

# Jan Mikołaj Wolski

---

"Палеологовият синодик в славянски превод [Paleologian variant of Synodicon in Slavic translation]", Иван Билярски, София 2013 : [recenzja]

---

Studia Ceranea : journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe 4, 318-320

---

2014

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](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

of God's purpose. What should be emphasized, Marinow suggests a need to verify a belief on the 'messiah idea' in the text; in his opinion, majority of scholars *equate this idea with God's choice of Bulgarians*, when *there is nothing in the text what indicates, that its author intends to point out suffering of the Bulgarians, which could set the other inhabitants of the world free from their sins and fallen nature*<sup>6</sup>.

Emphasizing the presence of Bible texts tradition in medieval history, in history of medieval Slavonic literature, using prosopography for describing characters acting in the text, interpretation of sources and meanings of

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 73.

**ИВАН БИЛЯРСКИ, Палеологовият синодик в славянски превод [Paleologian variant of Synodicon in Slavic translation], Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“, София 2013, pp. 117 [= История и книжнина].**

The book presented here is an edition of Slavic Synodicon placed in the manuscript of the Library of the Romanian Academy ref. 307 (XVI c.). Edited source is accompanied by not very extensive, but exhaustive overview of philological and historical issues related to the text, its creation and subsequent functioning.

The manuscript attracted moderate interest so far. Primarily it drew the attention of scholars studying history of Bogomilism, because of the Slavic translation of Athos gramma, relating to the famous controversy of 1344<sup>1</sup>. Though the existence of this text has long been known, its content remained unknown from various causes for a long time. Jean Gouillard claimed in 1967 that knowing its content would increase our knowledge of Bogomils in the fourteenth century, but the manuscript, according to him, was in a terrible condition and its reading was not possible<sup>2</sup>. Thus, he repeated the opinion of Alexander Jacimirskij who has seen the manuscript at the beginning of the twentieth century<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> A. RIGO, *L'assemblea generale athonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili*, CS 5, 1984, p. 475–506.

<sup>2</sup> J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie. Edition et commentaire*, TM 2, 1967, p. 237.

<sup>3</sup> А.И. ЯЦИМИРСКИЙ, *Славянския и руския*

a literary text leads to quit the 'national' understanding of the *Bulgarian Apocryphal Chronicle* and makes it an evidence of significance of the Byzantine-Slavonic Commonwealth. One of the *Tale's* reviewers defined it as a crucial text – from historical and historiographical point of view; as a text beginning a new era of Bulgarian historical thought<sup>7</sup>. Maybe this opinion shall convince the up-to-now unconvinced ones to get acquainted with this valuable monograph.

*Małgorzata Skowronek (Łódź)*

<sup>7</sup> Т. КАПРИЕВ, *Историография без комплекси*, Кул 37(2655), 4.11.2011 [http://www.kultura.bg/bg/article/view/18950, 27.05.2014].

Antonio Rigo, on its turn, postulated in 1984 to publish the text saying that looking into the Slavic version of the anathemas against Athos Bogomils would give us a complete picture of the events of 1344<sup>4</sup>. It was only in his book of 1989 that the Italian scholar took into account the content of Slavic translation, which turned out to be not particularly interesting, being an almost literal translation of the Greek gramma<sup>5</sup>.

The publication of the Italian researcher did not put a stop to speculations regarding the possibility of deciphering the anathemas from BAR 307. Already in 1993 Dimităr Angelov in his monography of Bogomilism has sent the reader to the manuscript, pointing out that it was unfortunately illegible<sup>6</sup>. The edition of the manuscript presented here will finally dissipate these misunderstanding stretching out nearly half a century.

*рукописи румънских библиотек, СБОРЯС 79, 1905, p. 479.*

<sup>4</sup> A. RIGO, *op. cit.*, p. 488.

<sup>5</sup> ИДЕМ, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivolte agli esicsti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, Firenze 1989, p. 144–145.

<sup>6</sup> Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Богомилиите*, София 1993, p. 461, note 4.

The BAR 307 manuscript is really in a bad shape, and large parts of it are unreadable, but the passage on Bogomils is relatively well preserved. The lesson of the text of the Gramma, which Ivan Biliarsky proposes, is missing only a few words, although it should be underlined that part of the text has been reconstructed according to the Greek version. It is now worth emphasizing that, as the author demonstrates, this is not the most interesting fragment of the manuscript.

