the dyptich section of Bulgarian commemorations and anathemata. Anathemata against the Bogomils were also included, taken from the letter of the ecumenical patriarch Cosmas. They were already part of the Bulgarian Synodicon, evident in the Palauzov manuscript (belonging to variant *C*).

The story of the Council of 1211, connected with the diptych section, was also included in the Synodicon's *P* variant that came from Mount Athos), as well as certain anti-dualist anathemata that are not present in the Byzantine witnesses to the text. There are many indications that the inserted texts were borrowed from a Slavic witness to variant *C,* which was probably a version of the text created in 1211. This may have been the Palauzov manuscript itself or, more probably, an earlier manuscript in its line of transmission. This briefly explains the creation of the protograph of the Drinov manuscript of the Bulgarian Synodicon.

As mentioned, there are two extant South Slavic manuscript witnesses to Synodicon variant P, both from the 16th century. The Drinov manuscript was probably copied in Bulgaria. Based on the textual convoy, the other works with which the Synodicon was combined in the manuscript codex, it can be suggested that it was meant simply to be read, although its use in liturgy cannot be excluded. The Bucharest manuscript is evidently closely connected with Wallachia. The miscellaneous codex is important for the culture and traditions of that principality as it contains the only known Slavic translation of the Vita of St. Gregory Decapolites, the country's patron saint, written by Ignatius Deacon[4]. The mutual dependence between the Russian Synodicon (Synodal collection, №667) and the translation that is the topic of this book is difficult to ascertain, but it seems that there is such a connexion, which would indicate that some witness to the text had appeared relatively early on among the Eastern Slavs. More important for the present research is the evidence for a strong connexion between the lost Byzantine version on which the Bucharest translation is based and the printed Synodica. This connexion is probably due to the similarities between the source of the translation reflected in the Bucharest manuscript and the version from the metropolitan see of Patras, upon which the Greek printed Triodion with Synodicon was based, which subsequently served as the basis for the Slavic and Romanian printed Synodica. This very important question should, however, be the topic of a separate study.

[4] Ив. Билярски, „Житието на св. Григорий Декаполит в ръкопис Ms. sl. 307 от Румънската Академия", *Зборник радова Византолошког института*, L, 2013, p. 213-221.

ABBREVIATIONS

B = Bucharest copy of the Synodicon (BAR, Ms. Sl. 307)

BAR = Biblioteca Academiei Române, Bucharest

DRIN = Drinov copy of the Bulgarian Synodicon (= Manuscript NBKM, 432, XVI century)

ΕΠΛΒΙΠ = *Εγκυκλοπαιδικό προσωπογραφικό λεξικό βυζαντινής ιστορίας και πολιτισμού*

EPLBHC = *Encyclopaedic Prosopographical Lexicon of Byzantine History and Civilization*

GR ll. or G. ll. = Greek (original text of the Synodicon) with cited numbers of lines in the edition of Jean Gouillard

GIM = State Historical Museum (Государьственый исторический музей)

ll. = lines

NBKM = National Library 'Saints Cyril and Methodius' in Sofia

ODB = *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*

PAL = Palauzov copy of the Bulgarian Synodicon (= Manuscript NBKM, 289/55/, XIV century)

PBW = Prosopography of the Byzantine World

PLPZ = *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*

PLRE = *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*

PMBZ = *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit*

Popruženko = Edition of M. G. Popruženko (Михаил Г. Попруженко, Синодик царя Борила, (= Български старини, кн. VIII), София, Държавна печатница, 1928), when cited in the parts of the original Old Church Slavonic texts

БАН or BAN = Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (Българска Академия на науките)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Latin Alphabet Titles

Actes d'Iviron, t. IV (= *Archives de l'Athos*, t. XIX), éd. Jacques Lefort, Nikolas Oikonomidès, Dionyssia Papachryssanthou, Vassiliki Kravari, Hélène Métrévéli, Paris, CNRS, 1995

Hélène Ahrweiler, "L'Asie mineure et les invasions arabes", *Revue historique,* 1962, p. 1-32

Leon Allatius, *De libris et rebus ecclesiasticis Graecorum dissertationes et observationes variae*, Parisiis, 1646

Ioan Bianu, Nerva Hodoş, *Bibliografia românească veche, 1508-1830*, t. I (1508-1716), Bucuresci, 1903

Ivan Biliarsky, "The Synodicon of Orthodoxy in BAR Ms. Sl. 307 and the *Hagioreticon Gramma* of the Year 1344", *The Balkans and the Byzantine World before and after the Captures of Constantinople, 1204 and 1453,* ed. Vlada Stanković, Lexington Books, Lanham-Boulder-New York-London, 2016, p. 103-115

Ivan Biliarsky, Radu Gabriel Păun, "La version roumaine du Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie (Buzău, 1700) et les combats pour la « Juste foi » à la fin du XVIIe siècle", *Cahiers du Monde russe*, 58/3, Juillet-septembre 2017, p. 395-434.

Dumitru Bodin, "Grigore Decapolitul şi Ioan de Capistrano", *Revista istorică română*, XIV/3, 1945, p. 307-315.

Mathilde Boudier, "La mémoire des Patriarches dans l'Église melkite. Le cas de Christophore d'Antioche (X^{e} siècle)", dans *Les vivants et les morts dans les sociétés médiévales. XLVIII^{e} Congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public (Jérusalem, 2017)*, Paris, Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2018, p. 43-58

Michael Brett, "The Arab conquest and the rise of Islam", in: *The Cambridge History of Africa,* vol. II, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,1978, p. 490-55

Averil Cameron, *The Byzantines,* Blachwell Publishing, 2006, XVI+275 p.

Averil Cameron, "Byzantium and the Limits of Orthodoxy", *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 154, 2007, p. 129-152

Anne Comnène, *Alexiade*, t. III (l. XI-XV). éd. B. Leib, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1943

Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta. Editio critica, vol. IV/1, *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. Decisions and Synodika. From Constantinople 861 to Constantinople 1872*, ed. Alberto Melloni, Turnhout, Brepols, 2016

Marie-Hélène Congourdeau, "Deux patriarches palamites en rivalité : Kallistos et Philothée", dans *Le Patriarcat œcuménique de Constantinople aux XIV^e^-XVI^e^ siècles : rupture et continuité. Actes du Colloque international, Rome 57 décembre 2005*, Paris, Centre d'études byzantines, néohelléniques et sud-est européennes, EHESS, 2007, p. 37-53

Ivan Dujčev, "Das Synodikon von Boril als Geschichte und Schrifttumsdenkmal", *Byzantinobulgarica*, VI, Sofia, BAN, 1980, p. 115-124

František Dvornik, "La Vie de Saint Grégoire le Décapolite et les Slaves macédoniennes au IX^e^ siècle", *Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'Ètudes slaves*, V, Paris, 1926

