Sagners Slavistische Sammlung · Band 18

(eBook - Digi20-Retro)

Maurice L. Hébert

Hesychasm, Word-Weaving and Slavic Hagiography

The Literary School of Patriarch Euthymius

Verlag Otto Sagner München · Berlin · Washington D.C.

Digitalisiert im Rahmen der Kooperation mit dem DFG-Projekt „Digi20“
der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, München. OCR-Bearbeitung und Erstellung des eBooks durch den Verlag Otto Sagner:

http://verlag.kubon-sagner.de

«Verlag Otto Sagner» ist ein Imprint der Kubon & Sagner GmbH.

SAGNERS SLAVISTISCHE SAMMLUNG

herausgegeben von
PETER REHDER

Band 18

VERLAG OTTO SAGNER
München 1992

Maurice LaBauve Hébert

Hesychasm, Word-Weaving, and Slavic Hagiography:

The Literary School of Patriarch Euthymius

VERLAG OTTO SAGNER

München 1992

ISBN 3-87690-530-3

Druck: Strauss Offsetdruck, 6945 Hirschberg 2

Acknowledgements

This work represents my doctoral dissertation, done in the Department of Slavic Languages at Brown University under the direction of Professor Robert Mathiesen and a committee of two other readers, Professors Michael Shapiro (Slavic Languages) and Susan A. Harvey (Religious Studies). In addition to my committee of three, many other people have contributed to the evolution and development of this study, and it is my pleasure to acknowledge them here.

The first individual I must thank is Michael Scanlon. At a crucial point in my education, he encouraged me to pursue my love for language and literature; and his friendship and kindness were a constant source of encouragement to me. To Michael I owe the greatest debt of thanks.

Amongst those who advised me and gave of their time and expertise are Bogdan Bodanov, Diana Burgin, Aksinja Džurova, Harvey Goldblatt, John Hallowell, Jennifer Hixon, Klimentina Ivanova, Sonya Ketchian, Horace Lunt, Ellen Sarah Elizabeth Martin, Olga Nedelković, Marianne Shapiro, Nikolaj Stančev, Borjana Velčeva, Victor Terras, and Olga Yokoyama. In particular I should like to thank Prof. Dr. Peter Rehder and Leonid Pogrebinsky for the many hours they spent proofreading the manuscript of this book and making invaluable suggestions.

Lastly, I must acknowledge, too, the kind assistance of so many librarians at the university libraries of Brown, Harvard, Yale, and Columbia, the Boston Public Library, the Library of Congress, and the Ivan Dujčev Center of Sofia University.

Brown University, Summer 1992 M. L. Hébert

Table of Contents

Introduction

As the body of this dissertation assumes a familiarity with people and terms that may not be well known to Slavists who do not specialize in the medieval period and to Byzantinists who are not concerned specifically with the aspect of Byzantino-Balkan and Byzantino-Slavic contacts, some words should be devoted to their identification here. Euthymius was the last patriarch of the Bulgarian Church from 1375 to 1393, before the fall of Bulgaria to the Ottoman Turks.[1] His dates are disputed amongst historians. The year of his birth is usually cited as being between 1325 and 1330, and the year of his death between 1401 and 1412. Almost everything we know about Euthymius' life is contained in a panegyric written in his honor by his contemporary and fellow student Grigorij Camblak and also in the treatise of Konstantin Kostenečki, a monk who represents the generation after Euthymius' own and who developed as a writer and intellectual within the sphere of Euthymius' influence. We know that Euthymius studied at Kelifarevo with the Bulgarian monk Theodosius, a

---

[1] For the most general information on Euthymius, cf. I.Dujčev's article "Euthyme de Tirnovo" in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie écclesiastiques* 16, fasc.90, pp.75-77, Paris, 1964; and В.С.Киселков, "Патриарх Евтимий (живот и обществена дейност)," *Българска историческа библиотека*, том 3, 142-177, София, 1929.

Several monograph studies in book and article form have been done on Patriarch Euthymius and the Trnovo School. Cf. for example: Цветана Вранска (=Романска), "Стилни похвати на Патриарх Евтимий," *Сборник на Българската академия на науките и изкуствата* 37, 2 (1942): 107-280; M.Heppell, "The Hesychast Movement in Bulgaria: The Turnovo School and its Relations with Constantinople," *Eastern Churches Review* 7 (1975): 9-20; several articles by Klimentina Ivanova (see general bibliography under К.Иванова); В.Качанковский, "К вопросу о литературной деятельности болгарского патриарха Евтимия (1375-1393)," *Христианское Чтение издаваемое при Санкт-петербургской Духовной Академии* 2 (1882): 216-265; "Новые данные для изучения литературной деятельности болгарского Тырновского патриарха Евтимия," *Христианское Чтение* 3-4 (1888): 470-497; E.Kałużniacki, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393)*, Vienna, 1901; reprint London, 1971; В.С. Киселков, *Патриарх Евтимий*, София, 1938; Архимандрит Леонид, "Последний патриарх болгарского царства блаженный Евтимий и его сочинения," *Чтения в императорском обществе истории и древностей российских при Московском Университете* 4 (1870): 13-18; Х.И.Попов, *Евтимий, последен Търновски и Трапезицки патриарх*, Пловдив, 1901; П.А.Сырку, *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV веке*, том 1, Время и жизнь патриарха Евтимия Терновского, СПб, 1890; reprint, London, 1972; and Стефан Цанков, *Патриарх Евтимий*, София, 1906.

pupil of the great Hesychastic teacher Gregory the Sinaite and a personal friend of Patriarch Kallistos of Constantinople.[2] Euthymius also travelled abroad to Byzantium with Theodosius, where he continued his studies at the Studion Monastery and later on Mount Athos. When Euthymius returned to Bulgaria after eight years of travel and study in Byzantium, he served as the abbot of the Holy Trinity Monastery near the royal capital of Trnovo from 1371 to 1375. During this period he undertook his original compositions, new translations of Greek texts into Bulgarian and continued a process of orthographic reform that was probably already in place during the reign of Tsar Ivan Alexander of Bulgaria (1331-1371). As patriarch of the Bulgarian Church, Euthymius was perhaps the representative *par excellence* on Slavic soil of the Hesychastic community that included the patriarchs of Constantinople and the monastic centers on the Holy Mount (Athos)[3] and very soon found members in Serbia, Romania, and East Slavic lands as well. Euthymius, along with Grigorij Camblak, represents the second generation of Gregory the Sinaite's pupils. They learned firsthand from the Bulgarian monk Theodosius and Patriarch Kallistos of Constantinople, and they passed on their knowledge to such outstanding medieval Slavic literary figures as Konstantin Kostenečki and Paxomij Serb.

Euthymius is the author of several original works; amongst them are four hagiographic texts that form the basis of this study: the *Life of Ivan of*

---

[2] On the history of the associations between Gregory the Sinaite, Theodosius and Kallistos, see Г.А. Ильинский, "Значение Афона в истории славянской письменности," *Журнал министерства народного просвещения* 18 (ноябрь, 1908):1-41, esp. pp.26-27.

[3] For general information on the enormously important role played by Athos in medieval Slavic religious culture, cf. Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, *Mount Athos: the Garden of the Panaghia*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972; I.Dujčev, "Le Mont Athos et les Slaves au Moyen Âge," in *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol.1, 487-510, Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1965; "Chilandar et Zographou au Moyen Âge," in *Хиландарски зборник*, vol.1, 21-32, edited by G.Ostrogorsky, Belgrade: Српска Академија наука и уметности, 1966; Hristo Matanov, "Le Mont Athos et les rapports politiques dans la deuxième moitié du XIVe siècle," *Études balkaniques* 2 (1983): 69-100; A.E.Tachiaos, "Mount Athos and Slavic Literatures," *Cyrillomethodianum* 4 (1978):1-35; T.J.Burković, *Hilandar u doba Nemanića*, Belgrade, 1925; and Г.А.Ильинский, "Значение Афона в истории славянской письменности," *Журнал министерства народного просвещения* 18 (ноябрь, 1908):1-41.

Rila, the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena*, the *Life of Paraskeva*, and the *Life of Philothea*. This study is focused on tracing the development of the style of writing employed in this genre from the Early Christian period to the late medieval Orthodox Slavic period.

The religious movement called "Hesychasm" is well represented in theological, historical, and literary scholarship. Much has been written on this topic by such scholars as Bois, Syrku, Radčenko, Lixačev, Picchio, Mulič, Dujčev, Angelov, Meyendorff, Gillet, Tachiaos, all of whom are discussed and cited within this study. The first chapter of Section IV is devoted to examining in detail the history of this movement and its reflection in medieval Slavic culture. We will present here some generalities on the topic. The term "Hesychasm" is derived from the Greek word "ἡσυχία", meaning silence or quietude. Where the latter appears in medieval Slavic texts, it is usually rendered as "bezmъlvie" or "bezmlъvie". The term is applied to a religious movement that began during the fourth century of the Christian period and evolved with the philosophical writings of Evagrius, Pseudo-Macarius, John Climacus, Gregory the New Theologian, and, in its late medieval revival, with the teachings of Gregory the Sinaite and Gregory Palamas. According to the tenets of Hesychasm, a monk should seclude himself in the desert or in a mountain cell and observe several practices that include silent contemplation, or "mental prayer", and daily recitation of the Psalms. In later centuries, during its flourishing in Mt. Sinai, a specific physical discipline is added to the doctrine: that of assuming a position whereby one controls one's breathing and contracts the whole body and fixes one's eyes on the belly. All of this is to be done while repeating over and over the Jesus Prayer, or "prayer of the heart" (i.e., "Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me, a sinner"; "Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐλεείσον με τὸν ἁμαρτωλόν").

In its early stages, even during its first flourishing on Mt. Sinai, Hesychasm is little more than a distilling of the virtues of anchoritic monasticism, whereby an individual goes off and lives alone apart from the community. But in the fourteenth century, largely through the teachings of Gregory the Sinaite, who came to Mount Athos and to Paroria in southern Bulgaria, Hesychasm enjoyed a significant revival. This period in the evolution of the movement is often referred to in contemporary

scholarship as "Byzantine Hesychasm" to distinguish it from its earlier Christian and Sinaite periods. The tenets of the Hesychastic movement had not changed significantly during the centuries between revivals, but what had changed by the 14th-century was the official attitude of the Orthodox Church. The Hesychasts had to defend themselves against charges of heresy that were levelled by the professor Barlaam of Calabria. Through the eloquent defense of the Hesychasts, written by Gregory Palamas, Hesychasm was declared orthodox by the ecclesiastical councils of June and August of 1341, Palamas was promoted to the position of archbishop of Thessalonika, and Barlaam, now shamed by his defeat, returned to Italy and spent his old age tutoring Petrarch in Greek.

Hesychasm in the form of its Byzantine Revival spread to monastic communities in Serbia, Bulgaria, and East Slavic territories. Attempts to identify the precise impact of Hesychasm on the Slavs and to determine which spheres of Orthodox Slavic culture Hesychasm influenced have stimulated various responses and controversies in the field of Slavistics. Our goal in undertaking this study is to contribute toward the resolution of one of these controversies: namely, the question concerning the influence of Hesychasm on the literary style of medieval Slavic literature, using the hagiographic genre as our framework. We shall now outline the development of the controversy under consideration.

The terms "First South Slavic Influence" and "Second South Slavic Influence" both use East Slavic culture as their vantage point; that is, both terms refer to cultural influences emanating from South Slavic lands onto East Slavic peoples. The "First South Slavic Influence" refers to the actual transmission of literacy as well as a whole system of Byzantine Orthodox culture to East Slavdom in the late tenth and the eleventh centuries.

The notion of the "Second South Slavic Influence" was discussed by Sobolevskij in his seminal study, written at the begining of the twentieth century.[4] In this work Sobolevskij underscored changes that he observed in the orthography and the literary style of South Slavic texts in the

---

[4] А.И. Соболевский, "Южно-славянское влияние на русскую письменность в XIV-XV веках," *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV-XV веков*, Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности 74, №1, Санкт-Петербург, 1903.

fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that assumedly were then transferred to and absorbed into the literary tradition of the East Slavs. This study was elaborated upon by D.S.Lixačev. In his 1958 paper which he delivered to the Congress of Slavists[5], Lixačev attempted to demonstrate a connection between the mystical tenets of the Byzantine Hesychast movement and the appearance of a highly ornate rhetorical style in medieval Slavic hagiography. Lixačev maintained that the fourteenth-century revival of Hesychasm in Byzantium -- and especially on Mount Athos -- resulted in a wide-spread diffusion of Hesychasm to South Slavic territories. It was then claimed by Lixačev (and other scholars after him[6]) that under the influence of the saints' lives written by the Hesychast Patriarch Kallistos of Constantinople, there flourished in Bulgaria a literary school headed by Patriarch Euthymius. While this much is true, the assumptions which follow we maintain to be false. Lixačev went further to posit that Euthymius, now completely under the influence of Hesychasm, introduced a new literary style into Slavic hagiography, referred to by Slavists as "pletenie sloves" ("плетение словес"), or "word weaving". Scholars have described this style in various ways, but all seem to agree that it is characterized by an abundant use of certain rhetorical devices, such as metaphor, simile, alliteration, tautology, etc. It is claimed, moreover, that this new literary style was devised by Patriarch Kallistos, Patriarch Euthymius and their Hesychast brothers as a reflection of a specifically Hesychastic attitude to language. In essence, Lixačev posited a specifically Hesychast philosophy of the word in the aforementioned article:[7]

---

[5]Д.С. Лихачев, "Некоторые задачи изучения второго южнославянского влияния в России," *Исследования по славянскому литературоведению и фольклористике, Доклады советских ученых на IV Международном съезде славистов,* 95-151, Москва: АН СССР, 1960.

[6] See Section III, Chapter 1 of this study for bibliographical references.

[7] Лихачев, op.cit., p.112. The original passage reads: "Исихасты видели в слове сущность обозначаемого им явления, в имени божьем -- самого бога. Поэтому слово, обозначающее священное явление, с точки зрения исихастов так же священно, как и само явление. Это учение о языке и слове было распростанено Евфимием и его учениками на всю письменность."

> The Hesychasts saw in the word the essence of a phenomenon which is designated by the word, and [they saw] in the name of God God himself. For this reason, the word, which designates a sacred phenomenon, was from the point of view of the Hesychasts, also sacred, as is the phenomenon itself. This teaching about language and the word was extended by Euthymius and his pupils to the entire realm of the written word.

Following Lixačev's example, many scholars have made an association between the employment of an elaborate, ornamental style in hagiography (and other genres as well) and Hesychasm, wishing to prove the existence of a natural connection between the two. One example of this trend in scholarship can be found in the work of Riccardo Picchio, who identifies the ornamental style of the Euthymian period as "a result of the Hesychast theory of knowledge."[8] Such a stance on the issue attempts to demonstrate a spontaneous transference of Hesychast ideology onto formulæ for art in fourteenth-century South Slavic culture, especially in the production of hagiography, the most popular literary genre in medieval Slavic culture. As a result, Euthymius of Trnovo has received much attention as the founder of a Hesychast School of literature, which supposedly gave rise to the "word weaving" style, or "pletenie sloves", in East Slavic lands. The tradition in scholarship of maintaining a connection between Hesychasm and ornamental rhetoric in 14th-century Bulgarian on the one hand and a connection between this South Slavic "Hesychast literary style" with "word weaving" in East Slavic territories on the other has been perpetuated by many scholars who simply use Lixačev's work as an *a priori* point of departure. The assumption that the spread of Hesychasm in South Slavic lands led to a new style of writing has provided the theoretical framework for many studies on East Slavic "word weaving" and its relation to the movement.[9] Although, according to Dimitri Obolensky[10],

---

[8] R.Picchio and H.Goldblatt, "Old Russian Literature," in *Handbook of Russian Literature*, 316-322, edited by Victor Terras, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, p.319. For another example of a study that assumes a connection between the religious movement of Hesychasm and the employment of an ornate writing style, see R.Richardson, "Hesychasm in the Hagiographic Works of Patriarch Kallistos," Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1969.

[9] See, for example, Faith C.M.Kitch, *The Literary Style of Epifanij Premudryj: 'Pletenije sloves'*," Slavistische Beiträge, 96, Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1976; J.Manson, "Studies in Russian Hagiography During the Period of the Second South Slavic Influence," Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1968.

Lixačev is somewhat more successful in demonstrating a connection between Hesychasm and trends in visual art of the period rather than verbal art, the double connection for the sphere of literary creation is, we maintain, ungrounded on both accounts. The ornamental literary style associated with the fourteenth-century Slavic and Byzantine Hesychastic hagiographers such as Patriarch Euthymius and Patriarch Kallistos not only was not original to them, but there is no scholarly basis on which to establish a connection between its exploitation and the Hesychast movement at all. It is true that one can certainly treat Hesychasm and Byzantine rhetoric as being two coexisting cultural phenomena in medieval Slavic society, but to assume a causal relationship between them is not supported by the facts. All of Section III of this study is devoted to illustrating this point.

The literary style so often associated with the fourteenth-century Hesychasts was inherited from a long-established Byzantine tradition of ornate rhetoric; moreover, its first appearance in Slavic writing is not with the Hesychasts of the fourteenth-century "Euthymian School", but appears as early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries in East Slavic territories and in the thirteen century in Serbian vitæ. Euthymius and his pupils may indeed be regarded as masters of this style, but they certainly do not represent its innovators.

Other assumptions made heretofore concerning the Second South Slavic Influence should be questioned. There is evidence that argues against the assumed mass migration of Southern Slavs into East Slavic lands, as will be examined below. The appearance of a heavily ornate style in East Slavic hagiography of the fourteenth century--as in the vitæ of Epiphanius the Wise--does not have to be explained by a migration of Bulgarians and Serbs to East Slavic lands, but rather in East Slavdom's renewed ties with Byzantium. Just as the political motivations underlying Bulgaria's intensive Byzantinization should be kept in mind, East Slavdom of the late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century had its own strong political motives

---

10 D.Obolensky, "Medieval Russian Culture in the Writings of D.S.Likhachev," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 9 (Oxford,1976): 1-16, p.13. This article has been reprinted in D.Obolensky, *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe* , London: Variorum Reprints, 1982, as article 9.

for pursuing renewed contacts with Constantinople. In the mid-fourteenth cetury, East Slavs had just begun to rid themselves of the Mongol Yoke; and after two centuries of foreign cultural and economic domination, Muscovy looked to renew its ties with the religious and intellectual community of the Orthodox world. This was accomplished by increased contacts between Mt. Athos and East Slavic territories. To be sure, on Mt. Athos South and East Slavs continued to influence one another and share common Byzantine cultural ties; furthermore, we know that several well-educated and literate South Slavs went east: both Grigorij and Kiprian Camblak served as metropolitans in Russia, and the South Slavic writer and hagiographer Paxomij Serb also went there. But to attribute Russia's increased interest in and use of a Byzantine ornamental style in hagiography to a mass migration of Bulgarian Hesychasts to Russia is unfounded. As Talev points out: "why should they have gone all the way to Moscow or Novgorod when they could have gone to the next principality, the next town, the next monastery in their own land, or to neighboring Serbia, or to Wallachia or Moldavia, which had flourishing Slavic-language cultures throughout the 15th century?"[11] As we have pointed out in the first section of this study, the main academic monasteries in Bulgaria were not closed by the conquering Ottoman Turks. Evidence to support this is found in the Loveč Codex, which states that Euthymius spent the rest of his life teaching at Bačkovo Monastery. Presumably, then, some Bulgarian monks would not have had to leave Bulgaria to find centers where Orthodox culture and Orthodoxy itself were left intact.[12] Moreover, Konstantin Kostenečki's treatise on the letters indicates that many of the literate men of Trnovo found refuge in the neighboring lands of Serbia:

> I also plead that I not be judged by the unknowing or by the envious but by those competent to engage in such activities, that is, by men from the Holy Mountain or

---

[11] I. Talev, "The Impact of Middle Bulgarian on the Russian Literary Language (Post-Kievan Period)," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1972, p.76. This study appeared later as *Some Problems of the Second South Slavic Influence in Russia*, Slavistische Beiträge 62. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1973.

[12] See Section I, Chapter 2 for a more detailed discussion of Ottoman policies towards the Church in Bulgaria after its absorption into the Ottoman Empire in 1393.

the Trnovo lands. For many of them reside here [in Serbia] at the present time.[13]

The aim of this study is to demonstrate that there is nothing new or peculiarly Hesychastic in the hagiographic style employed by Patriarch Euthymius, and that this style of "pletenie sloves" was borrowed by him and other medieval Slavic writers from an earlier and long existing Byzantine tradition that predated the Hesychast Revival. In effect, this study attempts to disprove one of the basic assumptions of present scholarship of the period of the Second South Slavic Influence.

A call to re-examine the assumed role of Hesychasm in the development of a literary style during the period of the Second South Slavic Influence has been made by such scholars as Birnbaum, Ivanova, Iovine, Talev[14] -- and many have correctly observed Euthymius' debt to the stylistic reforms in hagiography brought about by Symeon Metaphrastes in the tenth century. Lixačev himself in his aforementioned article writes: "The question of Byzantine influence in the area of the 'word-weaving' style has been very little studied, but it is unquestionable that such an influence exists."[15] But until now a detailed comparison of the saints' lives written by Euthymius with those of earlier Byzantine and Slavic authors has not been made in order to prove this point. In fact, in the community of Slavists there have been calls to undertake such a study in order to obtain a better understanding of the nature and function of the "word-weaving" style.[16] In this study we hope to elucidate the position of

---

13 H.Goldblatt,*Orthography and Orthodoxy: Constantine Kostenečki's Treatise of the Letters,* Studia Historica et Philologica, no.16, Florence: Le Lettere, 1987, p.112. Professor Goldblatt writes in a footnote to this passage (p.211,fn.16): "This is an important reference to the many 'Trnovite' scribes and scholars who migrated to the despotate to escape the Turkish advance, as well as an indication of the depotate's [Stefan Lazarević's] close ties with Mount Athos."

14 See Section III, Chapter 1, fns.114-121 for a detailed discussion of these.

15 Лихачев, op.cit., p.98. The original passage reads: "Мало изучен вопрос о византийском влиянии в области стиля «плетения словес», но и здесь это влияние несомненно."

16 See, for example, M.Iovine, "The History and Historiography of the Second South Slavic Influence," Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1977, p.185. She writes: "...the hagiographic works of Euthymius himself, which include saints' lives and panegyrics, are

Euthymius in relation to the Byzantine and Slavic tradition that came before him.

That Hesychasm enjoyed a strong influence in the spiritual life of fourteenth-century Bulgaria is beyond doubt; there is both archaeological and literary evidence to prove it. The saints' lives of both patriarchs Kallistos and Euthymius reveal unequivocally that both of them were knowledgeable proponents of Hesychast mysticism. Kallistos wrote a vita about Gregory the Sinaite, the teacher of Hesychasm to monks on Athos and Paroria; and his life about Euthymius' spiritual father, Theodosius of Trnovo, contains many references to the basic teachings of Gregory (blessed quietude, mental prayer, the role of virtue, visions of the Divine Light). All of Euthymius' four vitæ contain similar references to spiritual disciplines that were specific to the Hesychasts.[17] In terms of the religious content of his saints' lives, Euthymius shows himself to be a Hesychast and an admirer of the hagiographic works of Patriarch Kallistos. We posit, however, that the category of religious content--that is, how the hero is developed as a character and how he or she attains sanctity--is the only sphere in which Byzantine Hesychasm had an influence on the composition of Euthymius' saints' lives.

In our own research, we have first translated all four vitæ of Euthymius (which are presented in Section II with an introduction and full annotation); then we have compared these saints' lives with several Slavonic and Greek hagiographic texts that cover the period of the Early Desert Fathers (the *Life of Anthony*), the pre-Metaphrastic Byzantine period (the *Life of Daniel the Stylite* and the *Life of St. John the Almsgiver*), the pre-Metaphrastic Slavic period (the *Life of Constantine*, the *Life of Methodius*, the *Life of Wenceslas* --all of which were written in the period around Metaphrastes but in the spirit of the pre-Metaphrastic models), the post-Metaphrastic Byzantine period (the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* by Theophylact, and the *Life of Theodosius* by Patriarch Kallistos [extant in Slavonic only]), and the post-Metaphrastic Slavic period (the *Life of*

---

readily accessible. These works are awaiting the thorough stylistic analysis which could provide the key to the problem of defining the new way of writing."

[17] See Section IV, Chapter 2.

Symeon by his son Sava [Rastko], and the saints' lives by Patriarch Euthymius).[18]

A comparative analysis of the style, structure and content of these hagiographic texts has resulted in the following findings: 1) there is nothing about the style of the Euthymian texts that is new or original to the hagiographic genre; and 2) every linguistic and literary rhetorical device in the texts can be traced back to hagiographic texts that predate the period of Symeon Metaphrastes and the revival of Hesychasm.[19] Although the post-Metaphrastic texts reveal a greater use of devices such as metaphor and simile, these devices certainly were not new to the high-style texts. Having made this observation, we were then forced to ask ourselves the following question: If these later texts are not distinguished from the texts of the earlier tradition by the repertoire of rhetorical devices, then how precisely do they differ from one another? One obvious answer is that the texts written according to the post-Metaphrastic norm use the same stock of rhetorical devices as pre-Metaphrastic texts, only more abundantly. This, alas, is not at all surprising. Another observation, however, followed from our research which is new and has led us to redefine the whole concept of "word weaving". The structure of the vitæ, those written according to the norms of the post-Metaphrastic tradition (the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid,* the *Life of Theodosius*, the *Life of Symeon*, and the Euthymian vitæ) all reveal a common structural feature of the narrative that is missing in the earlier texts of the pre-Metaphrastic style. We call this feature the "weaving of themes" and we posit that it is the most important characteristic feature of the writing style that Slavists now refer to as "word weaving". In pre-Metaphrastic texts, the sanctity of the hero is consistently developed through a narrative that is nothing more than a composite of individual anecdotes about the saint's miracles, healings, or teachings. If the author wants to develop as a subtheme of deeds the saint's ability as a good teacher, for example, he might include over a dozen separate tales about the saint's instruction to his flock of the teachings of Christ. In the post-Metaphrastic hagiographic tradition, the writer of the

---

18 For more information on these texts, consult the beginning of Section III, chapter 2.

19 See Section III, Chapter 2.

life introduces a certain subtheme in the text, such as the theme of the saint as a good teacher or pastor. He may then proceed to tell only two or three tales about the saint's specific deeds, and then this theme is recalled throughout the course of the text through the use of thematic phrases and formulaic images that suggest the subtheme without restating it through the vehicle of an actual anecdote or tale. It can be described as a kind of leitmotif that reappears throughout the work. In sum, the most important characteristic feature of texts that we identify as being examples of "word weaving" is not simply that they display a weaving or interlacing of words, but -- more importantly -- they display a narrative pattern that distinguishes them from texts of the earlier, pre-Metaphrastic tradition. This narrative pattern employs a weaving or interlacing of themes, or to be more precise, generic subthemes; moreover, these patterns appear in the hagiographic tradition well before and independently of the Hesychastic movement. Chapters 1 and 3 of Section III are devoted to the introduction and demonstration of this redefinition of "word weaving" based on changes in narrative structure of the hagiographic genre. This study, then, offers not only a redefinition of the notion of "word weaving", but also attributes its origins in Slavic writing to narrative patterns and stylistic norms that can readily be observed in the post-Metaphrastic examples of life-writing rather than in innovations by Kallistos, Euthymius, or the Hesychasts as a group. Euthymius can only be viewed as a stylistic innovator inasmuch as he perfected the norms of post-Metaphrastic hagiographic composition and gave them life and expression in Bulgarian literature. But the means of his communication in codifying the sanctity of his heroes -- i.e. all the components of his style and narrative structure -- were taken wholesale from an earlier Byzantine tradition.

In proposing the absence of a connection between the rise of Hesychasm and the adoption of a Byzantine ornamental style in hagiography during the fourteenth century, one has to account for the marked absence of this style in hagiography, specifically before the fourteenth century. It is possible to generalize by saying that -- with the exception of the Serbian hagiography of the thirteenth century -- early medieval Slavic hagiography is characterized by its straightforward and unadorned style, reminiscent of the prose of such early Christian texts as the *Life of Anthony*. If Hesychasm and the adoption of this style were

coincident but not interdependent cultural developments in fourteenth-century Bulgaria, why then did the Slavic hagiographers who lived during and after the Metaphrastic reforms not employ this ornamental style of hagiography, which was being used by their Byzantine contemporaries? One attempt to explain this has been put forward by Eremin[20], who accounts for the "lag" in the Slavic adoption of the Byzantine literary fashion by proposing that the newly Christianized Slavs in the ninth century had to first master the content of the liturgical and paraliturgical writings before they could cope with more complicated stylistic variations on the content. While Eremin correctly places the adoption of Metaphrastic reforms in hagiography in Slavic writing at the end of the twelfth century, his explanation does not account for the fact that there were stylistically complex translated works that circulated with success amongst the Slavs from the earliest period of literacy.

Perhaps another explanation can be found in what constituted Byzantine attitudes towards its own hagiographic literature of the period during the Christianization of the Slavs and their nascent literacy. As Mango has pointed out, the Byzantines were interested in rhetoric and rhetorical theory, but they also valued the simplicity of the early Christian classics[21]; and in choosing from a vast inventory of hagiographic texts to be translated for the Slavs, the Byzantines selected the early examples and not the more recent Byzantine ones for the most part.[22] As is evidenced by the writings of Kiril of Turov and Metropolitan Hilarion, the East Slavs

---

20 See И.Еремин, "О византийском влиянии в болгарской и древнерусской литературах IX-XII вв.," *Славянские литературы (Доклады советской делегации в Международный съезд славистов)*, Москва, 1963: 5-13; reprinted in Еремин, *Литература древней Руси: этюды и характеристики*, 9-17,,Москва-Ленинград: Наука, 1966.

21 C. Mango, *Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome*, New York, 1980, p.240.

22 Concerning the early period of Slavic writing, see I. Dujčev, "Les rapports littéraires byzantino-slaves," *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol.2, 3-27, Storia e letteratura, raccolta di studi e testi, 113. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1968. On pages 4-5, he writes: "Pour les Slaves de Sud et de l'Est, c'était en premier lieu Byzance, et l'Église de Constantinople qui insistaient sur la nécessité de suivre leur dogmas, et, en littérature, d'accepter sans hésitation les oeuvres de ces penseurs et écrivains traditionnels...En effet, la majeure partie des oeuvres en langue grecque, traduite par les slaves au Moyen Âge, appartient à la littérature patristique."

were acquainted with the Byzantine high rhetorical style at least as early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries and were capable of imitating it in original composition. The absence of such a style in early Slavic hagiography, however, must be regarded as the result of a conscious selection process on the part of the Byzantines. With models such as the *Life of Anthony* to follow, the Orthodox Slavs carefully followed the prescriptions given to them by the Byzantines, creating such works as the *Life of Constantine*, the *Life of Methodius*, the *Life of Wenceslas*, and the various *Lives of Boris and Gleb*. All of these belong to the pre-Metaphrastic tradition of stylistic composition and narrative structure. Only toward the beginning of the late medieval period did Slavic experimentation with post-Metaphrastic hagiographic models begin.

In this work the following points are examined in detail: 1) Patriarch Euthymius' position as a Hesychast and an important religious and cultural leader; 2) the social and political milieu in which he matured and developed as a writer; 3) the role of Hesychasm in medieval Slavic Orthodox culture and the ways in which the movement differed in Bulgaria and Byzantium; 4) a reexamination of the role played by Hesychasm in relation to the developments in medieval Slavic writing, and in particular in the genre of the saint's life; 5) a re-definition of "word weaving" based on observable changes and shifts in pre- and post-Metaphrastic hagiographic texts; 6) an exhaustive stylistic analysis of the Euthymian hagiographic texts with comparisons to the other texts examined in this study; 7) an identification of which aspects of these hagiographic texts can be linked specifically with the teachings of the Hesychasts; 8) and, lastly, an inquiry into the nature and essence of the Metaphrastic hagiographic aesthetic, employing some principles of semiotic theory as a point of departure. Included in the body of the dissertation are our own English annotated translations of all of Euthymius' vitæ. Heretofore these texts have appeared only in the original (Church Slavonic) and Modern Bulgarian translation. We hope that their appearance here will serve not only other Slavists but also scholars in all fields who are interested in medieval literature and, specifically, medieval religious literature.

We hope also that this study will contribute to establishing a better understanding of the place of Patriarch Euthymius in the development of Slavic writing and culture. Our goal in undertaking this study has been to

provide a foundation with which to apprehend a distinction crucial to the correct understanding of this man and his literary production: namely, that he found spiritual inspiration in the teachings of the Hesychasts, but he found literary inspiration in the models provided by Symeon Metaphrastes and his imitators. Furthermore -- and this is the most important point -- these models reflect a specific attitude toward language and a specific aesthetic sensibility that, while not existing in contradiction to the teachings of the Hesychasts, were in no way specific to the Hesychasts.

Section I

The Historical Background

Chapter 1:
The Life and Career of Patriarch Euthymius

The Life of Patriarch Euthymius:

Regrettably, very few details of the biography of Patriarch Euthymius are known. Much of the information about his life that circulates in modern scholarship is only speculation, and the only textual accounts we have for the events of his career are the panegyric written in his honor by his relative and pupil Grigorij Camblak (the *Slovo poxvalno*)[1] and Konstantin Kostenečki's *Skazanie izъjavlenno o pismenex*.[2] In

---

[1] The actual heading of the panegyric, referred to for the sake of convenience simply as the *Slovo poxvalno*, reads: "Grigoria, arxiepiskopa Rosijskago, poxvalno iže vъ svątyx otca našego Evtimia, patriarxa Trъnovskago." All quotes from Camblak's *Slovo poxvalno* in this study are taken from Kałużniacki's edition entitled *Aus der panegyrischen Litteratur der Südslaven* , 28-60, Vienna, 1901, Reprint, London: Variorum, 1971. Accompanying the quotes are the chapter (Roman numeral), page number and lines numbers (in Arabic numerals) as they appear in Kałużniacki.

Of Grigorij Camblak, M.MacDermott (*A History of Bulgaria: 1393-1885* , London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1962, p.60) writes: "[Camblak], a native of Turnovo...had studied under Patriarch Eftimi [Euthymius]. After the fall of Turnovo he lived for a time on Mt.Athos, then became private secretary to the Patriarch of Constantinople and later visited Moldavia and Serbia. Eventually he went to Kiev, and after some years he accepted an invitation from Prince Vitold of Lithuanian to become Metropolitan of Lithuanian and Kiev. He died in 1418, leaving twenty-five literary works, including a panegyric of Patriarch Eftimi of Turnovo." For general information on Grigorij Camblak, see also Muriel Heppell, *The Ecclesiastical Career of Gregory Camblak* , London, 1979.

For Modern Bulgarian translations of Camblak's panegyric, see П.Динеков, К.Куев, Д. Петканова, *Христоматия по старобългарска литература*, второ подобрено издание, София: Наука и изкуство, 1967, pp.423-441; and В.С.Киселков, *Патриарх Евтимий, Похвално слово от Григорий Цамблак.*, София, 1935. For additional information, cf. Боню Ангелов, "Неизвестен препис на 'Похвално слово за Патриарх Евтимий' от Григорий Цамблак," *Език и литература* 24, №6 (1969): 57-60; Георги Данчев, А. Давидов, "Похвалное слово за Евтимий от Григорий Цамблак," *Литературна мисъл* 17, №1 (1973): 140-141; and Émile Turdeanu, "Gregoire Camblak: Faux arguments d'une biographie," *Revue des études slaves* 22 (1946): 46-81; Малина Байчева, "Проблемът за светския подвиг на героите в 'Похвално слово за Евтимий' от Григорий Цамблак и 'Житие на Стефан Пермски' от Епифаний Премъдри," *Търновска книжовна школа*, том 4, 41-46, София: БАН, 1985; and D.V. Gonis, "A Commentary on the Encomium to Our Holy Father Euthymius, Patriarch of Turnovo," *Cyrillomethodianum* 8-9 (1984-85):215-225.

[2] The original text was first published by V.Jagić in "Рассуждения южнославянской и русской старины о церковно-славянском языке", *Исследования по русскому языку* I (1885-1895): 287-1070. It appeared the next year as *Codex Slovenicus rerum grammaticarum* , Berlin, 1896 and has been reprinted as such in the

addition to these, there are also some comments about Euthymius in the writings of Josef of Vidin. The amount of information about Euthymius given in these sources is, however, small.

Most scholars place Euthymius' year of birth between 1325 and 1330. Syrku places Euthymius' year of birth at about 1320 or earlier on the basis that Euthymius went to study with Theodosius in 1350 or around that time. Euthymius became Theodosius' assistant in administering the monastery at Kelifarevo; and according to Syrku, Euthymius would have to have been at least thirty years old to have filled this post.[3] There is, however, no evidence to support this claim. It is thought that he was born into a noble (boyar) family[4]; and some scholars maintain that Euthymius was related to the Camblaks.[5] Where Euthymius was born and where he received his intial education are also unknown, but the scholarly consensus is that these events took place in Trnovo. This, of course, is a logical

---

series Slavische Propyläen, no.25, Munich, 1968. H. Goldblatt in his Yale doctoral dissertation and in his book based on it presents an excellent and comprehensive translation and commentary of this document and its place in the overall tradition of medieval Byzantino-Slavic literary culture. See H.Goldblatt, *Orthography and Orthodoxy: Constantine Kostenečki's Treatise of the Letters* , Studia Historica et Philologica , no.16. Florence: Le Lettere, 1987.

Goldblatt (p.25) notes that the *Slovo poxvalno* was probably written sometime after Camblak was consecrated metropolitan of Kiev by local bishops in 1415 , and the *Skazanie* was written by Kostenečki sometime between 1423 and 1426 in the Serbian lands ruled by Despot Stefan Lazarević.

[3] See П.А.Сырку, *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV веке* , том I, Время и жизнь Патриарха Евтимия Терновскаго, 1890, Reprint, London, 1972, pp.254-255. He writes: "При поступлении Евтимия в Килифаревский монастырь, ему было, несомненно, около 30 лет, а может быть и более, иначе препод. Теодосий не поручил бы ему управления монастырем. Следовательно, Евтимий родился около 1320 г. или несколько раньше."

[4] The title "kurъ", or "κυριος" which appears in the heading of the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena* and the *Life of Paraskeva* does not indicate anything about the social position of Euthymius' family. It seems that this title was applied to all patriarchs.

