

Jan Mikołaj Wolski

"Бориллов Синодик. Издание и перевод", Иван Божилов, Анна-Мария Тотоманова, Иван Билярски, София 2010 : [recenzja]

Studia Ceranea : journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe 1, 218-221

2011

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Vaillant³, confronted with the original by Yuri Stoyanov⁴.

The historical introduction (p. 10–54) was written by Ivan Božilov. His works are well-known for his direct study of sources, and, as he declares himself, for denouncing *historiographical inventions* (p. 20). In the introduction to *Борилев синодик...* I. Božilov gives us a summary of his ideas about situation in Bulgaria in the early XIII c. and presents few threads of the late medieval Bulgarian history which were reflected in *Boril's Synodicon*. As it is impossible to write history without at least some *historiographical inventions*, in the introduction we can find a few preferred by the author. I discuss here the idea that Boril cooperated with Nicean *basileus* Theodore Laskaris in 1210–1211 (p. 22), an opinion that Bulgarian compiler of the Synodicon used *Panoplia dogmatika* of Euthymius Zigabenos (p. 31–32) and an identification of persons listed in anathemas 76–78 of Palauzov manuscript (P. 23a, 8–10, 11–13, 14–16) with bogomils (p. 33).

The hypothesis about Nicean-Bulgarian alliance in 1211 is based on a single letter of Latin Emperor Henry *universis amicis suis* (to all his friends)⁵. In this letter the Emperor informs his *friends* from the West about the victory over his four enemies. In fact, if we read the letter carefully we cannot find any evidence of the alliance. What we find is that Theodore Laskaris' and Bulgarian

tsar's actions are contemporary. The discussed hypothesis is just a logical conclusion of the mentioned fact. But since Boril entered conflict twice later we can explain it another way: when Boril realised that Henry was fighting with Theodore, he decided to take advantage of the situation. Boril's exact aims remain hidden – neither he gained anything, nor were any of his goals made clear in any of the sources. The idea of the supposed alliance, however, is commonly accepted in historiography⁶.

Many historians attempted to discover the place and the role of the synod of Tarnovo in Bulgarian foreign policy. Some of them, like I. Duičev, claimed that it was a part of the big political project based on the *Orthodox* alliance between Boril and Theodor Laskaris, when others treated the synod as an effect of the anti-heretical agitation of Pope Innocent III⁷. All these speculations are nothing more than *historiographical inventions*, and probably that is why they are omitted in the introduction to this edition

³ H.C. PUECH, A. VAILLANT, *Le Traité contre les Bogomiles de Cosmas le Prêtre*, Paris 1945, p. 343–346.

⁴ J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, Y. STOYANOV, *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650–c. 1450*, Manchester 1998, p. 260–262.

⁵ HENRICUS IMPERATOR, *Henricus imperator universis amicis suis de quattor imperii hostibus a se pervictis scribit*, [in:] *FLHB*, vol. IV, ed. M. VOINOV, V. GIUZELV, et. al., Serdicae 1981, p. 18–23.

⁶ В. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *История на българската държава през сръдните въкове. Томъ III. Второ българско царство. България при Аспъневици (1187–1280)*, София 1940, p. 290–291; И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Борилевият синодик като исторически и литературен паметник*, Библ 7–8, 1977 p. 27; А. ДАНЧЕВА-ВАСИЛЕВА, *България и Латинската империя (1204–1261)*, София 1985, p. 97–98; В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, И. БОЖИЛОВ, *История на средновековна България VII–XIV в.*, София 1999, p. 470; J.V.A. FINE, *The late medieval Balkans. A critical survey from the late twelfth century to the Ottoman conquest*, Michigan 1994, p. 97–99.

⁷ В. КИСЕЛКОВ, *Борилевият синодик като исторически извор*, ИП 19.6, 1963, p. 67; П. СТЕФАНОВ, *Нов поглед към унията между българската и римската църква през XIII в.*, ПКСИ, vol. V: *Изследвания в чест на проф. д.ист.н. Тотю Тотев*, ed. В. Гюзелев, Х. Трендафилов, София 2001, p. 344.

of *Boril's Synodicon*, but since they gained so much interest among historians, the lack of a commentary on this subject is noticeable.