EPLBHC = *Encyclopaedic Prosopographical Lexicon of Byzantine History and Civilization*, Alexios G. Savvides, Benjamin Hendrickx (ed.), vol. 1, *Aaron – Azarethes*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2007; vol. 2, *Baanes – Eznik of Kolb*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2008; vol. 3, *Faber Felix – Juwayni, Al-*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2012 (continue)

ΕΠΛΒΙΠ = *Εγκυκλοπαιδικό προσωπογραφικό λεξικό βυζαντινής ιστορίας και πολιτισμού*, τ. Α-ΣΤ, Αθήνα, Έκδοσεις ΜΕΤΡΟΝ/ΙΩΛΚΟΣ 1996-2006

Lynda Garland, *Byzantine Empresses: Women and Power in Byzantium, AD 527-1204*, London and New York, Routledge, 2002

Lynda Garland, Stephen Rapp, "Mary "of Alania": Woman and Empress between Two Worlds", *Byzantine Women: Varieties of Experience, 800-1200*, ed. Lynda Garland, (Centre for Hellenic Studies, King's College London, No 8), Aldershot, Routledge, 2006, p. 91-123

Lynda Garland, Shaun Tougher, "Eudocia Ingerina, Wife of Basil I", *De Imperatoribus Romanis. An Online Encyclopedia of Roman Rulers*, Salve Regina University, http://roman-emperors.sites.luc.edu/EudInger.htm (04. 04. 2021)

Nina G. Garsoïan, "L'abjuration du moine Nil de Calabre", *Byzantinoslavica*, 35/1, 1974, p. 1227 [*Armenia between Byzantium and the Sasanians*, London, Variorum, 1985]

Jean Gouillard, “L’hérésie dans l’Empire byzantin dès origines au XII^e siècle”, *Travaux et mémoires*, vol. 1, 1965, p. 299-324

Jean Gouillard, “Le Synodicon de l’Orthodoxie : edition et commentaire”, *Travaux et mémoires*, vol. 2, 1967, p. 1-316

Jean Gouillard, “Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril : la lettre inédite du patriarche Cosmas”, *Travaux et mémoires*, vol. 4, 1970, p. 361-374

Paris Gounaridis, “La Canonisation du patriarche Joseph”, *Βυζαντινά Σύμμεικτα*, 17, Αθήνα, 2005, p. 239-253

John F. Haldon and Hugh Kennedy, “The Arab-Byzantine frontier in the eighth and ninth centuries: military organisation and society in the borderlands”, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta,* XIX, 1980, p. 79-116

John F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century. Transformation of a Culture*, Cambridge, CUP, 1990

Martin Hinterberger, “Die Affäre um den Monch Niphon Skorpios und die Messalianismus-Vorwürfe gegen Kallistos I.”, in Antonio Rigo (ed.), *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del xiv secolo bizantino*, (= *Orientalia Venetiana*, 16), Firenze, Casa Editrice Leo S. Olschki, 2004, p. 211-248

Kenneth G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses. Women and Imperial Domination in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, University of California Press, 1982

James Howard-Johnston, *Witnesses to a World Crisis. Historians and Histories of the Middle East in the Seventh Century*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010

Herbert Hunger und Wolfgang Lackner, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, 3,3: *Codices theologici 201-337*, Wien, Hollinek, 1992 (*Museion* N.F. 4, Bd. 1, T. 3,3)

Martin Hurbanič, *The Avar Siege of Constantinople in 626. History and Legend*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, X+361 p.

Nicolae Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance. Continuation de l’“Histoire de la vie byzantine”*, Bucarest, Éditions de l’Institut d’études byzantines, 1935

Marek Jankowiak, “The first Arab siege of Constantinople”, *Constructing the Seventh Century* (= *Travaux et mémoires*, vol. 17), éd. Constantin Zuckerman, Paris, 2013, p. 237-320

Romilly James Heald Jenkins, Cyril Mango, "A Synodikon of Antioch and Lacedaemonia", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 15, 1961, p. 225-242

Emil Kałużniacki, *Aus der panegyrischen Litteratur der Südslaven*, Wien, In Commission bei Carl Gerold's Sohn,1901

Patricia Karlin-Hayter, "Restoration of Orthodoxy, the Pardon of Theophilos and the *Acta Davidis, Symeonis et Georgii"*, *Byzantine Style, Religion, and Civilization: In Honor of Sir Steven Runciman*, ed. Elizabeth Jeffreys, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 361-373

Kriszta Kotsis, "Empress Theodora: A Holy Mother", *Virtuous or Villainess: The Image of the Royal Mother form the Early Medieval to the Early Modern Era*, ed. Carey Fleiner, Elena Woodacre, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, p. 11-36

András Kraft, István Perczel, "John Italos on the Eternity of the World. A New Critical Edition of Quaestio 71 with Translation and Commentary", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 111/3, 2018, p. 659-720

Paweł Lachowicz, "The Family Strategy for Purple – Comparing the Methods of Andronikos I and Alexios I Komnenos of Constructing Imperial Power", *Studia Ceranea*, 9, Łódź, 2019, p. 301-317

Vitalien Laurent, "La liste épiscopale du Synodicon de Monembasie", *Echos d'Orient*, 32, 1933, p. 129-161

Frederick Lauritzen, "Against the Enemies of Tradition, Alexios Studites and the Synodikon of Orthodoxy", in: *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Byzantium. The Definition and the Notion of Orthodoxy and Some Other Studies on the Heresies and the Non-Christian Religions*, ed. Antonio Rigo, Pavel Ermilov, (*Quaderni di Νέα 'Ρώμη*, 4) Rome, Università degli Studi di "Tor Vergata", 2010, p. 41-48

Frederick Lauritzen, "Synod Decrees of the Eleventh Century", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 105/1, 2012, p. 101-116

Emile Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des Grecs aux XV^e^ et XVI^e^ siècles*, vol. I-IV, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1885-1906

Emile Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des Grecs au XVIII^e^ siècle,* vol. I-II, Paris, Garnier frères, 1918-1928

Paul Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantine : notes et remarques sur l'eseignement et la culture à Byzance des origins au X^e^ siècle,*

(Bibliothèque byzantine, Etudes, 6), Paris, Presses universitaires de France, 1971, 326 p.