[5] Cf. Émile Turdeanu, *La littérature bulgare du XIVe siècle et sa diffusion dans les pays roumains* , Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves, no.22, Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1947, p.68; Петър Динеков, "Евтимий Търновский," *История на българската литература,* том I, 285-307,София: БАН, 1963, p.285. On the question of Grigorij Camblak's familial relationship to Kiprian Camblak, see Н.Дончева-Панайотова, "По въпроса за родството между митрополит Киприан и Григорий Цамблак," *Старобългарска литература* 3 (1978): 77-85.

assumption, as Trnovo was the capital city of the kingdom and the center of intellectual and religious culture. Turdeanu hypothesizes that Euthymius began his education at Our Lady of Hodegetria Monastery in Trnovo, which was under the direct patronage of Tsar Ivan Alexander.[6] It is easy to imagine that Euthymius grew up and attended school and church in the elite noble community of Caravec in Veliko Trnovo; nevertheless, the events of his childhood must be left for now to specualtion.

Probably around 1350, when Euthymius was somewhere between the age of twenty and twenty-five (or thirty, if one accepts Syrku's estimate of his year of birth), he became Theodosius' pupil at Kelifarevo; and at this point, Euthymius was already a monk.[7] Theodosius was originally from the northwestern region of Vidin and had become a monk at the Monastery of St. Nikolaj near Arčar.[8] Theodosius was probably the most influential force in Euthymius' early career in the Church. Through the *Life of Theodosius* by Patriarch Kallistos[9] and Camblak's panegyric, we know that Theodosius was himself a Hesychast.[10] Furthermore, it seems that he initiated Euthymius into the teachings of Gregory the Sinaite.[11] Under the

---

6 ibid., p.68.

7 See П. Динеков, op.cit., p.285.

8 Cf. Иван Богданов, *Патриарх Евтимий, Книга за него и неговото време*, Библиотеки бележити българи, № 2, София: Изд. на Отечествения фронт, 1970, p.45.

9 See В.С. Киселков, *Житието на св. Теодосий Търновски като исторически паметник* , София, 1926, pp.i-iii. Kiselkov argues that although Kallistos may indeed have written a life of Theodosius, the Slavonic text we have is not a translation of his text but a complete reworking by a fifteenth-century Bulgarian monk.

10 References to Theodosius' love of "quietude" (ѣezmъlvie, ἡσυχία) abound in the *Life of Theodsius*. There is also this passage from Camblak's *Slovo poxvalno* : "sam [Teodosie] že nemnogim rastoaniemъ ot obitěli krajnee ѣezmiъvia ljuѣomǫdrjьstvuaše" (IV,33, lines 4-5) = "and Theodosius went off some distance from the monastery and gave himself over to the activity of practicing quietude".

11 Camblak implies that Euthymius learns about Sinaitic Hesychast doctrine of πράξις and θεωρία from Theodosius, for in the *Slovo poxvalno*, there is a scene in which Euthymius is an eye-witness to Theodosius' vision of the Taboric light: "zritъ duxovnosnago onogo ot glavy daže do nogy vъsego jako ognь, prava že stoǫšta, jakože Samuila pišetъ slovo..." (IV,33, lines 25-27) = "Euthymius saw the spiritual [Theodosius] standing up [covered in light] from head to toe as in a fire, as is written of Samuel in the Scriptures."

guidance and instruction of Theodosius, Euthymius became a practitioner himself of the quietist methods of prayer and contemplation that were embraced by the Hesychasts. The textual evidence to support the idea that both Theodosius and Euthymius were Hesychasts and participated in a Hesychastic monastic community is too abundant to be doubted or dismissed by scholars. Of Euthymius, Camblak states that he "loved the wilderness"[12], a common topos for Hesychastic hagiographic writings, as they advocated separation from the world and total seclusion in the desert. Furthermore, Camblak writes that when Euthymius returns later in his life to Bulgaria after spending the better part of a decade abroad, he lives in a cave cell in order to live in total silence.[13] Finally, after the fall of Trnovo to the Turks in 1393, Camblak writes that he cries tears of joy when he sees that the place of his exile conforms to his desire to live a life of seclusion.[14]

Presumably, Euthymius spent the next thirteen years of his life, from 1350 to 1363, under Theodosius' instruction at Kelifarevo. In these years, Euthymius developed spiritually and intellectually in this small, rural monastery that was not far from the royal capital. Because of Kelifarevo's

---

In another passage, Camblak emphasizes the extent to which Theodosius was influenced by Gregory the Sinaite: "Sъj Sinaijskago onogo i mnogago vъ bogoviděni Grigoria naslědova umnago žitia pravilo neprělьstnoe, iže Paraorskyą gory ispytnym razuma ustavom ni vъ česomže Sinajskyą otstaati gory upravi, i onogo ubo blažennyj Teodosie, sego že čjudnyj Evtimie priemnikъ žitiu i molitvě běše" (IV, 33, lines 12 - 18). = "This man [Theodosius] inherited the rule for mental living [i.e. living by mental praksis and prayer] from Gregory [the Sinaite], who had had many visions of God. [Gregory] through the tested rule of reason made the mountains of Paroria in no way different from Mount Sinai. And the blessed Theodosius continued this way of life and prayer from Gregory, and Euthymius from Theodosius."

12 Camblak writes: "sъ Ilieǫ i Ioannom [Evtimij] pustyną vъždelě" (II,30, line 22) = "Together with Ilias and John the Baptist, [Euthymius] loved the desert/wilderness."

13 Camblak writes: "no pešterǫ někǫą selenie tvorit, otstoǫštǫą gradskyą i vъsąkoǫ inoǫ mlъvy dovolno" (IX, 39-40, lines 30-31, line 1) = "but he made his home in a cave, removing himself from the squalor of the city and from all other noise."

14 Camblak writes: "Poneže na městě bystъ, ideže vedom běše, i pustyną vidą pustynoljubnaa ona duša i sъglasno togova želania sъmotri město, prosiъzy są..." (XX, 58, lines 3-6) = "Once he had arrived at the place where they led him, and viewing the wilderness and seeing that it was in accordance with his desires, his desert-loving soul wept."

proximity to the royal capital, Euthymius was no doubt aware of and influenced by cultural exchanges and ties with Constantinople. Theodosius had, after all, come to Kelifarevo after having studied on Mount Athos, so one may assume that he brought to his flock at Kelifarevo a comparatively high level of culture. During his stay on the Holy Mount, Theodosius would have had ample time to acquaint himself with the contents of the Greek and Slavic libraries available to him. Theodosius was also a personal friend and fellow student of the Byzantine patriarch, Kallistos[15], and he had studied under Gregory the Sinaite at Paroria[16], according to the *Life of Theodosius*. If the author of the *Life of Theodosius* (presumably Kallistos) is to be believed in these matters, then this has great consequences for our understanding of Euthymius' formation and education under Theodosius. It means that he was exposed through Theodosius to the current developments in Byzantine literary and religious culture, which included the writings and precepts of the Hesychasts.

There is no indication in the extant sources that Euthymius ever knew or even met Gregory the Sinaite; and if he had, Camblak, as Syrku points out, would very probably have mentioned it.[17] We can however state with confidence, based on the information in Camblak's panegyric, that Euthymius learned of Gregory's teachings from Theodosius, as stated

---

15 Unless otherwise noted, all quotes from the *Life of Theodosius* are taken from Zlatarski's edition "Житие и жизнь преподобнаго отца нашего Теодосия," *Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжина* (СбНУНК), №20, (София, 1904): 1-41, and are indicated by chapter (Roman numeral), page number and line number (in Arabic numerals).

At the beginning of chapter XXIV, Kallistos tells us that Theodosius, his former fellow student under Gregory the Sinaite, wrote to him: "Vъ sixъ ubo tomu suštu. i tělesnoju ugnětaemu boléźniju, izvolise tomu pisati kъ mně samo vъ konstantinovъ gradъ blagslovenia radi kupno i duhovnago naslaždenia. ovo ubo jako vъselijenskago patriarxa me viděti i blagoslovenie prieti. ovo že jako brata i sъučenika, edinomudrъno poslužívša bližennomu onomu i čjudnomu grigoriu sinaitu." (XXIV,31, lines 22-26) = "And thus these things having happened, [Theodosius] rid himself of his bodily illness and wrote to me in Constantinople for the sake of [receiving] blessing and spiritual delight. [He desired] to see me, the universal Patriarch, and receive my blessing. And he is like a brother to me, [for he was my] fellow-student; [we both] served with like mind that great and wonderful man, Gregory the Sinaite."

16 See chapter VI of the *Life of Theodosius*.

17 Сырку, op.cit.,251.

above. Furthermore, if Syrku is correct in his assertion that the works of Gregory the Sinaite were translated very early, both at Paroria and at Kelifarevo, then we can probably assume that Euthymius had access to manuscripts of his works while at Kelifarevo.[18]

Syrku observes that the monastery at Kelifarevo was organized according to the Sinaitic rule[19], though he points out that it is hard to know which version or variation of the Sinaitic rule was employed there.[20] As mentioned above, Euthymius was appointed by Theodosius to supervise the monastery, a detail from his life which Syrku claims can be implied from a certain passage from the Life of Theodosius.[21] Presumably, Euthymius would have also become acquainted there with Kiprian Camblak and possibly Roman of Vidin.[22]

The *Life of Theodosius* tells us that Theodosius made a journey to Constantinople accompanied by his pupils[23]; however, Euthymius is not mentioned amongst them by name.[24] In Camblak's panegyric, it is stated

---

18 Сырку, op.cit., 240, writes: "они [т.е. сочинения Григория Синаита] переведены были очень рано, может быть еще при жизни препод. Григория, частью на Пароия, а частью в Килифареве судя по тому, что славянские списки его творения начинаются еще с XIV века. " ("They [i.e. the works of Gregory the Sinaite] were translated very early, possibly even during his own lifetime. Parts [were translated] at Paroria and parts at Kelifarevo, judging from the fact that the Slavonic copies of his works begin to appear already in the 14th century.")

19 Сырку, op.cit., 241.

20 For a comparative study on Paroria and Mount Sinai, see В.С.Киселков, "Средновековна Парория и Синаитият монастир," *Сборник в чест на В.Н.Златарский*, 103-118, София, 1925.

21 See Сырку, op.cit., 250-251.

22 Сырку, op.cit., 250-252.

23 Apparently Theodosius did so at the displeasure of Patriarch Theodosius of Bulgaria who, according to Radčenko, feared that the monk Theodosius might engage in a collaborative plot with Kallistos against him. See К.Радченко, *Религиозное и литературное движение в Болгарии в эпоху перед турецким завоеванием*, Киев, 1898, p.187.

24 "vъšdь vъ někotoryi korabiь sъ četyrmi svoimi učeniky, i konstantinovь dostiže gradь." (XXIV, 32, lines 9-10) = "and [Theodosius] boarded a ship with four of his pupils, and he arrived in Constantinople."

that Euthymius was a member of Theodosius' entourage to Constantinople.[25] This trip took place in or about 1363.

Euthymius was abroad from approximately 1363 to 1371, and these eight years were spent acquiring his education at the Studion Monastery near Constantinople, at Mount Athos and, for a brief period, as a prisoner on the island of Lemnos. Precisely when all of these travels occurred after Euthymius had reached Constantinople cannot be ascertained; however, as it seems that Euthymius spent a total of eight years abroad, we can make two assumptions that stay well within the bounds of reason. The first assumption is that in eight years' time, Euthymius must have mastered Greek. At the very least, he must have perfected his reading and writing skills, for we know from Camblak that he made new translations of Scriptural texts from Greek into Church Slavonic.[26] There are also extant three anti-Bogomil epistles which Euthymius presumably wrote while in Constantinople (probably while at the Studion Monastery) to his fellow Bulgarians in Trnovo.[27] These epistles survive only in Greek, and Syrku suggests that these may well have been exercises for Euthymius in Greek composition.[28] This is important for scholars who are especially interested

---

25 "Varvarom jaže okrlъjstъ vъsě plěnuǫštim, ixže radi i ljubeznǫą onǫ pustyną ostavlъ, kupno sъ otclъjmъ vъ velikyj prixodit Konstantinovъ grad" (V,34, lines 18-20) = "On account of the barbarians, who were now all around and taking people captive, they left their beloved place in the wilderness. And [Euthymius] together with his [spiritual] father [Theodosius], travelled to the great city of Constantinople."

26 See Camblak, chap.IX, p.40, lines 22-30 and p. 41, lines 1-20.

27 The titles are: "ἐπιστολὴ Εὐθυμίου ἀσκητοῦ τῆς Περιβλέπτου μονῆς."/ "Ἐυθυμίου μοναχοῦ τῆς Περβλέπτου μονῆς. στηλιτεύουσα μερικῶς τῆς τῶν αὐτῶν αἱρέσεων"/ "Ἐπιστολή Ευθυμίου μοναχοῦ τῆς Περιβλέπτου μονῆς, σταλεῖσα ἀπὸ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ τῆς εἰρημένης μονῆς πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ πατρίδα, στιλιτεύουσα τὰς αἱρεσεις τῶν ἀθεωτάτων καὶ ἀσεβῶν πλάνων τῶν τε Φουνδαγιαγιτῶν ἤτοι Βουγομίλων καὶ Μασσαλιανῶν λεγομένων, καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἀρμενίων βεβηλὸν καὶ βδελυρὰν αἵρεσιν, καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς ἀθέσμους καὶ πάνυ βεβύλους αἱρέσεις". See Сырку, op.cit.,552, fn.4 for the bibliographical information for each.

28 Сырку, op.cit., 552-3. If these Greek epistles of Euthymius were indeed composed in Greek for a Bulgarian readership, then they provide ample demonstration that there is nothing irregular about the fact that one Bulgarian should write to or communicate with another Bulgarian in Greek as a *lingua franca*. We raise the point here as an important one, because I.Talev has tried to use the fact that some folia of the Tomić Psalter contain instructional margin notes in Greek to prove that there was no Trnovo school of manuscript illumination. See I.Talev, "The Impact of Middle Bulgarian on the Russian Literary Language (Post-Kievan Period)," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Los

in the aspect of Euthymius' career that concerns the much discussed and debated literary and orthographic reform.

The second assumption that we may make, which follows from the first, is that with a sound knowledge of Greek, Euthymius--in the libraries of the Studion and Athonite monasteries--was able to acquaint himself with much of Byzantine religious literature, especially hagiographic and homiletic literature. K. Ivanova has observed that in the scope of Bulgarian late medieval literature, Euthymius appears as a "sudden phenomenon."[29] This is true inasmuch as with Euthymius, the Metaphrastic norms of hagiographic stylistic composition are employed and perfected in Bulgarian writing. As we will examine at length in this study, Euthymius, in the content of his vitæ, shows himself to be the consummate Byzantine Hesychast, and in the realm of his literary style and aesthetics, he is a direct descendent of Metaphrastes. Euthymius' first teacher, Theodosius, was not a writer as far as we know, so one is left to assume that while Theodosius exercised the most profound influence on Euthymius' spiritual development as a practitioner of Hesychasm, it was probably Patriarch Kallistos of Constantinople (to whom is ascribed the authorship of both the *Life of Gregory the Sinaite* [30] and the *Life of Theodosius* [31]) that had the greater

---

Angeles, 1972, pp.28-31.Talev concludes that the artist doing the illuminations could not possibly have been Bulgarian. If he were, Talev maintains, the instructions would have been written in Bulgarian. Furthermore, if the artist were living in Trnovo, he would have received his instructions orally and not in written form.

First of all, the fact that there are written instructions does not prove anything as to where the artist lived in relation to Trnovo. Secondly, for the Bulgarians of Euthymius' day, the highest intellectual achievement was to become assimilated into the dominant Byzantine culture. For two Bulgarians to communicate with one another in Greek would have functioned as a kind of cultural status symbol, indicating their total assimilation into Byzantine culture.

[29] Cf. К.Иванова, "Патриарх Евтимий и агиографската традиция в средновековната литература," *Литературна мисъл* (1977): 90-99. On page 95 she writes: "Euthymius of Trnovo is, for original Bulgarian hagiography, a huge and, in a certain sense, sudden phenomenon. On our soil he has practically no predecessors in the [hagiographic] genre." (The original passage reads: "За оригиналната българска агиография Евтимий Търновски е едно голямо и в известен смисъл внезапно явление. На наша почва той почти няма жанрови предшественици.")

[30] For the published text of the Greek original, see И.В.Помяловский, *Житье иже во святых отца нашего Григория Синаита*, Записки историческо-философского факультета Ст-Петербургского Университета, №35, Санкт-Петербург: Тип.

influence on Euthymius as a writer. This is meant, however, in a different sense from what is meant by most scholars who work on the question of fourteenth-century Byzantine and Slavic hagiography. Many scholars take the view that Kallistos' writings are examples of a specifically Hesychastic style of writing that is then reflected in the next generation of writers, the most prominent example being Euthymius.[32] We reject completely the notion of a Hesychastic style of writing (as subsequent sections of this study show) and see only Hesychastic themes or content within the vitæ by Kallistos and Euthymius. The literary style of their texts is, however, entirely Metaphrastic in spirit and contains not a single stylistic element that can be attributed specifically to Hesychasm. Both Kallistos and Euthymius, we maintain, should not be viewed, in terms of the stylistic qualities of their works, as Hesychast writers but rather as writers who both emerged from a shared post-Metaphrastic tradition. Only within the realm of content --i.e. who their heroes are and how their heroes attain their sanctity--can they be viewed correctly as Hesychast writers. It is possible that Kallistos introduced Euthymius to post-Metaphrastic norms of hagiographic composition; on the other hand, it is also possible that Euthymius came across Greek examples of hagiographic texts written in the Metaphrast high style while studying in Byzantium. If Kallistos indeed wrote the two vitæ in question, then his primarily influence on Euthymius would probably have been to introduce him to the process of creating specifically Hesychastic themes in hagiographic literature. Either by example or through his own imagination, Euthymius was able to create out

---

Императорской Академии наук, 1896. A published edition of the Slavonic translation of this vita may be found in П.А. Сырку, "Житие Григория Синаита составленное константинопольским патриархом Каллистом, Текст славянскаго перевода Жития по рукописи XVI века и историко-археологическое введение," *Памятники древних письменности и исскуства*, № 172 (СПб, 1909):1-48. For secondary literature, cf. А. Яцимирский, "Из критико-литературных наблюдений над житьем Григория Синаита," *Византийский временник* 15, №2-3 (1908): 300-331; and A.E. Tachiaos, "Gregory Sinaite's Legacy to the Slavs: Preliminary Remarks," *Cyrillomethodianum* 7 (1983): 113-166.

31 See fn.15 for bibiographical information on the *Life of Theodosius*.

32 See, for example, R. Richardson, "Hesychasm in the Hagiographic Works of Patriarch Kallistos," Ph.D.Dissertation, Harvard University, 1969.

of Ivan of Rila, Hilarion of Moglena, Petka-Paraskeva and Philothea paragons of Hesychastic virtue.

After Euthymius and Theodosius reached Constantinople in 1363, Theodosius died there.[33] Euthymius then went to the Studion Monastery near the imperial city.[34] Syrku maintains that we do not know how long he was there[35], while Dinekov writes that Euthymius was there "about a year."[36] Euthymius apparently lived in the Peribleptos Monastery near Studion, where there was a community of Slavic monks.[37] The inscriptions to Euthymius' aformentioned epistles[38], which state that he was a monk at Peribleptos, corroborate this.

From Constantinople, Euthymius travelled to Mount Athos. Syrku hypothesizes that he went there in 1365, after Kallistos went to Serbia.[39] Syrku points out that if his date is correct, then Euthymius' residence in the Great Laura of Athanasius would have coincided with Philotheos' stay there. Philotheos was patriarch of Constantinople from 1354 to 1355 and again from 1364 to 1376.

After having spent some time in the Laura, Euthymius moved, although it is not known when, to the Bulgarian monastery of Zograph.[40]

---

33 Both the *Life of Theodosius* (chaps.XXIV-XXVII, pp.31-33) and Camblak's *Slovo poxvalno* (V, 34, lines 20-23) confirm this.

34 Camblak writes: "Svědětelstvuǫtь togovy poty i trudy vъ tělě i ešte obrětaǫšte są Studijiskią obitěli inoci, svědětele izvěstni i prěpodobnago Atanasia lavry žitele i vъseǫ Atonskyą gory bezmlъvnici" (VI,35, lines 12-15).

35 Сырку, *К истории исправления книг*, 552.

36 Динеков, "Евтимий Търновски," 286.

37 See Сырку, op.cit.,552. Cf. Turdeanu (op.cit., 66-68) and Динеков (op.cit., 285-307); they make no mention of the Peribleptos Monastery.

38 See fn.27.

39 Сырку, op.cit., 553, writes: "Из Константинопля Евтимий переехал на Атон, по всей вероятности, в 1365 г., т.е. после отправления патриарха Каллиста в Сербию" ("From Constantinople, Euthymius went to Athos, in all probability in 1365, that is, after Kallistos went to Serbia.")

40 See Сырку, op.cit., 554.

Camblak tells us that once on Athos, Euthymius had a very unpleasant confrontation with the Byzantine emperor, John V Paleologue. In 1370, when the emperor was traveling back to Constantinople from Rome, he was convinced by some of the monks on Athos--presumably enemies of Euthymius who had grown to despise him for his sincerity and sanctity--that Euthymius was in the possession of riches that did not belong to him. Euthymius allowed the emperor to search his belongings and his cell, but he remained unconvinced of the truth of Euthymius' words and exiled him to the island of Lemnos as a prisoner in 1371.[41] The theme of false monks or heretics contriving and plotting to cause trouble for a holy man whose reverence and piety they cannot tolerate is a topos of hagiographic literature. It is important to remember that Camblak's work is not a chronicle or annal but a panegyric which, like the vita, had as its main purpose that of edifying its audience. Inasmuch as the social function of these genres was didactic and preceptive and not the preservation of historical fact for posterity, authors of such works often combined fact with fiction in order to paint a portrait of the hero that would increase his or her sanctity in the eyes of the audience or readership. With this in mind, we are inclined to approach the historical accuracy of Euthymius' imprisonment on Lemnos with a certain amount of caution until another historical source can be located that supports it.[42]

In that same year, 1371, Euthymius returned to his native country and became the hegemon (abbot) of the Trinity Monastery near Trnovo. It was there that the famous "Trnovo School" was located.[43] According to

---

[41] See chap.VIII, p.38, lines 4-13 of Camblak's *Slovo poxvalno*. V.S.Kiselkov suggests that the actual reason for Euthymius' imprisonment may have been his open opposition to the tsar's policies with Rome. See В.С.Киселков, *Патриарх Евтимий*, София: Светият Синод на Българската църква, 1938, pp.16-17.

[42] See К.Радченко, *Религиозное и литературное движение в Болгарии в эпоху перед турецким завоеванием*, Киев, 1898, pp.250-251. Radčenko believes that the only element of Camblak's story about Euthymius' imprisonment on Lemnos to be true is the imprisonment itself. He questions the circumstances surrounding it, reminding the reader that in the mid-1360s a war had broken out between Byzantium and Bulgaria. He goes on to suggest that there may have been political reasons why the Byzantine emperor exiled Euthymius.

[43] See Петър Динеков, "Търновската книжовна школа (история, основни черти, значение)," *Старобългарска литература* 20 (1987):3-19.

Camblak's panegyric, it was at this time, before his incumbency as patriarch, that Euthymius undertook the task of making new translations of Greek Scriptural texts into Bulgarian because, according to Camblak, the older translations that existed in Bulgarian were incorrect and led many to heresies because of their imprecision at expressing the content of the original Greek.[44]

Euthymius' incumbency as patriarch did not begin until 1375, and one is left to assume, for lack of other information regarding his previous whereabouts, that he remained as hegemon of the Trinity Monastery until that time. Turdeanu writes that Tsar Ivan Šišman built the Trinity Monastery in 1371-1372.[45] Syrku, on the other hand, believes that the Monastery was already in existence before 1363 when Euthymius went to Byzantium. He posits that Tsar Ivan Šišman simply endowed the monastery with monies and gifts.[46]

The topic of the Euthymian literary and orthographic reform will be dealt with below, but suffice it to mention here that many scholars believe Trinity Monastery to have become, under Euthymius' direction, a center of Slavic literary and religious culture unparalleled in Bulgaria. Dinekov writes:

> From this passage of the panegyric of Camblak, it is obvious that in the monastery of the Holy Trinity, Euthymius undertook and accomplished his book reform. This was a matter of enormous importance for Bulgarian literature of that time and it lent even greater prestige to Euthymius.[47]

---

[44] See chapter IX, pages 40-41. This passage will be examined in detail below.

[45] Turdeanu, op.cit.,68.

[46] Сырку, op.cit.,559. Bogdanov concurs with Syrku on this point. See Иван Богданов, *Кратка история на българската литература*. том I, Литература на възраждането, София: Народа просвета, 1969, p. 139. He writes: "С подкрепата на Иван Шишман Евтимий възстановява стария запустял манастир в клисурата на Янтра, на север от града 'Св.Троица', и се установява там, като привлича ученици."

[47] See Динеков, "Евтимий Търновски," 288. The original passage reads: "От тоя цитат на похвално слово на Григорий Цамблак се вижда, че в манастира 'Св. Троица' Евтимий е предприел и извършил своята книжовна реформа. Това е било дело от голямо значение за тогавашната българска литература и то е издигнало още по-високо престижа на Евтимий."

The year of Euthymius' return to Bulgaria, 1371, coincides with two major events in the country. In that year Tsar Ivan Alexander died, and the long patriarchate of Theodosius II came to an end (1348-1371). The tsar's death may have prompted his return; however, in considering hypothetically the reasons why Euthymius did not choose to remain in Constantinople after an alleged prison term on Lemnos, one should not dispense with the possibility that Euthymius was, in 1371, being considered for the position of patriarch. After his many years studying under Theodosius of Trnovo at Kelifarevo and after a total of eight years abroad (six or seven of which were presumably spent on Athos) during which time he came to know the patriarchs Kallistos and Philotheos personally, Euthymius would have been seen by his fellow countrymen as highly qualified for the post. He was a devout Christian, his spiritual mentor enjoyed prestige in Trnovo and in Constantinople, he was well connected with the Orthodox Church in Byzantium through his associations with the Hesychast patriarchs there, he was outspoken against current heresies at home[48], he knew Greek, and he was possibly of noble birth. If the story of Euthymius' exile to Lemnos is true, then another possibile reason for Euthymius' return to Bulgaria in 1371 could have been that he considered it too dangerous to remain in Constantinople after already having had trouble with the emperor. After four years as hegemon of the Trinity Monastery, Euthymius, in 1375, was chosen to succeed Ioanikij (1372-75) as patriarch of Bulgaria, and the choice was "unanimous".[49]

Euthymius' original literary output will be discussed below. Suffice it here to say that the years of his patriarchate were his most productive as a writer. It was during this period that he wrote the saints' lives and the panegyrics.[50] In addition to his literary contribution to the church, Euthymius must have been seen as an authority on dogma and morality, for

---

48 Cf. К.Радченко, op.cit.; Георги Данчев, "Отношение Евфимия Тырновского к еретическим учениям, распространявшимся в болгарских землях," *Byzantinobulgarica* 6 (1980): 95-113.

49 Camblak writes: "i jako ot sъglašenia někoego kupno vъsi edina ustna běxǫ i edin glas, prosąšte Evtimia" (XI,43,lines 19-20) = "and thus in accord they all expressed the same [opinion] and asked Euthymius [to be patriarch]."

50 Динеков, "Евтимий Търновски," 288.

we have Euthymius' response in epistolary form to the Hungaro-Wallachian metropolitan Anthim on the subject of marriage and on the decline of morality in the country.[51] Moreover, Camblak's panegyric emphasizes Euthymius' position as an oustanding teacher[52] and writer.[53] The hegemon of the Tismana Monastery in Wallachia, Nicodemus, called upon Euthymius to clarify some questions of dogma.[54] Euthymius apparently maintained ties with the Russian Church through his relative Kiprian Camblak, the metropolitan of Kiev, who came to visit him in Trnovo in 1379 on his way to Constantinople and is commemorated in Grigorij Camblak's eulogy to Kiprian.[55]

In 1393 the Turkish sultan Bayezid (reigned 1389-1402) captured Trnovo. Camblak's panegyric gives an account of Bayezid's arrival in Trnovo. According to him, Euthymius bravely stood up to Bayezid and, as a result, was honored at the sultan's table before his eventual exile. The other primary sources on the fall of Trnovo are Camblak's tale of the translation of the relics of St. (Petka) Paraskeva from Trnovo to Vidin[56] and the *Life of Patriarch Philotheos* written by one of his pupils, Joseph.

According to Camblak, the Turks killed one hundred and ten boyars (noblemen) in the church in Trnovo. Having tricked the boyars into believing that they were calling a general meeting there, the Turks then

---

51 ibid.

52 "Abie vъzyde na učitelskyj prěstolъ i abieže o svoeplemennom iměše milovanie i děly javlenno tvoréše" (XI,43,lines 24-25) = "and he immediately ascended the preceptor's throne and moreover prayed for his fellow countrymen and he did many deeds [for them]".

53 "Kotoryj bo ązykъ, Blъgarskomu sъglasenъ věštaniju, togovaa sъpisania ne priątъ, togovaa učenia, togovy trudy i poty" (XV,49, lines 19-21) = "And what people speaking [a language] similar to Bulgarian did not receive his writings, his teachings, his labors and toils?"

54 Turdeanu, op.cit.,69.

55 See Turdeanu, op.cit., 69. The eulogy has been published as "Надгробное слово Григория Цамблака Росийскому Архиепископу Киприяну" in the *Чтения московского университета*, 1872, I, pp. 27-28.

56 See Kałużniacki *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393)*, Vienna, 1901; Reprint, London: Variorum Reprints, 1971, pp.437-450.

slaughtered them. Euthymius was apparently given the opportunity to become Muslim but refused.[57] He was driven out of the patriarchal church of the Ascension and was arrested.[58] The Turks then abolished the Bulgarian patriarchate and handed the Church over to the authority of Constantinople. Jeremiah, a Greek, who had been serving as Metropolitan of Moldavia was made bishop of Trnovo.[59] According to Camblak, he was stripped and was brought to the wall of the city where they were going to kill him in a public spectacle. Then, in a scene most reminiscent of the miraculous events of hagiographic narrative, we read that the executioner lifted his axe to smite Euthymius, but it fell out of his hands, and the executioner stood there motionless.

According to Camblak, Euthymius was then sent as a prisoner into exile to "Macedonia."[60] Dinekov matains that Camblak is actually referring to the south of Thrace, an area "that was probably considered at that time to be a part of Macedonia."[61] Euthymius died somewhere there, it is

---

57 See Syrku, op.cit., 585-6.

58 Camblak writes: "I ąkože doblestvenъ někyj voevoda, poběždenъ ot suprotivnyx, ne daetь plešti v koněcь, no, paky sъvokǫplь są, sъstavląetь pobědu, tako i on. Poneže ot crlъkve otgnanъ bystь, vъ drǫgǫju vъxoditь, ąže na imą vrьxovnyx osvąštenna bě..." (XVI,51, lines 25-29)

59 Turdeanu, op.cit.,68. See also Section I, chapter 2, fn.65. There is an extant epistle of Patriarch Matthew of Constantinople (1397-1419), which is dated 1401. The epistle comemmorates the placement of Jeremiah to the post in Trnovo. Quoted in Kiselkov in Slavonic translation (Киселков, *Патриарх Евтимий*, София, 1938, p.152).

60 Camblak writes: "Izvoli są varvaru po čjudesi semь prěselenie sъtvori ljudem na vъstokь (sice bo i povelěnia careva istązuaxǫ), božia že člověka vъ Makedonię zatočena otpustiti" (XIX,55, lines 24-27).

61 Динеков, "Евтимий Търновски," 289: "Изворите не дават по-точни данни за заточението на Евтимий; според Григорий Цамблак търновци били преселени на изток (вероятно в Мала-Азия), а Евтимий бил заточен в 'Македония' (на юг от Тракия, в област, която е влизала тогава в географското понятие Македония)." ("The sources do not give more detailed facts about the imprisonment of Euthymius; according to Grigorij Camblak, the residents of Trnovo were sent to the east [probably to Asia Minor], and Euthymius was imprisoned in 'Macedonia' [to the south of Thrace, the region which was understood at the time to form a part of Macedonia].")

thought, between the years 1401 and 1412.[62] Syrku writes that the notion that Euthymius went to Bačkovo Monastery, south of Phillipopolis (Plovdiv) was originally suggested by Kačanovskij and that this notion was fabricated.[63] Syrku maintains that we cannot be sure where in "Macedonia" Euthymius went. He says that, to be sure, Euthymius did not go to Athos, as Kačanovskij had suggested, for there is no evidence for this in the Athonite sources.[64] As H. Goldblatt has pointed out, however, the Loveč codex states explicity that Euthymius was exiled to the city of Stanimaka (Asenograd) at the monastery of "Petriotisa" (Bačkovo).[65]

---

[62] Camblak writes that Euthymius has "survived even up to our day" (IX,40-41, lines 17-28; line 1). Goldblatt (op.cit.,25) writes that Camblak's panegyric "probably was completed shortly after [Camblak] was consecrated metropolitan of Kiev by the local bishops in 1415." This would mean, then, that Euthymius was alive in 1415; or, it means that Euthymius had died earlier than 1415, but Camblak had not yet heard of his death when he wrote the panegyric.

Kostenečki's *Skazanie,* writes Goldblatt (op.cit.,25) "was compiled sometime between 1423 and 1426." In chapter II of the Skazanie, Kostenečki also refers to Euthymius as living. He writes: "Euthymius, who truly revealed himself to be and even now is a light for those lands..." (Goldblatt, 114). This last statement is, however, ambiguous. Kostenečki could mean that the legacy of Euthymius' toils is still a source of inspiration even though the man himself may already be dead.

[63] Syrku, op.cit., 591. He writes: "Сообщение г. Качановского было бы чрезвычайно интересно, если бы нельзя было заподозрить г. Качановского в примышлении этого предания." (= "The information given by Mr. Kačankovskij would be very interesting if there were no grounds to suspect Mr. Kačankovskij of fabricating this tradition.") The work of Kačanovskij to which Syrku refers is "Новые данные для изучения литературной деятельности болгарского Тырновского патриарха Евтимия," *Христианское Чтение* 3-4 (1888): 470-497, p.472.

[64] Syrku, op.cit., 591-2.

[65] H. Goldblatt, op.cit.,52, fn.42. Goldblatt gives the passage from the Loveč codex as published by J.Trifonov in "Живот и дейност на Константина Костенецки" *Списание на Българската академия на науките* 66 (1943): 223-292, pp.291-2: "Togda i Eufimie bě, vъ stěniměxъ izganěetsę. ideže i konecъ žitiju priemъ. mnogaa pisania izъostavivъ izložena o žitiax stxъ...crkvy že petriotisi pad'šisędo osnovania ot nečъstivyx vrěmenъ vladęštixъ." In the same footnotes, Goldblatt writes: "As Vasil Pandurski [in "Панегирикът на дяк Андрей от 1425 г. Търновска книжовна школа", т.I, 1974:225-241] has pointed out, this is a clear reference to the monastery of Bačkovo, which is called 'Petriotisa' ('Petrizos') in the constitution that was drawn up by Gregory Pacurianus (Bakuriani) shortly after he founded the house in 1083."

See Kiselkov's summary of an archeological finding from a burial site at Bačkovo in 1905. Claims were made at the time that the grave of Patriarch Euthymius had been found,

The Literary Works of Patriarch Euthymius:

Euthymius was the author of several original hagiographic, panegyrical and epistolary works--some of which propagandized against the Manichaeans and the Bogomils--and a church service.[66] Modern scholarship has also attributed to him the status of literary and orthographic reformer. This will be examined in detail below. Here we will deal with Euthymius' achievements as writer and opponent of heresies.

In addition to the four saints' lives translated and analyzed in this study, Euthymius was the author of four panegyrics: 1) the panegyric to Constantine and Helena, 2) to Nedela, 3) to Michael of Potuka, and 4) to John, bishop of Polybotum. There are also four extant epistles by Euthymius in addition to those which were presumably written by him but only extant in Greek (see above): two epistles to the monk Nicodemus of the Tismana Monastery in Romania, who asked his advise on ecclesiastical matters[67]; an epistle to Kiprian Camblak, archbishop of Russia, who addressed Euthymius on questions regarding ascetic life; and an epistle to Anthim, the metropolitan of the Hungario-Wallachian lands, to whom Euthymius responded in detail concerning moral questions.[68] In addition to the vitæ, panegyrics and epistles, there is one extant service to Empress Theophano, consort of the Byzantine Emperor Leo VI (886-912). Euthymius also did some translations of texts that have survived to our day. Most of them are contained in the so-called Služebnik of Patriarch

---

but these claims were never substantiated. See В.С.Киселков, *Патриарх Евтимий*, София, 1938, pp.171-175.

66 The original and translated works of Euthymius are collected by Kałużniacki in his collection*Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393)*, Vienna, 1901; Reprint, London, 1971. All references throughout this dissertation to the works of Euthymius are taken from this collection and are cited by chapter number (Roman numerals) and page number (Arabic numerals).

For brief summaries on the content of Euthymius' works, see В.С.Киселков, *Патриарх Евтимий*, София, 1938, pp.187-313.

67 See V. Ćorović, "Посланица бугарског патријарха Јевтимија Тисменском архимандриту Никодиму," *Јужнословенски филолог* (1932-34): 162-165.

68 See Syrku, op.cit.,573-4 for a general discussion.

Euthymius and appear in critical editions by both Kałużniacki[69] and Syrku.[70] Of those translations in the Służebnik that Kałużniacki considers to be of undisputable authorship ("unzweifelhafte Übersetzungen des Patriarchen Euthymius"[71]) are: 1) a prosthesis to the liturgy of John Chrysostom by Patriarch Philotheos[72], 2) the prayer on the turning away of Epidemius[73], 3) a prayer on the occasion of the induction of a new bishop, archbishop or metropolitan[74], 4) a prayer of thanks and earnest supplication[75], 5) a prayer on the beginning of a new indiction[76], 6) a prayer on the onset of a drought[77], 7) a prayer for the emperor/tsar.[78] Other translations contained in the Służebnik that appear in Kałużniacki's edition he considers to be of questionable authenticity; these are classified by Kałużniacki as "zweifelhafte Übersetzungen".These are: 1) a liturgy of John Chrysostom[79], and 2) two liturgies of Basil the Great.[80] There are also various translated prayers contained in the Służebnik and an introduction to the Służebnik, all of which do not appear in Kałużniacki's

---

69 See E.Kałużniacki, *Werke*, 279-436.

70 See П.А.Сырку, *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV веке*, том 2, Литургические труды патриарха Евтимия, Санкт-Петербург, 1890; Reprint, London: Variorum Reprints, 1972.