The idea that *Panoplia dogmatica* was used during the composition of *Bulgarian Synodicon* was once widely disputed (first proposed it M. G. Popruženko in the late 19th c., the idea was accepted by D. Obolensky). Then it was connected with searching for the sources of anathemas containing Bogomil's dogmas which now we know were mainly translated from the letter of Patriarch Cosmas. I. Božilov recalls this idea with a different purpose in mind. He is looking for answer to the question from where the *Boril's Synodicon* compiler took information about Basil the Physician, condemned under Alexius Comnenus (anathema against him is placed in P. 15b, 20 – 16a, 3). I. Božilov correctly indicates that the process of Basil the Physician was mentioned in the works of Anna Comnena, John Zonaras, Michael Glykas and Euthymius Zigabenos. I. Božilov rejects the possibility that the Bulgarian compiler's source was one of the first three mentioned texts with words: *we could hardly suppose that these three Byzantine works were available for the Bulgarian writer*. And he continues: *just one possibility is left: „Panoplia dogmatica”* (p. 31). The importance of Euthymius Zigabenos work was noticed from the beginning of modern historiography. It would be pointless to enumerate here writers using *Panoplia dogmatica* while describing history of Bogomilism or Bulgarian literature in the times of Patriarch Euthymius. Maybe this long lasting tradition led I. Božilov to exaggerate the role of *Panoplia dogmatica*? Supporting his supposition, he only notices that Vladislav the Grammarian put Slavic translation of the mentioned work in *Zagrebian Collection* from 1469 (p. 31). It is very weak evidence and I do not find any-

thing else in favour of I. Božilov's opinion.

There are more than 150 persons mentioned in the *Palauzov* manuscript of the *Synodicon* (in the memorial part alone I. Božilov counts 144 persons!). Among them, we find saints, heretics, Byzantine and Bulgarian Emperors, their wives, Patriarchs, bishops, Serbian Kings, Romanian Voivodes and boyars. The authors made a considerable effort to identify them. In the introduction I. Božilov presented a detailed comparison between the content of Bulgarian and Greek lists of Byzantine Emperors, Empresses and Patriarchs. *Boril's Synodicon*, presents not just a selection of the original list, but there are a few persons added, whom we don't meet in the Greek versions. In the Bulgarian list, Emperor Michael III, Leon VI, Manuel I are not mentioned. The Bulgarian compiler adds instead Theodosius I, Honorius, Theodosius II and Marcian (p. 35–36). Analysing lists of Bulgarian rulers and Patriarchs, the Author points out not only persons included in the document, but primarily the excluded ones. The Author brings our attention to persons like Ivailo, Smilets or Patriarch Basil. The analysis of the content, additions and missing information about events and persons leads I. Božilov to formulate hypothesis about 8 steps of composing *Boril's Synodicon* (p. 41–46).

While analysing anathemas placed in P. 23a, 8–10, 11–13, 14–16 I. Božilov identifies the heretics condemned there (Tychicus, Aemilian, Luke and Mandaleus – the latter two with some reservations) as bogomils (p. 33). Supporting the identification, he invokes the work of D. Angelov. The cited opinion is not at all justified. It is based on the fact that two heretics among them (Moses the Bogomil, Peter of Cappadocia) are undoubtedly bogomils, and others mentioned in the same anathemas were not identified. But few lines above we can find anathemas collecting together such different heretics as

Simon Magus and Arius (P. 22a, 20 – 22b, 2) or Macedonius I and Apollinaris of Laodicea (P. 22b, 8–9)! Surprisingly in the footnotes we can find that the opinion criticized here is abandoned, and Tychicus is suggested to be a Paulician, whereas Aemilian, Luke and Mandaleus are marked as unidentified (p. 329–330, 370).

To sum up, I would like to stress that in publishing *Борилов синодик...* the Authors provided an excellent tool for further work with the text. Broad introduction (p. 10–86) gives readers knowledge about the circumstances in which both Byzantine (p. 10–17) and Bulgarian (p. 17–25) Synodicons appeared, detailed analysis of the translated part of the Synodicon with comparison with the original version, and commentaries about the supposed Greek prototype (p. 26–37). The introduction continues with a presentation of the Bulgarian part of the Synodicon (p. 36–52) and the part of the introduction written by I. Božilov ends with a table comparing Bulgarian and Byzantine lists of the Byzantine Emperors and Empresses (p. 52–54). Further on we find a comprehensive study of A.-M. Totomanova and I. Biljarski devoted to both Palauzov and Drinov MSS. They discussed not just the appearance of the copies, their content and their orthographical and palaeographical characteristic; the Authors published all of the marginalia giving us knowledge about the late history of MSS as well. Moreover they presented information about liturgical use of the texts placed in Palauzov copies, and Boril's Synodicon

itself. The critical edition of the main text is placed on the pages 91–178. In the edition we can find original orthography with all diacritics preserved. The table comparing rubrics of Palauzov and Drinov copies put on p. 179–195 was necessary to help us to orientate in the text because the copies differ in the order of the passages. Subsequently there are placed the Bulgarian horoses and liturgical prayers (p. 196–276) and Greek horoses (p. 277–295). This part was prepared by A.-M. Totomanova, and by A. Dimitrova (Greek part). It is followed by the Bulgarian (p. 296–316) and English translations (p. 337–358; respectively by A.-M. Totomanova and M. Paneva) with footnotes (by I. Božilov and I. Biljarski, p. 317–336) containing prosopographical, historical, textological and philological comments.