Letters of Gregory Akindynos, Greek Text and English Translation by Angela Constantinidis Hero, Washington D. C., Dumbarton Oaks, 1983

Ralph Johannes Lilie (Hgb.), *Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit (Germanos I. – Nethodios I. /715-847/)*, Berliner byzantinische Studien, Bd. 5, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 1999

Paul Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180)*, Cambridge, CUP, 1993

Georgios Makris, *Ignatios Diakonos und die Vita des Hl. Gregorios Dekapolites*. (= *Byzantinisches archiv*, Band 17), Stuttgart und Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1997

Lamprini N. Manou, *Δαμασκηνός ο Στουδίτης: ο βίος και το έργο του*, Athens 1999

Alexandru Mareş, *Filigranele hîrtiei întrebuinţate în ţările române în secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1987

Dragoljub Marjanović, *Creating Memories in Late 8th-Century Byzantium. The Short History of Nikephoros of Constantinople*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2018

Bernadette Martin-Hisard, "Le patriarche Pierre III d'Antioche (1052-1057), son pseudo-successeur Jean IV/Denys et le géorgien Georges l'Hagiorite († 1065)", *Nea Rhomè, Rivista di ricerche bizantinistiche*, 4, 2007, p. 177-215

Franz Ritter von Miklosich, Joseph Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca sacra et profana*, vol. I, *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani MCCCXV-MCCCCII*, Vindobonae, C. Gerold, MDCCCLX

Bernard de Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Coisliniana olim Segueriana*, Paris, Ludovicus Guerin & Carolus Robustel, 1715

Vladimir A. Mošin, *Ćirilski rukopisi Jugoslovenske Akademije*, I dio, Opis rukopisa, Zagreb, 1955

Vladimir A. Mošin, "Plevljanski rukopis Sinodika Pravoslavlja", *Slovo*, VI-VIII (= *Vajsov zbornik*), Zagreb, 1957, p. 157-176

Benjamin Moulet, *Évêques, pouvoir et société à Byzance (VIIIe-XIe siècle). Territoires, communautés et individus dans la société provinciale byzantine* (= Byzantina Sorbonensia, 25), Paris, Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2011

Petre Năsturel, "Le surnaturel dans les sources médiévales roumaines", *L'empereur hagiographe. Culte des saints et monarchie byzantine et post-byzantine*, Bucarest, New Europe College, 2001, p. 122-136

Savvas Neocleous, "*Tyrannus Grecorum*: The Image and Legend of Andronikos I Komnenos in Latin Historiography", *Medioevo Greco*, 12, 2012, p. 195-284

Dimitri Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe 500-1453*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 197, XIV+445 p.

The Old Testament in Byzantium, ed. Paul Magdalino, Robert Nelson, Washington, D. C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2010

Victor Ostapchuk, "An Ottoman Gazânâme on Halil Pasa's Naval Campaign against the Cossacks (1621)", *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 14, 1990, p. 482-521

The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, vol. I-III, New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991

Petre P. Panaitescu, *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române şi slave din Biblioteca Academiei Române*, vol II, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2003

Dionyssia Papachryssanthou, "Hiérissos, métropole éphémère au XIV^{e} siècle", *Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilization de Byzance*, 4, 1970, p. 395-410

Dionyssia Papachryssanthou, "Histoire d'un évêché byzantin : Hiérissos en Chalcidique", *Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilization de Byzance*, 8, 1981, p. 373-396

Radu Gabriel Păun, Ivan Biliarsky, *Du combat pour la « juste foi » au péché politique. Pour une histoire du Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie*, Wien, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Schriften zur Balkanforschung), 2021, 370 p. forthcoming

Şefik Peksevgen, "Osman II", in: Gábor Ágoston & Bruce Masters**,** *Encyclopaedia of the Ottoman Empire*, New York, Infobase Publishing, 2009, p. 446-447

Louis Petit, "Damascène le Studite", *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,* vol. IV, Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1924, p. 27-28

Dragoş P. Petroşanu, "Sf. Grigore Decapolitul din mănastirea Bistrița-Vâlcea", *Biserica Ortodoxă Română*, LIX/11-12, 1941, p. 682-703

Gabriel Pieterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2003

Gerhard Podskalsky, "Damaskenos Studites", *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd ed., ed. Cardinal Walter Kasper, vol. III, München, 1994, 1381

Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit, ed. Erich Trapp et alii, Bd. 1-15, Wien, Verlag des Österreichischen Akademie des Wissenschaften, 1976-1995

Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit, Bd. I/1 (#1–2182). Berlin-New York, Berlin-Branderburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999; Bd. I/2, #2183–4270, Berlin-New York, 2000; Bd. I/3, #4271–6265, Berlin-New York, 2000; Bd. I/4, #6266–8345, Berlin-New York, 2001; Bd. I/5, #8346–8675, Anonymi #10001–12149, Berlin-New York, 2001 http://pom.bbaw.de/pmbz/index_engl.html (04. 04. 2021)

Prosopography of the Byzantine World, éd. Michael Jeffreys *et al.*, *2016* (King's College London, 2017): http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk (04. 04. 2021)

Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, vol. I (A. D. 260–395) A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, J. Morris. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1971; vol. II (A. D. 395–527), J. R. Martindale. Cambridge, 1980; Vol. III/A (A. D. 527–641), A-I, J. R. Martindale, Cambridge, 1992; vol. III/B (A. D. 527–641), K-Z, J. R. Martindale. Cambridge, 1992.

Christian Raffensperger, "Revisiting the idea of the Byzantine Commonwealth," *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 28, 2004, p. 159-74.

Antonio Rigo, "L'assemblea generale atonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili (ms. Vat. Gr. 604 ff. 11r-12v)", *Cristianesimo nella storia. Ricerche storiche, esegetiche, teologiche*, 5, 1984, p. 475-506

Antonio Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivole agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, (Orientalia Venetiana, II), Firenze, MCMLXXXIX

Antonio Rigo, "Giovanni Italo", in: *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, vol. 56, Rome, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 2001, p. 62-67

Antonio Rigo, "Il *Synodikon dell' Ortodossia* di Lavra (1400 circa)", *Revue des études byzantines,* 75, Paris, 2017, p. 255-282

Antonio Rigo, “Le Synodikon de l’Orthodoxie et le Palamisme. La forme primitive de p (1351 – avant 1360): les sources et les témoins”, dans Ivan Biliarsky (éd.), *Laudator temporis acti. Studia in memoriam Ioannis A. Božilov*. II, *Ius, Imperium, Potestas Litterae Ars et Archaeologia*, Serdicae, MMXVIII, p. 227-241

Antonio Rigo, “Un nouveau témoin du Synodikon de l’Orthodoxie P : le manuscrit de la Sainte-Trinité à Chalki 34”, *Revue des études byzantines*, 76, Paris, 2018, p. 73-98

Antonio Rigo, “Gli estratti del *Synodikon dell’Ortodossia* del *Vat. gr.* 1700 (verso 1370)”, *Ambrosiana, hagiographica, Vaticana. Studi in onore di Mons. Cesare Pasini in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno,* (= *Studi e testi*, 535), a cura di Ambrogio M. Piazzoni, Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2020, p. 575-580