71 Kałużniacki, op.cit., vi.

72 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 283-306; and Сырку, op.cit., 1-31.

73 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 335-340; and Сырку, op.cit., 78-81.

74 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 341-343; and Сырку, op.cit., 81-82.

75 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 344-345; and Сырку, op.cit., 83-84.

76 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 346-350; and Сырку, op.cit., 84-86.

77 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 351-352; and Сырку, op.cit., 86-87.

78 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 353-354; and Сырку, op.cit., 88.

79 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 357-373; and Сырку, op.cit., 32-44.

80 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 374-402; and Сырку, op.cit., 44-65.

edition but do appear in Syrku's edition.[81] Two other liturgies translated by Euthymius but not included in the Služebnik are 1) the liturgy of James, which Kałużniacki believed definitely to have been translated by Euthymius[82], and 2) the liturgy of Peter, which appears only in Syrku's edition.[83]

Camblak emphasizes in his panegyric that, as a writer, Euthymius had come to enjoy fame throughout the Slavic-speaking lands[84] and that he had distinguished himself as a teacher of his people.[85] Camblak also explicitly states that Euthymius protected the Orthodox faith in Bulgaria against the "various heresies", including the "Saracen" heresy (i.e. Islam).[86] Moreover, the epistles in Greek mentioned above demonstrate that Euthymius was active in combatting Bogomilism.[87] The Bogomils, as well as the Manichaeans and the Armenians, became the focus of Euthymius' theological polemic in the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena*.[88]

---

81 See Сырку, op.cit., 66-109 and 110-148, respectively.

82 Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., 307-334; and Сырку, op.cit., 179-218.

83 See Сырку, op.cit., 221-231.

84 See fn.53.

85 See fn.52.

86 "ovi ubo različnyx eresej jako ot jazъ svobaždaaxǫ są, ovi že Sarakinskago nečьstia tъmǫ otběgaaxǫ" (XX,58, lines 14-16) = "Some freed themselves [under Euthymius' guidance] from various heresies as from a knot, and others fled the darkness of the Saracen heresy."

87 Сырку, op.cit.,552. For general information on the Bogomil movement, cf. D.Obolensky, *The Bogomils*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948; Д.Ангелов, *Богомилството в България*, София: Наука и изкуство, 1980; I.Dujčev, "I Bogomili nei paesi slavi e la loro storia," In *Medioevo bizantino-slavo.*,vol.1, 251-282, Storia e letteratura, raccolta di studi e testi, 102, Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1965; P.Kolendarov, "On the Initial Hearth and Centre of the Bogomil Teaching," *Byzantinobulgarica* 6 (1980): 237-242; and Janko Lavrin, "The Bogomils and Bogomilism," *Slavonic Review* 8 (1929-1930): 269-283. J.Fine offers a fresh look at the actual representation of the group on the Balkans in his study "The Size and Significance of the Bulgarian Bogomil Movement," *East European Quarterly* 11, no.4 (Winter, 1977): 385-412.

88 See our translation in Section II, chapter 3.

According to Camblak, Euthymius also countered the pro-Barlaamite faction in Bulgaria. In chapter XII of Camblak's panegyric we meet Piron (or Piropul), who is pro-Nestorian, pro-Barlaamite and an Iconoclast. He comes to Trnovo from Constantinople to spread his beliefs amongst the Bulgarians. Despite his efforts to sway the people of Trnovo away from Orthodoxy, they are saved and preserved from heresy through Euthymius' prayers.[89]

Concerning the general nature of Euthymius' activities against heresies, Turdeanu writes the following:

> Dans les jours ténébreux que vivait alors la Bulgarie, la mission du patriarche de Trnovo se révéla particulièrement difficile. De nombreuses hérésies se faisaient jours dans le chaos moral du siècle. Euthyme s'éleva contre elles par des écrits et des sermons. Contre la décadence des moeurs et la ségrégation de la famille par les divorces et par la vie en marge des lois, le Patriarche mena une lutte qui retentit non seulement dans le milieu de la capitale, mais aussi au delà du Danube, où le métropolite de Valachie, Anthime, suivait son example.[90]

Dinekov interprets Euthymius' activities in teaching against the heresies as the result of an illusion that Bulgaria could be saved from its demise or fall by the restoration of morality and by the renewal of monasticism through asceticism and quietude (i.e. the doctrine of Hesychasm).[91] This may indeed be the case, and if it is, then our own assertion regarding the

---

89 "na veliką bědu kolébaxu pravoslavnoe stado, poneže obyče poslušnoe ravné i v dobrýx i vъ zlyx revnovati načalьstvujuštim. Čto ubo nebesnyj onъ člověkъ? Ąko sie uvédé, trębam svąštennikь onéx upodobivъ svoj gortanь, imiže Erixonьskya stény padoša, i sta mężьsky k nizloženiju gubitelstva onogo, dlьjnemь ljudi zbiraą vъ crlьjkovь i six potvrьždaą, nastavląą, réštaą nedouménnaą, obličaą zlyą plevely, vъ noštex že, molą są sъ slezami, prošaše sъvyše ot boga pomoštej" (XII,46,lines 13-22).

90 Turdeanu, op.cit.,69.

91 Динеков, "Евтимий Търновски," 288: "Евтимий се е стремел да помогне на страната в тия тежки дни, да запази кораба на държавата от все повече приближаващата се катастрофа...Той живее с илюзията, че това може да стане чрез отстраняване на нравствената поквара и издигане морала на населението (оттук борбата му срещу упадъка на брака срещу разводите, срещу разпуснатостта на нравите по време на храмовите празници в околните търновски манастири); чрез обновяване на монашеството по пътя на аскетизма и исихазма."

distinctly different role played by Hesychasm in Bulgaria as opposed to Byzantium is corroborated: namely, that Hesychasm for fourteenth-century Bulgaria served primarily as a means of combatting ascetic laxity and threatening heresies; whereas in Byzantium, Hesychasm came to the forefront of religious discussion because of conflicts within the Church.[92]

The Literary Reforms of Euthymius: New Translations and a Revised Orthography:

As a religious writer, Hesychast, and church prelate, Euthymius has received much attention in medieval Slavic studies. Within the realm of his activities as a writer, Euthymius is credited with having imbued his writings with the spirit of Hesychasm, and it has often been claimed that Euthymius' own committment to express Hesychastic tenets in his writings -- especially his hagiographic works -- gave rise to a "new style" of ornamental prose known as "word-weaving" or "pletenie sloves". The question of whether this style was indeed new and to what extent, if any, it had anything to do with the quietist movement forms the central focus of this study.

A. Camblak's Account

There are other aspects of Euthymius' career that must be addressed here. In addition to being credited with the innovation and elaboration of a literary style that was connected with the Hesychasts, Euthymius is also celebrated for the establishment of the so-called "Trnovo School", where presumably he undertook new translations of texts and an orthographic reform. In his panegyric, Camblak makes no mention of an orthographic reform, but he states clearly that Euthymius made new translations of "divine books" from Greek texts because the existing Slavonic translations were incorrect[93]; moreoever, Camblak complains that these bad

---

92 This concept is dealt with in Section IV, chapter 1 of this study.

93 "Kotoraa sia? Prěpisanie božьstvnyx knigь ot Elladskago ązyka na Blьgarskyj. I da ne kto, slyšavь sia glagoląšta mą, vьznepštuetь nas ot istiny vьnę isxoditi, za eže knigamь Blьgarskym mnogymi lěty starějšim i ot samyx načąlь krьštenia ązyka onogo sǫštim, nǫ i velikago vь svątyx sego, samyą tyą učivša knigy, daže do dlьžnij našixь dostigšago. Věm sie i azь i něstь inako" (IX,40, lines 22-28; 41, line 1).=

translations were not only simple in style but had distorted the meaning of the church dogmas, resulting in heresies and the perishing of Bulgarian souls.[94]

As we have already seen above, Euthymius translated some liturgical and paraliturgical texts as well. Camblak also states clearly that Euthymius had studied the early Slavic translations of sacred books; so in this way, presumably, Euthymius was able to compare the content that he had learned from them with the Greek originals that he would have seen either in Bulgaria or during his eight years abroad in Constantinople and on Mount Athos. The meaning of this passage from Camblak leads us to conclude that even if Euthymius indeed undertook an orthographic reform

---

"What are these matters? The translation of the divine books from the Hellenic language into Bulgarian. And let no one who hears these things think that I have led us away from the truth, for the Bulgarian books are many years older and have been in existence since the very beginning of the baptism of the people. But this man [Euthymius], great among holy men, who has reached even unto our days, studied these very books. I know this and it is no other way." (English translation taken from Goldblatt, op.cit.,33)

94 "Nǫ prъvii prěvoditele, ili za eže Ellinskago ązyka že i učenia ne vъ konecъ věděti ili za eže svoego ązyka debelosti služiti, ąže izdašą knigy, nesložny vъ rěčex javišą są i razuměniju grъčьskyix pisanij nesъglasny, debelstvom že svązany i ne gladky kъ tečeniju glagolьnomu i tъkmo ot eže imenovati są blagočьstivyix knigy věrnoe iměxǫ, mnog že vrěd vъ nix kryaše są i istinnym dogmatom sъprotivlenie. Těmže mnogy eresi ot six proizydošą, jaže vъsě drevnéa vtoryj sъj zakonopodavecъ upraznivъ, jakože někyą bogopisannyą skrižali, sъ vysoty umnyą gory sъšed i rǫkama nosą, imiže i trudi są, crlъkvi prědastъ skrovište vъ istinnǫ nebesnoe, vъsě nova, vъsě čьstna, evaggeliu sъglasna, nepokolěbima vъ krěposti dogmatom, jako živa voda blagočьstivyx dušam, jako nožь eretičьskym ązykom, jako ognь tex licom, i vъpiaše sъ Pavlom: 'Drevnéa mimoidošą, se byšą vъsě nova.'" (IX,41, lines 2-18) =

"But the first translators, either because they were not fully acquainted with the Hellenic language and doctrine or because they made use of the coarse [elements] in their own language, brought forth books which revealed themselves to be simple in the expressions and not consonant with the meaning of the Greek Scriptures. [These books] were compiled in a coarse way and were rough in the flow of expressions. And only because they were called holy books were they accepted as correct. But they concealed in themselves many errors and were not in agreement with the true dogmas. Thereupon many heresies arose from them. When he [Euthymius] had destroyed all the old [books], this second lawgiver, descending from atop of the spiritual mountain and carrying in his hands [the books] (similar to the Tablets written by God) at which he had labored, delivered to the Church in truth a heavenly treasure--all new, all true, in accord with the Gospel, unshakable in the force of the dogmas, like the water of life for the souls of the pious, like a knife for the tongues of the heretics, like fire for their [heretics'] faces. And he cried out with Paul: 'The old has passed away. Behold! Everything has become new' [2 Cor.5:17].'" (English translation taken from Goldblatt, op.cit.,33).

that aimed to archaize the codification of Church Slavonic in what was perceived at the time to be the Cyrillo-Methodian state of the language, he was clearly dissatisfied with the content of the texts that had been written in the generation just after the Cyrillo-Methodian mission.[95]

Mathiesen underlines the fact that the "metalinguistic tradition" of the Cyrillo-Methodian period is quite different from the "metalinguistic tradition" of the Euthymian period; and this difference helps to explain why Euthymius would have considered a linguistic reform to be necessary. While the Cyrillo-Methodian metalinguistic tradition was concerned with shaping and establishing a Slavic vernacular for religious purposes, the Euthymian metalinguistic tradition was primarily focused on ensuring that that vernacular (Church Slavonic) enjoy equal prestige with Greek:

> Under the Euthymian tradition the norms of Church Slavonic were reshaped not so much in response to the structures of various languages -- Greek, earlier types of Church Slavonic, or Slavic vernaculars -- as in defense against the ever-present danger of accidentally heretical expression and the threatening prestige of the Greek metalinguistic tradition. Church Slavonic was no longer simply another language, a vehicle of communication and communion with men and God, but an icon of given theological truth as well. And this icon was primarily visual rather than auditory, for only the written form of Church Slavonic, with its system of antistoecha, was really capable of serving as such an icon; the spoken form of Church Slavonic, with its numerous cases of theologically dangerous homophony, would have to pattern itself after the written form to be able to serve in this capacity...Under the spell of these attitudes the artificial character of Church Slavonic ceased to be a mere fact, and became a part of the ardently desired ideal which created the Euthymian tradition.[96]

---

95 In her doctoral dissertation, ("The History and Historiography of the Second South Slavic Influence," Yale University, 1977) M. Iovine summarizes the scholarship on the topic. On page 15, she writes: "According to a generally accepted view in the historiographic tradition, Euthymius and his school, with the support and approval of the Bulgarian monarch, initiated a program of orthographic reform in the written Church Slavic language of the fourteenth century Bulgaria. They also undertook a comprehensive correction of the liturgical books through the usage of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition and the original Greek texts as models. Euthymius and his followers produced numerous retranslations, completely new translations, and their own original works clothed in a newly elaborated rhetorical style."

96 R.Mathiesen, "The Inflectional Morphology of the Synodal Church Slavonic Verb," Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1972, p.37-8.

The concern that Church Slavonic enjoy equal prestige with Greek is articulated in passages from extant writings of some learned Slavs of Euthymius' day. Clearly there was not only concern that the existing Slavonic translations of Greek texts were inaccurate (a fear that is expressed explicity by Konstenečki), but also the concern that Church Slavonic lacked the refinement and elegance of Greek. This opinion is voiced by the monk Isaiah in the colophon to his Church Slavonic translation of the works of St. (Pseudo) Dionysius the Areopagite made in 1371 on Mount Athos: "And our Slavonic language was well made by God, for all that God makes is very good, but in the absence of the love of learning of men zealous of words it was not dignified with science (xytrosti) [as the Greek language was]."[97]

The other important primary source from the generation after Euthymius is Konstantin Kostenečki's *Skazanie*.[98] He offers additional information regarding the decline of books in Bulgaria.[99] He also refers to Euthymius as the "velikyi xudožnikъ slověnskyix pismenъ" ("the great master of Slavic letters") and the "kur evtimie vъ tyx stranъ xudožněišii bys" ("Kurios Euthymius was the most masterful/artistic in those lands").[100]

Based on the passage from Camblak's account that have been given above, it seems that Euthymius was motivated to undertake his book reform when he realized the extent to which the existing translations had distorted the content of the original Greek. It could be that Euthymius was inspired to follow the example set by a monk named John the Elder, a Bulgarian who lived on Mount Athos. Dinekov suggests the possibility that

---

97 English translation quoted from Mathiesen, ibid., p.27. Original Slavonic passage can be found in Ljubomir Stojanović, *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi*, Srpska kraljevska akademija, Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskoga naroda, Prvo odeljenje: Spomenici na srpskom jeziku, III, Belgrade, 1905, pp. 41-44, (no.4944).

98 See fn.2.

99 "vъ trъnovskyix stranax pismena pogybla byla sutъ" (as quoted in Syrku, op.cit.,560) = "in the Trnovo lands and environs, literary pursuit had perished"

100 Quoted in Сырку, op.cit., 560.

when Euthymius travelled to the Holy Mount, he found there some living pupils of John. The libraries of Athos, writes Dinekov, contain his manuscripts.[101] Apparently John had undertaken translations from Greek into Bulgarian and, like Euthymius after him, devised the new goal of re-editing books in order to correct existing translations. We do not, however, have proof that Euthymius knew of John's works, but one must consider the possibility that he might have been inspired by John to undertake his own book reform.[102]

The Life of Theodosius reveals to us that another pupil of Theodosius, Dionysius, a contemporary and fellow student of Euthymius, was also engaged in the translation of books from Greek into Slavonic.[103] The account lauds in particular his skill in rendering the content of the original into Slavonic; it was executed, the author writes, "very artfully and marvelously." Among the works that Dionysius translated was John Chrysostom's Μαργαρίτης ("The Pearl").[104] Another contemporary of Euthymius who wrote on issues of language was the Bulgarian-born Jewish scholar Judah Leon Mosconi. Mosconi was born in Oxrid in 1328 and

---

101 Динеков, "Евтимий Търновски," 286-7.

102 Iovine, op.cit., 188, also suggests that a literary reform, such as the one undertaken by Euthymius, could conceivably have already been started on Athos; and she points specifically to the translating activities of "starec Ioan". For a bibliography of other scholars' work on the literary tradition of Starec Ioan, see Iovine, 377, fn.547-9.

И.Богданов (*Кратка история*, 139) goes as far as to posit that it was precisely during this period on Athos that Euthymius became aware of a need to reform Middle Bulgarian orthography. He writes: "Поразен още на Атон от правописния хаос в каноническите книги, от смесицата в езиковите форми, Евтимий се заема да уеднакви правописа на литургическите книги, да наложи единство в езика." While this is a reasonable assumption, we do not know at what point Euthymius felt it necessary to conduct a reform. Furthermore, Bogdanov's statement assumes that the state of Bulgarian orthography at this period was still "chaotic." As is discussed below (see fn.109), there exists the possibility that an orthographic reform was already well under way by the time of Ivan Alexander's reign.

103 "mužь někyi čjudьnь i dělomь i žitiemь, dionisie tomu ime...vъ pisani prěmudrь. bložlestvlenjnoe že pisanie oboju ezyku grъčьskoe že i slovenskoe na ezycě nose. vъ razumě glьbokь. iměaše že i darь ot boga ot ellinskago na slovenskyi prělagati ezykь xytrě že i čjudně. i mnogy knigy prěloživ, crkovnoe ukrasi sъstoanie" (XII,18, lines 8, 16-20)

104 See Сырку, op.cit.,248, fn.2.

travelled extensively throughout the Mediterranean. His linguistic philosophy, as described by Fine, resembles closely that of Euthymius:

> A philosopher and metaphysician, he [Mosconi] also wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch and, like his Slavic contemporary Euthymius of Trnovo, was interested in grammar and believed incorrect interpretations of scripture often resulted from neglect of it. He left among his many works an unfinished treatise on grammar.[105]

The common source of inspiration for both Euthymius and Dionysius could have come from earlier trends that had been established in the Trnovo capital during their boyhood. There is evidence that suggests that Patriarch Theodosius II of Bulgaria (1348-1371)--not to be confused with Euthymius' spiritual father and fellow Hesychast--either completed himself or oversaw the making of new manuscripts to be sent to the Bulgarian Zograph Monastery at Athos. There is an extant letter from Patriarch Theodosius to his brothers on Athos that accompanied some manuscripts that he was sending to them.[106] The English text of the letter reads as follows:

> [From] Theodosius, [who is] by the grace of God, patriarch of the royal city of Trnovo and of all Bulgarians. A letter to my good brothers who lived on the Holy Mount of Athos, in the monastery of St. George, the holy ascetic and vanquisher in Christ -- also referred to as the Zograph Monastery -- where I was educated in the prayer of the holy ascetic George and of our holy and pious father. And though my life be corporeal, with your divine prayers may God grant that it be spiritual [i.e. eternal]. I have sent Your Grace [presumably the hegemon of the monastery] these two divinely inspired books--the Gospel of the Lord God and our Savior Jesus Christ according to [the book of] John, and the Book of St. Nikon [commentaries of the Lord's commandments]--that you should have them and read them for your solace and benefit and so that you should be mindful of our humility.[107]

---

105 Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans*, 450.

106 The text is reproduced in Иван Дуйчев, *Из старата българска книжнина*, том 2, София: Хемус, 1944, p.171.

107 The original text reads as follows: "Teodosie mililostią bložią patriarx' crigrad' trnova i vsěm' bigaromъ. Dobrimъ braltiam' poslanije vъ stěi gorě atonstěi živǫštimъ vъ monastiri stgo velikomčnka i pobědonosca xsva georgia gleimějěmъ Zografi. ideže są azъ vъspitaxъ militvami stgo velikomcnka georgia i prpodbnyx i bgonosnyx otcъ našix i ešte vъ životě moemъ ašte i tělesně. nǫ mitvami vašimi stymi da spodbnt' gъ bъ i dševně pripustix vašej stině dvě knizě bgodъxnověnně siǫ. bigověstie ga ba i spsa našego iu xa eže ot ioanna. i

Whether these manuscripts were new translations or simply copies of existing ones cannot be ascertained from the letter. What this letter does permit us to conclude, however, is that Trnovo was an important center that not only benefitted and flourished under the influence of established Athonite Orthodox culture; but, more significantly, Trnovo enjoyed a symbiotic relationship with Athos, supplying it --and not just extracting from it -- the fruits of their literary activities.[108]

Talev, repeating theories of scholars before him, posits that the process of a literary and orthographic reform in Bulgaria started as early as the reign of Ivan Asen II (1218-1241) and continued throughout the fourteenth century.[109] Indeed, the colophons of the Acts and the Epistles as

---

knigǫ stgo nikona tlьkovania zapovědem' gnimъ jako da imate da pročitaete vъ utěšenie i polzǫ vašǫ. i naše směrenie pominaete."

108 V.Gjuzelev stresses the importance of Veliko Trnovo as a religious cultural center for the Serbs, Hungaro-Wallachians and Russians that was on a par with Constantinople and Mount Athos. See В. Гюзелев, *Духовната култура на среновековна България през XIII-XIV в.*, София: Народна процвета, 1985, pp. 67-69. See also Дмитрий Полывянный, "Тырновград глазами средневекового современника," *Търновска книжовна школа*, том 4, 262-269, София: БАН, 1985. He writes that he maintains that the notion of "Trnovo, the Third Rome" factored in the medieval political consciousness (p.265). For general information on the role and prestige of medieval Trnovo, see also И.Дуйчев, "Търново като политически и духовен център през късното средновековие," *Археология* 8.3 (София,1966): 1-9.

109 See Talev, op.cit., 366-7: "Revisions of Bulgarian texts and language was a process which must have begun with the political unification of Bulgaria under Ioan Asen (1218-1241) and the re-establishment of the Church Slavic liturgy in connection with the restoration of the Trnovo Patriarchate in 1235. This process of revision of the Church Slavic books continued through the entire 14th century. By 1337 and 1355/6, when Ioan Aleksander's Psalter and Four Gospels were written, the orthographic, grammatical and lexical norms of the 14th-century Middle Bulgarian literary language were firmly established."

A summary of the scholarship on this subject done before Talev may be found in Iovine, op.cit.,377, fn.542: "In the recent historiographic tradition, this opinion has been put forward by Mošin, Mulić, and Talev, among others (cf.fns.24, 25 and 536). We should also make note of the comments of A.I. Jacimirskij and K.Radčenko who, at the beginning of this century, denied the originality of the Euthymian reform. According to Jacimirskij, the comparison of the Euthymian orthography with that of 'Middle Bulgarian' texts of the thirteenth to fourteenth century showed that Euthymius was not an innovator but merely made the texts more uniform by systematizing the orthography under the influence of the correct Athonite texts (Jacimirskij 1904 [*Григогий Цамблак: очерк его жизни, административной и книжной деятельности*], 388-402). Radčenko [*Религиозное и литературное движение в Болгарии в эпоху*

well as the Gospel of 1356, which were ordered by Tsar Ivan Alexander for his royal library, both state specifically that these works were translated from Greek (and not simply copies from earlier Church Slavonic translations).[110]

Many scholars have made observations that concur with the view that new translations were being carried out before Euthymius, even as early as the re-establishment of the Bulgarian Kingdom (the so-called Втората Държава, or Second Empire) under Ivan Asen II. D. Lang, for example, writes:

> The reestablishment of Bulgarian independence under the Assen family towards the end of the twelfth century after nearly two centuries of Byzantine domination, with consequent discouragement of Slavonic vernacular literature heralded a revival in Bulgarian literary activity. Under Tsar Ivan Assen II (1218-41), some magnificent Slavonic manuscripts were copied and illustrated. Approximately to this period belong[s] the Bologna Psalter.[111]

Mathiesen points to the fact that new translations were certainly being made in Bulgaria by the beginning of the fourteenth century:

> By the start of the fourteenth century...Church Slavonic grammar and textual criticism had become objects of the greatest interest. This newly awakened interest found its expression in the revision or retranslation of a number of works already available in Church Slavonic, in the unprecedented care taken by scribes to provide texts "of the new recension" (novago izvoda) or "of the correct recension of Mount Athos" (izvoda svetogorskoga pravoga), and ocassionally in even more ambiguous critical projects.[112]

перед турецким завоеванием, Киев, 1898] likewise declared that the possibility of precedents for Euthymius' reform was very likely. In his opinion, the texts written and copied for Tsar John Alexander presented already a fairly consistent system of orthographic usage. (Radčenko, 320, 332-3)."

110 The colophons for each are given by Syrku (Сырку, op.cit., 433, 437-8).

111 D.Lang, *The Bulgarians: From Pagan Times to the Ottoman Conquest* , Boulder: Westview Press, 1976, pp.116-7. For photographic reproductions of sample folia from manuscripts of this period, see А. Джурова, *Хиляда години българска ръкописна книга:Орнамент и миниатюра*, София: Изд. Септември, 1981, plates 72-116; for folia specifically from the Bologna Psalter, see plates 72-74. See also И.Дуйчев, *Болонски Псалтир. Български книжовен паметник от XIII век*, София: БАН, 1968.

112 Mathiesen, op.cit., 22.

M.Iovine also upholds the view that an orthographic reform was underway in the court of Ivan Alexander:

> Tsar John Alexander, as we have indicated, had skilled copyists working for him to produce books for his personal library sometime before the Euthymian program began. The Laurentian copy (1348) of the monk Xrabr's treatise on the language [O pismenex] is a particularly significant example of this activity carried out under John Alexander's patronage. If we compare the orthography and way of writing of the tsar's scribes with those of Euthymius and his school, we find that most of the innovations attributed to Euthymius' reform can already be identified in earlier texts produced during the reign of John Alexander and earlier.[113]

While Talev finds textual evidence to support the notion that orthographic norms were already being established in Bulgaria in the decades before Euthymius' career, he goes too far in disclaiming any involvement on the part of Euthymius in the process of revising the literary language.[114] As we will demonstrate in the next sub-section of this chapter, Kostenečki gives us ample information to infer that Euthymius was concerned with and undertook measures to reform or to continue a reform of the literary language. Regarding the use of "word-weaving", we will establish in this study that Euthymius' writings represent a culmination of Slavic imitations of Byzantine high style, but the point is that Slavs had been making attempts to imitate this style since the earliest period of their literary activities as is evidenced in the original works of such East Slavic writers as Metropolitan Hilarion and Cyril of Turov. Evidence also suggests that measures had already been taken prior to Euthymius to standardize the orthography and to introduce certain archaizing tendencies at least as early as the reign of Ivan Alexander. In this context, Euthymius must be viewed not as the innovator of a Bulgarian orthographic reform, but, as with the employment of "word weaving", as one who contributed to a tendency already under way. M.Iovine suggests that the linguistic reform

---

113 Iovine, op.cit.,187.

114 Talev, op.cit., 174, writes: "There was no spelling reform carried out by the 14th-century Bulgarian Patriarch, Euthymius of Tərnovo. His 'orthographic' and 'grammatical' reform of the Bulgarian literary language is one of those 19th-century myths, created in the literature at a time when very little was yet known about the entire epoch."

associated with the Euthymian period can be viewed as part of a larger trend that encompassed not just the Byzantine "Palaeologan" Renaissance (during which there was a push to "Atticize" Byzantine Greek to make it resemble a more archaic state of the language[115]) but also concurrent Western European movements such as the fourteenth-century *questione della lingua* in Italy, which was focused on the need to establish a linguistic norm.[116]

If one examines Camblak's panegyric in isolation, the only motive for Euthymius' book reform that can be construed from the text is his concern over the heresies that had resulted from the incorrect Slavonic translations. The conclusion to be reached, therefore, from Camblak's account is that Euthymius was singularly motivated by a desire to preserve Orthodoxy in Bulgaria by routing out heresies through corrected religious texts. While Euthymius no doubt believed this to be true, all of the heretical movements that challenged the Bulgarian Church, including Bogomilism, had been formed before the Slavic Christian period and, consequently, before the existence of Slavic translations of Greek Christian texts. Euthymius' motives for undertaking his reform and writing original texts were, to a large extent, rooted in a sincere desire to raise the level of Bulgarian Orthodox literary culture and to save those that might, through the errors contained in incorrect translations of Greek texts, be led astray.[117]

---

115 See fn.122 below.

116 M.Iovine, op.cit., 194. She writes: "We should point out here that the problem of the language facing the Slavs during the period of the Second South Slavic Influence was analogous to the more famous *questione della lingua* which developed at approximately the same time in Italy among the Humanists. Both the age of textual criticism in the West and the period of *ispravlenie knig* in the Slavic East were inspired by a common tradition which had its roots in Byzantine sources." For another study which draws parallels between the activities of the Trnovo School and intellectual questions in fourteenth-century Italy, see R.Picchio, "Early Humanistic Trends in the Turnovo School," in *Bulgaria, Past and Present*, 255-260, Columbus, Ohio: American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, 1976.

117 H.Goldblatt, op.cit.,24-25, emphasizes Euthymius' religious motive for undertaking his reform: "This conviction of Euthymius [that the public welfare, morality and purity of the Orthodox faith were dependent on the accuracy and literary qualities of the sacred books] obliged him, together with his collaborators, to undertake an immense revision of Slavic religious texts and led to the introduction of a language (above all, orthographic)

One must also consider the political motive that Euthymius might also have had for undertaking his reform. The jurisdiction of the Trnovo patriarchate had already been reduced by a decision on the part of Ivan Stracimir (Ivan Alexander's eldest son by his first wife, whom he divorced) to cut his territory of Vidin off from Trnovo's control[118], and Dobrudja was also put under the authority of Constantinople's patriarch. Euthymius must have at least in part been interested in demonstrating to Constantinople his own indispensability and the indisputable role of Trnovo as a leading cultural and religious center. The implication of this political message would be that Euthymius was endeavoring to prevent any further fragmentation of the power of the Bulgarian Church. [119]

As we have stated above, Euthymius' alleged innovation of a specific literary style ("word-weaving") connected with Hesychasm will constitute the main focus of this study. Any doubts, however, regarding the existence of a book reform conducted by Euthymius must be put aside after considering the following facts. Euthymius did make translations of Greek texts; we know this, for many of them are extant. Furthermore, there must

---

'reform' which aimed to establish a pure and unified linguistic norm for all the lands of Orthodox Slavdom."

See also R.Picchio, "The Impact of Ecclesiastical Culture on Old Russian Literary Techniques," in *Medieval Russian Culture*, 249-279, California Slavic Studies 12, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1984. On page 253 Picchio writes: "The best-known aspect of the Orthodox Slavic language question is represented by recurrent attempts to restore the 'purity' of the sacred medium into which it was claimed that the Slavic Scripture had originally been translated. In practice, every 'revision of the books' (*ispravlenie knig*, according to the formula provided almost a century ago by P.A. Syrku) expressed the concern of a vigilant ecclesiastic authority to keep under control any possible deviation from the 'true word.' The external history of Orthodox Slavic letters, that is, their changing status within Eastern Christianity, may be outlined on the basis of the discussions that developed on the dignity and norm of the Slavonic (slověnьskyi) language."

118 Fine (op.cit.,367) writes: "Stracimir's recognition of Hungarian suzerainty also enabled him to assert his independence from his father and subsequently to resist his brother [Ivan Sišman], toward whom he felt great bitterness throughout his life. Exercizing the freedom this Hungarian support gave him, John Stracimir now assumed the title of tsar and removed his Church from the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Trnovo and subjected it to the Patriarch of Constantinople. He also began coining his own money."

119 Dinekov (Динеков, "Евтимий Търновски," 288) seems to concur with this point by emphasizing that all of Euthymius' activities with the reform were done in order to combat heresy and immorality and to protect the power of the Bulgarian Church.

have been an officially sanctioned reform during his years at the Holy Trinity Monastery as hegemon. Camblak tells us explicitly that Euthymius made new translations into Slavonic of "divine books" because the old translations were faulty. For Camblak even to write that previous translations were inaccurate and led many Bulgarians to theological error would have in itself constituted a heresy had this not already been the received official position on the matter. Precisely what Euthymius re-translated is not known in its entirety, but he did carry out translations; and Camblak must have been expressing accurately the contemporary view on the pre-existing Slavonic translations.

As we have seen, the account by Camblak states unequivocally that Euthymius undertook a revision of translations of certain religious texts from Greek into Bulgarian. It seems certain, however, that this measure must have involved more than simply the act of making new translations, but included the concept of an orthographic "reform". Perhaps this can be more accurately termed an orthographic "restoration" based on archaizing tendencies that sought to approximate the Church Slavonic of an earlier period, the period of the Cyrillo-Methodian missions to the Slavs.[120] Presumably, this restoration would result in a form of Slavonic that would be supranational and a *lingua franca* for all Slavs.[121] The linguistic reform

---

[120] For general information on the history of the missions by Cyrill and Methodius to the Slavs, cf. for example V.Jagić, "The Conversion of the Slavs," in *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol.4, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966; F.Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs*, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1970; *The Slavs and Their Early History and Civilization*, Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1956, pp.165-169; D.Obolensky, "The Cyrillo-Methodian Mission: The Scriptorial Foundations," *St.Vladimir Theological Quarterly* 30, 2 (1986): 101-116; G.Ostrogorsky, "Moravska misija i Vizantij," *Vizantija i sloveni*, vol.4, 59-78, Belgrade, 1970; A.Dostál, "Počátky staroslověnského písemnictví a Byzanc," *Slavia* 38, 4 (1969): 597-606.

[121] Syrku (Сырку, op.cit.,561-2) writes that Euthymius not only undertook an orthographic reform in order to correct texts, but he also wanted to make revisions so that they would be accessible to all the Slavs.

Iovine (op.cit.,53) writes: "The Euthymian linguistic reform aimed to establish a uniform Church Slavic literary language in the Balkan and Russian lands through the elimination of those local tendencies which had been asserting themselves in the language of the Orthodox Slavic community. Following the Greek and Cyrillo-Methodian models, the reformers sought to prevent the encroachments of the specifically 'Bulgarian', 'Serbian' or 'Russian' elements in the literary language. Thus they hoped to reestablish the old linguistic unity of the epoch of Cyril and Methodius by restoring the 'purity' of the Church Slavic language and by creating for the Orthodox Slavic community, an official

in Bulgaria -- whether it was initiated by or simply continued by Euthymius -- can be viewed as the Slavic reflection of similar tendencies in philology pursued by the Byzantines during the Palaeologan Renaissance. They, too, were seeking to purify and reestablish the integrity of their literary language by reviving Attic Greek, or, rather, what they believed to be Attic Greek.[122]

Neither of our sources, Camblak nor Kostenečki, states anything specific about an orthographic reform, but both (especially Kostenečki) provide sufficient information to infer one. Regarding the passage from Camblak's panegyric that we have already examined, Mathiesen and

---

supranational language which did not correspond to the written or spoken language of any one locality within it."

122 This was merely one component of a larger humanistic revival in Byzantium. For a detailed study on the period of the Palaeologan Renaissance in Byzantine history and its impact on various art forms, cf. S.Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970; L.Bréhier, "La renovation artistique sous les Paleologues et le mouvement des idées," in *Mélanges Charles Diehl*, vol.2, Études sur l'histoire et sur l'art de Byzance, 1-10, Paris, 1930; M. Chatzidakis, "Classicisme et tendances populaire au XIVe siècle. Les recherches sur l'évolution du style," in *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines (6-12 septembre, 1971, Bucarest)*, vol.1, 153-188, Bucharest: Editarai Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1974; C.Krestev, "Sur la renaissance balkanique au XIIIe et XIVe siècles," *Actes du XIIe Congrès International des Études Byzantines*, vol.3, 205-211, Belgrade, 1964; Л.А. Фрейберг, Т.В.Попова, *Византийская литература, эпохи расцвета, IX-XV вв.*, Москва: АН СССР, 1978; А.Ф.Лосев, *Эстетика Возрождения*, Москва: АН СССР, 1978; and И.П.Медведев, *Византийский гуманизм XIV-XV вв.*, Москва: АН СССР, 1976.

It should be noted that this was not the first time Byzantine scholars and rhetors were fascinated with their classical past. During the 8th century A.D. Byzantium underwent its first Classical revival, the so-called "Macedonian Renaissance", during which schools endeavored to teach an elaborate prose style based on what was perceived at the time to be an accurate recreation of Attic conventions of prose. See Mango, *Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome*, New York: Scribner, 1980, p.137.

M.Iovine (op.cit.,101-2) summarizes the philosophy behind the linguistic conservatism in 14th-century Byzantium during the Palaeologan Renaissance: "The archaizing, or 'Atticizing' tendency encouraged by the educated writers of the last centuries of Byzantium was by no means a new development in the history of the Greek literary language. The origins of the 'Atticist movement' are to be found towards the end of the first century B.C. At this time grammarians and theoreticians began to insist that the language should not be permitted to change and develop since, from their point of view, the concept of change implied decadence. Moreover, the only 'correct' Greek was declared to be that which was used by the establishment classical Attic writers. The koine, on the other hand, as both the common spoken language of all layers of society and a distinct literary from itself, was rejected out of hand as vulgar and unlearned."

Goldblatt offer insights that help us reconstruct what Euthymius' motives for continuing a literary reform may have been. Goldblatt sees Euthymius as having taken on his shoulders a moral responsibility to preserve the Slavic Christian literary heritage intact for his fellow Bulgarians, *ipso facto* preserving Orthodoxy intact for them as well:

> In his *Slovo poxvalno* Gregory [Camblak] defines Euthymius' literary activity at the monastery of the Holy Trinity as the "translation" [prěpisanie] of the divine books from the Hellenic language into Bulgarian. One should note that it would be a mistake to understand the word prěpisanie in the narrow sense of "rendering from one language to another." Euthymius had a broader, more fundamental mission, namely to ensure that the light of divine truth, which had first been absorbed from the Greeks with the "baptism of the people," would continue to be transferred in its entirety to the Bulgarians. In order to preserve the pristine Orthodox tradition, Euthymius considered himself to be duty-bound to "rewrite" (Slav. prěpisati, Gr. μεταγράφειν) the sacred "Bulgarian books", that is, to alter and correct what had been corrupted by ignorant scribes.[123]

Mathiesen touches on the essence of the intimate tie between the word (here meant as a grammatical sense) and theological concepts described by words -- i.e. the relationship between signifier and signified -- that must have existed in the mind of Euthymius and his contemporaries. If one assumes that such a tie exists, then heresy can be expressed not only through various theological concepts but even through the word itself:

> [One] cause of the new wave of interest in Church Slavonic grammar and textual criticism seems to have been the popularity of a particular concept of heresy, which can be stated in modern terms as follows: not only can a thought or a belief be heretical, but also a symbol of a thought or belief, even if what it symbolizes is not perceived or known. This concept implies that the relationship between the signifying and the signified is to a certain extent necessary, not arbitrary...[124]

B. Kostenečki's Account

Kostenečki gives us much more information to infer an orthographic reform undertaken by Euthymius and his pupils. First of all Kostenečki establishes that his own understanding of textual correction has

---

[123] Goldblatt, op.cit., 33-34.

