

Francis J. Thomson (*Antwerp, Belgium*)

## PATRIARCHS EUTHYMIUS OF TĀRNOVO AND PHILOTHEUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE AND LITURGICAL REFORMS IN FOURTEENTH CENTURY BULGARIA

Елена Коцева. *Евтимиев служебник. Софийски препис от 80-те години на XIV век.* С., Наука и изкуство, 1985. 218 с.

The importance of the study of liturgical texts has recently been highlighted by the discovery of original Bulgarian hymnographic works composed over a period from the late 9th<sup>1</sup> to the 16th century<sup>2</sup>. Although several articles have recently been devoted to the liturgical reforms which were introduced in Bulgaria in the 14th century and to Euthymius' role in them<sup>3</sup> and although the guiding principles behind the reforms are well known — the introduction of the Jerusalem typicon, the development of new forms of liturgical chant, the addition of new facts to the kalendar, the eradication of abuses — nevertheless much remains obscure and the publishers of this book must be congratulated upon producing an excellent, very legible facsimile of a 14th century Bulgarian hieraticon (служебник), viz. codex 231 in the National Library, Sofia, which is a copy of a codex written by Euthymius himself, as is shown by the phrase on 51v: по ѡмѣнѣ Гн, патрѣаха кувъ Евдимиѣ сѣа написавашаг.

The introduction to such an edition should describe the codex in detail and succinctly indicate its importance within the historical con-

text. Although Elena Kotseva's erudition cannot be doubted, the introduction to this edition is in places extremely obscure<sup>4</sup>, sometimes inaccurate and prone to unsubstantiated claims. Indeed, it does not even provide a proper description of the actual composition of the codex, a comparison of which with another copy of the codex originally written by Euthymius, viz. the 14th-15th century codex in the Zographou collection<sup>5</sup>, reveals that the Sofia codex is made up as follows: beginning missing<sup>6</sup>, 1-13<sup>7</sup>, missing folia<sup>8</sup>, 14-19<sup>9</sup>, 20<sup>10</sup>, 21-47<sup>11</sup>, missing folia<sup>12</sup>, 48-74<sup>13</sup>, 75-77<sup>14</sup>, missing folia<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> This may in part be due to poor editing, which is suggested by the total irrelevance of the first starred footnote on p. 29, although the presence of such starred footnotes shows that Kotseva herself has altered the text of her introduction.

<sup>5</sup> Edited by Сырк у, П. К истории и управления книги в Болгарии в XIV веке. I, 2. Санкт-П., 1890, 1—109. Kotseva fails to point out that this codex (=Z) on 64r has the same phrase that the Sofia codex (=S) has on 51v, showing that they are copies of a manuscript written by Euthymius.

<sup>6</sup> =Z 1r-12r, ed. Сырк у. История, 1—14.

<sup>7</sup> 1v-13=Z 12r-25v (and not 24v, as Kotseva, p. 28, claims), ed. *ibid.*, 14-29. 1r in the Sofia codex is illegible.

<sup>8</sup> =Z 25v-27v, ed. *ibid.*, 29-31.

<sup>9</sup> =Z 27v-34r, ed. *ibid.*, 32-36.

<sup>10</sup> =Z 34r-v, ed. *ibid.*, 36. This folio is a

17-18th century addition to replace a lost folio.

<sup>11</sup> =Z 34v-59r, ed. *ibid.*, 36-50.

<sup>12</sup> =Z 59r-61r, ed. *ibid.*, 50-51.

<sup>13</sup> =Z 61r-87r, ed. *ibid.*, 51-65. The top third of 74-77 and the bottom line of 78-79 are missing. Kotseva's claim that there are folia missing between 52 and 53 is incorrect, cf. Z 66r, ed. *ibid.*, 53.

<sup>14</sup> Not in Z.

<sup>15</sup> Since the preceding text was not in Z, how much of the text lost here was in Z is unknown.

<sup>1</sup> See Попов, Г. Триодни произведения на Константин Преславски. — In: Кирило-Методиевски студии. II. С., 1985.

<sup>2</sup> See Кожухаров, С. Тах Андрей — един незабелязан химнописец от XVI в. — Старобългарска литература, XVIII, 1986, 150-160.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. Чифлянов, Б. Богослужбната реформа на патриарх Евтимий. — Духовна култура, LII, 3-4, 1972, 60—68; Русев, П. Место и роль Тырновской Евфимиевой школы в культурном общении на Балканах и в Восточной Европе в средние века. — Славянские культуры и Балканы. Ред. Н. Тодоров и др. I. С., 1978, 348—361; Constantinescu, R. Euthyme de Târnovo et la réforme liturgique au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle. — Etudes Balkaniques, III, 1986, 62-78.