Antonio Rigo, “Il Synodikon dell’Ortodossia di Tessalonica”, *Revue des études byzantines* 78, Paris, 2020, p. 193-217

Antonio Rigo, *1347 Isidoro patriarca di Costantinopoli e il breve sogno dell’inizio di una nuova epoca* (= *Wiener byzantinische Studien*, Bd. XXXI), Wien, Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2020

Antonio Rigo, “Le Synodikon de l’Orthodoxie à l’époque des Paléologue”*, Travaux et mémoires,* 2021, forthcoming

Tatiana A. Sénina (moniale Kassia), “Notices sur l’atmosphère intellectuelle à l’époque du second iconoclasme”, *Scrinium*, 4/1, 2008, p. 318-340

Jonathan Shepard, “The Byzantine Commonwealth, 1000-1550”, in: *The Cambridge History of Christianity,* vol. 5: *Eastern Christianity*, ed. M. Angold, Cambridge, CUP, 2008, p. 3-52

Baki Tezcan, “The History of a Primary Source: The Making of Tughi’s Chronicle on the Regicide of Osman II (1622) in 1623”, *Bulletin of School of Oriental & African Studies*, 72 /1, 2009, p. 41-62

Andrei Timotin, *Visions, prophéties et pouvoir à Byzance. Étude sur l’hagiographie méso-byzantine (IX-XI siècles*), Paris, EHESS, 2010

Franz Tinnefeld, “Das Schisma zwischen Anhängern und Gegnern des Patriarchen Arsenios in der orthodoxen Kirche von Byzanz (1265-1310)”, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 105/1, 2012, p. 143-166

Klaus-Peter Todt, *Region und griechisch-orthodoxes Patriarchat von Antiocheia in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit und im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge (969-1204)*, vol. I, Wiesbaden, 1998

Anna-Maria Totomanova, "The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria", *Studia Ceranea*, 7, Łódź, 2017, p. 165-226

Maria Vaiou, "Nicolas Mystikos", *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History*, ed. David Thomas, Alex Mallet et alii, vol. 2 *(900-1050)*, Leiden-Boston, 2010, p. 169-183

Michel van Esbroeck, Nural Karadeniz, "Das Synodikon vom Jahre 843 in georgischen Übersetzung", *Annuarium historiae conciliorum*, 19, Paderborn, 1987, p. 300-313

Patricia Varona Codeso, *Miguel III (842-867). Construcción histórica y literaria de un Reinado* (= *Nueva Roma*, 33), Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, 2009

Antonios Vratimos, "Eudokia Makrembolitissa: Was She Implicated in the Removal of Her Husband, Romanos IV Diogenes, from Power?", *Revue des études byzantines*, 71, Paris, 2013, p. 277-284

Wanda Wolska-Conus, "De quibusdam Ignatius", *Travaux et mémoires*, 4, 1970, p. 329-360

Mirjana Živoijnović, "The spiritual father of the monastery of Chilandar", *XVI. Internazionaler Byzantinistenkongreß*, Akten II, 2/*JÖB,* 32/2, 1982, p. 247-256

Cyrillic Alphabet Titles

Димитър С. Ангелов, *Богомилството в България*, София, Наука и изкуство, 1969, 562 p.

Иван Ал. Билярски, „Погановския поменик", *Годишник на Софийския университет, Център за славяно-византийски проучвания „Акад. Ив. Дуйчев"*, т. 84-85, 1990-1991, p. 53-77

Иван Ал. Билярски, *Институциите на средновековна България. Второ българско царство (XII-XIV век)*, София, Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски", 1998, 426 p.

Иван Ал. Билярски, *Палеологовият Синодик в славянски превод*, София, Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски", 2013, 118 p.

Иван Ал. Билярски, „Житието на св. Григорий Декаполит в ръкопис Ms. sl. 307 от Румънската Академия", *Зборник радова Византолошког института*, L, 2013, с. 213-221

Иван Ал. Билярски, Марияна Цибранска-Костова, „За един композитен тип и за Палеологовия вариант на славянския Синодик в Неделята на Православието", *Palaeobulgarica*, XXXVI, 2012, 1, p. 51-65

Иван А. Божилов, *Фамилията на Асеневци (1186-1460). Генеалогия и просопография*, София, 1985

Иван А. Божилов, Иван Ал. Билярски, Христо Димитров, Илия Илиев, *Византийските василевси*, София, 1997

Иван А. Божилов, *Византийският свят / Le monde byzantin*, София, 2008

Иван А. Божилов, Анна-Мария Тотоманова, Иван Ал. Билярски, *Борилов синодик. Издание и превод*, София, ПАМ Пъблишинг Къмпани ООД, 2012

Иван А. Божилов, *История на средновековна България*, т. I, *Варварска България*, 440 p.; т. II, *Християнска България*, 620 p., София, Фондация „Българско историческо наследство", 2017

Български етимологичен речник, т. I-, София, БАН, 1971-

Екатерина И. Демина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин. Болгарский памятник XVII века*, София, БАН, 1968, 236 p.

Владимир В. Дергачев, "Вселенский Синодик в древней и средневековой России", *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, 3, 2001, p. 17-28

Ирина В. Дергачева, „Типология Синодиков в русской писмености XV-XVII вв.", *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописных книг*, Москва, 1990, p. 246-270

Ирина В. Дергачева, *Посмертная судьба и „иной мир" в древнерусской книжности*, Москва, Издательство „Кругъ", 2004

Иван С. Дуйчев, „Българският княз Пленимир", *Българско Средновековие. Проучвания върху политическата и културна история на средновековна България*, София, Наука и изкуство, 1972, p. 153-160

Васил Н. Златарски, „**Житїе и жнзнь преподобнаго отца нашего Ѳеѡдосїа, нже въ тръновѣ посннуьствовавшаго, съпнсано свѣтѣншнмъ патрїархомъ Кѡнстантнна града кѵрь Калнстѡмъ**", *Сборник за народни умотворения и народопис*, кн. II. XX, София, 1904, p. 1-41

Васил Н. Златарски, *История на българската държава през средните векове, т. III, Второ българско царство. България при Асеневци (1187-1280)*, София, Придворна печатница, 1940, XVI+637 с.

Йордан Иванов, „Поменици на български царе и царици“, in: Й. Иванов, *Избрани произведения, т. I, Литература, история, фолклор*, съст. Б. Ангелов, София, Наука и изкуство, 1982, p. 144-153

Петар Илиевски, „За македонскиот превод на дамаскинот“, *Македонски јазик*, год. XI-XII, Скопје, 1961, кн. 1-2, p. 33-51

Петар Илиевски, „За средногорскиот превод на дамаскинот“, *Македонски јазик*, год. XI-XII, Скопје, 1961, кн. 1-2, p. 53-71

Георги Т. Каприев, *Византийска философия. Четири центъра на синтеза*, 2 ed. София, Изток-Запад, 2011, 478 с.