[124] Mathiesen, op.cit., 28.

as much to do with orthography as it does with textual content. Kostenečki states his purpose for writing his *Skazanie* in the preface. He reveals a conviction that the correct transmission and interpretation of the theological message are inseparably linked with orthography[125]:

> You who wish to write or teach...take notice that unless you first master the essence of all these letters and marks, all your labors are in vain. If you alter the position of any one of them, you transform the expression.[126]

According to this view, each letter and diacritic mark itself is an autonomous religious sign. Any change to these autonomous signs alters the resulting signification of the whole text, which in itself is a heresy: "blasphemy in the letters is the enemy of God."[127]

Somewhat further on in the preface, Kostenečki echoes the same opinion expressed by Camblak in his *Slovo poxvalno*, that the many translations of the Scriptures done in Slavonic were marred by error and led many astray:

> The divine Scriptures have been brought forth from the Greek language many times by a host of translators. Yet through a lack of understanding the Scriptures have been corrupted continuously.[128]

and this is expressed again in chapter I:

> And the reason for writing this treatise is far from minor; rather it has grown out of the many evils that have endured for so long in the divine Scriptures.[129]

In chapter III, Kostenečki makes the point again, but here the context of orthography is clearer than in the two preceding passages. Here the phrase

---

125 See Goldblatt, op.cit.,216, note 11.

126 Goldblatt, op.cit.,105.

127 Goldblatt, op.cit.,113, chap.II.

128 Goldblatt, op.cit.,106.

129 Goldblatt, op.cit.,111.

"writing in a corrupted manner" is to be understood as emendation and/or omission of letters and diacritics:

> In our writings [as opposed to those of the Greeks], however, even if one hundred books were gathered together, no two books would be found to be the same and correct...Not only the letters and the *antistixa* but also such signs as the s'troka, meždostročye, dasjia, apostrofь, varija, oksija, and perispomeni are ommitted, transformed, or needlessly inserted...I am obliged to state that both those who write in a corrupted manner and what they write should be committed to the fire.[130]

After having made his position quite clear as to the link between orthography and the correctness of religious message, Kostenečki repeats it yet again in chapter XXVI, but this time it is discussed clearly in the context of the Trnovo School, stating explicitly that this kind of error in writing had already been eradicated there:

> Yet how can unbelief not exist when so many blasphemies against God are introduced into the writings and when his commandments are violated?...Evil must first be eradicated in the capital city. That is why the Trnovites restored the principle first in the capital city of Trnovo and then in all their lands.[131]

The notion of an orthographic reform in Trnovo is further supported by the information contained in the heading to chapter II of Kostenečki's *Skazanie* :

> And how they [i.e. the Scriptures] were corrupted in our language, not only here[in Serbia--MH] but among the Bulgarians. Yet after these things the Trnovites restored [them] perfectly in their own lands.[132]

Perhaps the single most important passage from Kostenečki that supports the idea that under Euthymius there was a policy to correct the Slavic translations of Greek texts through an orthographic reform, or restoration, is found in the body of chapter II:

> And the letters had also been lost in the Trnovo lands, but the tsar and the

---

130 Goldblatt, op.cit.,117-8.

131 Goldblatt, op.cit.,159.

132 Goldblatt, op.cit.,112.

> patriarch brought illumination. And behold, how much good they did through this, and not only then and in their own lands. For their plantings and foundation are forever and even now illuminate the surrounding kingdoms.[133]

By "tsar", Kostenečki is surely referring to either Ivan Alexander or to Ivan Šišman; and by "patriarch", to Euthymius. Talev has tried to demonstrate that Kostenečki was actually referring to a much earlier period in Bulgarian history, namely the period of Byzantine control of the country from 1018 to 1185, the period between the First and Second Bulgarian Empires.[134] Talev writes that Kostenečki did not know the names of the patriarch and tsar "otherwise he would have given them."[135] Goldblatt offers an alternative explanation that should have been obvious to Talev, namely, that the names of the patriarch and tsar were so well known that it was unnecessary to state them.[136] Furthermore, Euthymius is already mentioned by name several lines above in this passage, so Kostenečki would not have to have repeated his name. Given the fact that in the preface he refers specifically to letters (pismena) in the sense of components of language and not solely in the general sense of "literature" or "literary pursuits", we are then, I believe, justified in interpreting "pismena" as "letters" here. Consequently, we may understand that Euthymius (the "patriarch") saved the Bulgarian literary tradition through an orthographic reform and not merely through the carrying out of new translations.

Kostenečki implies Euthymius' involvement in an orthographic reform. He writes that he himself is an "imperfect master" at this endeavor to which he has set out in this treatise (i.e. elaborating a system of orthography) because he "did not reach [the level of] that great master of Slavic letters, the Trnovo patriarch Euthymius, who truly revealed himself

---

133 Goldblatt, op.cit.,114.

134 Talev, op.cit.,170-73.

135 Talev, op.cit.,171

136 Goldblatt, op.cit.,219, note 19.

to be and even now is a light for those lands as far as the river called Marica, and in the Scythian lands and Zagore."[137]

Euthymius left no treatise on the reasons, methods, or principles of his orthographic and literary reform, and we may assume that he never wrote such a treatise based on Kostenečki's statement:

> Even among the many men wondrous in their words, no one has ventured to concern himself with the art of correction...[138]
> ...Though Euthymius was the most masterful one in the Trnovo lands, even he did not strive to write an affirmation of the letters similar to what can be found in Greek writings, but only some partial explanations.Yet because of his great authority, he had only to provide accurate instruction and lay the foundation of the doctrine. And evil was uprooted and no one stood against him.[139]

In the first passage, Kostenečki's statement that no one before him had concerned himself with "the art of correction" is not to be interpreted to mean that Euthymius never concerned himself with orthographic reform, but rather, he never concerned himself with the "art" of it, i.e. he never produced an elaborated guideline or manual. And even though Euthymius never produced a similar treatise, Kostenečki, nevertheless, states that Euthymius provided some "partial" explanations of his orthographic reform and provided ample instruction to his pupils as to how to carry out the reform.

Both of our sources--Camblak and Kostenečki-- reveal a consistency in the information given about Euthymius' activities. Camblak focuses on

---

137 Goldblatt, op.cit.,114, chap.II.

138 Goldblatt, op.cit.,111, chap.I.

139 Goldblatt, op.cit., 114, chap.II. Concerning Kostenečki's reference to "partial explanations" Goldblatt (op.cit.,220, note 22) writes: "Constantine seems to be distinguishing here between, on the one hand, a descriptive grammatical manual (utvrъždenie) which could be used in the art of scriptural restoration and, on the other hand, an 'explanatory' work (izъjavlenie) which would reveal the primary reason behind the need to restore the Slavic sacred texts. Judging from Constantine's presentation, it seems that for Patriarch Euthymius the instruction of his pupils in the theoretical principles upon which linguistic standardization was based was of even greater importance than the compilation of an 'affirmation of letters.' Apparently, Euthymius' position and authority made it unnecessary for him to compile a handbook [such as Manuel Moschopoulos' Ερωτηματα γραμματικα to which Kostenečki makes reference] of Slavic grammar..."

the inaccuracy of the existing translations and on Euthymius' personal efforts in re-doing them so that they should reflect precisely the content of the original Greek. Kostenečki states the same opinion of the Slavic translations, as quoted above, and singles out Euthymius for his success in saving letters in Bulgaria. Kostenečki, as we have seen, offers us more information to support the notion that Euthymius contributed to an orthographic reform in addition to contributing new translations of texts. Regarding the consistency of the information contained in the two sources, we quote Goldblatt[140]:

> Thus, Constantine Kostenečki's *Skazanie* and Gregory Camblak's *Slovo poxvalno* betray a common ideological attitude which assigns to Patriarch Euthymius of Trnovo a central part in the revision of Slavic religious texts which took place in fourteenth-century Bulgaria. Both works identify Euthymius' literary pursuits with a critical-philological program which aimed to restore uncorrupted editions of the Slavic writings through the use of authoritative models of linguistic purity.

As has been indicated above, there have been attempts to disclaim any such reform by Euthymius and his Tmovo School centered at the Holy Trinity Monastery. For example, Talev's attempt to disprove a Euthymian orthographic reform through a comparison of Ivan Alexander's Gospel (copied in 1355/6 into Church Slavonic before the supposed reform) with Euthymius' own Služebnik of 1370 is, as Goldblatt convincingly points out, superficial and unacceptable.[141] Unfortunately, the questions surrounding an orthographic reform by Euthymius have become further distorted by the opposite extreme found in the scholarship: namely, inventing features of a Euthymian orthographic reform that have no factual bases. Mirčev goes so far as to elaborate specific points of an orthographic reform as conceived by Euthymius that can be found nowhere in the extant sources.[142] Only a careful consideration of the statements we do have at our disposal--and not a hasty rejection or fabrication of them--will

---

140 Goldblatt, op.cit., 35.

141 Cf. Talev, op.cit.,175-181 and Goldblatt's rebuttal, op.cit., 24, fn.48.

142 К.С. Мирчев, *Историческа граматика на старобългарски език*, София: Наука и изкуство, 1963, pp.54-5. See also Боню Ангелов, *Старобългарски писатели*, София: Народна просвета, 1981, p.109.

elucidate the questions under consideration. One must also consider the hypotheses advanced by scholars that the orthographic reforms of Euthymius represented nothing truly innovative but rather simply a systematization and standardization of pre-existing trends.[143]

Euthymius' own personal mission in undertaking his reform and its precise scope and characteristics must remain to us, for the time being, largely unclear. All we have is what the sources tell us. Just as the elaborate writing style that he employs in his own works has been consistently linked with Hesychasm--and erroneously so, as this dissertation is dedicated to proving--so has his orthographic and literary reform. Iovine writes that Kostenečki's treatise is the "only source which can provide a clarification of the relation between the basic philosophy of the Euthymian reforms and Hesychast theory."[144] This is similar to D.S. Lixačev's own assertions that Kostenečki was, in expressing a relationship between orthography and orthodoxy, exposing a specifically Hesychastic attitude to language. Lixačev states that the Hesychasts "saw in the word the essence of the phenomenon it designated -- in the name of God, the divinity itself"[145]; and he uses Kostenečki as an illustration of this point.[146] There is nothing, however, in Kostenečki's *Skazanie* that permits us to conclude that

---

143 See Goldblatt, op.cit., p.25.fn.49. The scholars he cites regarding this question are А.И. Яцимирский, *Григорий Цамблак: очерк его жизни, административной и книжной диятельности*, СПб, 1904 (esp.p.128); V.Mošin, "'Revolucije' u istoriji starog srpskog pravopisa", *Bibliotekar* 15:6 (1963): 465-474; O. Nedeljković, "Pravopis 'resavske škole' i Konstantin Filosof", in *Srpska književnost u književnoj kritici*, ed. D.Trifunović, vol. 1: Stara književnost, 467-475, Belgrade, 1972; "Знаки ударений в сербских дорсавских рукописях" *Slavia* 37:1 (1967): 24-32; "Знаки ударений в средневековных сербских рукописях" in *Источники и историография славянского средневековья*, 101-134, Москва, 1967; "Problem radjanja resavskog pravopisa povelje iz doba kneza Lazara", in *O knezu Lazaru*, 243-254, Belgrade, 1975.

144 Iovine, op.cit.,71.

145 Д.С. Лихачев, "Некоторые задачи изучения второго южнославянского влияния в России," *Исследования по славянскому литературоведению и фольклористике, Доклады советских ученых на IV Международном съезде славистов*, 95-151, Москва: АН СССР, 1960, p.112. The original passage reads: "Исихасты видели в слове сущность обозначаемого им явления, в имени божьем--самого бога. "

146 ibid., 99-114.

Kostenečki's expressed view of linguistic conservatism was connected with Hesychasm (though indeed he was probably a practicing Hesychast himself). The very notion that a movement dedicated to quietism should elaborate its own specific theory of language as separate from the shared community of Orthodox Slavdom and innovate a flowery, verbose writing style is, we posit, counterintuitive.

Chapter 2: The Cultural and Political Climate of Fourteenth-Century Bulgaria

The childhood, youth and young adulthood of Euthymius all took place during the reign of Tsar Ivan Alexander,[1] who -- along with Tsar Symeon and Tsar Ivan Asen II -- is numbered amongst Bulgaria's great benefactors of the arts and the Church. As Syrku has pointed out, other than the reign of Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria (the so-called Golden Age of Bulgarian literature, during which there was much book-making, translating, and teaching of letters[2]) we know of no other period in

---

[1] For an interesting study on portrayals of Ivan Alexander in medieval Bulgarian literature, see К.Куев, "Образът на Иван Александър в сренобългарската поезия," *Българско среновековие (Българо-съветски сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф. И. Дуйчев)*, 270-286, София: Наука и изкуство, 1980.

[2] John Fine writes (in *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983, pp. 132-133) that when Symeon returned to Bulgaria from Constantinople "he was accompanied by various students from the Slavonic school in Constantinople. Symeon quickly became the leader of a massive translation project (Greek to Slavonic) at this monastery. After he left the monastery to become ruler, he seems to have remained interested in literature and sponsored many translations. These included both legal and religious works (in particular liturgical texts and the writings of Greek church fathers). In addition, Byzantine historical chronicles were now translated. Symeon was associated with a major collection (sbornik), probably the translation of a popular Byzantine encyclopedia; this compilation is usually named after a Kievan prince Svjatoslav (1073-76) because the text survived in his copy. Under Symeon the first original Bulgarian works appeared: the treatise of Hrabr [his defense of Slavonic as liturgical language, cf. Fine, vol.1, 134 for translation], the first saints' lives, and the writings of John the Exarch, which in addition to their religious content shed light on social and religious conditions in Bulgaria. John's major work is the Sestodnev (The Six Days), an account of the creation, which is quite heavily derived from the *Hexaemeron* of Saint Basil. Its preface is a panegyric addressed to Symeon which also praises the town of Preslav. " Concerning the Sestodnev, Dimitar Mishew (*The Bulgarians in the Past: Pages from the Bulgarian Cultural History*, Lausanne: Librairie centrale des nationalités, 1919; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1971, p.7) underscores the point that it "is not a translation. It contains six sermons whose contents is partly original and partly an imitation of Basil the great [sic] and Sevelian of Cheval."

On the topic of literary achievements during the reign of Symeon, Dinekov (in "Outlines of Old Bulgarian Literature", p.20) makes note of some works not mentioned by Fine. They are the apparently original "Hexameron" by Konstantin Preslavski, "Physiologue" and "Christian Topography" by Kozma Indikoplov, "The Heavens" by John Damascene. Cf. also К.Иванова, "Болгарская переводная литература X-XIV вв. в контексте 'Slavia Orthodoxa'," in *Studia slavica mediaevalia et humanistica*, no.2, edited by Riccardo Picchio, 361-371, Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1986; И.Божилов, *Цар Симеон*

Bulgarian history in which there was so much writing and copying of books as during the reign of Tsar Ivan Alexander.[3] This was the Silver Age of Bulgarian Literature, and it encompasses the period of the formation of Euthymius' Trnovo School, which was centered at the Holy Trinity (Света Троица) Monastery, three kilometers north of the royal capital.

The burgeoning of cultural activities in literature, art, architecture, and science that Byzantium experienced as the "Palaeologan Renaissance"[4] was being felt as well across its northern frontier in Bulgaria. This is the period in Slavic studies that bears the historiographic designation of the "Second South Slavic Influence" because of the assumed influence that South Slavic culture exerted on the cultural life of the East Slavs. In both countries, this flourishing of intellectual and artistic production was a period of brilliant output before their political demise.

For Bulgaria and Byzantium this was a period of great political decline, on the one hand, but also a period of great intellectual and artistic achievements on the other.[5] Runciman comments on the cultural significance of the Palaeologan Renaissance:

> In strange contrast with the political decline, the intellectual life of Byzantium never shone so brilliantly as in those two sad centuries. In the sphere of art the earlier Palaeologan period was of supreme importance; and if the artistic output faltered as time went on, that was due to the lack

---

Велики (893-927): Златният век на среновековна България. София: БАН, 1983; and S.Runciman, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*, London, 1930.

[3] See Сырку, *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV веке*, том I, Время и жизнь патриарха Евтимия, Санкт-Петербург, 1890; reprint, London: Variorum Reprints, 1972, p.411.

[4] Cf. S. Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970; R.Browning, *Byzantium and Bulgaria, A Comparative Study Across The Early Medieval Frontier*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975, pp.140-186; J.Meyendorff, "Humanisme nominaliste et mystique chrétienne à Byzance au XIVe siècle," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 70, no.9 (1957): 905-914, reprinted in *Byzantine Hesychasm* as article 6; И.Медведев, *Византийский гуманизм*, Москва: АН СССР, 1976.

[5] For a survey on Bulgaro-Byzantine relations and history during the first half of the fourteenth century, see Т.Флоровский, *Южные славяне и Византия во второй четверти XIV века*, Санкт-Петербург, 1882; reprint, London, 1973.

> of material resources, not of inspiration. It was an age of eager and erudite philosophers...At no other epoch was Byzantine society so highly educated and so deeply interested in things of the intellect and the spirit.[6]

Bulgaria was participating in a cultural revival that emanated from Constantinople. For the Bulgarians, moreover, this renaissance, which also included the dissemination of Hesychasm, served specifically as an Orthodox renaissance or revival.

By the end of the fourteenth century, Bulgaria had been absorbed into the Ottoman Empire; and by the middle of the fifteenth century, the Turks held Constantinople as their own, and their capital was moved there from Bursa, across the Sea of Marmara. As C. Moser observes, it seems that "the very imminence of political disaster" stimulated Bulgarian literary activity[7] and cultural activity in general during the last few decades of the Second Bulgarian Empire; and as D.Lang writes, the reign of Ivan Alexander in retrospect "appears as a false dawn, a swan-song of medieval Bulgaria's political and cultural glory."[8]

Ivan Alexander's forty year reign, from 1331 to 1371, is hailed as a great period in Bulgarian letters, architecture, manuscript illuminations, and fresco painting. The Tomič Psalter (ca.1360)[9], the Sofia Psalter (i.e.Psalter of 1337)[10], the Manasses Chronicle[11] and the famous London

---

6 S.Runciman, op.cit.,1-2.

7 C.Moser, *A History of Bulgarian Literature: 865-1944*, The Hague: Mouton, 1972, p. 24.

8 D.Lang,*The Bulgarians: From Pagan Times to the Ottoman Conquest*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1976, p.87.

9 Cf. В.Н.Щепкин, "Болгарский орнамент эпохи Иоанна Александра," *Сборник статей по славяноведению, посвященных проф. М.С. Дринову*, Харьков, 1904. стр.153-8; Аксиния Джурова, *Хиляда години българска ръкописна книга, Орнаменти и миниатюра*, София: Изд. Септември, 1981, plates 193-200; and Аксиния Джурова, *24 миниатюри от томичовия псалтир*, София: Български художник, 1982.

10 See Аксиния Джурова, *Хиляда години българска ръкописна книга*, plates 156-160.

11 See Иван Дуйчев, *Летописта на Константин Манаси*, София: БАН, 1963; А. Джурова, *Хиляда години българска ръкописна книга*, plates 165-174.

Gospel of 1355/6[12] are all examples of masterful manuscript illumination executed under his patronage. Also for his own library he had translated from Greek some writings of the early Church Fathers, contemporary Byzantine theologians, saints' lives, proceedings from ecumenical councils, and also some other secular works including The History of Troy, legal works, and works on medicine and natural science. He also commissioned an encyclopedia.[13] His collection of original Slavic works included a copy of Monk Xrabr's "O pismenexъ."[14] His eldest son Ivan Stracimir and Stracimir's wife Anna were also great patrons of the arts in Vidin. Under Stracimir's commission, the famous Bdinski Sbornik, or the Vidin Compilation, was executed.

According to the *Life of Theodosius*, in the period when Ivan Alexander came to power, the monasteries in Bulgaria were poor and in bad repair[15]; and in this sphere of cultural life, too, the tsar gave generously. He gave many gifts to Gregory the Sinaite's community of monks at Paroria; and when they were attacked by bands of marauders, he fortified the monastery. He founded a monastery at Kelifarevo (Holy Mother of God, Св. Богородица), where Theodosius trained Euthymius in Hesychastic prayer and cultivated his community of Hesychastic monks. On the mountain of Vitoša, near Serdica (Sofia), the tsar founded a monastery at Dragolevci, the Monastery of the Immaculate Mother of God.[16] He also founded the breathtaking cave monastery at Ivanovo, whose chapel is dug out of one of the cliffs and is decorated with several fine

---

12 See Джурова, *Хиляда години,* plates 179-187.

13 See J.Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans, A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Empire,* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987, p.436.

14 For the edited Slavonic text and Modern French translation, see A.Vaillant, *Textes vieux slaves*, vol.1, 57-61; and vol.2, 47-51, respectively. For a partial English translation of the text, see Marin Pundeff, "National Consciousness in Medieval Bulgaria," *Südost-Forschungen* 27 (1968):1-27 (pp. 19-20); and J.Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans*, 134-136.

15 See the *Life of Theodosius* (4,12, line 28): "skudni bo ubo běxu togda vъ stranaxъ blъgarskyx."

16 Сырку, op.cit.,163.

frescoes.[17] Ivan Alexander was known as a pious man, and his love of the monks is noted by Kallistos in the *Life of Theodosius* : "za eže ljubiti izrednye mnixy i o sixъ jakože moštno raduese."[18]

While the culture of Bulgaria flourished under the reign of Ivan Alexander, the power and international prestige of the country was clearly in decline as Bulgaria suffered grave territorial losses and subsequent blows to its stature and position as a leader on the Balkan peninsula.

Bulgaria's decline as a great power in the Balkans was by no means a phenomenon of Ivan Alexander's reign. It was, rather, a steady process that began in the mid-thirteenth century, after the death of Ivan Asen II. In 1242, just a year after his death, during the reign of Koloman, the Golden Horde of Khan Batu, who had just devastated the East Slavic lands of Rus', invaded and plundered Bulgaria. In 1257 a civil war broke out in Bulgaria over the rights to the throne; and finally, the boyar council elected Konstantin Tih, the governor of the region of Skopje, as tsar. He then married the Byzantine princess Maria, the niece of Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus. To add to the problems of a weakening political infrastructure at home, the Bulgarians were suffering Tartar invasions from without. From 1272 onward the Tartars invaded and plundered the Bulgarian lands every year, and in addition to this, they also suffered periodic Hungarian and Byzantine invasions. In the years 1277-1279, there was a popular uprising led by the peasant Ivajlo that even put him on the throne.

In 1279, the Asen dynasty regained control. The grandson of John Asen II, John Asen III, became tsar. In 1280, during the reign of John Asen III's elected successor, the elected Georgij Terter I, the Golden Horde of Khan Nogay invaded Bulgaria, razing everything in its path to the ground. Terter was eventually dethroned and fled to Constantinople where he took refuge. At this point, the Tartars were able to fill the vacated throne with one of their own sympathizers, a Bulgarian boyar, Smilec. As a puppet ruler answerable to Khan Nogay, Smilec looked on passively as

---

17 See A.Grabar, "Les fresques d'Ivanovo et l'art des Palaéologues," *Byzantion* 25-27 (1955-1957): 581-590; C.Diehl, *Manuel de l'art byzantin*, vol.2, Paris: A Pickard, 1926, fig.434.

18 *Life of Theodosius* (7, 14, lines 15-16).

Tartar hordes roamed and pillaged unchecked throughout the Bulgarian countryside. The Tartars' virtual control over Bulgaria was expanded in the years 1299 and 1300, when Khan Nogay's son, Khan Čaka, took the Bulgarian throne for himself.

Bulgaria, then, entered the fourteenth century during a period of great upheaval, when the country was functioning as a vassal of the Tartar khans, a period when even the throne itself had been usurped from the native aristocracy. In 1300, however, the crown was restored to the house of Terter: Georgij I Terter's son, Theodore Svetoslav, became tsar and concluded an alliance with Byzantium by marrying Theodora, the sister of Emperor Andronicus III.

The period of Theodore Svetoslav's reign (1300-1322) was marked by a brief period of improvement of Bulgaria's domestic politics and international stature. There was a severe crackdown from the top in order to eliminate the disloyal amongst the elite boyar population. Even Patriarch Joachim III was put to death on suspicion of treason. Despite the royal alliance between Theodore Svetoslav and the Byzantine princess, the administration in Constantinople was constantly trying to undermine Theodore's control over Bulgaria, but their attempts were largely unsuccessful. Under Theodore, Bulgaria regained some of its lost territory: the fertile plains of Thrace, Zagora, and some of the Black Sea coast, crucial to Bulgaria's economy. Furthermore, in the last years of the second decade of the fourteenth century, relations between Bulgaria and Serbia were restored, an alliance which displeased Constantinople.

With domestic problems somewhat mitigated and with the re-acquisition of certain lost territories, Bulgaria under Theodore Svetoslav seemed to be on the ascendant by the second decade of the fourteenth century. Even a brief crisis precipitated by the unexpected death of Theodore Svetoslav's son and successor, Georgij II Terter (resulting in a six month interregnum from December 1322 to May 1323 by a dissenting boyar council) did not destabilize the country. A strong-willed boyar was elected to the throne, Mikhail Šišman. During his seven year reign (1323-1330) Mikhail Šišman reasserted Bulgarian control over Thracian and Black Sea coastal territory that had been lost. He also continued the tradition of Byzantine-Bulgarian royal alliances. He divorced his Serbian wife, Anna (Stefan Dečanski's sister), who along with their son Ivan

Stefan (who had been his co-ruler and heir) was imprisoned.[19] Once again, Bulgaria's political alliance with Byzantium proved to be meaningless when, in 1330 at the Battle of Velbužd (today Kjustendil), the Byzantine army was not present to render help to the Bulgarians against the Serbs.[20] Most of the Bulgarian army was destroyed, and Mikhail Šišman was killed. The outcome of this battle was that the Serbian kingdom of Stefan Dečanski (1321-1331) --and after him, Stefan Dušan (1331-1355) --was established as the dominant power on the Balkan peninsula. Fine comments on the political consequences for Bulgaria after this battle[21]:

> Bulgaria was never to regain its former position. The battle resulted in the Serbs' gaining what was to be a permanent edge--at times even hegemony--over Bulgaria to last until Bulgaria fell to the Turks at the end of the [fourteenth] century.

Fine writes that the sources mention no territorial change after the battle, but some scholars believe that Serbia regained Niš from Bulgaria at this time. Fine points out, moreover, that Serbia, not Bulgaria, was to annex from Byzantium "the lion's share of Macedonia."[22] Also, due to the Golden Horde, Bulgaria, around the same time, lost its territory north of the Danube.[23] From the summer of 1330 to February of 1331, Mikhail Šišman's son, Ivan Stefan, ruled in Trnovo at the insistence of the Serbs. That winter, a palace coup was undertaken by some Trnovo boyars, and Ivan Stefan's cousin, Ivan Alexander, was chosen as tsar, and an alliance with Serbia was concluded through the marriage of Stefan Dušan to Ivan Alexander's sister, Elena.

Ivan Alexander began his reign in the year following the Battle of Velbužd. Despite some territorial gains in northern Thrace in the

---

19 See Fine, op.cit.,270.

20 The Byzantines were allied at the time with Bulgaria against Serbia, but as Fine writes (op.cit.,272), the Byzantines apparently had no intention of supporting their allies against Serbia and were nowhere in sight during the battle.

21 Fine, op.cit., 272.

22 Fine, op.cit., 272.

23 ibid.

Rhodopes, domestic politics and territorial losses worsened throughout the years of Ivan Alexander's reign, part of it due to familial disputes. In 1345, the tsar, apparently bored with the dull intellect of his first wife, Theodora, the daughter of the Byzantine emperor, divorced her and married a Jewish woman, Sarah. Sarah converted to Orthodoxy and also took the name Theodora.[24] His son by his first wife, Ivan Stracimir, was disinherited and given the territory of Vidin as a consolation. Ivan Alexander's son by his second wife, Ivan Šišman, succeeded his father as tsar. Outraged and embittered, Stracimir eventually became a vassal to the Hungarians and shut Vidin off from his father's kingdom, declaring himself a tsar of this northwestern territory.[25]

Ivan Alexander also lost territory in the northeast when three boyar brothers from the town of Karbona (today, Balčik) defected and sided with the Byzantines.[26] These brothers were descendents of the Terter family and their names were Balik, Theodore and Dobrotica (hence the name of the region, Dobrudja). Dobrotica was particularly land-hungry; and he added to his power by seizing Varna and several coastal towns on Bulgaria's northeastern coast, such as Emona, Kavarna and Kaliaka.[27] Like Ivan Stracimir, Dobrotica cut his lands off from the control of the Patriarch of Trnovo, "recognizing the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople."[28]

In addition to Varna, Ivan Alexander lost three more major Black Sea ports in 1364 to Byzantium: Mesembria, Anchialos and Sozopol. This left Bulgaria with almost no access to the Black Sea. Added to this weakening of Bulgaria through territorial losses, a faltering economy (especially with the loss of the Black Sea ports), and wars waged against

---

[24] Fine, op.cit., 366. On the question of Jewish cultural presence on the Balkans during the period in question, see N.Kočev, "The Question of Jews and So-Called Judaizers in the Balkans from the 9th to the 14th Century," *Bulgarian Historical Review* 1 (1978): 61-79.

[25] See Section I, Chapter 1, fn.118.

[26] Fine, op.cit., 367.

[27] Fine, op.cit., 423.

[28] ibid.

Hungary and Byzantium[29], Bulgaria was also threatened by an impending attack from the Turks.

A lack of international cooperation between Bulgaria, Serbia and Byzantium resulted in a fragmented and weakened Balkan alliance that was incapable of repelling the Ottoman Turks. As a result of disputes within the Balkans, Bulgaria and Byzantium were theirs for the taking. Also in 1364, Sultan Murad and his army seized Philippopolis (Plovdiv) and Stara Zagora. By 1369, the Ottomans had established an adiministrative center in Adrianople (today Edirne, Turkey). Now the Ottoman state bordered on the Bulgarian kingdom:

> This lack of unity within Bulgaria itself was matched by a similar lack of unity among the various Balkan states, so that when during the fourteenth century, the rising tide of Turkish expansion reached their very doorsteps, they failed to take energetic joint action against the common foe. Step by step in their inexorable march westwards, the Turks were able to overrun the Balkan peninsula. At first they were content to obtain control through alliances, and, where force had to be used, to restore the defeated local rulers as their vassals. But when in 1389 the Battle of Kossovo Field sounded the death knell of Serbian independence, Sultan Bayazid decided to proceed to the next stage of conquest--that of direct rule.[30]

It is clear, then, that the Bulgaria of Euthymius' youth and early adulthood was a center of great cultural activity on the one hand, but a swiftly crumbling political power on the other. By the time Euthymius returned home from his travels in Byzantium in the year 1371, the year of Ivan Sišman's coronation, Bulgaria was reduced to a shell of what it once was, consisting mainly of Trnovo and its environs, a far cry from the glorious days of territorial expansion under Tsar Ivan Asen II (1278-1241), when Bulgarian lands stretched to the Adriatic.

The years of Euthymius' hegemony at the Holy Trinity Monastery (1371-1375) were spent under constant threat of an Ottoman takeover. In 1372 Trnovo was invaded when Ivan Sišman violated his treaty with the Turks. The tsar's sister, Kera-Tamara, was given to Sultan Murad I as a

---

[29] D. Kossev, H. Hristov, and D. Angelov, *A Short History of Bulgaria*, Sofia: Foreign Language Press, 1963, p.84.

[30] M. MacDermott, *A History of Bulgaria: 1393-1885*, London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1962, p.20-21.

bride in an attempt to normalize relations between them.[31] Meanwhile, all around the Trnovo kingdom territories were becoming vassals to the Ottomans: Vidin, Dobrudja, and large parts of the Byzantine Empire.

During the third year of Euthymius' patriarchate, in 1378, the Ottomans seized more Bulgarian territory, capturing Stipone (present-day Ikhtiman) and Samokov. They were now well positioned to take Sofia, which fell to them in 1382, and Niš and Pirot, which fell in 1385. The Ottomans had now closed in Trnovo on its southern and eastern sides. To make matters worse, Serbian initiatives to forge an alliance with Trnovo against the Turks were being thwarted by the loyal Ottoman vassals, namely, Tsar Ivan Stracimir of Vidin, and the despots Konstantin Drageš and Marko.

Then in April 1393, the forces of Sultan Bayezid I, under the command of his son Celebi, laid siege to Trnovo. According to Gregory Camblak's *Slovo poxvalno*, Patriarch Euthymius led the defense at the fortress surrounding Carevec. After three months of maintaining a brave resistance, Trnovo finally fell on July 17, 1393.

According to Camblak's panegyric, the boyars were massacred in a church, and Euthymius, along with his clergy, was sent into exile and apparently went to Bačkovo Monastery, south of Philippopolis, where he died sometime in the early years of the fifteenth century. Tsar Ivan Sišman died in captivity in 1395, and his brother and enemy, Ivan Stracimir, was led into captivity the following year.

Given the grave domestic and international problems the country faced (combined with the presence of some pro-Barlaamite factions and such heretical groups as the Bogomils), it is easy to understand how a revival of conservative religious practices should have been perceived as the most effective defense against the impending doom that lay ahead. With his outspokenness against heresies and his conservative stance on moral issues, Euthymius was clearly attempting to bring Bulgarians back into the fold of mainstream Orthodoxy. He, no doubt, believed that a strong Orthodox Church could save the country from peril.

---

[31] Apparently this was done only on the condition that she not be forced to convert to Islam. See Lord Kinross, *The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire*, New York: William Morrow, 1977, p.52.

We have already conjectured in the previous chapter on Euthymius' motives for undertaking a literary and orthographic reform. These activities were clearly aimed at a purification of language, which, as we may understand from Camblak and Kostenečki, would lead to a purification of the Church's constituency. Euthymius' concern was that inconsistent orthographic practices and faulty translations had led to heresies and the perdition of many souls in his country. Furthermore, in the hagiographic works of Euthymius, one sees clearly his deliberate polemics against anything that threatens the stature of Orthodoxy in Bulgaria. He devotes quite a bit of space in these texts propagandizing against not only such heresies as that of the Manichaeans and Bogomils, but even other Christians (i.e. the Armenians) because of the "faults" in their practice of Christianity. As is typical for all spokesmen of societies in decline, Euthymius alludes often to the glories of the country's past. The heroic feats and expansionist prowess of Ivan Asen II and Kalojan are favorite themes. Even Euthymius' choice of heroes is motivated by an urgent desire to appeal to the nationalistic pride in every Bulgarian and, more specifically, every resident of the royal capital. The relics of Ivan of Rila, Hilarion of Maglena, (Petka) Paraskeva, and Philothea were all transferred to Trnovo.

To add to the Patriarch's anxieties over the future of the Bulgarian Church, significant regions -- both Vidin and Dobrudja -- had been removed from the jurisdiction of the Trnovo patriarchate by their despots and were handed over to the Patriarch of Constantinople. In essence, the size and stability of the Bulgarian Church of Euthymius' day was being weakened by foreign enemies on the outside (i.e. by the politically destabilizing threat of Turkish invasion) and by enemies on the inside (heretics and recalcitrant local rulers). Added to these problems were the further territorial losses already mentioned, which meant that these areas were also out of the control of the Trnovo patriarchate. Apparently there was some concern in Constantinople that the Bulgarian Church had been observing improper practices, and in a letter to Theodosius, Patriarch Kallistos (Theodosius' friend and fellow student in the Hesychastic teachings of Gregory the Sinaite) urged that this matter be addressed and that the Hesychasts -- as the keepers of strict ascetic lives --supervise the

restoration of proper liturgical practices.[32] This fact lends even more support to the notion that Hesychasm was, especially for the Bulgarians, primarily a means of combatting ascetic laxity within the Church.

To summarize, the whole system of Euthymius' reforms and activities as hegemon of the Holy Trinity Monastery (1371-75) and as patriarch (1375-93) can be seen as an attempt to bring rigor back into the spiritual life of the country and to unify and fortify the Church. As a sincere Orthodox Christian, Euthymius no doubt believed that the policies of his reforms would be enough to support the whole country, to renew Bulgaria's power and prestige, and, most importantly, to rescue it.

Tsar Ivan Šišman obviously approved of Euthymius' policies of purifying the Bulgarian clergy and the Church literature. He was Euthymius' benefactor at Holy Trinity and apparently gave him full authority to pursue his literary reform:

> As patriarch he [Euthymius] tried to prevent the appearance of new, corrupt texts by banning newly copied texts from use until they had received patriarchal approval. And he ordered that each new manuscript copied in Bulgaria be sent to the patriarch for approval. He also tried to limit copying to those people who had had proper training. Tsar John Šišman supported him in these efforts, endorsing his edicts on texts.[33]

In fact, it is likely that Ivan Šišman would have given Euthymius complete and unchecked authority to undertake his literary and administrative activities. Clearly the tsar had many more pressing concerns than the methods and implementation of orthographic and liturgical reform. It seems that from the very first year of his reign, he was vexed with the problem of Bulgaria's survival as an independent kingdom. His own brother, Ivan Stracimir, was at war with him, and he was struggling "to consolidate his authority in Bulgaria."[34] Fine also points out that some scholars believe that immediately following the death of Ivan Alexander, the Turks "had exerted considerable pressure, possibly threatening an attack on Bulgaria, upon the new ruler, who was therefore doing

---

[32] Cf. Iovine, op.cit., 154; Fine, op.cit., 440; and Сырку, op.cit., 82-89.

[33] Fine, op.cit., 443.

[34] Fine, op.cit., 378-9.

everything he could to appease them."[35] Thus, with these serious occupations and troubles of the tsar, it is unlikely that Euthymius proceeded with his activities at Holy Trinity with anything but *carte blanche* from Trnovo. At this point Euthymius had been a monk for at least twenty years, had served and studied under Theodosius at Kelifarevo Monastery, and had spent eight years abroad at the prestigious religious and cultural centers of Studion and Athos; moreover, in only four more years Euthymius was to be "unanimously chosen" as patriarch.[36] He must have enjoyed the tsar's total and complete trust to undertake his reforms on his own as the tsar tended to more urgent political matters.