78r<sup>16</sup>, 78v-79<sup>17</sup>, missing folia<sup>18</sup>, 80-81r 12<sup>19</sup>, 81r 12-83<sup>20</sup>, missing folia<sup>21</sup>. The codex contains Philotheus Coccinus' *Ordo sanctae liturgiae, quomodo sacerdos cum diacono ministrare debeat* (1r-13v): the liturgies of St. John Chrysostom (1r-13v), St. Basil (35v-57v) and the Presanctified (58r-74v); two prayers, one of exorcism (75r-77v) and one to be said after eating something impure (78r) and the rite to be performed when something impure falls into wine or oil (78v-79v). Folia 80-83 are from a different codex and contain gospel and epistle readings. A comparison of the text in the Sofia codex with that in the Zographou codex reveals that the Sofia codex contains a text in places abridged and also distorted by scribal errors<sup>22</sup>.

Kotseva (p. 32-37) ascribes great importance to the prayers on 75r-79v, especially to that for the exorcism of a devil (75r-77v), since it is found in the 14th century Zaykov hagmatarion (требник) in the rite for baptism (1r-11v) and is similar to one found in the 11th century *Euchologium Sinaiticum* on 51v-56v, where — according to her (p. 32) — it was also intended for the rite of baptism<sup>23</sup>. This she considers

<sup>16</sup> = Z 92r-v, ed. *ibid.*, 68.

<sup>17</sup> = Z 93v-94v, ed. *ibid.*, 69-70.

<sup>18</sup> Since the subsequent text only occurs much later in Z, it is impossible to estimate what is missing here.

<sup>19</sup> = Z 147v-149v, ed. *ibid.*, 105-106. 80-83 are an addition from a different codex dating to approximately the same period.

<sup>20</sup> Not in Z.

<sup>21</sup> It is obviously impossible to estimate what is missing.

<sup>22</sup> Unfortunately Kotseva does not list these and it is impossible to give a complete enumeration here. A flagrant example is the omission because of haplography (and not the loss of a folio) of a whole passage between 1 and 2, cf. Z 12v, ed. *ibid.*, 14: *Ѡ БЛАГОВѢРЕНЕМЪ [и БОГЪ-ХРАНИМЪ] ЦАРН . . . Ѡ БЛАГОВѢРЕНЕМЪ [и БОГЪ-ЛЮБИМЪ] ЦАРН*. Scribal errors are not the prerogative of mediaeval scribes. There are far too many printing errors in this book, the nadir being the fifth in the title of Beck's book (p. 37, n. 77), where incidentally the page reference is incorrect, and what does 631PG150 (*ibidem*) mean? Greek also seems to pose a problem, e.g., *λετουργιαρον* (p. 28) for *λετουργιαριον* and *Топика* (p. 37, n. 63) for *Топика*, cf. the complete absence of accents in the title of Trempelas' book (p. 37, n. 77) — because the original was in unaccented capitals? The English of the English résumé (p. 213-214) is atrocious.

<sup>23</sup> For the Zaykov hagmatarion, now codex 960 in the National Library, Sofia, see Стоянов, М. и Х. Колов. *Опис на славянските ръкописи в Софийската народна библиотека*. III. С., 1964, 114-115; for the prayer in the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* see the edition by Frček, J. *Euchologium Sinaiticum*. Texte slave avec sources grecques et traduction française. — *Patrologia Orientalis*. XXIV, 5,

proof that the Sofia codex contained not merely a hieratikon but also a hagmatarion, viz. it was a *euchologium magnum*. However, a strict division of liturgical codices into hieratica and hagmataria is impossible before the sixteenth century, since almost all codices contained varying collections of rites and offices<sup>24</sup> and hieratica containing the rite of baptism are not unknown<sup>25</sup>. Moreover, the prayer for exorcism in the *Euchologium Sinaiticum* is not in any way associated with the rite of baptism and has only a similarity of theme not text.