Петр А. Лавров, *Дамаскин Студит и сборники его имени „дамскины“* в югославянской литературе, Одесса, Экономическая типография, 1899

Евтимиос К. Лицас, „Дамскин Студит: некоторые нерешенные вопросы его биографии и творчества“, ΜΟΣΧΟΒΙΑ: К 60-летию Б. Л. Фонкича, Москва, 2001, p. 247-258

Кирилл А. Максимович, „К уточнению корпуса русских домонгольских переводов с греческого: Синодик в Неделю Православия“, *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, 46, 2011, p. 77-84

Георги Минчев, „Бориловият Синодик 800 години по-късно: *Борилов Синодик. Издание и превод*. Встъпителни студии, издание, превод и коментари Ив. Божилов, А. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, Поредица История и книжнина“, София, 2010, 386 р.“, *Palaeobulgarica*, XXXV, 2011, 2, с. 68-84

Майя А. Момина, „Постная и Цветная Триоди. Содержание Триоди (состав служб)”, *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописейдля Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*, вып. 2, часть II, Москва 1976, p. 389-419

Владимир А. Мошин, “Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю Православия. Анализ текстов”, *Византийский временик*, т. XVI, Москва, 1959, p. 317-394

Владимир А. Мошин, “Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю Православия. Тексты”, *Византийский временик*, т. XVII, Москва, 1960, p. 278-353

Николай Ив. Новиков, *Синодик, Древняя Российская вивлиофика или собрание древностей российских до Российской истории, географии и генеалогии касающихся*, 8, 1775, p. 1-125

Румяна Павлова, *Станиславов (Лесновски) пролог от 1330 година*, Велико Търново, Фабер, 1999

Спиридон Н. Палаузов, „Синодик царя Борила: рукопись XIV века“, *Временник императорскаго московскаго общества истории и древностей Российских*, 21, 1855, p. 1-20

Донка Петканова, *Дамаскините в българската литература*, София, БАН, 1965, 260 p.

Донка Петканова, *Народното четиво през XVI-XVIII век*, София, Български писател, 1990, 424 p.

Георги Петков, Мария Спасова, *Търновската редакция на Стишния пролог. Текстове, лексикален индекс*, т. III (месец ноември), Пловдив, УИ „Паисий Хилендарски“, 2009

Мая Петрова-Танева, *Помощница на царете: св. императрица Теофана в южнославянската традиция*, София, Издателски център Боян Пенев, 2018, 335 p.

Евгений В. Петухов, *Очерки по литературной истории Синодика*, т. I-II, Санкт Петербург, Императорское общество любителей древней письмености, 1895

Повесть временных лет, изд. Дмитрий С. Лихачев, 2 изд., Санкт-Петербург, Наука, 1996, 668 p.

Михаил Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Бориса*, Одесса, Экономическая типография и литография, 1899

Михаил Г. Попруженко, *Синодик царя Борила*, (= Български старини, кн. VIII), София, Държавна печатница, 1928

Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика, књ. I-, Београд, Институт за српски језик САНУ, 1959-

Серафим Ристић, *Дечански споменици. Скупио и издао архимандрит Дечански Серафим Ристић*, У Београду, У Државной штампаріи, 1864

Пеньо Русев, Иван Гълъбов, Ангел Давидов, Георги Данчев, *Похвално слово за Евтимий от Григорий Цамблак*, София, БАН, 1971

Венета Савова, *Песни за св. Йоан Владимир. Изследване и издание на словесната традиция за свети Йоан Владимир*, София, Парадигма, 2018, 356 p.

Татьяна А. Сенина (Монахиня Кассия), “Иоанн Грамматик и Лев Математик под прицелом ортодоксальной критики:

параллели и исторический контекст", *Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 4: История. Регионоведение. Международные отношения*, 21/5, 2016, p. 102-112 (doi: 10.7256/2454-0757.2017.6.22413)

Словарь древнерусского языка (XI-XIV вв.), т. I- , Москва, Руский язык, 1988-

Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси, т. II, *Вторая половина XIV-XVI вв.,* Ленинград, АН СССР, ИРЛИ, 1989

Влада Станковић, *Комнини у Цариграду. Еволуције једне владарске породице*, Београд, САНУ, 2006

Стара българска литература, т. IV, *Житиеписни творби*, съст. Климентина Иванова, София, Български писател, 1986

Љубомир Стојановић, „Требник манастира св. Тројице код Плеваља", *Споменик Српске Амадемије*, LVI, Београд, 1922, p. 22-30

Анна-Мария Тотоманова, „За една парономазия в Бориловия Синодик", **Словеса прѣчюдна**. *Юбилеен сборник в чест на проф. Иван Буюклиев*, София, ПАМ Пъблишинг Къмпани ООД, 2012, p. 36-42

Анна-Мария Тотоманова, Иван Христов, *Речник-индекс на словоформите в Бориловия Синодик*, София, ГРАФИС – Ал. Жеков, 2015, 212 p.

Юрдан Трифонов, „Ритор Теофан и иподякон Дамаскин", *Списание на БАН*, кн. 71, Клон историко-филологичен, 34, 1950, p. 1-27

Федор И. Успенский, *Синодик в Неделю Православия. Сводный текст с приложениями*, Одесса, Типография Одесского военного округа, 1893

Беньо Цонев, *Опис на ръкописите и старопечатните книги на Народната библиотека в София*, т. I, София, Държавна печатница, 1910.

Беньо Цонев, *История на българския език*, т. I, София, Наука и изкуство, 1984

Александр Ив. Яцимирский, *Славянския и русския рукописи румынских библиотек*, (= *Сборник Отделения русскаго языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук*), том LXXIX, Санкт-Петербург, Издание Императорской Академии наук, 1905, p. 1-965

ANNEXE

THE TOME OF CONDEMNATION OF THE HOLY MOUNTAIN (BEGINNING OF 1345)

Antonio Rigo

At the beginning of 1345 (March/April)[1] the general assembly (*katholikè synaxis*) of Mount Athos, meeting at the *prôtaton* in Karyès, condemned a large group of monks for Bogomilism. It is not our intention here to go over again the events - which took place between Thessaloniki, the Holy Mountain and then Tărnovo, to which we have already devoted a study several years ago,[2] after publishing the document of condemnation issued at Karyès -,[3] events to which, for the Athonite phase, can perhaps be traced back the troubles that disturbed the life of Great Laura at that time.[4]

On the occasion of the edition, by our colleague and friend Ivan Biliarsky, of the Slavic *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* kept in the Bucureşti manuscript, B. A. R. 307, containing the anathemas that condemn these monks (a manuscript that I had been able to study at the time, thanks to the help of a much esteemed master, Emil Turdeanu, whom I want to remember here), we present here the Greek text of the copy of the *Haghioreitikòn gramma*, emending some typos present in the first edition, accompanied for the first time by an English translation.