The exact year of Bulgaria's change in status from an independent kingdom to an Ottoman vassal is disputed. Some scholars place it at 1372, others 1373, and still others 1376. If the date 1372 or 1373 is correct, then it means that Bulgaria was already paying tribute to the Ottoman sultan when Euthymius was working on his new translations and writing his original compositions. Further evidence of Bulgaria's acknowledgement of Turkish suzerainty was Tsar Ivan Šišman's decision to give away his sister, Kera-Tamara, to Sultan Murad to add to his harem, which probably occurred sometime between 1371 and 1376.[37] In this context, the emphasis laid upon Bulgaria's glorious past by Euthymius in all four of his hagiographic works is particularly poignant. By the 1370s, Turkish dominance in the Balkans was a fact, and there were probably few other means for Euthymius to rekindle in his older audience and instill in his younger audience a sense of national pride than to make fond and lingering references to the days of Tsar Ivan Asen II and Kalojan and the "weakness" then of the Byzantine Empire. The following passages from his four vitæ illustrate the point:

> [God] lifted up the horn of the Bulgarian kingdom under the pious Tsar Asen...This man thus having taken the flag of the kingdom, fortified well all the Bulgarian cities. And having armed himself well against the

---

35 Fine, op.cit.,379.

36 See Camblak as quoted in Section I, Chapter 1, fn.49.

37 Fine, op.cit.,407.

Greek Empire, he conquered the surrounding lands, cities, and villages.[38]

After much time passed, the Greek Empire became poor and decreased in size; the Bulgarian kingdom however became much greater, and the most pious Bulgarian tsar Kalojan at that time was holding the scepter. For he was brave and he took a large part of the Greek land called Thrace and Macedonia, Trivalia and Dalmatia, and to their number [he added] also Neada and Elada and also Aetolia.[39]

At the same time, radiantly and brilliantly, piety was being upheld solidly by the pious Bulgarian tsar Ivan Asen, the son of old Tsar Asen, who never frightened even a doe...And they say he ruled over all these territories all the way to Durazzo. [40]

Much time having passed and many miracles having been worked, the Greek Empire had become extremely powerless...And at the same time, the Bulgarian kingdom was very solid and strong, and it was seizing all the surrounding lands and conquering them. At that time [in Bulgaria], the royal scepter was being held by the pious and glorious Tsar Kalojan.[41]

---

38 The original and translated works of Euthymius are collected by Kałużniacki in his work *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393)*, Vienna, 1901; reprint, London, 1971. All references throughout this dissertation to the works of Euthymius are taken from this collection and are cited by chapter number (Roman numerals) and page number (Arabic numerals).The four saints' lives, the *Life of Ivan of Rila*, the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena*, the *Life of Paraskeva*, and the *Life of Philothea*, will be referred to throughout this work by the abbreviations LIR, LHM, LP, and LPh.

The original passage reads: "vъzdviže rogъ Blъgarskago carьstva pri blagočьstvějšemъ cari Asěni...Sъ ubo xorǫgvi carьstvia jako prěemъ, vъsą Blъgarskyą grady padšąą są dobrě ubtvrъdi i obetšavšąą obnovi i, na Grъčьskoe dobrě opoasavъ są carьstvo, pokarěaše okrъstnyą strany, grady že i vesi." (LIR,XII, 23)

39 The original passage reads: "Po mnozě že vrěmeni Grъčьskomu oskǫděvšu carstvu i umalenu vъsěčьsky, Blъgarskomu že i zělo vъzveličivšu są, blagočьstvějšij carь Kalojan Blъgarskoe togda pravlěaše skiptro. Zělo že xraborstvuą togda, prěątь Grъčьskyą zemlą čąstь ne malǫ, Trakiǫ glagolą i Makedoniǫ, Trivaly že i Dalmatiǫ, kъ simže Neadǫ i Eladǫ i ešte že i Etoliǫ." (LHM,XVI, 56)

40 The original passage reads: "Vъ tože vrěme blagočьstie světlě i javlenně krěpcě udržavšu blagočьstivomu carju Blъgarskomu Ioannu Asěnju, synu starago cara Asěnja, i nikakože těxъ Iaanij užasšu se...se država, daže i do Drača. " (LP, VI, 69-70

41 The original passage reads: "Vrěmeni že i mnogu prěšedšu i čjudesemъ mnogomъ byvaǫštimъ, Grъčьskoe do konca iznemože carstvo...Vъ tože vrěmą i carstvo Blъgarskoe, krěpko sǫšte i silno zělo, vъsą okrъstnyą strany obъmlěše že i

Within the texts themselves, the prayer that appears at the end of each of Euthymius' saints' lives contains the most important clues for reconstructing the political climate during the years 1375-1393, the years during which Euthymius wrote these texts.

At the end of the *Life of Paraskeva*, he prays to her to "grant longevity and peaceful days to the kingdom."[42] This is a general wish of prosperity for the country, as is the prayer to Hilarion to preserve the flock of Bulgarian Orthodox Christians "from all the snares of our Adversary."[43] What Euthymius writes in the *Life of Ivan of Rila* is more revealing. This passage implies a more specific threat; and from it it is clear that Euthymius is concerned about an attack or a takeover of the country. This is probably a reference to the enmity that existed between the brothers Ivan Stracimir and Ivan Šišman and to the growing menace of Sultan Murad's forces.[44] This passage taken from the *Life of Ivan of Rila* is the most significant insight we have from the Euthymian vitæ into the current political situation at the time he wrote these texts:

> ...pray to the Most Merciful Ruler [that He may] save your relatives, your fellow-countrymen, the Bulgarians[45]; and help our royal tsar, Ivan Šišman. Vanquish for him all his contrary enemies under his feet, preserve the pure faith, fortify our cities, bring peace to the whole world, deliver us from hunger and destruction, and protect us from foreign invasion (LIR, XIII, 50).

---

pokaréaše. Carskaa že skiptra togda upravléaše dobré že i krasně blagočьstivějšij i slavnéišij carь Kaloioannъ." (LPh, XII, 95).

42 "dlьgotu carьstviju i dlьjni mirny tomu daruj..." (LP,IX,76)

43 "Sъxrani stado naše ot vъsěx sъprotivnago kъznej" (LHM,XVIII, 57-58).

44 Relations at the time between Serbia and Bulgaria seemed to be peaceful. Prince Lazar (1371-1389) of Serbia had formed an alliance with the Bulgarian tsar by giving his daugher in marriage to Ivan Šišman's son, Alexander.

45 In the manuscripts C,N,O and T described by Kałużniacki (consult introduction to translations, Section II, Chapter 1, for descriptions), the passage reads: "edinorodnyj ti ezykь, Blъgare že i Srъblje", i.e. "your fellow-countrymen, the Bulgarians and the Serbs". See Kałużniacki,*Werke*, 26, fn.3.

From this passage we may understand that the situation in Bulgaria must have become quite serious. Euthymius is no longer appealing to the saint on behalf of the overall, general welfare of the nation (as in the LP) or simply making reference to foreign hostile princes (LHM). Here he is asking Ivan of Rila to intercede for them in three important matters: 1) to save the Bulgarians, 2) to render assistance to the tsar, and 3) to save the country from an invasion. This is a specific and rather detailed request. An appeal to preserve the safety and welfare of the nation is obviously not as urgent an exhortation as a prayer to preserve a nation from foreign invasion. And if indeed the tsar were not in need of help and if a foreign invasion were not impendent, why should Euthymius mention quite so specific a concern? Thus, we may deduce from this passage that during the time of Euthymius' patriarchate, there was some doubt as to whether Bulgaria could survive such an attack. This is significant in that this conclusion enables us to understand the urgency he must have felt in undertaking a revision of the liturgical books in Slavonic. Euthymius had more to worry about than just heresies, as Camblak's and Kostenečki's works imply; but he was clearly concerned about the fate of Christianity at large in the Balkans, with the growing threat of the Turks, who would impose Islam on them.

In sum, then, we may say that the years of Euthymius' career in Bulgaria after his return from Byzantium were characterized by a great deal of anxiety over the future of the country and the future of the Church. Moreover, it is safe to assume that given the tsar's problems both with his brother's principality of Vidin and the Turks, he entrusted entirely to Euthymius the affairs of the church. It is important to remember that Euthymius and his Camblak cousins, Gregory and Kiprian, were not only Church prelates but also aristocrats, and as such they wielded considerable power. We have seen in our historical survey above how the boyar councils were instrumental on several occasions in implementing a change in the government by eliminating and installing rulers. It is also important to keep in mind that Euthymius was able to achieve the office of the patriarchate not simply because of his talents and dedication but also in large part because of his status as a nobleman (if indeed he was a nobleman). This observation is not meant to imply that Euthymius was not sincere in his role as patriarch or that he relied solely on his noble origins to climb his way up the ecclesiastical ranks. The point is simply

underscored here as a reminder of the power that the Church officials had in such a social structure and how achievement of such positions was in large part dependent upon the status and influence of ones family. As Angelov has pointed out, in fourteenth-century Bulgaria, unlike in Western Europe, no middle class, or "burgher" class (bourgeoisie) had yet developed.[46] According to Angelov, this urban middle class in the West actually assisted the ruler in limiting the power of feudal lords.[47] In Bulgaria of Euthymius' day, the absence of such a class enabled the feudal lords to develop stronger power than in the West, and the power of the monarch was weakened.[48] Concerning the specific role played by the Church hierarchy in such a social structure, Angelov observes: "The absolute domination of the feudal class was synonymous with the rule of the church, whose clergy were part of the ruling class."[49] Like the boyar families, the monasteries in Bulgaria also wielded considerable political power through ownership of huge parcels of land:[50]

> The monasteries all owned large estates. Thus, for instance, scattered over different parts of Macedonia, the Monastery of St. George (near the town of Skopye) owned over 30 villages, while the Rila Monastery owned more than 20 villages. The charter granted to the monastery by Tsar Ivan Sišman in 1378 is convincing proof of this.

---

46 This opinion is also held by M.MacDermott (op.cit.,23), who writes: "The Turks conquered the Balkans at a time when feudalism in both Byzantium and Bulgaria was already in decay and its downfall inevitable in the natural course of events. In this case Bulgaria would perhaps have followed the same line of development as in Western Europe where the growth of towns and trade was ushering in a new era of social and economic development. Instead the rise of a Bulgarian merchant class and *bourgeoisie* was prevented by the fact that when the Turks destroyed the Bulgarian feudal nobility and the economic power of the clergy, they did not bring with them a more advanced form of economy, but a new feudalism showing no signs of decay or obsolescence."

47 D.Angelov, "Humanism in Medieval Bulgaria," *Études balkaniques* 3 (1980):3-20, pp.5-6.

48 Regarding the erosion of royal power at the hands of feudal lords in medieval Bulgaria, Mishew (op.cit.,165-6) writes: "The tzars and kings themselves were responsible for the creation of *sui generis* feudal rulers in order to be able to control them more easily, without taking into account that by so doing they were undermining the foundation of their own state and power."

49 Angelov, op.cit., 6.

50 Kossev, et al., op.cit., 73.

Lest one accuse Angelov of forcing a Marxist analysis onto medieval Bulgarian history, it should be noted that Angelov's and his Bulgarian colleagues' assessments of the power held by Bulgaria's boyar class in the period of the Second Empire are corroborated by the scholarship of Western scholars such as Fine, who writes:[51]

> The boyars (nobles) in the new state [the Second Empire] were no longer from ancient Bulgar families dating back to the previous Bulgarian empire. The boyars in the revived state rose to prominence from their role in the liberation struggle or from royal appointment...In time...some boyars...accumulated vast estates and with them considerable local authority, enabling them to become in times of central government instability, autonomous rulers in their provinces.

We have surveyed the history of fourteenth-century Bulgaria, the resurgence of the arts (referred to by many different historiographic designations, the most common being the "Second South Slavic Influence"[52]), the concurrent decline of the kingdom, the dissemination of Hesychasm, and the course of Euthymius' career. We should now devote some words to a description of the actual environment in which Euthymius carried out his reforms and served as Patriarch and to the political environment after Bulgaria's absorption into the Ottoman Empire.

Much scholarship has been devoted to the importance of Trnovo as a cultural center in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. We have examined in this and in the previous chapter the development there of an Orthodox cultural revival that culminated in the literary efforts of Euthymius and his pupils. We know that under Ivan Alexander many monasteries were endowed with generous gifts and were restored and decorated by master craftsmen. This benefaction must surely have been felt first at home in the capital, in the churches, the libraries, the schools and the royal residence of Trnovo. Ivan Alexander's capital city boasted dozens of churches, among them St. Dimitar, Holy Mother of God, St. Ivan of

---

51 Fine, op.cit.,16-17.

52 See Iovine, op.cit.,1-65 for a thorough summary of the historiographic formulæ posited by scholars to describe the period in question. Two terms that have gained wide acceptance in their application to this period of artistic and literary development are Eastern European Pre-Renaissance (Lixačev) and Orthodox Slavic Revival (Picchio).

Rila, Church of the Twelve Apostles, St. George, Holy Annunciation (the patriarchal church), and the two already mentioned, SS Peter and Paul and the Church of the Forty Martyrs. Camblak in his panegyric also describes Trnovo as a glorious city, and Patriarch Kallistos once referred to as second only to Constantinople in its beauty.[53]

Trnovo of Euthymius' day, with its relative proximity to Constantinople (with all the advantages and disadvantages that this brought with it) had been undergoing a greater level of Hellenization or Byzantinization than the administrative centers of other Slavic Orthodox lands[54]; and the Bulgarians were the medium through which the Eastern Slavs received their religious literature and Christian culture during the so-called "First South Slavic Influence."[55] Kievan Rus' was, prior to the mid-thirteenth century, another splendid city, larger than the Paris or London of its day[56] and the chosen place of King Harold's exile from England after his defeat at the hands of the Normans.[57] Moreover, political alliances

---

53 See Сырку, op.cit.,390, fn.4. For drawings of building reconstructions and photographs of objects from fourteenth-century Bulgarian material culture, see Assen Tschilingirov, *Christliche Kunst in Bulgarien, von der Spätantike bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, Berlin: Union Verlag, 1978. On page 22 there is a drawing of a reconstruction of the basilica of the palace at Carevec in Trnovo.

54 For an interesting study which examines specific points on which this process of acculturation was limited, see M.Gaebner, "The Slavs in Byzantine Europe--Absorption, Semi-Autonomy and the Limits of Byzantinization," *Byzantinobulgarica* 5 (1978):41-56.

55 See Francis Thomson, "The Bulgarian Contribution to the Reception of Byzantine Culture in Kievan Rus'--the Myths and the Enigma," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988-89): 214-261. He writes on page 214: "The conversion of Kievan Rus' did not lead to the introduction of Byzantine Greek culture, but to the transfer *en masse* of the results of over a century of Bulgarian efforts to receive and adapt that culture to Bulgaria's own needs." See also other controversial and thorough studies by Professor Thomson that demonstrate East Slavic dependence on Bulgarian adaptations and translations of Byzantine literary landmarks in the early Slavic Christian period: "The Implications of the Absence of Quotations of Untranslated Greek Works in Original Early Russian Literature Together with a Critique of a Distorted Picture of Early Bulgarian Culture," *Slavia Gandensia* 15 (1988): 63-91; and "Quotations on Patristic and Byzantine Works by Early Russian Authors as an Introduction of the Cultural Level of Kievan Russia," *Slavia Gandensia* 15 (1988): 65-102.

56 See Serge Zenkovsky, *Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles and Tales*, New York, 1974, p.5.

57 ibid.

concluded between Rus' and Byzantium had brought more than one Byzantine princess to the Kievan court as the tsar's consort. But two centuries of Mongol domination over Rus' had interrupted the process of East Slavdom's Byzantinization, and the East Slavs were only beginning to throw off their yoke in the fourteenth century.[58] So while Kievan Rus' had been razed and Muscovy was just beginning to emerge as the new center of cultural, religious, and political activity, Bulgaria had had since its Christianization steady contact with Byzantium.[59] Moreover, Bulgaria, as

---

[58] Much scholarship has been devoted to the cultural ties between medieval Bulgarian and East Slavic culture and on East Slavdom's cultural ties with Byzantium. Cf., for example, В.Адрианова-Перец, "Дренерусские литературные памятники в южнославянской письменности," *ТОДРЛ* 19 (1963): 5-27; Боню Ангелов, "Проникване на старобългарски съчинения в стара руска литература," *Старобългарска литература* 2 (1977): 20-45; *Руско-южнославянски книжовни връзки*, София: БАН, 1980; Д.Ангелов, *Руско-български връзки през вековете*, София: БАН, 1986; Б.В.Брюсова, "О русско-болгарских связях в искусстве XI-XV вв,"*Byzantinobulgarica* 8 (1986): 131-149; И.Калиганов, "Несколько соображений о методике изучения болгаро-сербско-русских средневековых литературных связей," *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985): 58-73; В.Лазарев, *Византийское и древнерусское иссуство*, Москва: АН СССР, 1978; Г.Литаврин, "Древняя Русь, Болгария и Византия в IX-X вв.: история, культура, этнография и фольклор славянских народов," *Материалы IX Международного съезда славистов*, Москва: АН СССР, 1983; D.S.Lixačev, "The Type and Character of Byzantine Influence on Old Russian Literature," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 13 (1967): 16-32; М.Сперанский, *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей*, Москва: АН СССР, 1960; М.Тихомиров, "Исторические связи русского народа с южными славянами с древнейших времен до половины XVII в.," *Славянский сборник*, 125-201, Москва, 1947; D.Worth, "The Second South Slavic Influence in the History of the Russian Literary Language (Materials for Discussion)," *American Contributions to the 9th International Congress of Slavists, (September 1983, Kiev)*, vol.1, Linguistics, 349-372, edited by M.Flier, Columbus, 1983.

[59] The year of Christinization of the Bulgarians under Tsar Boris is usually placed at 864. For general information, see R.E.Sullivan, "Khan Boris and the Conversion of Bulgaria: A Case Study of the Impact of Christianity on a Barbarian Society," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 3 (1966): 51-139. On the question of dating this event, see Stamen Mihajlov, "The Interpretation of ЕТХЪЕХТН and the Year of the Conversion of the Bulgarians into the Chrisian Faith," *Bulgarian Historical Review* 1 (1979): 75-90. The article calls into question the 864 dating by Vaillant and agrees with Zlatarski's interpretation based on a proto-Bulgarian calendar, putting the date around 866.

will be remembered, even constituted a part of the Byzantine Empire from 1018 to 1185.[60] Birnbaum writes:

> Given Bulgaria's proximity to Constantinople and the capital's highly developed and sophisticated civilization, it is not surprising that soon after the Slavic population south of the lower Danube had largely assimilated their Turkic [proto-Bulgar] conquerors, a form of cultural precociousness evolved in the East Balkans which implied a far-reaching Byzantinization unmatched anywhere else among the Slavs...Given the strikingly rapid cultural development of Bulgaria, it seems only natural that, in addition to Greek Byzantium itself, it would become the chief model and source of inspiration for the other Slavic nations recently converted, or about to be converted, to Orthodox Christianity, the Slavs of Kievan Rus' among them.[61]

It is worth noting as well that in less than a one hundred year span, from approximately 1250 to 1345, four different Bulgarian tsars took a Byzantine princess as a wife. Tsar Konstantin Tih (1257-77) married princess Maria, the niece of Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus; Tsar Theodore Svetoslav (1300-1322) married the sister of Emperor Andronicus III. Then, after the one-year reign of Georgij II Terter, she was taken by the successor Tsar Mikhail Šišman as his consort. Finally, Tsar Ivan Alexander's (1331-1371) first wife (whom he divorced ca.1345) was the Byzantine princess Theodora. So for the first fifty years of the fourteenth century, queens of Byzantine origin presided at the Bulgarian royal palace. The presence of Byzantine royalty at the Bulgarian court must have greatly enhanced the level of the cultural institutions there that were already firmly in place and thriving. This five-decade long representation in the Bulgarian royal court of the highest level of Byzantine culture also provides a partial explanation for Bulgaria's pursuit of parallel cultural activities that characterized Byzantium's "Palaeologan Renaissance". The Bulgarians' desire to "be Greek" in the context of the Golden Age of Tsar Symeon has already been discussed in passing in the

---

60 See Д.Ангелов, *Общество и обществена мисъл в средновековна България (IX-XIV в.)*, София: Партиздат, 1979, the section entitled "Византийско владичество," 258-269.

61 H.Birnbaum, "The Balkan Slavic Component of Medieval Russian Culture," in *Medieval Russian Culture*, California Slavic Studies 7, edited by H.Birnbaum and M.Flier, 3-30, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1984.

previous chapter. Evidence that the Bulgarians continued a policy of creating out of their country a colony of Byzantine culture is found in the vestiges of Ivan Asen II's reign, when many Byzantine-style churches were built. Also, the frescoes of the Bojana Church, built ca. 1259 during the reign of Konstantin Tih, show Konstantin and the tsarina dressed in full regalia that is clearly fashioned on that of contemporary Byzantine dress.[62] The London Gospel of Ivan Alexander also shows him and his wife Sarah-Theodora in Byzantine royal dress, and the tsar is standing on a cushion which bears the Byzantine royal symbol, the two-headed eagle, later to be adopted in Russia.

Once Trnovo was destroyed, the Ottomans set up a capital first in Plovdiv and then in Sofia.[63] With Trnovo in ruins, the heartbeat of cultural life of the country was destroyed; and another decision made by the Ottoman administration had a serious impact on the source of spiritual life: this was the abolishment of the two hundred-year-old Bulgarian patriarchate.[64] Euthymius, having refused the Turks' offer to convert to Islam, was sent into exile, and immediately the office of the Trnovo Patriarch was eliminated, and jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Church was handed over to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Jeremiah, Metropolitan of

---

[62] See plates IV and V in Андрей Грабар, *Боянската църква*, София: Наука и изкуство, 1978.

[63] See B.A. Cvetkova, "Sur le sort de Tarnovo, capitale bulgare au Moyen Âge, après sa prise par les Osmanlis," *Byzantinobulgarica* 2 (1966): 181-198; and V. Tchaplikov, "Le tombeau d'Euthyme de Tirnovo," *Echos d'Orient* 9 (1906): 292-8. For a summary of the concurrent struggle in Byzantium against the Turks, cf. George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan Hussey, Oxford: Blackwell, 1956, pp. 489-503; L.Bréhier, *The Life and Death of Byzantium*, Amsterdam, New York: North Holland Publishing Co., 1977; D.Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261-1453*, London: Hart-Davis, 1972; and А.Васильев, *Падение Византии: эпоха Палеологов (1261-1453)*, Петроград, 1925; A.Vasiliev, *A History of the Byzantine Empire*, 2 vols., Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.

[64] The independent Trnovo patriarchate was established in 1234 under the reign of Ivan Asen II. Metropolitan Joachim of Trnovo was consecrated as the first Bulgarian patriarch. See D.Mishew, op.cit., p.26. For general information on the history of relations between the Bulgaria and Byzantium on issues of the Church, cf. Е.Голубинский, *Краткий очерк истории провославных церквей болгарской, сербской и румынской*, Москва, 1871; and V.Swoboda, "L'origine de l'organisation de l'église en Bulgarie et ses rapports avec le patriarcat de Constantinople (870-919)," *Byzantinobulgarica* 2 (1966):67-81.

Moldavia, was made bishop of Trnovo.[65] Mishew notes that the Ottoman decision to abolish the Bulgarian patriarchate was "inconsistent with their general policy of preserving the previous order of things and avoiding [intrusions] upon the spiritual life of the conquered nations."[66] He concludes that this decision may have very likely been prompted by interference from Constantinople, whose Patriarch "had always been hostile to the Bulgarian National Church."[67] This conclusion is quite plausible. Later we see a clear-cut example of Greek interference in the affairs of the Bulgarian Church regarding the continued existence of the archbishopric of Oxrid, which had been established in 1020. The Turks had allowed the post to remain intact up until 1767; and apparently they only abolished the post then at the insistence of Samuel, the Patriarch of Constantinople.[68] According to Mishew, the patriarchate of Constantinople "obtained from the invaders such privileges as it had not enjoyed even under the Byzantine rulers."[69] In a letter to the Pope written in the year 1385, the Patriarch of Constantinople "testified...that the Sultan left to his church complete liberty of action."[70]

The attitude of the Ottomans toward the Bulgarian Church seems to be one of ambiguity. Sultan Murad, from the beginning, when Bulgaria was still a vassal state, adopted "a certain tolerance toward the indigenous Christians"[71]; but Murad's policy clearly had limits. Ottoman soldiers could, under the protection of the law, enslave and have complete control over the inhabitants of a captured area unless they vowed to practice Islam.

---

65 Cf. Mishew, op.cit., 173-175. For information on the circumstances regarding the placement of Jeremiah in this post, cf. N. Iorga, *Istoria Bisericii Românesti*, vol.I, Bucaresti, 1908, pp.49-50. These pages are also quoted by Mishew, ibid.

66 Mishew, op.cit.,175.

67 ibid.

68 Mishew, op.cit., 26.

69 Mishew, op.cit., 171.

70 Kinross, op.cit., 59.

71 Kinross, op.cit., 47.

Yet the Ottomans left intact some of the most important institutions of the Church. Though Bulgaria now had no patriarch of its own, it did for more than two centuries, as just mentioned, retain its archbishop's seat at Oxrid. Furthermore, if the passage in the Loveč Codex that states that Euthymius went to live at Bačkovo Monastery is true[72], then this would indicate that some of Bulgaria's monasteries remained open and working after Bulgaria was absorbed into the Turkish Empire. As a policy the Turks did not close existing Christian churches in Bulgaria, but placed strict parameters on their construction: they could not have windows, bells, belfries, cupolas; and they had to stand lower than the mosques.[73] For a time, however, the Turks did forbid the construction of new churches.

The preservation of certain aspects of the Church's infrastructure under the Ottomans serves as a contrast to their harsh treatment of the Bulgarians. The boyars who would not convert to Islam were either killed, as is corroborated by Camblak's account in his panegyric, or were exiled to Asia Minor. While the Turks never forced Islam on the peasant population, the consequences for remaining a Christian, or *raya* (i.e. a non-Moslem) were harsh. The Christian peasants were retained to work the land of the *spahi* estates (the estates given to members of the elite cavalry to administer) and were levied very heavy taxes. The most devastating of these taxes was the *ispendzh*, a levy of Christian children. Under this tax, every five years the best children from *raya* households were taken away to be sold as slaves or to be trained as militant Moslems and warriors in Constantinople. The latter group would enter the Sultan's infantry, the Corps of the Janissaries.[74] Only married Christian young men were

---

[72] See H.Goldblatt, *Orthography and Orthodoxy: Constantine Kostenečki's Treatise of the Letters*, Studia Historica et Philologica, no.16. Florence: Le Lettere, 1987, p.52, fn.42.

[73] MacDermott, op.cit., p.26.

[74] MacDermott, op.cit., 29. The term "janissaries" comes from the Turkish phrase "yeni çeri", or "new army." See also Elizabeth Zachariadou, "Les «janissaires» de l'empereur byzantin," in *Studia turcologica memoriæ Alexii Bombaci dicata*, 591-597, Seminario di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor XIX, Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1982; reprinted as article XI of *E.A. Zachariadou, Romania and the Turks (c.1300-c.1500)*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1985.

exempted from this conscription.[75] Those Bulgarians who did convert to Islam -- as did the tsar's own son Alexander[76] -- had the possibility of entering the elite strata of Ottoman society. According to MacDermott:[77]

> Those Bulgarians who gave up their religion and embraced Islam *ipso facto* entered the ranks of the ruling class, since the Turks made no division between race or nationality, but only between Moslem and non-Moslem.

Through loyal service to the sultan, the convert could himself become a feudal lord under the new government. Even some Bulgarians who did not convert but served the state loyally or who possessed a needed skill or craft were given special privileges by being exempt from some taxes.[78]

Such were the conditions in Bulgaria during Euthymius' old age. He developed into one of his culture's greatest writers and intellects during a splendid and brilliant moment in Bulgaria's history. The Trnovo he grew up in and came back to from Byzantium as a middle-aged man was the

---

75 MacDermott, op.cit., 24, describes other hardships that befell the Bulgarian people: "The Bulgarians had to suffer national and religious persecution, many were taken into slavery; women and girls were taken away to Turkish harems; efforts were made to force individuals to become Moslems, and the Bulgarian population was chased out of towns to make room for Turkish colonists."

It seems, however, that under Bulgarian rule, the indigenous peasant population also suffered terrible burdens of taxation. D. Kossev, H.Hristov, and D. Angelov (op.cit.,73-4) write: "The peasants were heavily burdened with numerous taxes. The most widespread of these were the different kinds of tithes levied on farm produce (wheat and fruits) and on domestic animals (cows, sheep, poultry). A tax was paid on each house, called *dimnina* (from *dim* -- smoke), a tax for the church (*canonicon*) and many more. Besides the regular taxes, the peasants were often compelled to supply additional quantities of foodstuffs and domestic animals for the needs of the officials and the army. They also had to pay various taxes in order to engage in certain economic activities (fishing, milling wheat) or to utilize the forests and pastures which belonged to the state or the boyar (to cut wood and graze their cattle). Most of the taxes were paid in kind, but some of them had to be paid in cash."

76 Tsar Ivan Šišman's son, Alexander voluntarily converted to Islam in order to retain some power and under the Ottoman rule became the governor of the Asiatic city of Samsun. His younger brother, Vladislav, fled to Hungary.

See V.N. Zlatarski's article "Bulgariens historia till befrielsen 1878" in *Bulgarerna*, ed.M. Ehrenpreis and A.Jensen, Stockholm, 1918, pp.3-39. On page 21 Zlatarski writes: "Hans [Ivan Šišmans] äldste son Alexander övergick till islam och blev ståthållare i den asiatiska staden Samsun; den yngre sonen Vladislav flydde till Ungern."

77 MacDermott, op.cit.,25.

78 MacDermott, op.cit., 29-31.

jewel of the Balkans. Euthymius, perhaps more than any of his contemporaries, helped to enact this great literary flourishing that has come to be associated with the "Second South Slavic Influence." Then, after 1393, the face of his country changed completely. His homeland was destroyed; the capital city lay in ruins; the tsar fled to Nikopol and was later killed on Bayezid's order.[79] His friends and colleagues were killed, enslaved, imprisoned or exiled; and now, his Church taken away from him, he was sent away -- having been mercifully spared his life -- to live out his remaining years in the south. His literary descendents -- the greatest among them Gregory Camblak and Konstantin Kostenečki -- went abroad, to East Slavdom and Serbia respectively. These men continued the literary work that was pursued apparently indefatigably by the last Bulgarian patriarch, Camblak in the capacity of metropolitan of Lithuania and Kiev and Kostenečki as the intellectual force behind the Resava School.[80] Through these and other men, Euthymius' legacy was spread to other Orthodox lands, where it was to be a source of inspiration for a long time to come.

---

[79] Kossev, et al., op.cit., 87.

[80] See H.Goldblatt, op.cit., 68-69.

Section II

The Vitæ of Patriarch Euthymius: Introduction, Translations, and Annotation

Chapter 1: Preface to Translations and Inventory of Extant Manuscripts

A. Preface:

This entire section of our study is devoted to the hagiographic texts of Patriarch Euthymius. Heretofore, these texts have appeared in editions only in the original (Church Slavonic) or in Modern Bulgarian translation. One reason, of course, for translating a work is to increase the size of its audience, to make the work available to a linguistic community that otherwise would not have known the text (except perhaps through descriptions found in secondary sources that are accessible). Naturally this was one of the goals we had in mind in translating the saints' lives of Patriarch Euthymius. The other reason we had for undertaking these translations was to make the content of these texts as clear as possible so that there should be no impediment to following the arguments developed in Sections III and IV of this study. Of course, for Slavists these translations are meant to be used merely as a supplement to the original texts. For those scholars who work with hagiographic sources from other traditions, we hope that these texts, along with the other translations that exist of Slavic works, will render Slavic literature less esoteric and inaccessible.

In translating the four hagiographic works of Patriarch Euthymius into English, we employed the reprint edition of Kałużniacki's *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius.* This is the only edition in which all four of Euthymius' extant saints' lives appear in the original Church Slavonic with all textual variants. Of the four vitæ by Euthymius, only the *Life of Ivan of Rila* has appeared in other editions in Slavonic.[1] The *Life*

---

[1] Й.Иванов, *Български старини из Македония,* 1st edition, Sofia, 1908; 2nd edition, Sofia, 1931; reprint of 2nd edition, Sofia, 1970: pp.369-383. ; and *Жития на св. Ивана Рилски с уводни бележки,* Годишник на Софийски Университет, ист.-филолог. фак., кн. 32, 59-73, София, 1936. This last edition contains all of the various versions of the vita: the folk version, the prologue versions, and the Euthymian version. See Turdeanu, *La littérature bulgare du XIVe siècle et sa diffusion dans les pays roumains,* Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves, no.22, Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1947, pp. 72-3; for the details of Ivanov's edition. There was also a study done by P.A. Syrku, "Несколько заметокъ о двух произведениях Терновскаго

of Paraskeva has appeared only in excerpts in various anthologies[2], and the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena* and the *Life of Philothea* have not been published in any source other than Kałużniacki's. Kałużniacki's edition contains all of the textual variants that occur in the manuscripts that he examined. Moreover, Kałużniacki includes in his study manuscripts from his private collection to which Ivanov, in his later study of the Euthymian texts (see footnote 1) did not have access and does not even mention in his study.[3]

All four vitæ of Patriarch Euthymius have appeared previously in Modern Bulgarian translations. There are four Modern Bulgarian translations of the *Life of Ivan of Rila*, three of the *Life of Paraskeva*, one of the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena* and one of the *Life of Philothea*.[4] There is also a Modern Macedonian translation of the *Life of Hilarion*.[5] All of these translations vary greatly in the wealth of scholarly annotation they offer. For example, in the *Христоматия по старобългарска*

Патриарха Евѳимия," *Сборникъ статей по славяноведению В.И. Ламанскаго*, Санкт-Петербург, 1883, pp.346-380.

2 See also Krasimir Stančev's article on post-Euthymian Greek versions of the *Life of Paraskeva* : К.Станчев, "Едно малко познато гръцко житие на Параскева Епиватска (Петка Търновска)," *Българско средновековие (Българо-съветски сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф. И. Дуйчев)*, 270-286, София: Наука и изкуство, 1980.

3 See Turdeanu, op.cit., 75, fn.1.

4 1) LIR: In addition to the translations contained in the *Христоматия по старобългарска литература* (Динеков, Куев, Петканова, ред., София: Наука и изкуство, 1967) and volume 4 of *Стара българска литература* (К.Иванова, ред., София: Български писател, 1986), the LIR appears in Modern Bulgarian translation also in the following editions: В. Киселков, *Свети Иван Рилски*, p. 38-60; and Ив. Гошев, *Трите най-стари пространни жития на Иван Рилски*, Годишник на Софийски университет, бог. фак., том 25 (1948); 2) LP: In addition to the translations contained in the *Христоматия* and volume 4 of *Стара българска литература*, the LP appears in Modern Bulgarian translation also in the following edition: В.Киселков, *Житие на св. Параскева*, Българска историческа библиотека, том I, 1930, с.190-217; 3) LHM: A Modern Bulgarian translation is contained in vol.4 of *Стара българска литература* ; 4) LPh: Only the translation contained in vol.4 of *Стара българска литература* is known to us.

5 See Вера Антиќ, *Локални агиографии во Македонија*, 47-73, Скопје: Просветно дело, 1977.

литература, one will find translations of the *Life of Ivan of Rila* and the *Life of Paraskeva* (as well as a translation of Euthymius's letter to Kiprian).[6] These translations, while accurate, contain extremely few notes to the texts (all three translations contains a total of eleven endnotes), and none of the biblical passages is ascribed to its scriptural sources.

In the anthology *Стара българска литература* (том 4, Житиеписни творби), there are translations of all of the Euthymian hagiographic texts, and these are the most scholarly translations done into Modern Bulgarian. All of the translations of the Euthymian vitæ in this volume were done solely by Klimentina Ivanova, Bulgaria's most serious scholar of Euthymius and his hagiographic school[7] (except for the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena*, which was done by her in collaboration with M.Spasova). Ivanova's translation of the *Life of Ivan of Rila* is based on the edition of J.Ivanov and the copy of the Zograph Sbornik.[8] The translation of the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena* is based on a photocopy of the Zograph Sbornik and Kałużniacki's edition.[9] Ivanova's translations of the *Life of Paraskeva*[10] and the *Life of Philothea*[11] are both based on Kałużniacki's edition.

Our translations are done directly from the Church Slavonic texts as published by Kałużniacki, and we consulted the aforementioned translations only in the final stages of translating the works into English.

---

6 See pp.390-417 for the translated texts and endnotes.

7 Of her many studies, see, for example, К.Иванова, "Литературни наблюдения върху две похвални слова от Евтимий Търновски," *Старобългарска литература* 14 (1983): 10-36; "Похвалното слово за Иоан Поливотски от Евтимий Търновски," *Старобългарска литература* 12 (1982): 30-53; "Византийските източници на Похвалната за Константин и Елена от Патриарх Евтимий Търновски," *Старобългарска литература* 10 (1981): 3-15.

8 For the text of the LIR, see volume 4 of *Стара българска литература* (К.Иванова, ред., София: Български писател, 1986) pp.135-148; and annotation, pp.551-556.

9 For the text of the LHM, ibid., pp. 89-108; and annotation, pp. 531-537.

10 For the text of the LP, ibid., pp.191-202; and annotation, pp.577-581.

11 For the text of the LPh, ibid., pp.202-216; and annotation, pp.581-584.

All information taken from K.Ivanova's translations or her annotations to them are credited below in our footnotes.

We should like to make some remarks regarding specific issues in rendering these texts into English:

Sentence Structure:

In translating these saints' lives, we have aimed to preserve as much as is possible the original structure of the sentences. This results at times in long, paragraph-length sentences and in series of dependent clauses that do not have any logical connection. We feel, however, that in order to render in translation the complexities of the high-style rhetoric -- with its elaborate intertwining of dependent and independent clauses -- it is better to forgo smoothness of style, which might be acheived by breaking up the texts into shorter sentences. Paragraph breaks in the translations do not appear in the original and are added simply to give some organizational structure to the content.

Tautological devices:

Throughout his writings, Euthymius employs the convention of tautology, the repetition of the same word or root within a phrase. This is a common feature of high Byzantine and Slavonic rhetoric. We have tried to preserve these tautological devices wherever they occur, and the result may seem awkward to the reader (i.e. "shepherded by a true shepherd", in *Life of Ivan Of Rila,* chap. III).

Verb Tense:

In the texts of the vitae the present tense, as well as the aorist and imperfect, is used to relate past events. Where the present tense occurs in this context, we have employed the past tense for the sake of uniformity of tense throughout the translation.