A gloss on 51v shows that the codex was copied by the priest Gerasimus, who also copied folia 63-102 of the Palauzov codex containing the Bulgarian synodicon, conciliar decisions and various rites and prayers<sup>26</sup> and Kotseva (p. 32-37) considers that originally the two codices formed part of the same manuscript which contained Patriarch Euthymius' *euchologium magnum*, whose contents can thus be reconstructed<sup>27</sup>. The fact that she has not proved her contention that the Sofia codex is more than just a hieratikon does not necessarily disprove her idea that originally both it and the Palauzov codex were once parts of the same codex which could then be considered to be a *euchologium magnum* and it is clear that a complete edition of the Palauzov codex is one of the major desiderata in the study of the 14th century liturgical reforms to enable Kotseva's theory to be properly evaluated.

For Kotseva herself there is no doubt about Euthymius' personal role in these reforms as

Paris, 1933, 758-778. Since Kotseva has failed to notice that in the Sofia codex which she is publishing, there are folia missing between 77 and 78 she incorrectly considers the prayer for exorcism extends to 78r.

<sup>24</sup> For a succinct survey see Розов, Н. *Русские служебники и требники*. — *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*. II, 2. М., 1976, 314-339. South Slav codices in no way differ in this respect from Russian ones.

<sup>25</sup> E. g. the 14th century codex 952 in the Synodal collection, Moscow, 109v-130r, see Горский, А. и К. Невоструев. *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной библиотеки*. III, 1. М., 1869, 28-35.

<sup>26</sup> Now codex 289 in the National Library, Sofia. There is a large bibliography on this codex which need not be given here, see Цонев, Б. *Опис на ръкописите и старопечатните книги на Народната библиотека в София*. С., 1910, 187-198.

<sup>27</sup> An idea she has already expressed elsewhere: *Литургическите преводи на патриарх Евтимий в ръкописни преписи и в първопечатни издания (края на XIV-ти—начало на XVII в.)*. — *Първи международен конгрес по българистика, София, 23 май—3 юни 1981*. Доклади. *Българската литература и световният литературен процес*. II. С., 1985, 32-38, cf. 33-34.

translator. Thus she talks of Евтимиев превод на трите литургии (p. 9) and also asserts (p. 37, n. 75) that he translated the liturgies of SS. Peter and James. However, the ascription of one of the three (possibly four) translations of the liturgy of St. James to Euthymius rests solely upon the claim by Joannicius Lichudes of Cephalonia (1633-1717) that his Slavonic version<sup>28</sup> is a revision of a translation by Euthymius. Syrku believed that he had discovered Euthymius' translation in the 17th century codex 332 in the Hilandar collection<sup>29</sup>, but the two versions are so different that they may well be entirely unrelated translations. As for the ascription of the translation of the liturgy of St. Peter to Euthymius, it rests solely upon the fact that it is found in the same Hilandar codex which contains his alleged translation of the liturgy of St. James,<sup>30</sup> a reason which has — quite rightly — been dismissed out of hand<sup>31</sup>. Kotseva's ascription of a translation of the three main liturgies to Euthymius is left unsubstantiated and is open to doubt since the "Euthymian" version antedates his patriarchate (1375-1393),<sup>32</sup> although by how much

<sup>28</sup> Ed. С ы р к у. Истории, 179-218 and К а л у з н и а с к и, Е. Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393). Wien, 1901, 307-334. Both Syrku, op. cit. XC1, and Kaluzniacki, op. cit. XCVIII-XCIX, confused Joannicius Lichudes with the Joannicius who went to Russia with Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem and remained there until his death in 1630.

<sup>29</sup> Ed. С ы р к у. Истории, 179-218.

<sup>30</sup> The Petrine liturgy has been thrice edited from this codex, first by П о р ф и р и й (К. У с л е н с к и й). Второе пугшество по Святой Горе Афонской в годы 1858. 1859 и 1861 и описанье скитов Афонских. М., 1880, 180-184, who, *ibid.* 179, 184-185, advanced the fantastic theory that it had been translated in c. 680 at the behest of Archbishop John of Thessalonica, then under Roman obedience — a theory based upon his misinterpretation of the Solun legend; then by С ы р к у. Истории, 221-231; finally by V a š i s a, J. Slovanská liturgie sv. Petra — Byzantinologica, VIII, 1939-1946, 1-54, cf. 23-51, who argued, *ibid.*, 5-17, that the translation could be dated to the Cyrillomethodian period, a theory which is quite unacceptable, cf. L a u r e n č i k, J. K otázce slovanské liturgie sv. Petra. — Studia palaeoslovenica. (Joseph Kurz septuagenario dedicatum), ed. V. Havránek. Praha, 1971, 201-214, and M a r e š, F. Das Verhältnis des slavischen Textes der Petrusliturgie zum griechischen Original im Lichte der Rubriken. — Cyrilomethodianum. V, 1981, 120-129, whose dating of the translation to the late 14th or early 15th century is the most probable.