As a part of the project *История и историзъм в православния славянски свят. Изследване на идеите за история (History and Historicism in the Slavic Orthodox World. Study of Historical Thought)* under which *Борилов синодик...* were published, the scientific conference in Veliko Tarnovo was organised between 29.04–01.05. 2011 *Търновград – духовен и книжовен център през XIII в. (Tarnovgrad – spiritual and literacy centre in XIII c.)*. A significant number of papers was devoted to *Boril's Synodicon*. The hope of the Authors that their work will give a new impetus to the study of this text (p. 386) was fulfilled.

Jan Mikolaj Wolski (Łódź)

URSZULA WÓJCIŚKA, *Literatura staroruska z elementami historii i kultury dawnej Rusi* [Древнерусская литература с элементами истории и культуры Древней Руси], Bydgoszcz 2010, pp. 368.

Среди польскоязычных публикаций, посвященных средневековой культуре восточных славян, очень трудно найти учебное пособие для студентов русской филологии и других специальностей, содержащее целостный образ эпохи. Преобладают краткие обзоры восточнославянской письменности с древнейших времен до современности¹. Правда, существует также польский перевод обширного труда Герхарда Подскальского под заглавием *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus'* (*Христианство и богословская литература в Киевской Руси*), однако упомянутая публикация, сосредоточенная на древнейшем периоде русской истории, охватывающем время от начала христианства на Руси до нашествия монголов (1237), адресована не студентам филологических и исторических факультетов, а профессиональным исследователям-славистам².

Именно поэтому первым учебным пособием по древнерусской литературе, который предлагается вниманию польского читателя, можно считать новей-

шую публикацию Уршули Вуйчицкой, профессора Университета им. Казимежа Великого в Быдгоще, специалиста по литературе допетровской Руси (X–XVIII вв.)³ и другим вопросам русской средневековой культуры. Как сообщает автор в предисловии к рецензируемой публикации, она является результатом ее многолетней преподавательской и исследовательской работы. Следуя распространенной в современном литературоведении тенденции, Вуйчицка предлагает рассматривать историю русской культуры допетровского периода как единое целое, без разграничения средневековой письменности и литературных достижений писателей XVI–XVII вв. Поскольку в отечественной печати практически отсутствуют публикации об истории и культуре средневековой Руси⁴, исследовательница решила показать древнерусскую литературу на широком фоне общественно-исторических событий и достижений культуры (изобразительного искусства и зодчества) Древней Руси.

¹ *Historia literatury rosyjskiej*, ed. M. JAKÓBIEC, Warszawa 1976; В. МУСНА, *Historia literatury rosyjskiej. Od początków do czasów najnowszych*, Wrocław 2002.

² G. PODSKALSKY, *Chrześcijaństwo i literatura teologiczna na Rusi Kijowskiej (988–1237)*, trans. J. ZUSNOWICZ, Kraków 2000. Первое издание книги на немецком языке: G. PODSKALSKY, *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus'* (988–1237), München 1982. Русский перевод: Г. ПОДСКАЛЬСКИ, *Христианство и богословская литература в Киевской Руси (988–1237 гг.)*, trans. А.В. Назаренко, ed. К.К. Акентьев, Санкт-Петербург 1996 [= *Subsidia Byzantinorossica*, 1]

³ Дополнением к предлагаемой вниманию читателя книге является другой учебник Уршули Вуйчицкой, который целиком посвящен русской литературе XVIII столетия: U. WÓJCIŚKA, *Literatura rosyjska XVIII wieku z elementami historii i kultury Rosji*, Bydgoszcz 2008.

⁴ Краткий очерк истории Древней Руси польскоязычный читатель может найти прежде всего в начальных главах учебных пособий по истории России и Украины (L. BAZYŁOW, P. WIECZORKIEWICZ, *Historia Rosji*, Wrocław 2010, p. 9–71; W. SERCZYK, *Historia Ukrainy*, Wrocław 2001, p. 20–53), а также в первом томе труда: А. ANDRUSIEWICZ, *Cywilizacja rosyjska*, Warszawa 2004, p. 7–304.