Textual Insertions:

Actual names of characters in the vitae are sometimes put in brackets where the original simply uses a pronoun. In order to avoid the confusion that results in the use of "he", for example, within one sentence to refer to three different male characters, we provide the names of the people

referred to in brackets to make the meaning clearer. Also, sometimes words are inserted into the text that do not appear in the original for the sake of clarifying the meaning. These words are also put into brackets.

Biblical quotations:

Actual quotes from the Bible have been translated into English by employing the Revised Standard Version (RSV). For the sake of comparing Biblical quotations of the original Slavonic text with a Slavonic Bible, several sources have been employed: 1) the Sinai Psalter[12]; 2) the Codex Zographensis[13]; 3) the Codex Assemanianus[14]; 4) the Codex Christinopolis, a twelfth-century Slavonic translation of the Acts and the Epistles[15]; and 5) a Russian Church Slavonic Bible, published by the Moscow Synodal Press.[16] We refer to quotations from this Moscow Synod Bible in the footnotes with the abbreviation MSB. Quotes from the Revised Standard Version will be accompanied by the abbreviation RSV. Where passages from the King James (Authorized) Version are quoted for the sake of comparison with the RSV, the standard scholarly abbreviation AV is employed. For Greek scriptural variants, we have used two sources: 1) the Rahlfs edition of the Septuagint[17], referred to throughout by the standard scholarly abbreviation LXX; 2) and for the Greek New Testament, *The Triglot Bible*.[18]

---

12 С. Северьянов, *Синайская Псалтырь, глаголический памятник XI в*, Петроград: Издание отделения руссого языка и словесности российской акадамеии наук 1922; reprint, Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

13 Vatroslav Jagić, *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*, Berlin, 1879; reprint, Graz: Akad.Druck-U.Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

14 Josef Kurz, *Evangeliarium Assemani (Evangeliář Assemanův)*, Vol.2, Úvod, text v přepise cyrilském, poznámky textové, seznamy čteni, Prague: Nakladatelství československé akademie věd, 1955.

15 Émile Kałużniacki, *Actus Epistolaeque Apostolorum Palaeoslovenice*, Vienna, 1896.

16 *Библия*, Москва: Синодальная Типография, 1904; reprinted by Harasté Press in Italy.

17 Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 2 vols., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935.

18 *The Triglot Bible*, vol.2 (The New Testament), London: Dickinson, 1890.

B. The Manuscripts:

Because Kałużniacki's volume is relatively difficult to obtain, we have reproduced here the information given by Kałużniacki on the extant manuscripts of the vitæ he consulted for his edition. In those cases in which the whereabouts of the manuscripts Kałużniacki examined are known to us, we have given them along with his description.

Contained within Kaluzniacki's own introduction to his volume, he lists the eighty-seven manuscripts containing Euthymius's work available at the time of the compilation of the book.[19] This does not come close to an exhaustive list of the extant manuscripts of the vitæ by Patriarch Euthymius,[20] but as Ivan Dujčev points, Kałużniacki used "all the manuscripts available at that time."[21] Of the extant texts of the vitae, Kałużniacki was able to examine personally M, N, O, P, Ř,S, T, V, W, Y, Z, Ž, A^1, B^1, $Č^1$, D^1, E^1, I^1, T^1, A^3, and C^3 (information on each below). He acquainted himself with the other manuscripts through copies, excerpts or publications available to him.[22]

Because Kałużniacki already devised alpha-numeric codes for cataloguing the manuscripts, we will use the same sigils to avoid any confusion for the sake of those wishing to refer to his original footnotes to the texts of the vitae. Turdeanu, in his book *La littérature bulgare et sa*

---

[19] See Kałużniacki, *Werke*, c-cxxii

[20] For more, consult, for example, the subject indices of Bogdanović, Dimitrije. *Inventar ćiriłskix rukopisa u Jugoslaviji (XI-XVII veka)*, Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda, 31, Belgrade: Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, 1982; and Христов, et al., *Български ръкописи от XI до XVII век запазени в България*, том I, София: Народна Библиотека «Кирил и Методий», Българска Археографска Комисия, 1982.

[21] See Kałużniacki, *Werke*, p.iii.

[22] He writes (op.cit., p.cxxi): "Alles in Allem genommen, lassen sich sonach die hier verzeichneten Handschriften, beziehungsweise die darin enthaltenen Werke des Euthymius vom Standpunkte der Art, wie sie von mir benutzt worden sind, in nachstehende Gruppen scheiden: 1. in solche, die ich habe unmittelbar benutzen können; 2. in solche, die mir in Abschriften, Collationen, Excerpten u.s.w. vorlagen ; 3. in solche, die mir in fertigen Abdrücken zur Verfügung standen." This is followed by lists of manuscripts for each of the three groups

diffusion dans les pays roumains also preserves Kałużniacki's cataloguing system.

Throughout his own edition of the texts of Euthymius's vitae, Kałużniacki singles out variants between the various extant manuscripts. Most of his comments serve to point out differences in the spelling of individual lexical items, differences in verbal aspect usage or verb tense. Such textual variants we will not treat in this introduction or in our own footnotes to the translations. The reader who is interested in these points of the original texts may find all of the information in Kałużniacki's volume. The textual variants that we are conerned with in translating these vitae are those that reflect significant differences in content. Such variants are embedded in the footnotes of our translations of the texts.

1. Extant manuscripts of the *Life of Ivan Of Rila*:

Originally, before Euthymius composed his own vita of Ivan of Rila, there were four known versions of the life: 1) a folk version, which literary historians feel had to have been written before 1183 because it makes no mention of the taking of the relics by the Magyars from Serdica to Hungary; 2) a version written by the Byzantine writer and administrator of Serdica, Gregorios Skylitz, sometime in the second half of the 12th century and later translated into Bulgarian; and 3) two short vitae (prologue versions) by Bulgarian writers of the late 13th or early 14th century, well after the translation of Ivan's relics back to Trnovo.[23]

Kałużniacki divides the Euthymian versions of the life into three categories: 1) the original redaction, which represents the life as Euthymius originally wrote it (manuscripts A^1 and $\check{C}^1$); 2) the expanded redaction (manuscripts C, N, O, and T), which differs from the original redaction in that it includes a rather lengthy account of the renovation of the Rila Monastery and an account of the translation of the relics back to Trnovo (inserted between chapters XII and XIII of the original redaction) and in some other ways which Kałużniacki covers in detail on pp.lv-lvii of his introduction. Kałużniacki feels certain that this version can be attributed to Vladislav the Grammarian of the Marien Monastery in Žeglegovo, Montenegro[24]; and 3) the shortened redaction, of which Kałużniacki distinguishes three different forms. The first form of the shortened redaction (manuscript E^1) was used by Kałużniacki as a supplement to manuscript A^1 of the original redaction to reproduce the text of the vita. It differs from the original redaction only in that the final sentence of Chapter XII ("slepii bo ubo prixodąšte", etc.) and all of Chapter XIII are missing. Though Kałużniacki does not state this, one can assume that he used manuscript C^1 to arrive at this summary of differences, at least as far as chapters III-VII are concerned, which are missing in his own

---

[23] Cf. Божков, Динеков, et al.,ed. *История на българската литература*, том I (София: БАН, 1963):293; and Kałużniacki, op.cit., li.

[24] He writes (ibid.,lix): "In Ansehung all' der Umstände trage ich sonach kein Bedenken, mich auf die Seite derer zu stellen, die die Erzählung von der Wiederherstellung des Ryler Klosters und der Übertragung der Gebeine des Johannes Rylski in dieses Kloster für eine Arbeit des Grammatikers Ladislaus halten."

manuscript A^1. The details of how the other two forms of the shortened redaction differ from the original redaction can be found in Kałużniacki's introduction on pages lxi-lxiv.

For the Euthymian versions (original, expanded and shortened) of the *Life of Ivan of Rila*, there are twenty-three manuscripts alone. Kałużniacki says (p.6,fn.1) that text A^1 (a copy of the original redaction) provided the basis of the reproduced text of the *Life of Ivan of Rila* in this volume; and for whatever was missing in that text, he used E^1 (a copy of the shortened redaction). He also footnotes ten others and lists eleven more in his introduction (see notes on each below). I have listed them in the same order they appear in his introduction (pp.c-cxxii):

C. A manuscript from the Chilandar Monastery [Mt.Athos], Nr.214, of the 17th century, Serbian-Church Slavonic. It contains the expanded redaction. Description found in K.P. Dimitriev-Petković in his *Обзоръ Аѳонскихъ древностей,* Ученыя Записки, Имп. Акад. Наук, VI, Supplement Nr.4, p.61, and in Sava Chilandarec, *Rukopisy a starotisky Chilandarské,* Sitzungsb. der königl. böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissensch.,Cl. für Philosophie etc., Jahrgang 1896, Abh. VI, pp.53-54.

D. A manuscript from the Monastery of St. Paul on Mount Athos, of the 17th century, Serbian-Church Slavonic. Description in K.P. Dimitriev-Petković in his *Обзоръ Аѳонскихъ древностей,* Ученыя Записки, Имп. Акад. Наук, VI, Supplement Nr.4, p.34.

L. A manuscript from the Zograph Monastery on Mt. Athos [no reference number given], of the 15th century, Bulgarian-Church Slavonic. Description in V. Istrin in *Журналъ министерства народного просвещения,* April, 1896, p.75.

M. Manuscript of the Rila Monastery in Bulgaria, Nr.47, 17th century (1602), Serbian-Church Slavonic. It contains: the shortened redaction, third form. Cited by Kačanovskij in Христианское Чтение, 1882, II, p.248, annotated text. [This manuscript is now preserved in the Народен Музей

«Рилски Монастир» in Rila, Bulgaria under No. 1/22 (47). See Христова, et al., *Български ръкописи*[25], entry 414, p.153 -- MH].

N. Manuscript of the Rila Monastery in Bulgaria, Nr.61, a Serbian-Church Slavonic recension written in 1479 by the well-known scribe, Vladislav the Grammarian. It contains the expanded redaction. Kałużniacki wrote that a detailed description of this manuscript, which is important in many respects, was not available to him. Incidental notes can be found in: 1) *Život sv. Konstantina* etc., edited by P.J. Šafařik, p.111 ff.; 2) V. Grigorovič, *Очерк путешествия по европ. Турции*, p.158 onward; 3) *Описание болг. свящ. монастыря Рыльскаго, составилъ иером. Неофитъ Рылецъ*, p.101 onward; 4) Христианское Чтение, 1882, II, p.216 onward; Периодическо Списание, new series, I, p.42 onward; C. Jireček, *Cesty po Bulharsku*, p.465 onward.; B. Conev, "Ръкописната сбирка въ Рилския манастиръ," reprinted in *Български Преглед* X, p.6. [This manuscript is now preserved in the Народен Музей «Рилски Монастир» in Rila, Bulgaria under No. 4/8 (61). See Христова, et al., *Български ръкописи*, entry 131, p.62 -- MH].

O. Manuscript of the Rila Monastery in Bulgaria, Nr. 62, a Serbian-Church Slavonic recension. According to the epilogue, it was written in 1483 by several scribes in the Rila Monastery. It contains the expanded redaction. It appears in the same sources as item N, and in addition: Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина XII (София, Державна Печатница), p.615 onward. [This manuscript is now preserved in the Народен Музей «Рилски Монастир» in Rila, Bulgaria under No. 4/5. See Христова, et al., *Български ръкописи*, entry 132, p.63 -- MH].

P. Manuscript belonging to the church of the village of Rila, Bulgaria, 15th-century, Bulgarian-Church Slavonic; preserved today in the monastic

[25] Full bibliographical details in fn.20 above.

library. It contains the shortened redation, third form. Mentioned by Kačanovskij in Христианское чтение, 1882, II, p.219, annotated text.

Š. Manuscript of the St. Prochorus Monastery (near Pčinja on the Vranja) in Serbia. The orthography belongs to the 16th century, Serbian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction, third form. Description by Philaret, *Святые южныхъ славянъ*, II, p.43 onward, and in the Известия Имп. А.Н.,VIII, p.150 onward.

T. A manuscript of the Serbian National Library in Beograd, Nr.22. Kałużniacki writes: "It is not, as Novaković believes, of the 15th century, but on the contrary of the 16th century, and is to be sure Serbian-Church Slavonic." It contains the expanded redaction. A detailed description can be found in Гласник XXII, p.233 onward, and Гласник IX, pp.40-41, and Видов Дан, 1863, Nr. 11-12. [This manuscript burned during World War II, see Dimitrije Bogdanović, *Inventar ćirilskix rukopisa*[26], p.271 -- MH].

W. A manuscript of the Viennese Imperial Library (der Wiener Hofbibliothek) [now the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek -- MH], Slavic section, Nr.53. Of the 16th century; and certainly Serbian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction, third form. Kałużniacki writes that no description of this manuscript is available.

Y. A manuscript of the St. Onuphrius Monastery in Lemberg, Nr.15, 16th century, Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction, third form. Description in B. Dudik, *Die Archive im Königreich Galizien und Lodomerien*, Archiv für österreichische Geschichtsquellen XXXIX, p.151 and in Kałużniacki's *Обзоръ славяно-русскихъ памятниковъ языка и письма, находящихся въ библиотекахъ и архивахъ Львовскихъ*, reprinted in *Труды третьяго археологическаго съезда въ России, бывшаго въ Киеве въ Августе 1874 года*, том II, Киев, 1878, p.8 onward.

---

[26] Full bibliographical details in fn.20 above.

A[1]. A manuscript from Kałużniacki's own Collection, Nr.10, 15th century, Bulgarian-Church Slavonic. It is the same manuscript from which he published the *Legende vom Taxaotes,* Archiv für slav.Philol. XVI (1894), pp.42 onward. It contains a fragment of the original redaction. Of particular note are extant: a) the heading/title; b) the beginning of chapter 1 up to and including: "Dovolno bo takovoe bǫdetь žitie"; c) the beginning of Chapter II up to and including: "Nǫ doblyj nepokolěblemь prěbyvaaše"; d) the end of Chapter VIII from the words "Carь že sie pročьtь"; and e) all of Chapters IX-XIII.

Č[1]. A manuscript of the Némţŭ Monastery in Romania, Nr.14, 15th century, Serbian-Church Slavonic. It contains only the heading and the beginning of Chapter I up to and including the words: "I slyšeštiimь prilagajet se duševna pišta". According to the heading, this manuscript could represent the vita in its original redaction as well as the first form of the shortened redaction. Description in in G. Tocilescu's Revista pentru istorie, archeologie si filologie II., p 130 and in А.И. Яцимирский *Славянские рукописи Нямецкаго монастыря въ Румынии,* reprinted in *Древности слав. коммисии Москов. археолог. общества,* 1898, pp.59-60.

E[1]. Manuscript of the Némţŭ Monastery in Romania, Nr.106, 15th century (1439), Bulgarian-Church Slavonic. This manuscript was penned by Gabriel, the monk and late abbot of the Nemtu Monastery. It contains the shortened redaction, first form.

F[1]. A manuscript of the Bistrita Monastery in Romania, Nr.11. It is from the end of the 15th century, possibly the beginning of the 16th century; Bulgarian-Church Slavonic; and is today in the Romanian National Museum in Bucharest as Nr.1144. It contains the shortened redaction, first form. A description appears in Melčisedek's *Notiţe istorice şi archelogice, adunate pe la 48 mônastiri şi biserici antice din Moldova,* Bucharest 1885, p.72.

I[1]. A manuscript of the Archeographical Commission in Kiev, Nr.433, 16th century, Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction, third form. Kałużniacki writes that no description was available to him.

Ř[1]. A manuscript of the Rumjancev Museum in Moscow, Nr.1706, of the 16th century, Bulgarian-Church Slavonic. Of the works of Euthymius it contains the *Life of Ivan Rylskij,* the shortened redaction, third form. Description by A. Viktorov, *Собрание рукописей В.И. Григоровича,* Moscow, 1879, pp.16-17. [This manuscript is now housed in the Государственная Библиотека СССР им. В.И. Ленина in Moscow -- MH].

Š[1]. A manuscript of the Xludov Collection, Nr.190, end of the 14th century, Bulgarian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction, third form (without the beginning). A description appears in A.Popov's, *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церк. печати библиотеки А.И. Хлудова,* Moscow, 1872, p.380; also in K.Th. Radčenko's, *Отчетъ о занятиях рукописями в библиотеках Москвы и Ст.-Петербурга,* Kiev, 1898, p.64. The collection is housed in the St. Nicholas Monastery near Moscow. [This manuscript is now preserved in the собрание А.И. Хлудова (ф. №86795) of the Государственный Исторический Музей in Moscow -- MH].

T[1]. A manuscript of the Synodal Library in Moscow, Nr.175, 16th century, Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction, third form. A brief description appears in Savva's, *Указатель для обозрения Москов. патриаршей, ныне синодальной библиотеки,* Moscow, 1858, p.210 onward. [This manuscript is now preserved in the Синодальное собрание (ф. №80370) of the Государственный Исторический Музей in Moscow -- MH].

Y[1]. A manuscript of the Synodal Library in Moscow, Nr.987, 16th century, Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction, third form. A description appears in Archimandrite Josif's *Подробное оглавление Великихъ Четиихъ Миней всеросс. митроп. Макария*, etc., Moscow,1892, pp. 95-96 and 102. [This manuscript is now

preserved in the Синодальное собрание (ф. №80370) of the Государственный Исторический Музей in Moscow -- MH].

B². A manuscript of the Carskij (now Uvarov) Library, Nr.210 (formerly 1053), 17th century, Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction, third form. A description appears in Систем. Описание, etc., II, p.368. [This manuscript is now preserved in the собрание А.С. Уварова of the Государственный Исторический Музей in Moscow -- MH].

A³. Manuscript of the Petersburg Public Library, Hilferding Collection, Nr.56, beginning of the 16th century (1509), Serbian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction, first form. A description appears in the Отчетъ имп. публичной библиотеки за 1868 год, pp.123-134. [This manuscript is now preserved in the собрание А.Ф. Гильфердинга (ф. №182) of the Государственная Публичная Библиотека им. А.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина in Leningrad (St.Petersburg) -- MH].

F³. A manuscript of the Petersburg Public Library, with the catalogue number F.I.488. It contains the shortened redaction, first form, complete in parts, and in others only small fragments; the end of Chapter XII contains the text from this phrase on: "Isъ paJtriarxom i učiteljem Srědьcь dostygoše". A description appears in Отчетъ имп. публичной библиотеки за 1873 год, pp.13-17. [This manuscript is now preserved in the basic collection of the Государственная Публичная Библиотека им. А.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина in St. Petersburg -- MH].

2. Extant manuscripts of the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena* :

Kałużniacki lists twelve extant manuscripts of Euthymius's vita of Hilarion of Moglena. Seven of them are mentioned above: D, L, O, E¹, F¹, A³, and F³. Kałużniacki writes (p.27,fn.1) that text E¹ provided the basis of the reproduced text in his volume. The remaining five extant manuscripts are the following:

U. Manuscript of the Archimadrite H. Ruvarac, now in the possession of the Zagreb Academy of Science, No.III.a. It is the work of the well-known Vladislav the Grammarian of the Marien Monastery in Žeglěgovo, done in the year 1469, and certainly Serbian-Church Slavonic. Detailed description by G. Daničič in Starine I, pp.44-54; a supplement was done by Speranskij in Сборник за народ. умотворения, наука и книжнина, XVI-XVII, pp.325-338.

L[2]. A manuscript of the Troicko-Sergej Monastery in Moscow, Nr.686 (formerly 1847), 15th-16th century, Russian-Church Slavonic. A description appears in *Описание слав. рукописей библиотеки св. Троицко-Сергиевой лавры,* Moscow, 1878-79, III.,p.50. [This manuscript is now housed in the собрание Троице-Сергиевой лавры (ф.№304) of the Государственная Библиотека СССР им. В.И. Ленина in Moscow -- MH].

R[2]. A manuscript of the former Volokolamskij Monastery, Nr.214 (formerly 629), 16th century (1537), Russian-Church Slavonic. A description appears in *Описание рукописей, перенесенных из библиотеки Иосифовова монастыря в библиотеку Москов. дух. Академии иеромон. Иосифа,* Moscow, 1882, p.245. [This manuscript is now housed in the Государственная Библиотека СССР им. В.И. Ленина in Moscow -- MH].

T[2]. A manuscript of the former Volokolamskij Monastery, Nr.230 (formerly 655), 15th-16th century, Russian-Church Slavonic. For a description of the manuscript, see ibid.,p. 304. [This manuscript is now housed in the Государственная Библиотека СССР им. В.И. Ленина in Moscow -- MH].

L[3]. A manuscript of the Soloveckij Monastery, Nr. 619 (formerly 503), 15th-16th century, Russian-Church Slavonic. A description appears in Описание рукописей Соловецкаго монастыря etc., II.,p.386 onward. [This manuscript is now preserved in the собрание Соловецкого монастыря (ф. №717) of the Государственная

Публичная Библиотека им. А.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина in St. Petersburg -- MH].

3. Extant manuscripts of the *Life of St. Paraskeva* :

Just as with the Life of Ivan Of Rila, Kałużniacki divides the Euthymian versions of the Life of St. Paraskeva into three categories: 1) the original redation; 2) the expanded redaction, the second version of which was done by Grigorij Camblak[27]; and 3) the shortened redaction. On pages lxviii-lxxxv of his introduction Kałużniacki discusses the details of how these versions differ from the original redaction.

Kałużniacki lists twenty-three manuscripts for the Life of St. Paraskeva. Nine of them are already mentioned above: L (Kałużniacki does not indicate here which redaction); O (the expanded redaction, second form); Č^1 (the original redaction); T^1 (the expanded redaction, second form); Y^1 (the shortened redaction, third form); R^2 (the expanded redaction, second form); A^3 (the expanded redaction, second form); F^3 (the expanded redaction, without the beginning or the ending); and L^3 (the expanded redaction, second form).

On page 9, fn.1, Kałużniacki states that the text Č^1 (which contains the original redaction of the vita) provided the basis for the text reproduced in this volume. The remaining fourteen extant manuscripts are the following:

R. A manuscript from Žeravna in Bulgaria, 17th-18th century, in modern Bulgarian; Kałużniacki writes that the manuscript was then in Syrku's possession in Petersburg. It contains the shortened redaction. A description appears in Syrku's *Несколько заметок о двух произведениях патриарха Тръновскаго Евтимия, Сборник статей по славяноведению*, p.378; annotated text.

Ř. A manuscript of the National Library in Sofia, Nr.5, 16th-17th century; Serbian-Church Slavonic. Contains the expanded redaction, second form. Kałużniacki writes: "The text is very faulty. No description of the

[27] Cf. Kałużniacki, op.cit., lxvi and lxxv; and also the translated text of the *Life of St. Paraskeva*, fn.3.

manuscript is yet available."[28] [This manuscript is now preserved in the Народна Библиотека «Кирил и Методий» in Sofia, Bulgaria under the same number -- MH].

S. A manuscript of the Българското книжовно дружество in Sofia, Nr.1, 17th century; written in Modern Bulgarian. It contains the shortened redaction. The text is correct, as are the manuscripts mentioned in R and V. A description appears in Conev, *Новобългарска писменость преди Паисия,* reprinted in Български Преглед, (Sofia 1894), VIII, p.9 onward.

V. A manuscript of the Ljubljana National Library, Nr.21, 17th century; Modern Bulgarian. It contains the shortened redaction. It was described first by I. Lamanskij in the Журнал министерства народного просвещения, CLXIII, pp.349-378 and CLXIV, pp.84-123. A longer description is in G. Voskresenskij's *Славянския рукописи, хранящияся въ заграничныхъ библиотекахъ Берлинской, Пражской* etc., (1882), p.45, in Периодическо Списание на Българското книжовно дружество, new series, III, p.12 and in Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина, XII.,pp.463-466 and XVI-XVI [sic.],pp.246-314. In the aforementioned work, XII, pp.466-561 there is also a detailed edition of the whole manuscript of the *Life of St. Paraskeva.* [This manuscript is now preserved in the Kopitarev Collection (НУК Копитар, 21) of the Narodna universitetna knjižnica in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia. See Bogdanović (details in fn.20), entry number 212, p.29 -- MH].

B[1]. A manuscript from Kałużniacki's own collection, Nr.19, 17th century; South Russian, or rather it is written in the customary Ukrainian-Polish dialect of Church Slavonic of Southern Russia of the day. Kałużniacki writes that before it came into his possession, it belonged to Mr. J. Ciechański, the former vicar of the village of Mčava in Galicia. It

28 "Text sehr fehlerhaft, Beschreibung der Handschrift bis jetzt nicht vorhanden", p.civ.

contains the shortened redaction of the *Life of St. Paraskeva*. The text is missing a folio.

G[1]. A manuscript of the Bisericani Monastery in Romania, Nr.18, end of the 16th century; Bulgarian-Church Slavonic; it is also today in the Romanian National Library in Bucharest under No. 1178. It contains the expanded redaction, first form. The text shows several lacunae at the beginning and at the end. A description can be found in Melčisedek's *Notite istorice si archelogice, adunate pe la 48 mônastiri si biserici antice din Moldova*, Bucharest 1885, p.81.

L[1]. A manuscript of the Vilnius Public Library, Nr.79 (formerly 192), 16th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the expanded redaction, second form. A description appears in F. Dobrjanskij in his *Описание рукописей Виленской публ. библиотеки, церковно-славянских и русских*, Vilnius 1382 [sic.1882], pp.106-115.

M[1]. A manuscript of the Vilnius Public Library, Nr. 107 (formerly 98), 17th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the shortened redaction. For a description, cf. F. Dobrjanskij, ibid.,pp.231-241.

A[2]. A manuscript of the former Carskij (now Uvarov) Library, Nr.100 (formerly 135), 17th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the expanded redaction, second form. A cursory description in *Рукописи славянския и российския, принадлежащия И.Н.Царскому, разобраны и описаны П. Строевым*, Moscow 1848, p.71; for a detailed description, cf. *Систем. описание славяно-росс. рукописей собрания гр. А.С.Уварова, составил архим. Леонидъ*, Moscow 1893-94, II, p.469. [This manuscript is now preserved in the собрание А.С. Уварова of the Государственный Исторический Музей in Moscow -- MH].

E[2]. A manuscript of the Troicko-Sergej Monastery, Nr.630 (formerly 1882), beginning of the 16th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the expanded redaction, second form. A description can be found in *Описание слав. рукописей библиотеки св. Троицко-Сергиевой*

лавры, Moscow 1878-79, II, p.215. [This manuscript is now preserved in the собрание Троице-Сергиевой лавры (ф. №304) of the Государст-венная Публичная Библиотека им. А.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина in St.Petersburg -- MH].

S². A manuscript of the former Volokolamskij Monastery, Nr.223 (formerly 644), 16th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the expanded redation, second form. A description appears in *Опись рукописей, перенесенных из билбиотеки Иосифовова монастыря в библиотеку Москов. дух. Академии иеромон. Иосифа,* Moscow, 1882, p.289. [This manuscript is now housed in the Государственная Библиотека СССР им. В.И. Ленина in Moscow -- MH].

U². A manuscript of the Moscow Theological Academy, Nr.89, 16th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the expanded redaction, second form. A description appears in *Сведение о слав. рукописяхъ, поступившихъ изъ книгохранилища св. Троицко-Сергиевой лавры в библиотеку Троицкой духов. семинарии etc., архим. Леонида,* Moscow 1887, p.26. [This manuscript is now housed in the собрание Московской духовной академии (ф. №173, Фундаментальная библиотека) of the Государственная Библиотека СССР им. В.И. Ленина in Moscow -- MH].

B³. A manuscript of the Petersburg Public Library, Hilferding Collection Nr.85, 16th century; Bulgarian-Church Slavonic. It contains unfortunately only the beginning of the *Life of St. Paraskeva.* According to the heading, it could just as well have been from the original as from the shortened redaction. A description can be found in *Отчетъ имп. публичной библиотеки за 1868 год,* pp.150-151. [This manuscript is now preserved in the собрание А.Ф. Гильфердинга (ф. №182) of the Государственная Публичная Библиотека им. А.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина in Leningrad (St.Petersburg) -- MH].

M³. A manuscript of the Soloveckij Monastery, Nr.620 (formerly 501), 16th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. It contains the expanded redaction, second form. A description appears in *Описание рукописей*

Соловецкаго монастыря, etc., II.,p.390. [This manuscript is now preserved in the собрание Соловецкого монастыря (ф. №717) of the Государст-венная Публичная Библиотека им. А.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина in St.Petersburg -- MH].

4. Extant manuscripts of the *Life of Philothea* :

Kałużniacki lists only nine extant manuscripts in total for the *Life of Philothea*. It is interesting to note that the *Life of Ivan of Rila* (LIR) and the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena* (LHM) appear together in seven manuscripts (D, L, O, E^1, F^1, A^3, and F^3), the LIR and the *Life of Paraskeva* (LP) appear together in seven manuscripts (L, O, C^1, T^1, Y^1, A^3, and F^3), the LHM and the LP appear together exclusively in one manuscript (L^3); and all three--LIR, LHM and LP--appear together in four manuscripts (L, O, A^3, and F^3); yet the *Life of St. Philothea* does not appear together with any of the other vitae by Euthymius in any of the extant manuscripts.

Listed below are the nine extant manuscripts cited by Kałużniacki. He states on p.78, fn.1 of *Werke* that the manuscript D^1 provided the basis for the reproduced text in this volume.

Z. A manuscript from the Greek Orthodox Metropolitan Council in Cernovic, temporary designated under the code d); 16th century; Bulgarian-Church Slavonic. Kałużniacki writes that no description was available to him.

Ž. A manuscript of the same collection as Z, temporary designated under the code e); end of 15th century, possibly the beginning of 16th century; part Bulgarian, part Serbian-Church Slavonic. Kałużniacki writes that no description was available to him.

D^1. A manuscript of the Némtŭ Monastery in Romania, Nr.20, 15th century (1441); Bulgarian-Church Slavonic. Gabriel, the monk and later abbot of the Nemtu Monastery was the scribe. A description appears in Melčisedek's *Notiţe istorice şi archelogice, adunate pe la 48 mônastiri şi biserici antice din Moldova,* Bucharest 1885, p.131.

U[1]. A manuscript from the Synodal Library in Moscow, Nr.180, 16th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. Description in Savva, *Указатель для обозрения Москов. патриаршей, ныне синодальной библиотеки,* Moscow,1858, p.210 onward; also in Andrej Popov, *Обзоръ хронографовъ русс. редакции,* Moscow 1869, II, pp.31-32, and K.Radčenko, *Отчетъ о занятияхъ рукописями*, etc., pp.27-40. [This manuscript is now preserved in the Синодальное собрание (ф. №80370) of the Государственный Исторический Музей in Moscow--MH].

Z[1]. A manuscript of the Synodal Library in Moscow, Nr.994, 16th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. A description can be found in Archimandrite Josif's *Подробное оглавление Великихъ Четиихъ Миней всеросс. митроп. Макария,* etc., Moscow 1892, pp.186-187. [This manuscript is now preserved in the Синодальное собрание (ф. №80370) of the Государственный Исторический Музей in Moscow - - MH].

C[2]. A manuscript of the Sabbas-Storoževskij Monastery, Nr.192, 15th-16th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. Description in P. Strojev's *Описание рукописей монастырей Волоколамскаго, Новый-Иерусалим, Саввина Сторожевскаго и Пафнутиева-Боровскаго,* Ausgabe der Gesellschaft der russ. Bibliophilen Nr. XCVIII, p.289.

K[2]. A manuscript of the Troicko-Sergej Monastery, Nr.676 (formerly 407), 17th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. A description appears in *Описание слав. рукописей библиотеки св. Троицко-Сергиевой лавры*, Moscow 1878-79, III, p.30. [This manuscript is now housed in the собрание Троице-Сергиевой лавры (ф.№304) of the Государственная Библиотека СССР им. В.И. Ленина in Moscow -- MH].

O[2]. A manuscript of the Troicko-Sergej Monastery in Moscow, Nr.754 (formerly 1644), 15th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. A description appears in *Описание слав. рукописей библиотеки св. Троицко-Сергиевой лавры*, Moscow 1878-79, III, p.152. [This manuscript is now housed in the собрание Троице-Сергиевой лавры (ф.№304) of the

Государственная Библиотека СССР им. В.И. Ленина in Moscow -- MH].

N3. A manuscript of the Soloveckij Monastery, Nr.631 (formerly 514), 16th century; Russian-Church Slavonic. A description appears in *Описание рукописей Соловецкаго монастыря,* etc., II.,p.446. [This manuscript is now preserved in the собрание Соловецкого монастыря (ф. №717) of the Государственная Публичная Библиотека им. А.Е. Салты-кова-Щедрина in St.Petersburg -- MH].

Chapter 2:
The Life of Ivan of Rila[1]

The Life and Deeds of Our Venerable Father Ivan of Rila[2], written by Euthymius, Patriarch of Trnovo[3]

I. If we were to pass over in silence the life of the blessed Ivan, and if we were not to offer with all possible diligence what has been written for us as a primary example[4] unto those who desire and are zealous for the virtues which are good, then could not someone indeed justifiably[5] revile us, [saying] that we are not only indolent and negligent towards our goods but also that we are envying our fellow countrymen their share of the goods inasmuch as we have profited before others? Abundantly reflecting the combination of all [Ivan's] virtues, [this life] can bring no small profit

---

[1] John Fine (*The Early Medieval Balkans, A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983, p.169) writes that according to historical sources, Ivan of Rila was born in about 880 in a village near Serdica. The date of his death is believed to be August 18, 946 (see fn.87).

[2] In the manuscripts C, N, O and T there follows : "in which it is told how he was translated to Trnovo" ("vъ njemže i kako prěnesenъ bystъ vъ Trъnovъ"). See E.Kałużniacki,*Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393)*,Vienna, 1901; reprint, London:Variorum Reprints, 1971, p.5, fn2.

[3] Here the aforementioned texts include also the following, included by Kałużniacki in the appendix of his *Werke* : "and at the end of the story, about the renewal of his holy monasteries which are in Rila, and how he was translated back from Trnovo to the same glorious monastery of Rila, written by the last of the deacons, Vladislav the Grammarian" ("na konci že slova i o obnovljeni svetye obitěli ego, iže vъ Rylě, i kako paky prěnesenъ bystъ ot Trъnova vъ tъžde slavnyj monastirь Rylskyj, sъpisano poslědnyim vъ diacěx, Vladislavom gramatikomъ"). See Kałużniacki, *Werke*, 5, fn3.

[4] The word used in the original Slavonic is "образъ", which according to Sreznevskij (И. Срезневский, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам*, 1893; Reprint, Москва: Книга, 1989, vol.2, 540-541) can mean in Modern Russian not only "образ" or "икона", but also "изображение," "образец" and "пример."

[5] Note the different meaning of the word "lěpota" here in the expression "v lěpotǫ", meaning literally "in propriety or decorum" rather than "in beauty". See Sreznevskij, op.cit., vol.2, p. 73.

to those who examine it. For such a life is sufficient not only for those who laboriously follow in the footsteps of this great man (who ascends to glory as all do who draw near to God), but [this life is sufficient] also for him who is satisfied to attain the success already achieved by those who have set out to imitate this life even in small measure.

Not only for these people, but also for those who simply hear this [read aloud] will [Ivan and his deeds] be understood and [will serve as] a source of profit. For even when [this life] is simply heard [read aloud], [Ivan's] love pours into the souls of those who are listening, and when it is committed to memory, it can be like a sting which in due time will incite these people to imitate it. How much spiritual food is being offered to both those who relate this story openly and to those who listen to it! Such a life will be the cure of salvation, and God is praised for his sake. And I think that both [story-teller and listener] have equal need of this. Thus, some will not let the smallest detail slip past them, others will follow [the example set in] this life; yet both will endeavor to imitate [the life of Ivan].

It would be most unseemly for us to have thoughts of material and ephemeral nourishment, which does nothing but create toil for us. Rather, we can profit beyond all measure by finding our nourishment in immaterial and inexhaustible [food], for such food profits the soul and is always in abundance and requires no toil or pains from us, who are emaciated in our hunger for things divine.

Behold, we now present the beginning of the story about this man. May we be able to summon the grace which verily he received in abundance from God so that we should not miss through our ignorance the very thing which we seek; otherwise, we run the risk of "touching holy objects with unworthy hands" (as it is said)[6], and recounting the life of this

---

[6] Here Kałużniacki (*Werke*, 6, fn.8) includes the following note regarding this expression: "Eine etwas ungewöhnliche Ausdrucksweise, die wahrscheinlich in der Volkssprache der Bulgaren ihren Grund hat." See Sresnevskij's treatment of the expression (Срезневский, op.cit, vol.1, 364).

In her above-cited translation of the LIR, K.Ivanova (See К.Иванова, редак., *Стара българска литература*, том 4, София: Български писател, 1986, p.554, fn.2) includes the following information in her endnotes to her tranlslation: "What is meant here is the biblical figure of Uzzah who dared to put forth his hand to support the holy arc [of Noah] which was falling; and because of this he died, stunned by the wrath of God. See 1 Chron 13.9-11."

man would otherwise prove beyond our capabilities; we would do our listeners a disservice, [instead of] providing them the benefits of the best possible things.

Because this most divine man paid no heed to lowly and perishable things and had no concern for things of this world, it is our desire to relate quickly the memory of this man, thereby consigning to the depths of oblivion all the aforementioned lowly things. [Ivan] paid heed to his Fatherland on High[7], which is free, untroubled and solid; and in every aspect of his life, he strove to achieve [the sanctity of] our common Father and Creator.

We must, however, relate at least a few things about him. Indeed, those [writers] who wrote about him before us did so somewhat inartistically and crudely; whereas we have striven zealously to relate [this story] with beauty[8], as is fitting; for we well know that a story about a [spiritual] father brings joy to people who love such fathers and incites them to more fervent zeal.

II. The parents of the blessed Ivan were extremely pious and were Bulgarians by birth, having been born and raised in the village called Skrina, which is in the region of Serdica.[9] And Serdica is in the European lands and is one of [Europe's] glorious and famous cities. Thus they lived in this village, being of kind nature and leading a pious life; and they were the parents of two children, of which one was this wondrous Ivan. Having received a good upbringing from his parents, he was obedient to them in everything and gave them the respect he owed them.

After much time had passed, and his parent having died, he was always in fear of God, under no circumstances being absent from church,

---

[7] A circumlocution for "heaven".

[8] Dinekov writes that this line demonstrates that Euthymius knew three of the versions of the *Life of Ivan of Rila* that were written before him: the folk version, the version by Gregorios Skylitz and the first so-called short, or prologue, versions: See "Евтимий Търновский," *История на българската литература*. том I, 285-307, p.294, София: БАН, 1963.