<sup>31</sup> See К а л у з н и а с к и, Werke, XXXVI; also Vajs, J. Liturgia sancti Petri slavica. (Relatio). — Acta Academiae Velehradensis, XIX, 1948, 110-115, cf. 111: *ineple et incongrue adscripti Euthymio*.

<sup>32</sup> See Constantinescu. Ethyme 74-75. It must be said, however, that Constantinescu's

is uncertain and it could have been made by Euthymius while he was still on Athos (see below). It is perhaps not without significance that the Sofia codex is in pre-Euthymian orthography.

The liturgical reforms in Bulgaria must be viewed in the context of similar currents in Byzantium. While still in the Grand Lavra on Athos Philotheus Coccinus adapted an *ordo* of the liturgy to the Jerusalem typicon. If he had hoped to bring about uniformity, he was mistaken, since virtually all of the Greek codices of his *Ordo sanctae liturgiae, quomodo sacerdos cum diacono ministrare debeat* vary to a greater or lesser extent. There can be no doubt that Euthymius knew Philotheus personally, since in 1363 he went to Constantinople where he stayed for over a year. Philotheus was at that time metropolitan of Heracleia in Thrace, but resided mostly in Constantinople. In 1364 he was for the second time appointed patriarch, which post he held until 1376. It is also significant that when Euthymius left Constantinople he settled at the Grand Lavra on Athos, only returning to Bulgaria in c. 1371. Earlier in the century a Slav monk at the Lavra, a certain John<sup>33</sup>, had translated or at least revised, a large number of liturgical books, including the liturgies themselves, with which texts Euthymius must have become acquainted with at the Lavra. It was probably during his stay on Athos that Euthymius translated Philotheus' *Ordo*<sup>34</sup>, but whether Euthymius himself

article is so obscure as to make Kotseva's introduction seem by comparison a model of lucid clarity.

<sup>33</sup> In spite of all that has been written about John he remains an enigmatic figure. For recent views see H a n n i c k, C. Zur Schreibertätigkeit des Ieromonach Mefodije. — Die Welt der Slaven, XVII, 1972, 408-416, П о п о в, Г. Новооткрито сведение за преводаческа дейност на българските книжовници от Света гора през първата половина на XIV век. — Български език, V, 1978, 402-410, and Ч е ш к о, Е. Об Афонской редакции славянского перевода Псалтыри в ее отношении к другим редакциям. — Язык и письменность среднеболгарского периода. Ред. Е. Демина. М., 1982, 60-93, cf. 60-61.

<sup>34</sup> This is a probability but not a certainty as alleged by V. Gyuzelev in История на България. Ред. Д. Косев. III. С., 1982, p. 454. The ascription of the translation to Euthymius is attested by a 14th century roll in the Zographou collection and there is no reason to question the ascription. His translation has been thrice edited from this roll: Proskomidija iz Zografskog manastira u Svetoj Gore. Prijevod bugarsko-slovenskog partiarha Jevtimija. — Glasnik Srpskog učenog društva, XXV, 1869, 288-304, cf. 289-304 (an anonymous, bad edition); С ы р к у. Истории 1-31 (juxtaposed with the text in codex Zographou I), and К а л у з н и а с к и, Werke, 283-306. The translation is also in the Sofia codex, but is acephalous

revised the liturgies or whether<sup>35</sup> he took John's revised text remains as yet an open question. Kotseva's statements about the Slavonic translations of Philotheus' *Ordo* are somewhat confused. She asserts (p. 39, n. 79) that it is difficult to state how many there are, that, when compared to the Sofia codex, codex 1/23 in the Rila collection has an *expanded translation* (разширения превод) with a *substituted* (замениено) incipit (p. 27), while the 14th-15th century Russian codex *Vaticanus slavicus 14* has a *new translation* (p. 39, n. 79). In fact there are three Slavonic versions: Euthymius' with the incipit **ЄГДА ХОЩЕЪ ІЕРЕН БОЖЕСТВЕННЪ СВЪРШИТИ СВЪЖЕЪ**, the version found in metropolitan Cyprian's revision of the Russian hieraticon, the earliest codex being the late 14th century codex 601 in the Synodal collection, Moscow<sup>36</sup>, with the incipit **ХОТАЮ ІЕРЕН БОЖЕСТВЕННЮ СВЪРШИТИ ТАИИЪ**, and the most common version with the incipit **ХОТАЮ ІЕРЕН (САТОЕ Н) БОЖЕСТВЕННО СВЪРШИТИ ТАИИСТВО**, the earliest codices of which are of the second half of the 14th century, e. g., codex 316 in the Hilandar collection<sup>37</sup>. This anonymous version was translated

from a Greek redaction longer than that used for the other two versions. The question of possible interdependence between these three versions can only be answered when critical editions of their earliest forms are available and here Kotseva's facsimile will be of great service.