The BAR 307 manuscript contains Lenten and Flowery Triodion (f.1–113), the part of which is Synodicon of Orthodoxy (f. 2–39), and the Life of Gregory the Decapolite (f. 113–123) (p. 12–15). The Synodicon from BAR 307 represents a rare variant in the Slavic translation of the Greek Synodicon (Palaeologian variant), known so far in Slavic version only from the later printed books (p. 15–16). It is worth underlining that the comparative studies using BAR 307 text, allow us to recognize one of the copies of the Bulgarian Synodicon, Drinov's copy, previously considered to be representative of the Comnenian variant, as Palaeologian (p. 16–18).<sup>7</sup>

The first chapter of the book is devoted to the description of the manuscript and its linguistic characteristics (p. 12–20). In the second chapter the author discusses the location of Synodicon in the BAR 307 manuscript. In this case it is a fragment of the Triodion that is a liturgical book containing texts for Lent (p. 21–25). Taking into account the fact that Synodicon was read during the celebration on the first Sunday of this period, this location should be considered as natural, though synodicons are often found in codices of another type. The third chapter is devoted to a detailed overview of the content of published Synodicon (p. 26–32). In the fourth chapter we will find a comparison of lists of emperors, patriarchs and metropolitans, contained in Synodicon of BAR 307 and Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian synodicons (p. 33–47).

<sup>7</sup> These issues were already taken by the author of the book reviewed in an article written together with Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova: *За един композитен тип и за Палеологовия вариант на славянския Синодик в Неделята на Православието*, Pbg 36.1, 2012, p. 51–65.

Observations made in these chapters serve to define the type and time of creation of Greek Synodicon, which formed the basis of a translation placed in the BAR 307. This issue was developed in the fifth chapter (p. 48–64). The author refers to the systematization of the Greek synodicons created by Jean Gouillard<sup>8</sup>. As in the case of the Synodicon of Tsar Boril<sup>9</sup>, also developed by the author of the reviewed book, none of the texts described by the French researcher can be considered as the searched original. Ivan Biliarsky comes to the conclusion that the Greek prototype was created after the mid-fourteenth century on Mount Athos (p. 65). Careful analysis of the historical circumstances of creation of the text (p. 50–55), which leads the author to the presented conclusions, is generally convincing, and only one argument seems questionable. The author acknowledges namely for *terminus post quem* of creation of the text, the date of death of the local Metropolitan Jacob (1366) (p. 47–53), who has received the laudation – *eternal remembrance!* It seems, however, that in the original text instead of the mentioned term might have been the polychronion, updated only after the death of the Metropolitan. Such measures we find in Synodicon of Tsar Boril<sup>10</sup>.

This remark, however, must be regarded as secondary, as it does not undermine the fundamental thrust of the conclusion based on a variety of arguments. The conclusions regarding the dating were indeed formulated in two fragments of the book a bit differently, though non-contradictorily – once the date 1366 is deemed as *terminus post quem* of the creation of Synodicon, and in the summary the dating is described as – *after the mid-fourteenth century*. It remains for us to accede to the latter, more general wording. In the following part of the fifth chapter the author analyzes the content of the gramma relating to the issue of 1344, paying particular attention

<sup>8</sup> J. GOUILLARD, *op. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Бориловият синодик и неговият византийски първообраз*, [in:] И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилов синодик. Издание и превод*, София 2010, p. 27–29.

<sup>10</sup> See И. БОЖИЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 39, 44.

to the differences between Slavic and Greek versions (p. 55–64).

Ivan Biliarsky devotes much attention to the functioning of the BAR 307 manuscript.

Repeatedly he underlines its importance for the culture of the Danubian principalities. The author indicates the presence in the manuscript of the Life of Gregory the Decapolite by Deacon Ignatius in the Slavonic translation (unknown so far), which may be the basis for the future Romanian translation (p. 55, 67).

The edition of the text of Synodicon occupies pages 68–97. The Author has added necessary comments to the text, mostly containing

references to the Greek and Slavic parallel texts. As it was already mentioned several times, the manuscript is not in the best condition, and its reading in many places could create troubles. So the diligence in the reconstruction of the text by Ivan Biliarsky deserves the praise.

It remains to have a hope that, in accordance with the demands of the author, in which he declares the need for further research on Slavic Synodicon and the BAR 307 manuscript, soon we will see more of his publications on these topics.

*Jan Mikołaj Wolski (Łódź)*