Nicephorus Gregoras informs us that a copy of the document condemning the group of monks was sent from Athos to the Synod of Constantinople and

---

[1] For the exact datation of the general assembly see M. Hinterberger, "Die Affäre um den Monch Niphon Skorpios und die Messalianismus-Vorwürfe gegen Kallistos I.", in A. Rigo (ed.), *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino* (Orientalia Venetiana, 16), Firenze, 2004, p. 227.

[2] A. Rigo, L'assemblea generale athonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili, *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 5 (1984), p. 475-506; Id., *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di Messalianismo e Bogomilismo rivolte agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra Esicasmo e Bogomilismo* (Orientalia Venetiana, 2), Firenze, 1989.

[3] Rigo, L'assemblea generale athonita del 1344, p. 504-506.

[4] See A. Rigo, "Le Mont Athos entre le patriarche Jean XIV Calécas et Grégoire Palamas (1344–1346)", in *ΠΕΡΙΒΟΛΟΣ Књига I Зборник у част Мирјане Живојиновић*, I, Beograd, 2015, p. 262-263, 274-275.

then inserted into the patriarchal register. [5] In this way he consulted it, as we see from the repeated and precise references to the document in his works against Gregory Palamas and his followers (*Anthirretici* I, *Historia romana*, *Anthirretici* II).

Also from the Constantinopolitan circles of the antipalamites (Isaac Argyrus, Demetrius Cydones and later from Manuel Calecas) comes the manuscript Vatican City, BAV Vat. gr. 604 (*Diktyon* 67235). [6] The document of condemnation issued in Karyès (ff. 11^{r}-12^{v}) is part of the small heresiological collection featuring in the first folios of the manuscript, containing, among others, Peter of Sicily and Euthymius of Peribleptos. [7] Its title (*From the document of the Holy Mountain*), its *ex abrupto* incipit, the presence of expressions such as "And a little later" and "They also add this", the absence of any conclusions, the date and signatures appended to the original document (and to the specimen inserted in the patriarchal register) [8] all show that this is a partial copy of the tome of condemnation, [9] consisting of five *excerpta*, as we can see in the subdivision into paragraphs of our English translation. The extracts are also clearly from the copy kept by the Synod of Constantinople, while no trace of the original (or other copies) is preserved in the archives of Mount Athos.

Below is the edition of the document based on Vat. gr. 604, ff. 11^{r}-12^{v} (**v**).

---

[5] «ὁ εἰς τὸ τῶν βυζαντίων ἱερὸν κομισθεὶς συνέδριον ἔγγραφος (...) τόμος πρὸς τῶν θεοφόρων τοῦ ὄρους ἀνδρῶν», *Anthirretici*, I, 1, 2, 2: H.-V. Beyer, *Nikephoros Gregoras Antirrhetika* I. (Wiener byzantinische Studien, 12), Wien, 1976, p. 131 = *Historia byzantina*, XIV, 7: ed. Bonn, II, p. 718-719; «ἐξὸν ἐκ τοῦ τόμου τοῖς βουλομένοις μανθάνειν σαφέστερον, ὅς (…) τοῖς πατριαρχικοῖς ἐγγεγραμμένος κώδιξι», *Anthirretici*, I, 1, 2, 2: Beyer, *Nikephoros Gregoras Antirrhetika* I., p. 133 = *Historia byzantina*, XIV, 7: ed. Bonn, II, p. 719; see also *Historia byzantina*, XXXVII, 24: ed. Bonn, III, p. 541-542.

[6] R. Devreesse, *Codices Vaticani Graeci,* Codices *604-866*, III, Città del Vaticano, 1950, p. 1-7; also A. Gioffreda, *Tra i libri di Isacco Argiro* (Transmissions, 4), Berlin – Boston, 2020, p. 106-109, 138-139.

[7] See Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 139-143; also Id., "Les premières sources byzantines sur le Bogomilisme et les œuvres contre les Phoundagiagites d'Euthyme de la Péribleptos", in *Европейският югоизток през втората половина на X – началото на XI век, История и култура/South-Eastern Europe in the Second Half of 10th-the Beginning of the 11th Centuries: History and Culture*, Sofia, 2015, p. 541.

[8] «τόμος (…) ταῖς πάντων σχεδὸν τῶν ἐκεῖ λογάδων σεσημασμένος ὑπογραφαῖς», *Historia byzantina*, XXXVII, 24: ed. Bonn, III, p. 541.

[9] See also Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili*, p. 146-148.

Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγιορειτικοῦ γράμματος

Διὰ ταῦτα πάντα λοιπὸν κηρυχθείσης καθολικῆς συνάξεως καὶ πάντων συνελθόντων ἐν τῇ σεβασμίᾳ λαύρᾳ τῶν Καρηῶν, τοῦ τε ἱερωτάτου μητροπολίτου Ἱερισσοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Ὄρους, τοῦ πανοσιωτάτου καθηγουμένου τῆς σεβασμιωτάτης μονῆς Λαύρας, τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου καθηγουμένου τῶν Ἰβήρων, τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου καθηγουμένου τοῦ Βατοπεδίου, τοῦ Ἐσφιγμένου, καὶ ἄλλων τιμίων προσώπων ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν σεβασμίων μονῶν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων μοναστηρίων καὶ ἡσυχαστηρίων ἱερωμένων τε καὶ ἑτέρων, καὶ γερόντων εὐλαβῶν οὐκ ὀλίγων καὶ ἀπ› αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς σεβασμίας Λαύρας τῶν Καρηῶν· καὶ συγκαθισάντων μετὰ τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου δικαίω τοῦ πρώτου, καὶ τοῦ <τιμι>ωτάτου ἐν ἱερομονάχοις κῦρ Καλλίστου, τοῦ πνευματικοῦ κῦρ Μελετίου, καὶ πλείστων ἄλλων κύκλῳ παρισταμένων.