There are also several minor points in Kotseva's introduction which are confused or ambiguous. To give but one example. In the Sofia codex the *liturgia praesanctificatorum* is ascribed to Basil the Great (35v), in which connection Kotseva (p. 29, second starred footnote) refers to the fact that in the 1348 Ivan Alexander florilegium the *Historia ecclesiastica et mystica contemplatio*, attributed to Germanus I of Constantinople, is also ascribed to Basil. How is this to be understood — as a causal relation or as pure coincidence? In fact, of course, both Basilian ascriptions are well attested in Greek codices<sup>38</sup>.

Although the introduction to this facsimile edition leaves much to be desired the edition itself must be welcomed as a valuable contribution to the study of the liturgical reforms carried out in 14th century Bulgaria and it is to be hoped that it will be followed before long by the edition of critical texts<sup>39</sup>, which alone will enable the history of these reforms and of Euthymius' role in them to be fully elucidated.

owing to missing folia and the illegibility of 1r, see Kotseva's facsimile edition Iv-13v.

<sup>35</sup> As suggested by Constantinescu, *Euthyme*, 74-75.

<sup>36</sup> From which codex it has been edited by Красносельцев, Н. *Материалы для истории чинопоследования литургии святого Иоанна Златоустого*. Казань, 37-79. The traditional idea that this codex is a copy of Cyprian's autograph is now doubted as the orthography reveals scarcely any trace of South Slav influence, see Князевская, О. и Е. Чешко. *Рукописи митрополита Киприана и отражение в них орфографической реформы Евфимия Тырновского*. — Тырновска книжовна школа. II. С., 1980, 282-292, cf. 290-291. It has also been twice edited from the Vatican codex by Красносельцев, Н. *Сведения о некоторых литургических рукописях Ватиканской библиотеки с замечаниями о составе и особенностях богослужебных чинопоследований, в них содержащихся*. Казань, 1885, 172-194, and Горбач, О. *Три церковно-славянские литургические рукописи тексты Ватиканской библиотеки*. (Траци Философично — Гуманитично Факултету Украинского Католического Университету. I). Roma, 1966, 84-104. In places the Vatican codex has better readings than the alleged copy of Cyprian's autograph.

<sup>37</sup> See Bogdanović, D. *Katalog ćirilskih rukopisa manastira Hilandara*. Beograd, 1978, p. 133. The Rila codex 1/23 apparently contains this version, see Райков, Б., Х. Кочев, Б. Христова. *Славянски ръкописи в Рилския манастир*. I. С., 1986, 67-68. There is no scholarly edition of this version, but it is found in early Balkan and Venitian edi-

tions of the hieraticon, e. g., that published at Târgoviște in 1508, reprinted by Panaitescu, P. *Liturgierul lui Macarie (1508) cu un studiu*. București, 1961. This version lies at the basis of the *ordo* in the present Russian hieraticon, e. g., St. Petersburg, 1898, 69-94.

<sup>38</sup> For the Basilian ascription of the liturgy see King, A. *The Rites of Eastern Christendom*. II. Rome, 1948, p. 146, n. 358. The reason for this ascription might be the fact that the preconsecration takes place during the Basilian liturgy. On the Basilian ascription of the *Historia* see Thomson, F. *Constantine of Preslav and the Old Bulgarian Translation of the 'Historia ecclesiastica et mystica contemplatio'*. Attributed to Patriarch Germanus I of Constantinople. — Palaeobulgarica, X, 1, 1986, 41-48, cf. 42-43.

<sup>39</sup> A useful preliminary step would be the edition of the earliest codices of Constantinescu's four main classes of South Slav hieratica, viz. A. N. Popov 101, Hilandar 315, Berlin 23(19) and Rumanian Academy 27. It should be noted that for the Euthymian version Solovki 709 is also of importance.