[9] The ancient name for present-day Sofia, Bulgaria, known in Slavonic in the medieval period as Sredec.

but listening with great attention to the divine words of the sacred teaching; and it was his habit to please the Lord with fasting and prayers. And he was entirely captivated by the love of God; and like one of the seraphims[10], his soul burned for the Lord, his God; and he bore fruit, in truth, a hundred-fold, like a tree which has been planted by the streams of water.[11]

Some people, seized with envy and being indolent in their duties to do good, heaped injustices and humiliations on [Ivan], calling him a hypocrite and saying he was unworthy to live. This being the case, he took good advice and disperse his property into the hands of the poor, thus rendering unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's so that he could without hindrance render unto God the things which are God's[12].

God, who commanded that from darkness there should shine light[13], also said once to Abraham: "Get from your country and your kindred to the land that I will show you"[14]. And in just the same way, [God] appeared to [Ivan], and saying nothing less than these words, God showed him also the place where it pleased Him. Having awoken from sleep and having contemplated the vision [he had seen], [Ivan] became fired up with excitement, "as the hart longs for flowing streams"[15]; and he armed himself against an imaginary Goliath, just as David had once [armed himself against the real Goliath][16], according to the ancient account, taking

---

10 The fiery, six-winged angels that guard the throne of God. The word "seraphim" in Hebrew means "burning" or "noble". See Is 6.1-6.

11 A "tree planted by streams of water" is a Biblical image found in Ps 1.3; Jer 17.18. Cf. also Mt 7.17-18; 12.32; Lk 6.43-44;13.19. The Slavonic Psalter employs a circumlocution for "waters", i.e. "isxodivšix" vodъ". This device of paraphrase is common in Biblical and other religious rhetoric; for example, in the *Life of Constantine*, one finds the phrase "došedše (že) bezvodnyx mestъ pustъ" (chap.XII, in Vaillant, *Textes vieux-slaves*, vol.1, Textes publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves, no.8/1, Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1968, p.27)= "When they reached a waterless, empty place," meaning a desert.

12 Mt 22.21, Mk 12.17, and Lk 20.25

13 Gen 1.3

14 Gen 12.1, which leaves out the phrase "i ot domu otca tvoego" ("and from thy father's house").

15 Ps 42.1 (Slavonic Psalter 41.2).

16 A reference to the story of David and Goliath contained in 1 Sam 17.

three stones, i.e. faith, hope and love. So too [Ivan] dressed himself in the armor of righteousness[17], taking up the shield of salvation[18], the divine protection[19], and with passion and desire[20] he had himself tonsured.

[Ivan] then went to a monastery, and he lived there for short period of time so that he might study and learn. Leaving the material things of this world to the worldly and dust to ashes[21], he left the world and the Ruler of the world[22] and took nothing except a leathern tunic.

He went to the mountain that was shown to him by God, and there he made a small hut[23] out of bushes, and he lived there, burdening his body with fasting and vigils. And he would sing from the Psalms of David[24]:

---

17 2 Cor 6.7 : the original text refers to the "brъnju pravdy", RSV:"the weapons of righteousness", MSB: "oružii pravdy" Cf. also Is 59.17; Eph 6.11,13,17; 1 Thess 5.8. Also, in the *Life of St. Anthony*, he alludes to the same biblical image or the "armor of God" to advise the righteous on how to pass through unhindered to the kingdom of God (*Early Christian Biographies*, chapter 65, p.193).

18 Ps 18.35: "Thou hast given me the shield of thy salvation".

19 The Psalms abound in images of God as a shield and source of protection. Cf. Ps 3.3; 28.7; 33.20; 59.11; 84.9,11; 115. 9,10,11; 119.114; and 144.2.

20 Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit.,554, fn.14) cites here Gal 5.24 ("And those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires").

21 The Bible contains many verses that employ the image of dust and ashes to convey metaphorically the mortal, wordly and corporeal side of man's nature: e.g. Gen 2.7; 3.19; 18.27; Job 13.12; 30.19; 34.15; 42.6; Ps 22.29; 103.14; Eccles 3.20.

22 The "Ruler of the world" refers to the Devil. This passage may allude to Eph 6.12 ("for we are not contending against flesh and blood but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world of rulers of this present darkness..."). This makes sense, given the fact that in the preceding paraphraph there is a reference to the "armor of God", which appears in Eph 6.11, thus forming a nice transition of consecutive biblical images. Note that the Slavonic "mirodrъžec" is calqued from the Greek "κοσμοκράτωρ"

23 The word used here for hut is "koliba", which still exists in Modern Bulgarian as an equivalent to the Modern Russian "шалаш" or "хижина".This is probably a remnant borrowing from proto-Bulgar, a Turkic language. Cf. Modern Turkish "kulübe", meaning "hut, shed, sentry-box". See *The Concise Oxford Turkish Dictionary*, ed. A.D. Alderson and Fahir Iz, Clarendon: Oxford University Press, 1959.

24 The reading of the Psalms, along with the repetition of the Jesus Prayer, was especially important to the Hesychasts. Even before the Jesus Prayer, or "prayer of the heart" had been elaborated and incorporated into Hesychast mysticism through the writings of Macarius, Diadochus of Photice, St. John Climacus, and St. Symeon the New Theologian,

"Yea, I would wander afar, I would lodge in the wilderness. I would haste to find me a shelter from the raging wind and tempest."[25] Lifting up his venerable hands without rage or quarreling[26], and having nothing to eat--except some plant of grass, which the earth usually sprouts forth for cattle, and water which the springs abundantly poured forth--he sang out: "I was like a beast toward thee. Nevertheless I am continually with thee."[27]

Who then can tell of the works he then did? He would not take enough of that desert plant to fill him, but rather very little of it and in great scarcity, and only after sunset; and he also took only a little water, just enough to refresh his innards. Who is worthy to recount his "fountain of tears"[28], and also his all-night vigils and prayer? In multitudes devils would come to him, taking on the shapes of various beasts, wishing to frighten him and chase him away. But he was brave and unshakable in the face of such tortures, and like a hard stone, he beat them off and deflected all the waves that came upon him; or, to put it more precisely, [he was] like an adamant[29], [uncorrupted] by any iron.[30]

III. After much time had passed, [Ivan] left that place and went to another, where he found a very dark and gloomy cave. He settled there, adding labor unto labor and desire unto desire, storing them up as the

---

there were statements made by Evagrius in his "Chapters on Prayer" specifically on the mystical powers of repeating the Psalms: "[83]. The singing of Psalms quiets the passions and calms the intemperance of the body," quoted in Meyendorff, *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*, 22. For an English translation of Evagrius' "Chapters", See Kallistos Ware, *Philokalia*, vol. 1, London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

[25] Ps 55.7-8.

[26] K. Ivanova, (Иванова, op.cit.,554, fn.14) cites here 1 Tim 2.8 ("I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling...").

[27] Ps 73.22-23 (Slavonic Psalter 72.22-23).

[28] Jer 9.1. See also Lam 2.18

[29] See Ezek 3.9.

[30] i.e. being completely pure; see Jer 6.28

labor-loving bee does honeycomb and putting them into the treasure chest of his heart.[31]

It happened that his brother's son, having run away from own his father and mother in secret, came to the desert where the venerable one was living; and only after taking great pains was he able to find [his uncle, Ivan]. The blessed one, when he caught sight of [his nephew] approaching [the cave] from afar, thought it was a dream and began to pray. [The boy] came and prostrated himself, asking for [Ivan's] blessing. [Ivan], now realizing this was really happening and not a dream, conferred his blessing on [his nephew] and asked him the purpose of his journey. He told [his uncle] everything, and [Ivan] took him in [under his wing]. Luke was his name.[32]

The venerable Ivan, observing [how Luke thrived there] by his side like the cedar which grows in Lebanon[33], offered up hymns of thanks to God and kept this phrase on his lips the whole time: "The innocent and the righteous have put themselves in my hands."[34] And [Luke] was with him in the desert like an innocent lamb[35], shepherded by a true shepherd just as Abel or Isaac had been; imitating in every way these forerunners, who were raised from childhood in the desert.

Well, what [happened] next? [Satan] who once was the Morning Star[36] is today but darkness because of his pride; and wanting to destroy

---

31 See Lk 6.45

32 Although this is not stated in the text, one can infer that Ivan's brother and sister-in-law gave this name themselves to their own son, indicating that they themselves were Christians, a significant fact considering that Bulgaria had just been officialy Christianized a few decades before by Tsar Boris.

33 Ps 92.12 (in Slavonic Psalter, 91.13)

34 K.Ivanova, (Иванова, op.cit.,554, fn.17) cites here Slav.Ps 24.21 (RSV Ps 25.21 "May integrity and uprightness preserve me, for I wait for thee").

35 I Pet.1.19. The original text reads "jakože agną neziobivo", whereas the Slavonic text of the Christinopole Codex reads "jako agnьca neporočьna i prěsta" (see Kałużniacki, *Actus*, 81).

36 The Slavonic reads here "dennica", which refers to Satan's Latin name "Lucifer", meaning "light-bringing" or "morning star, Venus". See Is 14.12: "How you are fallen from heaven, O Day Star, son of Dawn!" Cf. also AV: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!"

both heaven and the seas, he opened his mouth to heaven and said: "I will exalt my throne in the clouds, and I will be like the Most High."[37] This proud and bombastic Enemy, unable to tolerate the virtue and the brave acts of mankind, was filled with envy and originated sickness and lawlessness.[38]

[Satan] went to the saint's brother in bodily form, in the image of one of his acquaintances. He found [Luke's father] gripped by sadness, pricked by nature's sting, and perplexed by the loss of his child; and [the Devil] said these words to him: "It is Ivan, your brother, who has deprived your child--your support in your old age, the heir to your home, the fruit of your seed--of his mother's bosom and of your embrace. During the night he came here, and he abducted your child so that he may have him with him. If you do not go in haste and take [Luke], he will be in no time sweet food for the wild beasts. And if you do not go look for him high and low you will then be no more than a child-killer! Come then, come, friend, and I will show you the place so you may take back straightaway the fruit of your seed."

When [Ivan's brother] heard this, he clothed himself with hatred as in a garment[39], and a cloud of wrath seized him; and what he did not say he would do to the innocent Ivan! The Devil took him and led [Ivan's brother] into the desert, guiding him and firing him up in order to cause him grief.

In the *Life of Anthony*, one finds this opening sentence to chapter 24: "Anthony said that they often appeared in that shape in which the Lord revealed the Devil to Job when he said: 'His eyes are as an image of the morning star'" (*Early Christian Biographies*, p.157).

[37] This original passage in the Slavonic combines excerpts from the text of Is 14.13 and 14.14: "You said in your heart, 'I will ascend to heaven; above the stars of God I will set my throne on high; I will sit on the mount of assembly in the far north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will make myself like the Most High."

[38] K. Ivanova, (Иванова, op.cit.,555, fn.19) cites here Slavonic Psalter 7.15 (RSV Ps 7.14 "Behold the wicked man conceives evil, and is pregnant with mischief, and brings forth lies")

[39] The image is taken from Ps 109.18 (Slavonic Psalter 108.18), which reads "As he clothed himself with cursing like as his coat". The vita text reads "oblěče są vъ nenavistь", whereas the Sinai Psalter reads "oblěče sją vь kljątvǫ" (see Северьянов, op.cit.,145).

And when they neared the place, [the Devil] pointed out the cave to him and then immediately departed. [Luke's father] then went to the indicated place and found the saint. And what he did not do to him, heaping on him injustices and humiliations and calling him a despicable old man[40] and a liar, and unworthy to live; and he threw sticks and stones at him, and was prepared to kill him.

And what about the humble disciple of the Humble Ruler? He stood in silence and said absolutely nothing, keeping in his thoughts this phrase: "But I am like a deaf man, I do not hear, like a dumb man who does not open his mouth."[41] With anger and cries he seized his child (O, what a pitiful cry [the child let out]!), and took him back to the world, to the world more evil than a fornicator, back to the mother of all uncleanliness and evil. He took [the child] away from the divine mountain, the fertile mountain, the mountain where God deigned for him to live.

When the blessed [Ivan] saw [what was happening] and realized that this was the craftiness of the Devil, a cloud of grief seized him, and he poured forth tears and fell prostrate, and praying, he said: "O Lord, it is said: 'Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver you.'[42] Deliver me now, O Ruler, cast Your compassionate eye upon me, and chase out the sadness in my heart, and make of me a sign of goodness.[43] May You be praised forever and ever, Amen."

After praying, he sat down, saddened and grieved over the loss of the child; and fearing that [Luke] had now been taken away back into the world, [Ivan] absorbed himself in worldly sorrows.

And what did God do, He who has commanded that we leave our children and come to Him? He said to [Luke's] father--if not actually in words, then in deed--"Let the children come to me, and do not hinder

---

[40] The word in the original text is "kakogirъ", a slavonicized term for the Greek "κακὸς γέρων", or "bad, evil or ugly old man".

[41] Ps 38.13 (in Slavonic Psalter 37.14).

[42] Ps 50.15 (in Slavonic Psalter 49.15)

[43] K.Ivanova, (Иванова, op.cit.,555, fn.23) cites here Slavonic Psalter 85.17 (RSV Ps 86.17 "Show me a sign of thy favor...").

them; for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven."[44] And as they were travelling along, a snake bit the child, and immediately death took the child away in her gentle palms. When [Luke's] father saw this, he did not know what to do; so he returned to the venerable [Ivan], and filled with shame and grief, he informed [his brother] what had transpired on the journey. [Ivan] ordered him to bury [the boy] and return home, which he did.

IV. The venerable [Ivan] glorified God for this and suffered no further grief over this. He lived in this cave twelve years and, having no physical comforts, he added labor unto labor and toil unto toil. The Devil, seeing this, did not cease to cause him grief in every way: sometimes with melancholy, sometimes with indolence. He even tried to frighten him many times with apparitions. But Ivan, possessing a soul like a diamond, was in no way affected by [the Devil's] tortures. [Ivan] used to sing [to the Lord]: "They surrounded me like bees around honey-comb; blazed like a fire of thorns; in the name of the Lord I cut them off!"[45]

One day the All-Evil [Satan] took an army of devils with him, disguised as robbers, and they came to the saint, threatening him, beating him unmercifully and pushing him and pulling him. They chased him away from the place and prevented anyone from approaching him. In that hour he obeyed the voice of the Ruler, who commanded, "When they persecute you in one town, flee to the next."[46] So moving not from city to city but from desert to desert, [Ivan] set off for another far-away place. And like the ancient Abraham, [Ivan] found there a large oak and lived in it. But Abraham, after having miraculously met with the Trinity under the oak, cast it out; whereas this man, Ivan, after having thoughtfully received the Trinity, brought within himself the living God to whom we bow down in the Trinity. And Ivan never lost heart, but held himself firmly to the first rule.

---

[44] Mt 19.14.

[45] In the original, this is a precise quotation of Slavonic and the LXX Ps 117.12. In the RSV, Ps 118.12 lacks the phrase "around honeycomb". The Slavonic reads "jako pčely sъtъ," and the Septuagint reads "ὡσεὶ μέλισσαι κηρίον".

[46] Mt 10.23.

V. And so what did [God] do, He who does everything to some profit? Just as in the days of old when it rained manna in the desert for the starving people[47] so that they could be filled with grace, so in just this way [God] performed [a miracle] here. He commanded the earth to grow peas for the saint's food, and [Ivan] fed on this and comforted somewhat his bodily sickness and assuaged the poverty in his belly, going from strength to strength, placing the ascents in his heart, crying forth springs of tears, watering the furrows of his soul, and flowering forth the fruits of grace.[48]

God, who commanded that from darkness there be light and who in doing so brightly clarified the obscurity of darkness[49], did not want the city which stands on top of the mountain to be concealed, but deigned rather to make known its grace.[50] At that time shepherds were shepherding somewhere nearby, just as shepherds did at the time of my Christ's birth. They were obediently putting the sheep out to pasture; when all of a sudden [the sheep] started to move quickly and began to run, not along the usual path, but on untrodden and unfamiliar parts of a deserted and craggy place. When [the sheep] reached the place where the blessed [Ivan] was living, they stopped in their tracks.

The shepherds being married to their flocks could not leave them, so they came to where the sheep were standing; and when they saw the saint, they were greatly bewildered. Who was he, where was he from, and how

---

47 See Exodus, chapter 16.

48 The "ascent" which Ivan places in his heart refers to his observance of the steps prescribed by John Climacus in his work "The Ladder." The expression "fruits of grace" in the original this reads "klasy", literally "ears" as in "ears of grain".

49 Gen 1.3.

50 See Mt 5.14-15: "You are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hid. Nor do men light a lamp and put it under a bushel, but on a stand; and it gives light to all in the house."

Compare this with the following passage from the *Life of Anthony* : "For, how he was heard of in Spain and in Gaul, how in Rome and in Africa--he sitting on the mountain--if it were not God who everywhere makes known his own people, and who in the begining had promised this to Anthony, also? For, though they themselves act in secret and though they wish to be hidden, the Lord, however, shows them as lamps to all, that even those who thus hear of them may know that the Commandments can be fulfilled and they may acquire zeal for the path of virtue." (Chapter 93, p.216)

did he get here? They asked of him, "Where is your home and your native country?" [Ivan] answered, "According to the aspostle, my home is in Heaven, and this is why I am waiting for my Saviour. My homeland is Jerusalem on High, but the country and city where I grew up is not for you to know. However, since you are already here, I should feed you some desert food."

And he commanded them to take some ripe peas. They took some and ate their fill. When they set out to leave, one of [the shepherds] went privily and stole rather a lot of peas and then gleafully set out again to catch up with the others. When he found them, he showed them [his bag of stolen peas]. The others grabbed it out of his hand. But when they opened the bag in which he was storing the food[51], they found nothing inside. Immediately [the thief] repented and they went back to the blessed [Ivan], telling him what they had done and asking his forgiveness. [Ivan] forgave them, saying: "O children, the All-Powerful God has deigned that here they should grow and that here they should benefit man."

After this miracle had been performed, [the shepherds] returned home, praising and glorifying God for all that they had seen and heard, telling [about it] throughout that country and in all the surrounding villages.

VI. Some of the Christ-loving people wanted to go to the saint and receive blessings from him. One man, who had been bitterly troubled for many years by an unclean soul, saw them going and followed them, for he wanted to heal himself of his ailment. When they had come within a mile[52] of the saint, [the man's] unclean soul was suddenly seized with terror, and he fell, collapsing [to the ground], saying: "A fire has emblazed me and I cannot go forward." The people seized him and tried to pull him by force.

---

51 The original here reads "zrъno", literally grain, though this is meant to refer to the peas which the shepherd stole from Ivan.

52 A "pъpriště", or "popъriště" is defined in one of our sources as a Roman mile ("римска миля"), equal to 1477.5 m. (see Стоян Стоянов, Мирослав Янакиев, *Старобългарски език. текстове и речник*, София: Наука и изкуство, 1965, p.179).

They fell to the ground and begged for [God's] blessings. Their request was fulfilled.

[Ivan] asked them the purpose of their journey. They told him everything, about how this man had become possessed by devils, and they fell before him and asked that he heal this man of his illness.

But Ivan--in no way relying on himself, but on God, who brings the dead back to life and calls forth the non-existing into existence[53]--said: "Not by our means, children, has this deed been done, not by our means; it is by [the work of] the one [and true] God that the devils are cast out. We humans are servile to You, [God], and therefore we are rendered powerless." For [Ivan] heeded the voice of the Ruler, Who comands: "When you have done all that is commanded of you, say, 'We are unnecessary servants.'"[54]

The people who were exhorting [Ivan] now became very insistent. They began to threaten and force Ivan, and he fell to the ground and began to pour forth tears, and he sighed from the depth of his heart and said, "God, in the Holy Trinity, to whom we bow down, who created everything visibile and invisible, whom everyone fears and trembles before, O Ruler, have mercy on Your own creation and do not allow this [man] to suffer long, and may it be [accomplished] not through us, but through Your benevolence and generosity. I am not worthy to utter Your sacred name with my unclean and sinful lips; however, having put my trust in Your kindness, I beckon to You to help. You yourself have assured [us] through the mouthpiece of Your servants, the prophets, that You not to desire the death of a sinner.[55] Because of this we all fall down before You, and we

---

[53] K.Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 555, fn.35) cites here Rom 4.17 ("...who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist").

[54] Lk 17.10. The phrase used in the original text for "unnecessary servants" is "nepotrébni rabi" (literally, unnecessary or unneeded servants/slaves). Both the Codices Zographensis and Assemanianus read here: "rabi nedostoini," literally, "unworthy servants," which is the translation found in the RSV. For Codex Zographensis, see V. Jagić, *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*, Berlin, 1879; reprint, Graz, 1954, p.118. For Codex Assemanianus, see J. Kurz, *Evangeliarium Assemani (Evangeliář Assemanův)* vol.2, Úvod, text v přepise cyrilském, poznámky textové, seznamy čtení. Prague: Nakladatelství československé akademie věd, 1955, p.131.

[55] K.Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 555,fn.37) cites here Ezek 18.32 and 2 Pet 3.9.

ask that You have mercy on us and hear us in Your Holy Kingdom. May You be praised forever and ever, Amen."

When Ivan was finished praying, the devil immediately left the [body] of the man, and he was completely healed, and he glorified and praised God. When those with him saw what had happened, they were seized with terror. Now increased in their faith, they gathered around the saint and pleaded with him to [allow them] to live with him; but [Ivan] would not allow it. He commanded them to go, and having given them enough food [for their journey], he sent them on their way, forbidding them to come back to him. They returned home, accompanied by their pious fellow traveler who had once been possessed by the devil.

From that time on, as the glory of [Ivan] spread throughout that land, everyone was praising God, and they attained much love and zeal toward him.

VII. Thus the brave Ivan, seeing what was happening, left that place[56], fearing the praise of men and, moreover, loathing it completely, relying instead on God's glory. And sweetly he would sing out: "But it is good for me to draw near to God: I have put my trust in the Lord God."[57]

And [Ivan] found a very high, rocky mountain, and immediately he ascended it just as that man [Moses], the visionary of God, at one time [ascended] Mount Sinai.[58] And [Moses] entered into the impenetrable darkness of a vision of God and received the tablets written by the Hand of God. Yet it was not those tablets of stone but rather the stone of the tablets

---

[56] Despite his efforts to remain apart from society, the crowds that flocked to see him eventually resulted in a little community at Rila. In about 941 Ivan abandoned this growing monastery for yet another secluded retreat, where he hoped to pursue his intended goal of a completely anchoritic monastic life. See Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans*, 169.

[57] A quotation from Ps 73.28 (Slavonic Psalter 72.28). The quotation in the text corresponds word for word with the Sinai Psalter; see Северьянов, op.cit., 92.

[58] This refers to Moses ascending Mount Sinai, where he had a vision of God and received the tablets (see Ex.19. 17-25). This Old Testament image became central to the Hesychasts and their conception of the Divine, or Taboric, Light. (Moses had another vision of God in a burning bush in his earlier years; see Ex.3.2)

of his heart[59] that [Ivan] wet with his tears; and through his all-night vigils and sighs, he produced the fruit of his labors a hundred-fold, speaking to himself alone, creating a path to the heavens with light wings, and suffering through the frost of night the heat of day.

The Unsleeping Eye, seeing how [Ivan] suffered bravely, was imperceptibly giving him even more strength and fortification. Now the Devil, hating good, did not tolerate for long such virtue of this man; but, having taken with him a legion of demons, they came ruthlessly to the saint. And what they did not say and do, beating him, pushing him, and dragging him! Finally, they beat him with stones, for none of them wanted him to live; and they left, believing him to be dead.

The valient Ivan lay there for a long time. He barely regained his senses. Moaning and suffering, he was grieved, and he said to himself: "Why are you cast down, O my soul, and why are you disquieted within me? Hope in God; for I shall again praise him, who is the health of my countenance, and my God."[60]

He got up and again climbed up the rock--firmly resolved to carry out his initial plan--and took refuge at the highest point. Looking down upon the earth and making it tremble[61], [God] looked down from up high with a benevolent eye on His saint and he commanded His angel to bring him food every day. And so that which is written was fulfilled by [Ivan]: "Man did eat angels' food."[62]

VIII. Once all of these things had happened, word of him--just as he had predicted-- began to travel, and even the tsar wanted to hear about him. At

---

59 2 Cor 3.3.

60 Ps 42.5 (Slavonic Psalter 41.6)

61 K.Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 555, fn.43) cites here Slavonic Psalter 103.32 (RSV Ps 104.32 "...who looks at the earth and it trembles."

62 Ps 78.25 (Slavonic Psalter 77.25). In the Slavonic Psalter, the image of "angels' food" is expressed by "angels' bread", "хlěbъ aggelъ" (Северьянов, op.cit.,101), or "хlěbь aggelьskyj" in the text. This is taken from the Septuagint which contains the specific image of "bread", rather than the more general image of "food": "ἄρτον ἀγγέλων ἔφαγεν ἄνθρωπος".

that time the pious Tsar Peter of the Bulgarian kingdom was holding the [country's] flag.[63] He came to Serdica, and after hearing of the venerable [Ivan], he sent men, very clever hunters, about nine in number, to find the saint, commanding them not to return if they could not find him.[64] They then, having received the command of the tsar, in good time[65] reached Rila.

Having spent several days there and having found nothing, they were stricken with hunger, and they became greatly distressed, for they could neither dare go back to the tsar nor could they wend their way further as they were starving in the wilderness. However, their fear vanquished their hunger, and they did not stop looking [for Ivan].

Sometime later they found some evidence [of him], and with that the men found his dwelling. [When they came to him] they asked him for his blessing. He granted them his blessing and asked them the purpose of their journey. They explained everything to him. Because he, with a spiritual eye, saw that they had been starving for five days, he offered them [food from] his table and graciously gave them nourishment.

He Who once fed five thousand men from five loaves of bread[66] fed here nine men from one loaf of bread. And it was a miracle how [in the ancient of days] enough pieces of bread remained [for the throng] and how here [atop Ivan's mountain all nine men were fed with] half a loaf still remained.

And [the tsar's men], having seen this, wondered greatly at it; for they, thinking one loaf of bread would not suffice, were thus sated with yet

---

63 A paraphrase for "ruling the country."

64 This passage appears in Fine, *Early Medieval Balkans*,169, regarding the requested royal audience with the tsar: "...in 941 John abandoned his growing monastery for a mountain retreat. He left behind a Spiritual Testament which contained a rigorous monastic rule, combining individual asceticism with community life. He stressed the value of manual labor and urged the monks to live in harmony, following the Christian faith taught by the church fathers, never aspiring to riches or power. The monks were urged to have nothing to do with the princes of this world, and the story has it that John refused to receive Tsar Peter when Peter came to his retreat." Dinekov (Динеков, op.cit., 294) notes that this incident is not attested by any historical source.

65 The original reads "faster than a word," "bystrěe neže slovo."

66 See Mt 14. 17-20.

half a loaf remaining. And when they returned, they told everything in detail to the tsar. The tsar became fired up with divine zeal and a cloud of joy seized him. Taking with him his favorites, he hastened away just as the hart hastens in the hours of harvest to the water brooks[67]; and they ran off in great haste to the mountain.

When they reached the river called the Rila River, they found the rock, very high and treacherous and very difficult to climb; and not being able to go further, they turned back. But then they began to climb another high mountain [nearby], which the locals used to call Knishava, and from there [the tsar's men] were able to point out to [the tsar] the mountain and rock where the venerable [Ivan] was living. But the tsar could not pass because of the steepness and impassibility of the place; and he immediately sent two children, whom he loved very much, to beg and plead with [Ivan] to grant [the tsar] his blessing, for [the tsar] very much desired to see him.

The children, when they had received the tsar's order, went there straightaway and explained everything to the saint. [Ivan] said that [their request] was impossible. "However, children," he said, "tell the tsar this: 'Your labor and proposal reach God and are received by Him like a sweet-smelling incense. Depart in haste from here; this place is rocky and treacherous; and so that You[r Majesty] should not suffer from any unexpected [danger], leave [this place] and take those with whom you came. You cannot see our humility in this life, but in future times we will see much of one another, and we will enjoy ineffable happiness if we offer up from here [to the Heavenly Father] worthy fruits of repentance.'"[68]

The tsar was sad, believing he had lost something great, and left with much lamentation and grief. And immediately he set out for the royal residence; and he sent [to Ivan presents of] much gold as well as an assortment of various fruits -- gifts befitting a monk in exchange for his blessing. And [the tsar] sent a letter containing the following [message]:

"To the most honorable father Ivan, the desert-dweller, [from] Tsar Peter. I have heard about the God-loving nature of your soul and about your desert-dwelling and ascetic and angelic existence; and, in addition to

---

67 The image of the deer in search of water is taken from Ps 42.1. See fn15.

68 Cf. Mt 3.8 and Lk 3.8.

this, [I have also heard] about your complete withdrawal from the world. And I desired very much to see your venerableness and to delight in your mellifluous words, for I have thought of how much benefit would flower forth from seeing you. But the desire for wealth, vainglory, and sensuality does not leave us alone, those [of us] who are being tossed about[69] in the sea of this vain life. May we rise up to the light of a pure and ascetic existence, for our spiritual eyes have been darkened over by the sadness and insurrection that is in this world -- and so now as if having woken up from some deep sleep, I wanted to see your saintliness. Since I have been deprived of this grace, I--who have repented on account of my many sins -- pray, falling before your venerableness, that you might send us some comfort of consolation and cool the intense heat of sadness. For you know, your venerableness, you know how many storms of the world and clouds of uprisings have caused my royal heart to become upset!"

Then the blessed Ivan as if breaking the force of his resolve, gave himself over to the [tsar's] request and to the food [sent him by the tsar], but he completely ignored the gift of gold, and responded to [the tsar] as follows:

"To the pious Tsar Peter, autocrat of the Bulgarian scepter; [from] poor Ivan. It is not possible for us to fulfill all of your requests; however, because of your faith and diligence, we will fulfill those things that are befitting: I have accepted [your gift] of food. But keep your gold, for such things are greatly harmful to those who are leading a monk's life[70], to those who are chosen to live in deserted and untamed places. For indeed why would people who do not even take enough bread to satisfy their hunger or enough water to quench their thirst need such things? We must live the life of Christ and attain death.[71] Such things [as you have sent me] are certainly fit for Your Majesty; however, not even you, who are

---

69 The Slavonic reads here vъlaǫštix sa < vъlajątisą/ vъlajatisja/ vъlatisja, which Sreznevskij (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, 378) defines by the Latin phrase "fluctibus agitari".

70 See Prov 23.10-11; Mt 10.9

71 K.Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit.,555, fn.48) cites here Phil 1.21 ("For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.")

bedecked in a crown, should delight in such things. For it is said: 'If riches increase, set not your heart on them.'[72] It is also written: 'The strength of a king is his wealth'[73], but such wealth should be spent not on armor and weapons nor on your own sensual desires, but should be distributed to the beggars and the poor, to the naked and those without kin. Furthermore, if you want to inherit more than a mere earthly kingdom, but the heavenly kingdom as well[74], then be merciful as our Heavenly Father is merciful.[75] Do not put your hope in falsehood and do not desire sensual pleasures.[76] Be humble[77] and forgiving to all[78], and keep a watchful eye upon all. Let the oil of your compassion pour forth onto everyone, and 'let not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing.'[79] Let the poor come away from your palace joyful, and let your princes carry praise for you on their tongues. Let your purple mantle shimmer with the brilliance of virtues, let sighs and tears be your children, keep the memory of death steadfastly in your mind, verily let your imagination picture the kingdom that is to be.[80]

---

[72] Ps 62.10 (Slavonic Psalter 61.11). There is a discrepancy in the content of the RSV passage and the Slavonic and Greek passages that deserves note. While the RSV passage contains the image of increasing wealth, the Slavonic and Greek passages convey the notion of fleeting or ephemeral wealth. The vita text reads "bogatstvo, ašte téčet", the Sinai Psalter "bogatъstvo ašte mimotékaet", which in turn is taken from the Septuagint: "πλοῦτος ἐὰν ῥέῃ, μὴ προστίθεσθε καρδίαν".

[73] K.Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit.,555, fn.50) cites here John Climacus' *Ladder of Divine Ascent* (Κλῖμαξ, Лествица) step 28: 87.

[74] Cf. Mt 25.24; 1 Cor 6.9,10,15.50; Gal 5.21.

[75] Cf. Exod 34.6; Deut 4.31; 2 Chron 30.9; Neh 9.17,31; Ps 103.8,116.5; Joel 2.13; Jon 4.2.

[76] Cf. 1 Pet 2.11. Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit.,555, fn.51) cites here John Climacus's *Ladder*, step 28. 87.

[77] See especially Jer 13.18; also 2 Ch.12.6; Prov 16.19; Is2.9; Mt 18.4, 23.12; Lk 14.11, 18.14; Jas 4.10; I Pe.5.6.

[78] See Eph 4.32

[79] Mt 6.3.

[80] K.Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit.,556, fn.53) writes that this passage is a paraphrase from the *Ladder* of John Climacus, the original passage of which reads: "Acquire the memory of death like an indivisible companion, and your beloved children shall be heart-felt sighs."

Throw yourself down at the feet of your Mother, the Church; prostrate yourself before and kneel down before the ruling hierarchy of the Church[81], so that the King of kings and Lord of lords, seeing such zeal as yours, will grant you rewards in return such as the eye has never seen and the ear has never heard and which have never entered into the human heart[82] -- things which God has prepared for His loved ones."

The tsar, having read this letter and thinking he had received something great, kissed it tenderly; and he kept it near his bosom as if it were some very valuable treasure [83]; and with frequent readings of this letter he chased away the darkness of the world.

IX. Now Ivan lived in that place all of seven years and four months, and not for one hour did he fall to indolence or lose heart, but added zeal unto zeal and diligence unto diligence; and, simply speaking, in his old age he showed the vigour of a young man.

Many people were still flocking to him, bringing their sick along with them; and they, receiving health through his prayers, would then leave. His great glory spread throughout this land, and many, zealots for such a virtuous life as his, wanted to live with him. And having established a church in a nearby cave and founded a monastery[84], [these people] had a leader and a venerable shepherd. And he, having shepherded his flock well, having led many to God and having worked great and glorious miracles, lived to a very old age.

And when he understood that his own time had come to depart to the Lord, he began to pray, and from his eyes he poured forth warm tears; and

---

[81] The original Slavonic here reads "prъvopréstolniki", which Sreznevskij defines as "занимающий первый престол, первенствующий иерарх" (see Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, 1764, "пьрвопрестольникъ")

[82] 1 Cor 2. 9.

[83] See Prov 2.4; Mt 13.44.

[84] i.e., Rila Monastery, Bulgaria's most famous religious community.

kneeling down to the ground, he said: "God, Ruler of all[85], take me, Your sinful and unworthy servant, and add me to the number of Your chosen people. I have done nothing good on this earth, O Kind One; because of this I beg of You in Your kindness, if it please You, to send the blessed angel so that my ascent [up to You and away] from wickedness will not be forbidden." And he also said: "Lord, I give my soul over to Your hands."[86]

Immediately he gave his soul over to the hands of God, having lived approximately seventy years; and he was buried by his disciples.[87]

X. Much time having passed, an endless stream of sweet-smelling scent was being given off [by his body]. When they opened the coffin, they saw the body of the venerable one completely intact, for decay had not set in on any part; and it was giving forth a sweet fragrance; and everyone was inspired with great zeal for God. The usual church service having been performed, they carred his purest of pure relics to the glorious city of Serdica, and they were placed in the Church of the Apostle Saint Luke. Afterwards, a church was built in his name, and his holy relics were then placed in it, working wondrous and glorious miracles.

XI. Much time now having passed, into the kingdom of the Greek emperor, Andronicus, came the Hungarian soldiers with their king, having crossed the Danube River; and they seized the Greek lands all the way to Serdica and conquered everything under foot.[88] They took the relics of the

---

85 The original Slavonic here reads "vъsedrъžitelь", a calque of the Greek "παντοκράτωρ."

86 K. Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 556, fn.55) cites here Lk 23.46 ("Then Jesus, crying with a loud voice, said, 'Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit!'").

87 K.Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 556, fn.56, writes: "It is supposed that Ivan of Rila was buried on August 18, 946.

88 This passage refers to the campaign of the Hungarian king, Bela III, against the Byzantine emperor, Andronicus I Comnenus (ruled 1183-85). Andronicus became the regent for Alexius II, the minor son of Manuel I Comnenus. Andronicus usurped power by having both Alexius and his mother strangled. This gave the Hungarian king a perfect excuse for his military campaign, for Manuel's murdered widow was his own wife's step-sister, and he claimed he was avenging his family. Bela was able to convince the Serbs to fight with him, and in 1184, they made their way down the main invasion route (today's

venerable [Ivan] with them, and they brought them back to their own country. For their king had heard about the wondrous and great miracles of the venerable one, and he commanded that [Ivan's] holy relics be placed in the church in the city called Ostrogon; and there too they worked glorious and wondrous miracles, casting out all disease and sickness. Word then spread throughout that country, and everyone gathered there together.

Now the Devil, hating good, did not tolerate for long their glorification of the venerable saint, and he stung the heart of the bishop of the city with the arrow of unbelief; and [the bishop] did not want [the villagers] to come and kneel to the relics of the venerable [Ivan], saying that this holy [man] was not to be [venerated] amongst the saints.[89] And this was not all, but through other means too he forbade them to go kneeling before [the relics]. "I," he said, "am thoroughly acquainted with all the saints and he is not found amongst their number."

And suddenly through God's righteous justice, [this bishop of Ostrogon] received a restraint on his tongue, and he was completely mute, not being able to say anything. Those who witnessed this miracle were seized with terror, and he was making signs to them with his hands like that ancient and wondrous priest Zacharias[90], his predecessor. When [the bishop] came to his senses, he contemplated his muteness, and having understood that it was because of his lack of faith that he suffered this at the hands of the saint, he ran quickly to the shrine of the saint, and he poured forth upon it warm tears. And with frequent sighs [the bishop] showed his heart-felt grief.

Orient Express route), plundering and destroying large parts of the cities of Niš (Yugoslavia) and Serdica (Sofia, Bulgaria). See John Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans, A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Empire*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987, pp. 6-7.

[89] The original text reads: "saying that this great man could in no way be found amongst the saints" ("glagolą, nikako sego prěpodobnago vъ svątyxъ obrětati").

[90] Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, is referred to as a "priest" by Luke (see Lk 1.5); the original text employs the term "arxierej" (from Greek "ἀρχιερεύς"), which Sreznevskij (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, 29) defines as "высший священник". The story is told in the first chapter of Luke how Zacharias received a message from the angel Gabriel that his wife, Elizabeth, was to give birth. Zacharias, doubting the accuracy of the message, asked Gabriel for a sign. As a punishment for his ingratitude and lack of faith, Zacharias was struck dumb and was to remain speechless until the birth of John.