Καὶ μετά τινα· Ἄλλοι δὲ πολλοὶ ἀνέστησαν εὐλαβεῖς καὶ πιστοί, μαρτυροῦντες ἰδεῖν παρ› αὐτοῖς τὰ αἰσχρότατα καὶ ἀθεότατα. Τάς τε γὰρ ἁγίας εἰκόνας συντρίβουσι καὶ κατακαίουσι καὶ τὰ τῶν ἁγίων λείψανα ἀτιμάζουσι, καὶ κρέα καὶ τυροὺς ἀδιαφόρως καὶ κατ› αὐτὰς τὰς τῶν ἁγίων νηστειῶν ἡμέρας ἐσθίουσι· καὶ τὰς σοδομιτικὰς πράξεις, ὡς οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν | πολλοῖς ἐξεῖπον, ἐπιμελῶς ἐργάζονται, καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ γυμνοὶ ἅμα εἰσερχόμενοι τὰ αἰσχρότατα πράττουσί τε καὶ πάσχουσι· καὶ τὸ οὖρον τῶν καθηγητῶν αὐτῶν ὡς ἁγίασμα δεχόμενοι ἑαυτούς τε καὶ τὰ βρώματα αὐτῶν περιῤῥαίνουσι καὶ οὓς ἂν οὗτοι τῷ ἑαυτῶν οὔρῳ κειμένους ἐπιῤῥάνωσι, ἀμετανόητοι καὶ ἀνεπίστροφοι τοῦ λοιποῦ πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν διαμένουσι· καὶ ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν οὐδὲν ἕτερον ὁ βίος αὐτοῖς, ἢ μέθη καὶ τρυφὴ καὶ αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία καὶ βδελυρία καὶ ἀκαθαρσία καὶ ἀσέβεια καὶ ἀθεΐα.

Καὶ μετά τινα· Ἰωσὴφ τῷ Κρητικῷ, Γεωργίῳ, Κυρίλλῳ καὶ Διονυσίῳ, Μωσῇ καὶ Μεθοδίῳ, Μαλαχίᾳ, Θεοφίλῳ καὶ Χαρίτωνι, Θεοδωρήτῳ, Νικάνδρῳ, καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτοῖς, τοῖς τὴν δεινὴν καὶ μυσαρὰν τῶν Πογομύλων αἵρεσιν παρ› ἑαυτοῖς δολερῶς καὶ κακούργως κατέχουσι, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πολλῷ μυσαρώτερα καὶ δυσσεβέστερα ἐκείνων καὶ ποιοῦσι καὶ διδάσκουσι· καὶ τάς τε θείας εἰκόνας ξύλα μόνον καὶ πηλὸν ὀνομάζουσι καὶ ἐκπτύουσι καὶ ἀτιμάζουσι καὶ κατακαίουσι καὶ πάντα τρόπον μιαίνουσι καὶ διαφθείρουσι· τό τε ἅγιον βάπτισμα καὶ τὴν πανίερον κοινωνίαν τοῦ παναγίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἀνοχῆς σου, Χριστὲ βασιλεῦ,

ἀνωφελὲς καὶ μάταιον ἡγουμένοις τε καὶ διδάσκουσι, καὶ τὴν θείαν καὶ
30 σωτηριώδη καὶ φιλάνθρωπον διὰ σαρκὸς οἰκονομίαν καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν
αὐτοῦ ἀθετοῦσι καὶ μήτε ἄγγελον μήτε νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ὀνομάζουσι,
πᾶσαν δὲ αἰσχρότητα καὶ βδελυρίαν ὡς μεγίστην ἀρετὴν ἐπιμελῶς
ἐργαζομένοις καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πάνδεινα καὶ πλήρη πάσης αἰσχρουργίας καὶ
ἀνοσιότητος καὶ ἀθεΐας δογματίζουσιν, ἃ μὴ ὅτι γράμ|μασιν ἢ γλώσσῃ,
ἀλλ› οὐδ› αὐτῇ τῇ διανοίᾳ χριστιανοῖς εὐσεβέσι περιφέρειν ἀνεκτόν, καὶ
35 πολλοὺς ἄλλους ἐν τούτοις διὰ τῆς ἐπικεχρωσμένης αὐτοῖς χρηστολογίας
καὶ ἀπάτης παραφθείρουσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τέχνην καὶ ἐπιτήδευμα καὶ
σπουδὴν μεγίστην τοῦτο ποιοῦνται, τῷ πλείστους ὅσους τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῶν
τῷ διαβόλῳ προσάγειν καὶ σὺν ἑαυτοῖς κἀκείνους εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀπωλείας
συνωθεῖν βάραθρον, ἀνάθεμα.

Πᾶσι τοῖς ὑποδεχομένοις καὶ κοινωνοῦσι αὐτοῖς ἐν εἰδήσει καὶ τὰ
40 μυσαρὰ αὐτῶν δόγματα στέργουσιν, ἀνάθεμα.

Προσέθηκαν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο· Ὡς εἴ τις εὑρεθείη ἢ τῶν ἐντὸς τοῦ Ὄρους,
ἢ καὶ τῶν πρὸ τοῦ Ὄρους φρουρίων τινὰ τούτων ὑποδεξάμενος ἔτι ἢ
συνεργήσας πρὸς τὸ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Ὄρος, ἢ ἰδών που μὴ ὑποδείξῃ
εὐθὺς ἵνα συλληφθῇ καὶ μαστιχθῇ καὶ ἀπελαθῇ, τῆς ἐκείνου εἴη μερίδος
καὶ κληρονομίας, καὶ σωματικὴν τιμωρίαν μεγίστην ἵνα πασχῇ.

45 Ἐπὶ τούτοις τῆς συνόδου διαλυθείσης, ἐπανῆλθε μὲν ὁ πανοσιώτατος
καθηγούμενος τῆς Μεγάλης Λαύρας· συνῆλθε δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ
ἱερώτατος μητροπολίτης διά τινα χρείαν προσκληθεὶς ὑπ› αὐτοῦ.
Ἅμα δὲ τῷ διασωθῆναι αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Λαύραν διηγγέλη αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ὁ
ἀσεβὴς Γεώργιος ἐνταῦθα κατέφυγεν εἰς τὰ περὶ αὐτὴν ἡσυχαστήρια.
Ἀποστείλαντες οὖν, συνέλαβον αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνηρώτων τήν τε ἀσέβειαν
50 αὐτοῦ ἐξειπεῖν καὶ τοὺς ὁμόφρονας καὶ συμμύστας αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ
ἀντιτείνων, μόλις ἠδυνήθη μικρόν τι τοῦ παρ› αὐτῷ ἰοῦ ἐξερεύξασθαι.
Ὡς γὰρ ἦλθε, φησίν, εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν Λαύραν καὶ ἀπεκάρη, ἔχων τινὰ ὡς
ἐδόκει προθυμίαν, προσῆλθε τῷ υἱῷ τῆς ἀπωλείας ἐκείνῳ τῷ Κρητικῷ
καὶ ἐξεδιδάχθη παρ› ἐκείνου μὴ πιστεύειν ὅτι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐγεννήθη
ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας |Παρθένου καὶ Θεοτόκου,
55 ἀλλὰ νοητῶς τοῦτο γενέσθαι καὶ ἅπαν τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον νοητῶς ἐκεῖνος
αὐτῷ ἐξηγεῖτο. Ὁμόφρονας δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐξεῖπεν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν Κρητικόν,
τὸν Νίκανδρον, τὸν Διονύσιον, τὸν μπαστᾶν, τὸν Θεοδώρητον, ἄλλον
τινὰ Καπνὸν λεγόμενον, τὸν ζωγράφον Μωσήν, καὶ Νικόλαον ἀπὸ τοῦ
Ἁγίου Ὄρους· Κύριλλον τὸν Μποσωτᾶν, Θεόφιλον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ

μπαστᾶ, τὸν Χαρίτωνα καὶ Νεόφυτον παρακηπωρὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Μεγάλης
60 Λαύρας· Μαλαχίαν ὃς ἦν ἐκκλησιαστικὸς τῶν Ἰβήρων, τὸν Ῥάπτην ὃς ἦν εἰς τὴν σκήτην τοῦ Μαγουλᾶ, Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Δομέτιον Σερβοπούλους, τὸν Νικόδημον, Θεοδόσιον τὸν Ἀτζυμήν, τὸν Μαυραντζᾶν, ἐν δὲ τῇ Θεσσαλονίκῃ τὴν Πορινὴν Εἰρήνην, Ἰωαννίκιον τὸν Κεκρατημένον, τὸν Κουβαρᾶν Μακάριον, τὸν Γερμανόν, τὸν Τριακοντάφυλον, τὸν Βαρθολομαῖον, τὴν Ἀγάθην. Καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων φανερὸν καὶ ἐμμάρτυρον ὅτι τὰ ὅμοια φρονοῦσιν αὐτῷ· συνηρίθμησε δὲ ἀμαρτύρως τούτοις καὶ τῶν ἀποιχομένων οὐκ ὀλίγους.

9 ωτάτου **v** || **32** ἐπικεχροσμένοις s. l. **v** || **35** συνοθεῖν **v** || **44** διηγγέλει **v** || **50** τούτω **v**

From the document of the Holy Mountain

[1.] For all these reasons the general assembly (*katholikè synaxis*) was therefore summoned and all gathered in the venerated laura of Karyès, the very holy metropolitan of Hierissos and of the Holy Mountain, the very holy kathigumen of the very venerated monastery of the Laura, the most holy kathigumen of Iviron, the most holy kathigumen of Vatopedi, of Esphigmenou and other honoured people from the same venerated monasteries, hieromonks and others from the other monasteries and *hesychasteria* and not a few pious elders from the same venerated laura of Karyès. They sat in assembly with the most holy *dikaios* of the *prôtos*, the most honoured hieromonk Sir Callistus and the spiritual father Sir Meletius. Many others stood around them.

[2.] And a little later: Many others, pious and devout, stood up and testified that they had seen them doing most dishonoring and godless things. For they smash and burn the holy icons and hold in no honor the relics of the saints, and they eat meat and cheese indifferently even on the holy days of fasting, and they addict themselves unrestrainedly to sodomitical practices, as their disciples have reported to many, and together they go down naked into the sea, doing and suffering most dishonoring things. They hold the urine of their teachers as a sacred thing, and with it they sprinkle themselves and their food, bathing those around them with their urine. They persevere without repentance and are not capable of

going back to their piety: in a word, their life is nothing but drunkenness, boasting, turpitude, dishonor, impudence, impurity, impiety and atheism.

[3.] And a little later: To Joseph the Cretan, George, Cyrill and Dionysius, Moses and Methodius, Malachias, Theophilus and Chariton, Theodoretus, Nicandrus and those with them who have deceitfully and mischievously received from these the horrible and impious heresy of the Bogomils, or rather who do and teach even more abominable and impious things than these; who say that the divine icons are only wood and mud, and who spit out at, do not hold in honor and burn them, defiling and destroying them in every way; who hold and teach that holy baptism and the most holy communion of the most holy and life-giving body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ - what is thy forbearance, O sovereign Christ! - are useless and vain; who reject the divine and saving Incarnation and its manifestation to men, and do not believe neither in angels nor in dead's resurrection; who carefully do all sort of turpitude and impudence as if it were a great virtue, and teach other nefarious things filled with all sort of turpitude, impiety, and atheism, things that it is not tolerable for pious Christians to propagate in writing or speaking or even with their thoughts. And by this they drag many others by means of their colourful seductive language, deceitfully corrupting them, for they do this with art, study and great zeal, to bring as many people as possible under the dominion of their father, the devil, and drag them with them into the abyss of perdition, anathema.
To all those who consciously receive them and take part in them and agree upon their abominable dogmas, anathema.

[4.] They also added this: If someone <living> in the Mountain or even in the villages near the Mountain is found giving hospitality to any of those people or even helping him go in the Holy Mountain or knowing it, in no way does he reveal it immediately, so that the person may be caught, flogged and expelled, this person shall have his own share and inheritance <in the matter> and he shall be subjected to a terrible corporal punishment.

[5.] When the assembly devoted to this affair was over, the most holy kathigumen of the Great Laura came back. He was joined by the most holy metropolitan whom he had called for some necessity. When they

came together to the Laura, it was announced to them that in the meantime the impious George had fled to the neighbouring *hesychasteria*. They sent someone to look for him, seized him and interrogated him, inviting him to confess his impiety and to give the names of those who agreed with him and his companions. He resisted for a long time, and with difficulty it was possible to make him spit out some of his poison. For when - he said - he had arrived at the holy Laura and was tonsured, having, as it seemed, a righteous purpose, he associated himself with the son of perdition, the deceased Cretan, and was instructed by him not to believe that the Lord Jesus Christ was truly born of the most holy Virgin and Mother of God, but that this had taken place in a spiritual way, and he explained the whole Gospel to him in a spiritual way. He added that Joseph the Cretan, Nicandrus, Dionysius, the *bašta*, Theodoretus, another one named Kapnos, Moses the painter and Nicholas of the Holy Mountain, Cyrill Bosota, Theophilus the brother of the *bašta*, Chariton, Neophitos the helper-gardener of the Great Lavra, Malachias who was the *ekklesiastikos* of Iviron, Raptes who lived at the *skiti* of Magoula, Joseph and Dometios Serbopoulos, Nicodemus, Theodosius Atzumes, Maurantzas, Irene Porinè in Thessaloniki, Ioannikios Kekratemenos, Macarius Koubaras, Germanus, Triakontaphilos, Bartholomeus, Agatha agreed with him. And about them, it is manifest and attested that they agreed with him. He also added to them, but without testimony, not a few of those who had managed to escape.