Ivan, God's saint and Christ's imitator, did not want [the bishop] to suffer for long, and so in short time undid the knot on his tongue[91] and restored back to him his speech. [The bishop] then having gotten back [the power of speech], offered up endless thanksgiving to God and to the saint. Now everyone, hearing and seeing this, showed increased faith and zeal to the saint. And [Ivan] performed many other wondrous and awesome miracles in the Hungarian land, about which we do not have enough time to tell in detail.

When the [Hungarian] king, [Béla], had found out everything in detail, he was seized with terror and awe, and decorated the shrine of the saint with gold and silver, and came often to kiss his relics. With great pomp, [King Béla] returned [the relics] back to Serdica and placed them in the church which had been built in [Ivan's] name, in the year 6695 [i.e., AD 1187], in the fifth indiktos.[92]

XII. A short time had passed before God graciously deigned to renew the Bulgarian kingdom and raise up again, as is stated in the accounts, the fallen canopy which had become delapidated as a result of the Greek war. He lifted up the horn of the Bulgarian kingdom[93] under the pious Tsar Asen, who in holy baptism was named Ivan.[94] This man thus having taken

---

91 This is a paraphrase from Mk 7.35 : "razdreši są ǫza jazyka ego" (Jagić, Codex Zographensis, 59). Compare this with the Greek "καὶ εὐθὺς ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ"). See also *Life of Hilarion of Moglena*, fn.9.

92 See Стоянов, Янакиев, op.cit.,131; "inъdikъtъ" is taken from the Greek "ἴνδικτος", which is "the number of the year in a cycle of 15 years".

93 K.Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 556, fn.59) writes: "The horn symbolizes power."

94 The historical event in question here refers to the re-establishment of the Bulgarian Empire. Bulgaria was ruled by Byzantium from 1018 to 1185, during which time there was no Bulgarian tsar, and the existing dynastic line was broken. The so-called "Second Empire" was brought about by a rebellion led by two landowners, Peter and Asen, against Byzantium. M. Heppell adds the interesting note that the two brothers were not even Bulgarian, but Wallachian. See her article "The Hesychast Movement in Bularia: The Turnovo School and its Relations with Constantinople," *Eastern Churches Review* 7 (1975): 9-20, p.10.

Asen ruled as the senior ruler from 1185 to 1196 and had his court in Trnovo, while his brother served as co-ruler in Preslav. Upon Asen's death, Peter became the tsar, from 1196 to 1197 (see Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans*, 10-16). For a discussion on whether Tsar Asen was given the name Ioann, or Ivan (John), as a baptismal name, see Георги Данчев, "Агиографско-панегиричното наследство на Евтимий Търновски--

the flags of the kingdom, fortified well all the Bulgarian cities which had fallen and renovated what had become delapidated. And having armed himself well against the Greek empire, he conquered the surrounding lands, cities and villages.

When he had reached Serdica, having conquered everything under foot, and having heard about the glorious and innumerable miracles of the venerable [Ivan of Rila], he immediately set out for the honorable church. And having kissed piously the venerable relics of the saint, he believed he had found some very valuable treasure. His soul was filled with much joy and happiness, and he came to a wise decision -- for the sake of the grand honor and fortification of the kingdom -- to bring the relics of the venerable father to his own glorious city of Trnovo. And immediately he sent to the patriarch and kyrios[95] Vasilij, who was in the great city of Trnovo, a letter commanding the following:

"To the pious patriarch and spiritual father of our royal kingdom. By God's will, I arrived in these territories and reached the city of Serdica, finding the saintly relics of the venerable father Ivan, a dweller of the Rila desert, which have performed miracles and healing. I thought myself to be as if flying in the air from joy! His great glory has spread throughout this whole country, and the wondrous and glorious healings performed [by the relics] are known not only here but also throughout the Hungarian kingdom. This being the case, our royal kingdom has considered the matter and has decided that Your Grace should come here with all the clergy of the church and with befitting honor in order to translate these holy relics

---

извор на сведения за дейността на Асеневци," *Търновска книжовна школа*, том 4, 9-18, София: БАН, 1985, p.11, fn.12. He writes: "Concerning the possibility that Tsar Asen's Christian name was indeed 'Ivan', as Euthymius of Trnovo states, we share the doubts of Prof. V. Zlatarski concerning the verity of this information. See Златарски, История на българската държава [през средните векове, т.2, София, 1972], pp.482-483."

The incident described above in chapter XII, as Euthymius (or some subsequent scribe) relates, occurred in 1195, three years before the birth of Ivan Asen II. Furthermore, the "renewal of the Bulgarian kingdom" discussed in the text would have to refer to the political career of Tsar Asen I and his brother Tsar Peter if the date of 1195 is correct.

95 Sreznevkij defines this as "a title specific to the Byzantine imperials house, which was given also to Russian princes" (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, 1420). The word in Greek means literally lord or master.

of the venerable father [Ivan] to our glorious royal city [of Trnovo] in praise of the fulfillment of the whole church and in the establishment of our pious kingdom."

The prelate hearing this, became overjoyed and offered up a prayer of thanksgiving to God and immediately summoned the church clergy and told them everything that had been related to him [in the letter]. They, with warm zeal and burning souls, all rejoiced in great pleasure, and they all worked diligently together toward the same goal: they wanted to bring [the relics] like some very valuable treasure [to Trnovo], and soon they arrived in Serdica with their patriarch and teachers.

The pious Tsar Ivan Asen had prepared everything for the translation of the saint. He entrusted everything to Patriach [Vasilij], leaving to him three hundred brave soldiers for the translation of the saint. And [Asen], having made great haste, quickly arrived in his royal city and set about building a church dedicated to the saint in the glorious city of Trapezica.[96]

The patriarch, having taken the holy relics of this venerable man, set out on the trip with all the church clergy, rejoicing and praising God; and following them was the abbot of the [Rila] monastery -- which was founded by the venerable [Ivan] -- and all his subordinate monks. And when the tsar saw the patriarch approaching [Trnovo], he went out immediately to greet him with his entire synod at the place called Krestec. And having kissed blessedly the relics of the saint, the tsar left them there to remain for seven days until the church was completed.

And so they, having sanctified [the church], piously placed the relics of the venerable one in it in the year 6703 [i.e., AD 1195], in the thirteenth indiktos[97], where they remain even up to this very day, working various

---

[96] Trapezica was a section of Trnovo. Fine (*The Late Medieval Balkans*, 436) offers this interesting historical note on the medieval plan of the city: "Trnovo on the Jantra River was built on two hills, Carevac (the site of a huge fortified enclosure containing the royal palace, patriarchal residence, cathedral church, and other related buildings) and Trapezica (containing the palaces of the leading nobles and many private chapels)." Heppell (op.cit.,11) adds that there was a Jewish quarter and another quarter of the city designated for foreigners known as "Frenkhishar."

[97] See fn.92.

healings for everyone who approaches them with faith. The blind[98] who come are enlightened by their faith, the deaf are healed, the mute quickly begin to converse in language pleasing to God, the sick gain back their strength, those possessed by devils are cured; and all those gripped by various sicknesses who come [to see Ivan's relics], are healed.[99]

XIII[100]. O Ivan -- esteemed leader, who is filled with the grace of the Holy Spirit, in which our Saviour and Father reside, who stands before the throne of the King of all and clearly delights in the light of the consubstantial Trinity[101], who with cherubic angels offers up the trisagion hymn, and who possesses enormous and unwavering courage -- pray to the Most Merciful Ruler [that He may] save your relatives, your fellow-countrymen, the Bulgarians[102]; and help our royal tsar, Ivan Šišman.[103] Vanquish for him all his contrary enemies under his feet, preserve the pure

---

98 Kałużniacki points out that in the manuscripts of the first form of the shortened redaction of the vita, this whole passage beginning with "the blind..." etc. to the end of the chapter is omitted and replaced by the "stereotype Formel": "vъ slavǫ xrista istinnomu bogu našemu, emuže slava sъ otcemь i svątymь duxomь, nyně i prisno",etc. ("In the glory of Christ, our true God, whose glory is with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and forever..."). See Kałużniacki, *Werke*, 25,fn.6.

99 In manuscripts C, N, O, and T [the so-called "expanded redactions" of the vita], there follows, under the heading "Gramatikovo" [of the Grammarian], a narration by Ladislaus [Vladislav] the Grammarian of the re-translation of the relics of Ivan of Rila from Trnovo to the Rila Monastery; and it is extant in two redactions: an older one and a more recent one. The older one is contained in T, and the more recent one is contained in manuscripts C, N and O. Both of the redactions are published in Kałużniacki's edition under Nr.I in the appendix but are not included in this translation. (See Kałużniacki, *Werke*, 25,fn.14).

100 This chapter, as has already been mentioned in the introduction to the translations, is not extant in the manuscripts that contain the first form of the shortened redaction. See Kałużniacki, *Werke*, 25, fn.15.

101 The original reads "edinosǫštnyą", or "ὁμοούσιος".See Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, 814. This corresponds to the Latin term "consubstantial" which was used since the Council of Nicea to combat the Arian heresy

102 In C, N, O, and T this passage reads: "edinorodnyj ti ezykь, Blъgare že i Srъbije", i.e. "your fellow-countrymen, the Bulgarians and the Serbs". See Kałużniacki,*Werke*, 26, fn.3.

103 Tsar Ioann Šišman ruled from 1371 to 1393.

faith, fortify our cities, bring peace to the whole world, deliver us from hunger and destruction, and protect us from foreign invasion. Console the aged, admonish the young, make wise the foolish, have mercy on the widows, protect the orphans, teach the young and save all of your people from all disasters; and on Judgment Day, through your prayers, separate us from the group that stands on the left [hand of God][104] and include us amongst the sheep [that sit on the right hand of God]. Grant that we may hear the voice of the Blessed Leader, Christ, [who says] : 'Come, you who are blessed by My Father, inherit the kingdom that has been prepared for you from the [time of the] creation of the world.' For His is the glory, the honor and the kingdom, forever and ever, Amen.

104 A reference to those who will be damned to Hell, by contrast with the "right" group, who will go to Heaven.

Chapter 3:
The Life of Hilarion, Bishop of Moglena[1]

The Life and Deeds of Our Venerable Father Hilarion, Bishop of Moglena in which [it is told] how he was brought to the glorious city of Trnovo, written by the kyrios Euthymius[2], Patriarch of Trnovo

I. Sweet is mortal life, but immortality is sweeter than all delights; and immortality knows how to create mankind in a wonderful image and to make [mankind] its own and pass it on into eternity. For another life awaits us which is impervious to destruction. And if we adhere to spiritual goodness in this present life, then our physical being will be rewarded with a better image just as if our former youth were to be restored to us for eternity.[3] And if we possessed a celestial language, we would tell of those things which are to come with beauty and with great sweetness, which is very delightful and abounds in our daily lives.

Since we have not been awarded this particular pleasure, we speak of other things which the coporeal sense is able to recognize. Thus it is impossible for mortal consciousness to speak easily of immortal and ineffable things and of things that are acquired by faith alone. It will be easy only for Hilarion to relate such things. He delights abundantly in these things both in soul and feeling, he whose beneficence we have called upon today.

---

[1] Hilarion was born towards the end of the 11th century and was canonized around the middle of the 12th century. See В.С.Киселков, *Патриарх Евтимий*, София, 1938, p.273.

[2] In manuscript O of Kałużniacki's catalogue, Euthymius is referred to here as "kurъ", from the Greek "κύριος". Sreznevkij defines this as "a title specific to the Byzantine imperial house, which was given also to Russian princes." See И.Срезневский, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам*, 1893; Reprint, Москва: Книга, 1989, vol.1, p.1420. The word in Greek means literally lord or master.

[3] See 2 Cor 3.18. The AV reads: "But we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

If [we do not succeed in writing this] with beauty, then we will, however, relate to the best of our ability the life and deeds of this man. But just as it is not easy to count rain drops, so it is also not easy [to relate] the acts and life of this man; but we will try to relate clearly what we have found scattered about here and there.

I believe that [Hilarion] will receive this with delight like a loving father[4] who delights in the meaningless babble of his own baby. And if we stray far from decorum, may that blessed soul, which is filled with great sweetness, forgive us as a father would his children, whom he loves. He will not revile us for our zeal, but rather he will help us and he will hasten to lead [us] to a truthful account. For he knows, he knows how to rejoice and labour for the benefit of sincere people.

II. The parents of the blessed [Hilarion] happened to be very holy[5], pleasing God like few others, and they lived according to all of God's commandments, engaging in prayer day and night. They were however childless and wanted with all their hearts to be blessed with a child.[6]

His mother, who was barren[7] like Hannah, Samuel's mother[8], used to pray unceasingly, but her voice was not heard. And realizing that she was getting on in years, she put her trust in the Mother of God.[9] And she would often go running to the church, and with frequent weeping and warm tears she would utter the following words: "Do not have contempt for your servant, Our Lady; do not leave me alone and childless within my own

---

[4] The Slavonic reads literally "child-loving father", "jako čądoljubivъ otьcъ."

[5] According to Sreznevskij, "naročityi" can also carry the meaning of "священный" (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, 323).

[6] Literally, "to receive fruit", "polučiti plodъ".

[7] Literally, "unfruitful", "neplodna".

[8] See 1 Sam 1.4-20.

[9] The original Slavonic text reads here "bogomater", a calque of the Greek "θεομήτωρ." John Beckwith (*Early Christian and Byzantine Art*, 1970; reprint, Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1986, p.70) notes that at the Council of Ephesus in 431 the Virgin was formally declared "θεοτόκος" [Slavonic, "bogorodica"], as opposed to "θεομήτωρ."

family. I am very much consumed by grief, and I cannot bear the disgrace of being childless. Because of this I have run to you alone, you who have the power to loosen the bonds[10] of my barrenness."

This is what she prayed every hour. One night the blessed Mother of God[11] appeared to her in a dream and, shaking her leg, she said: "Get up, woman, you have what you asked for. Ask nothing more of me." When she had heard this, she was filled with joy; and she experienced even greater [joy] when she heard [the Mother of God say] : "You will give birth to a son and he will turn many away from deep deceptions to the light of proper reason."[12] Thus she put her hope in these things, and she rejoiced further in these blessed hopes.

When a little time had passed, she conceived and gave birth to the blessed Hilarion. And what a miracle! When he had reached his third year[13], he sang out that angelic song which is sung on high, proclaiming: "Holy, holy, holy, one God."[14] When his mother heard this, she was filled with both joy and disbelief, and she wondered greatly at what he had said.

III. When he was grown up, they gave him over to the priests to learn the Holy Scriptures. When he reached his eighteenth year, having left his

---

10 There is a confusion of nasals in this phrase. The original text reads "neplodstva moego razdrěšiti ązy" rather than "ǫzy." The difference between the two nasals is phonemic and results in differing interpretations of the phrase. As the text reads, the content of the phrase could be understood as "to destroy the diseases/sicknesses of my barrenness" (Sreznevskij defines "ąza" as "болезнь"; see Срезневский, op.cit., vol.3, 1643); however, it is certain that Euthymius is borrowing here from a phrase found in Mk 7.35 : "razdreši są ǫza języka ego" (Jagić, *Codex Zographensis*, 59). Sreznevskij (vol.3, 1168) defines "uza" (pluralia tantum) as "оковы", i.e. "shackles" or "bonds."

Compare this with the Greek "καὶ εὐθὺς ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ..."), thus making the interpretation of the phrase "to destroy/loosen the bonds of by barrenness". Kałużniacki (in *Werke*) provides no footnote to this sentence in his edition, so one is left to assume either that all of the manuscripts that he examined have in common this particular error or that he simply did not take notice of it.

11 In Slavic, "Bogorodica."

12 See Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, 102. For Slavonic "blagorazumie", he gives as equivalents only Greek "εὔνοια", Latin "benevolentia."

13 The original reads: "Tretie že tomu provaždaǫštu léto."

14 See Isa 6.3.

parents and the world, he went off to pursue a monk's life. And from there he went to a monastery, and deferring to his superior in God[15], he had himself tonsured and donned a monk's habit.[16] And he was like a green olive tree in the house of God[17], like a second Isaac, obeying his father in everything, subjugating completely his own will and carrying out his service with the utmost zeal.[18] And his virtue shone forth so brightly, that his name was on the lips of all his [monastic] brothers, and they rejoiced in his virtues.[19]

His spiritual father[20], seeing this, was filled with joy every day. And thus observing him with a spiritual eye and comprehending the virtue that was given to him by God, he prayed for him to remain always untried [by temptation].

When a few years had passed, the father [of the monastery] understood that his time to depart to the Lord was nigh, and he summoned all the brothers who served under him to gather [around him]. And he gave them orders and handed over the leadership of the monastery to Hilarion. He lived for a few more days, and then he gave his soul over to the Lord. Thus Hilarion was the heir to his father's leadership, beneficence, and prayer, and he looked after the flock that was entrusted to him by God, all the while maintaining humility in everything, and setting an example for his brothers and everyone else, restraining himself with fasting, vigils and

---

15 The original texts reads here "načąlstvuǫsčomu svoǫ o gospodi prekloni vyǫ", literally, "bowing his kneck to his superior [i.e. abbot] in the Lord."

16 In the Slavonic, a monk's habit is expressed by the phrase "aggelskyi obrazъ", or "angelic image".

17 Ps 52.8 (Slavonic Psalter 51.10).

18 A reference to Isaac, the son of Abraham and Sarah. Abraham sired Isaac when he was one hundred years old (see Gen 21.1-8). When Isaac was twenty-five, his father was commanded by God to sacrifice him, and Abraham was ready to obey in his love and fear of God (see Gen 22.1-13).

19 The original passage reads "jakože vъsej brati togo na ązycě obnositi i togo krasiti są dobrodětělmi."

20 The designation "duxovnyj otьcъ", or "spiritual father", refers to the abbot of the monastery.

all-night prayer, pouring forth every night streams of tears, and imitating in every way that great monastic founder Theodosius.[21]

One time there was a great famine, and the brothers were greatly perplexed at the destitution that had befallen their lives, and they suffered from great poverty. The blessed Hilarion turned to prayer and with his tears he evoked God's philanthropy, and what a miracle! -- suddenly the storehouses were filled with food, and the cloud of grief that was hovering over the brothers was chased away. For the Lord is near to those who fear Him[22], and He heard their prayer. And [Hilarion] worked so many other deeds worthy of note, that were we to start telling about them in detail, this story would go on for a long time.

Thus this second Joseph turned out to be a giver of grain to his pupils, for increased diligence and faith were added unto him, and the number of his pupils grew. Everyone in the vicinity would gather before him, scooping up his divine blessing, and these people donned the monk's habit. Through Hilarion God was glorified.

Word of him spread all around, and there was no place where his name was not being uttered. But Hilarion in no way enjoyed any of this, but assumed even more the humility of Christ.

Not to us, Lord, not to us, but to Your Name should glory be given![23]

IV. Several years passed, and Hilarion continued to be a good leader for the monks. The Lord would not allow his lamp to be put under a bushel[24] [thus letting his talents to go to waste] by keeping him in his position as a

---

21 The original text reads here "velikaago onogo Teodosia obštezitelě", literally "that great cenobite Theodosius". Sreznevskij defines "obьštežitelь" as монахъ, κοινόβιος also as "основатель общежитія, начальник общаго житія (прозваніе св. Ѳеодосія Великаго, ум. въ 529 г.)" See Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, 579.

22 Spasova and Ivanova (see their collaborative translation of the *Life of Hilarion* in Иванова, *Стара българска литература*, том 4, p.534, fn.7) cite here Slavonic Psalter 144.18-19 (RSV Ps 145.18-19).

23 Ps 115.1.

24 Lk 8.16-17.

monk, but rather [the Lord wanted him] to enlighten his own orphaned flock with light and adorn the bishop's throne.

In Okhrid, the Holy Mother of God appeared in a vision to the Bulgarian archbishop -- Eustachius was his name[25] -- and she said the following: "Make haste, archbishop, place a candle on the candle stand.[26] Make Hilarion, who has accepted monastic instruction, the pastor of the people of Moglena. For he wants to turn many away from deceit and lead them to the light of proper reason."[27] When the archbishop heard this divine message, he immediately woke up and contemplated the power of the vision, and he then endeavored to fulfill what he had been commanded to do.

That same night, the blessed Hilarion also had a sweet vision, and this is what was said to him: "Behold now I begin to raise you up from the sons of Israel, I am the Lord, I have called you in righteousness, I have taken you by the hand and kept you; I have given you as a covenant to the people, a light to the nations, to open to the eyes of the blind, to liberate the prisoners from the dungeon, from the jail, those who sit in darkness."[28] When he had awoken and contemplated the power of the vision, he understood it to be from God. And though he was filled with grief at [having to be] separated from his brothers, he obeyed God's will.

When a few days had passed, the aforementioned archbishop of Bulgaria [Eustachius] conferred on him the title of bishop of Moglena.[29] When [Hilarion] arrived in his city and went into the cathedral, he kissed fervently the holy icons, and prayed intensely for his flock; and he gave the

---

25 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,534, fn.11 write: "There are no concrete facts surrounding the Archbishop Eustachius of Okhrid. It is supposed that he occupied the archbishop's throne between 1133 and 1143. See also Bistra Nikolova's article, "La vie d'Ilarion de Muglen par le Patriarche Euthyme et le renseignement sur l'archevêque bulgare Eustache," *Byzantinobulgarica* 8 (1986): 253-266.

26 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,534, fn.12, cite here Mt 5.15.

27 In Slavonic, "blagorazumie." See fn.12.

28 Isa 42. 6-7.

29 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit., 534, fn.15, write: "The eparchy of Moglena in the province of Macedonia was subordinate to the Oxrid archbishopric already by 1018."

flock peace and filled their hearts with joy. He taught them to maintain carefully the correct faith, to keep God's commandments, to observe the rules of orthodoxy, to forsake blasphemous heresies and their idle verbiage according to the Scriptures: "Do I not hate them that hate thee, O Lord?"[30], to go to church, to eschew any man who is unworthy, to believe in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, in the Indivisible Trinity; and to believe in the incarnation of Christ[31] and in the Tree of Life as an invincible weapon against the invisible enemies, to revere the holy relics of the divine eternal saints, to curse all heretics such as Arius[32], Eunomius[33],

---

30 Ps 139.21 (Slavonic Psalter 138.21).

31 i.e. the human form of Christ, an anti-Monophysite statement.

32 It was Arius's views that led to the convening of the first ecumenical council on May 20, 325 in Nicaea. Arius was a native of Libya and served as a cleric in Alexandria. See Frances M. Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon, A Guide to the Literature and its Background*, London: SCM Press, Ltd.,1983. On pages 58-59 he summarizes Arius' position: "The first of Arius' letters that we know is an appeal to Eusebius of Nicomedia, written before he left Egypt, complaining that he had been excommunicated because he says that the Son had a beginning, whereas God is without beginning. Arius contrasts his opinion with that of Alexander who persecutes him for refusing to preach the eternal generation of the Son. The second letter of Arius is addressed to Alexander [bishop of Alexandria], and is usually attributed to his time at Nicomedia. It is an ἔκθεσις πίστεως, a public letter outlining his position. He claims that he is setting out the faith of their forefathers, but then he gives the impression that he basically argued from propositions of a strictly monotheistic character: God alone is ingenerate (ἀγέν(ν)ητος), alone eternal, alone without beginning, alone true, alone has immortality, alone is wise, alone good, alone sovereign. The Son is not coeternal with the Father, but God is before all things, being Monad and beginning of all..."

See also W.H.C.Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1984. On page 494 Frend also gives a summary of Arius' position: "The heart of his system was the complete transcendence of God and the application of a rigorous logic to the relationship of the Son to God. We acknowledge, he wrote to Bishop Alexander of Alexandria (312-28), 'One God who is alone unbegotten [agennetos] alone eternal and alone without beginning.' From that premise he went on to assert that the Word was not only subordinate to the Father, but being begotten must have had a beginning of existence. Hence it was clear that there was [a time] when the Son was not. Logically, therefore, he had his existence from the non-existent.' And if he was 'made from nothing,' he must be a 'creature.'...If Arius' definitions were correct, Christ could not have been fully God nor man."

33 According to Lossky (*The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, first published as *Essai sur la Théologie Mystique de l'Église d'Orient*, Paris, 1944; London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd.,1957, p.33), the Cappadocian Fathers engaged in a polemic with Eunomius, who "maintained the possibility of expressing the divine essence in those innate concepts by which it reveals itself to the reason."

Sabellius[34] and Macedonius[35], Apollinarius[36] and Origen[37] and their writings; to abhor with all one's soul the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia[38] and his pupil Nestorius[39], Dioscorus[40] and Severus[41] and

---

[34] See *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, vol.846, New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.,1990 (hereafter referred to by the abbreviation EEC), p.808: "Figure involved in Christological debates. Sabellius's name is associated with the view that the Son was a different mode of the Father rather than a different person ('Modalist Monarchianism')."

W.H.C.Frend (*The Early Church*, Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1965, p.89) writes: "Much will be heard of 'Sabellius the Libyan' during the Arian controversy. He appears to have claimed that though the Trinity consisted simply of modes (hence the term Modalist) or aspects of the Father, God acted as Father in the creation, the Son in redemption and the Holy Spirit in prophecy and sanctification. There was one substance but three activities--loaded terms when it came to defining belief."

[35] See Frend, ibid.,183. He writes: "Macedonius, Constantine's Bishop of Constantinople (died 362), prepared to accept the Nicene formula but would not regard the Spirit as other than a 'creature', i.e. of the same nature as an angel. Among the leaders of this group [that agreed with Macedonius] was Eustathius of Sebaste in eastern Cappadocia."

[36] The Appollinarian heresy denied the human understanding in the manhood of Christ (see Lossky, op.cit., 187).

[37] Origen (d.254?) employed neoplatonic philosophy in an attempt to synthesize Christian and Greek philosophy. He was condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553. See EEC, pp.667-668; John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982, pp.33-34.

[38] Nestorius' teacher and spiritual father and one of the church intellectuals who held the Antiochene view on the Monophysite question. All of the following four, Nestorius, Dioscorus and Severus and Eutyches, were involved in the Monophysite controversy, so we shall cite here the synopsis given in EEC, pp.620-621:

"Movement that emphasized the divine nature of Christ in the Christological disputes of the fifth century, from a Greek term meaning 'one nature.' Monophysitism designates a specific theological tradition associated intially with the city of Alexandria, but the name in time came to be used more generally to indentify those Christian communities of the East that do not accept the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon (451): the Copts in Egypt, the Jacobites in Syria, and the Armenian Orthodox Church. Modern scholars regard Monophysitism as less a doctrinal deviation than a schism. In most respects, the Monophysite churches do not differ from other eastern Christian churches in doctrine, policy, or liturgy...At the time of the Council of Chalcedon, most Christians accepted the Nicene Creed, which affirmed that Christ was fully God, 'of one substance with the Father,' and that the Son, eternally begotten of God the Father, had 'become incarnate,' that is, entered fully into human nature. In the decades before the council, however, disputes had arisen about how best to express the relation between the divine and human in Christ. One school, that of Alexandria, taught that the eternal Word of God had *become* the person of Jesus of Nazareth; another school, that of Antioch, believed that the eternal Word had entered into the man Jesus of Nazareth as the Spirit had descended on the prophets but more fully and intimately, 'as in a son.' To explain their respective beliefs, each tradition used the term 'nature' (physis) in a different sense. Cyril, bishop of

Alexandria (412-444) and a disciple of the great Christian leader of the fourth century Athanasius of Alexandria, understood the term 'nature' to refer to the second person of the Trinity, the divine and eternal Word of God (as in Jn 1.1). In his view, and the tradition he represented, there was one 'nature,' the divine Word, and this Word had become incarnate in Jesus Christ. For him, then, the term 'nature' referred to a concrete and complete entity, the Word begotten of the Father, what we would call a 'person.' The other group of Christian thinkers, located primarily in the vicinity of Antioch in Syria, represented by Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Nestorius of Constantinople, used the term 'nature' in a different sense. 'Nature' for them designated a quality or a character, like 'brownness' or 'density,' not a concrete entity. Just as 'brownness' designated the quality of being brown, so human nature referred to the quality of being human. Peter was human, Paul was human, and Jesus was human, but each was a distinct individual person. The question, then, arose as to whether it was proper to say that Christ had two natures, divine and human. For Antiochene theologicans, the answer was 'yes.' Christ possessed the quality of humanity and the quality of divinity. For Cyril of Alexandria and his followers, talk of 'two natures' was confusing because it implied there were two Christs (i.e., two distinct and separate entities), two persons, one who was the eternal Word of God an the other the human being Jesus of Nazareth. Hence, they preferred to speak of 'one nature' in Christ...At the Council of Chalcedon, leaders of the churches from throughout the Christian world tried to reconcile these two traditions with the formulation 'one person in two natures' (divine and human). Although there was precedent for this wording, political divisions among the churches made the compromise formula suspect. The council deposed and excommunicated the bishop of Alexandria, Dioscorus, angering the faithful in Egypt. One document adopted at the council, the Tome (*Ep.*28) of Leo I, bishop of Rome, seemed, in the view of the Alexandrians, to divide Christ's work into separate human and divine activities. The council also repudiated Eutyches, archimadrite of a monastery in Constantinople. Eutyches had defended a formulation used earlier in Alexandria, 'two natures before but only one after the union,' which was discarded a the council. As a consequence, bishops of Egypt felt that the tradition of their church was being abandoned...The Monophysites produced a number of outstanding Christian teachers and spiritual writers, among them Severus of Antioch, Jacob of Sarug, Philoxenus of Mabbug, John of Tella, and Theodore of Arabia."

39 A monk of Antioch who became the patriarch of Constantinople in 428. Nestorius became involved both in the controversy involving the term "theotokos" and also in a christological debate that resulted in his condemnation. Frend (*The Early Church,* 226) writes regarding the first controversy: "Nestorius rejected the notion that the Virgin Mary was, as the mother of Jesus Christ, also the mother of the Divine Logos. 'Let no one call Mary Theotokos: for Mary was but a woman, and it is impossible that God should be born of a woman; declared his representative, the Syrian priest Anastasius. The most he would allow was that she was Christotokos (bearer of Christ) not Theotokos (bearer of God).'

As Frend writes in his other book, *The Rise of Christianity*, p.754, Nestorius was also involved in a christological debate with Cyril, archbishop of Alexandria. Nestorius "distinguished in Christ the Son of God from the Son of David. The latter was inhabited by the former. The body was the temple (see Jn 2.21) for the Word. Just as man though created 'in the image of God' was and would remain part of the created order, so the human nature of Christ remained human. It could be joined to the divine but never fused with it to make 'one nature' in the sense affirmed by Cyril." Frend writes in *The Early Church*, p.225, that the Antiochene, i.e. Nestorian, views were "grounded in the New Testament from which they derived a clear perception of the human nature of the Lord. Jesus Christ really went through the normal experiences which man must live. He was a true man. But his son-ship to God meant that God dwelt in him to a unique degree,

Eutyches[42] and such people and also Mani[43] and of Paul Samosata.[44] And having said this and much more, and having given peace to his flock, he let them go home.

---

indissolubly united with him, and enabling him to offer a perfect pattern of virtue and redemption to humanity. But depite all, the Antiochenes thought of Christ 'in two persons' or 'hypostases' (individualities) whose union must be conceived more as a conjunction of opposites (i.e., God and man) brought about by a harmonization of wills, rather than a union of essences as taught by the Alexandrians [represented by Cyril]. Their beliefs were recognizably akin to those of Paul of Samosata and this was not lost to their supporters."

40 The successor to St. Cyril in Alexandria and a defender of Euthyches' Monophysite heresey. He entreated Emperor Theodosius to summon a council to acquit Eutyches of heresy and reinstate him in office. The council took place in Ephesus on August 8, 449.

41 A patriarch of Antioch (465-538) who condemned the Monophysites. See Henry Chadwick, *The Early History of the Church*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1968, p.206. He writes: "Men like Severus of Antioch (465-538) and Philoxenus of Hierapolis in Syria (440-523) were theologians of high intellectual finesse. They urged with inexhaustible argument that Cyril of Alexandria's formula 'one nature after the union' was irreconcilable with Chalcedon and Leo, and they sharply disowned the extremist Monophysite doctrine (taught by Bishop Julian of Halicarnassus) that the physical body of Christ was incorruptible before the resurrection."

42 Eutyches was an extreme Monophysite. Of him, Chadwick, op.cit.,201, writes: "In November 448 at Constantinople Eutyches, evidently acting with all deliberation, challenged the orthodoxy of those who said that in Christ there are 'two natures after the union', and was condemned by Flavian as an Apollianarian."

43 Manes, or Mani (d.277), a Persian, formed a new sect out of the ancient Persian doctrine of the two kingdoms of Light and Darkness. Light is the domain of the kingdom ruled by God, whereas Darkness is the realm of Satan, who created both this earth and Adam. See Cyril Mango, *Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome*, New York: Scribner, 1980, pp.94-95).

44 Paul of Samosata was the bishop of Antioch (261-271). Frend (*The Early Church*, 125-126) writes: "He asserted among other things that the Virgin Mary gave birth to a man, and that the Spirit who anointed him was the same Spirit that had inspired the prophets. But in Jesus' case the inspiration was complete. The spirit took up his abode in him as in a temple. Moreover, Paul also used the term Homoousios [ὁμοούσιος] to describe the relationship between the Word and the Father, but in a sense that seems to have suggested the evidence of some quality prior to both." On page 703 of the EEC one reads: "Paul is usally noted for his place in Christological issues, but that position is clouded. He emphasized a Christology from below, rejecting the Son's preexistence and descent and stressing Jesus' ordinary manhood of body and soul. Synods in Antioch in 264 and 268 condemned these teachings. The later documents, which claim to give a transcript of his heresy trial, are most probably Apollinarian forgeries that sought to disparage the term *homoousios* and attach Antiochene Christology."

The believers, having heard this rejoiced, proclaiming the munificence of God, who gave them such a pastor and teacher. The heretics were fired up with hatred and wrath, for the blessed [Hilarion] was endeavoring to increase the talent that had been given him. [45]

V. Only a little time had passed, and the blessed [Hilarion] having taught and instructed carefully the devout people, saw how the territory of the Manichaeans, the Armenians, and the Bogomils had been increased[46]; and they were plotting conspiracies and casting slander against him, and they were trying to cast the upright in heart into darkness[47], corrupting the orthodox people and tearing the flock to bits like some wild beast. Thus he saw this increasing with every passing day, and he was consumed with bitter grief, and he offered up diligent prayers from his heart to the omnipotent God in order to shut their irrepressible mouths; and he gave frequent instruction to his people, teaching and convincing them to keep the orthodox faith.

The aforementioned heretics, hearing the things frequently said by him, set their hearts ablaze, and like wild beasts they gnashed their teeth at him, playing dirty tricks on him, and quarrelling beligerently with him. But the good pastor of God's sheep, Hilarion, made the One on High a refuge for himself[48]; and he brushed away easily, as one would a spider's

---

45 A reference to the story contained in Mt 25.14-31.

46 For a summary of Mani's teachings, see EEC, 562-563. Petar Dinekov writes: "Concerning the treatment of the Manichaeans, Paulicians, and the Bogomils, [Euthymius] used the well-known work of Euthymius Zigabenus, the *Panoplia Dogmatica*." See also П.Динеков, "Евтимий Търновский," *История на българската литература*, том I, 285-307, Стойко Божков, Петър Динеков, и.т.д. ред. София: БАН, 1963, p. 296.

For the original Greek text of Zigabenus' *Panoplia Dogmatica*, see *Patrologia Græca*, vol.130, pp.19-1362, edited by J.-P.Migne, Paris, 1865. Zigabenus described in this work the rituals of the Bogomils and their mystical foundations. Cf. R.I.Moore, *The Origins of European Dissent*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977, pp.160-62, 164; and J.Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986, p.158. According to the EEC (p.562), the Bogomils, Paulicians and Catharists were sectarian forms of Manichaeism that emerged in the medieval period.

47 See Ps 11.2.

48 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,534, fn.22, cite here Slavonic Psalter 90.9 (RSV Ps 91.9 "Because you have made the Lord your refuge, the Most High your habitation...")

web, all their snares and idle talk; and he continued to rejoice in the fulfillment of the faithful.

VI. One time the vile defenders of the Manichaean heresy[49] came humbly to him, like wolves in sheep's clothing[50], just as the Pharisees came to the Lord.[51] But falsehood, lying to itself, becomes more deeply entrenched into the net which it conceals, and the lie was clothed in truth.[52]

And they asked him, "Why do you not succumb to the truth but rather oppose it? We say that the Blessed God is the Creator of the heavens, but we consider the earth and everything on it to be [the work] of the other, evil creator."[53]

---

[49] According to Hussey (op.cit., 157), the Byzantines used the terms "Manichaean" and "Paulician" as synonyms. The connection between the two groups has not been made entirely clear (see Mango,op.cit.,100), but they shared much in common. Both maintained the dualistic division between good and evil, light and dark, with the material world representing the creation and domain of the Devil (the Bogomil's inherited this notion, adding to it the teaching that the Devil, Satanael, was the younger brother of Christ; see Browning, op.cit.,164-5). Both groups also rejected the Old Testament and the sacraments.

Hussey (op.cit.156) and Browning (op.cit.,162-3) point out that large numbers of Paulicians and Armenian and Syrian Monophysites were transplanted by the Byzantine government in the areas in and around Thrace in the eighth and tenth centuries to provide themselves with more soldiers against the Bulgars. Based on the fact that there were large numbers of Paulicians and Monophysites from Central Asia in Bulgaria during both the First and Second Empires and based on the specific points of the theological debate contained with this chapter of the vita (such as the status of the body of Christ and the cross), the group Hilarion encounters in this chapter are probably Paulicians.

Hussey (op.cit.162-3) comments specifically on the historical information contained within the *Life of Hilarion* : "In the Macedonian provinces the various forms of the dualist heresy continued to flourish during Manuel's reign. As in Alexius' day in Thrace there seemed to be a mixture of 'Manichaeans' (presumably Paulicians), Bogomils (which often included, or were synonymous with Messalians), and Armenians (Monophysites). Such is the information in the *life* of Hilarion, bishop of Moglena in Macedonia during Manuel Comnenus' reign."

[50] Cf.Mt 7.15; 10.16; Lk 10.3

[51] Cf. Matthew chapters 3, 12,16,19, 22 with parallel passages in Mark, Luke, and John.

[52] Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,536, fn.25, cite Slavonic Psalter 9.16 (RSV Ps 9.16).

[53] A statement of one of the tenets of Manichaean belief, namely that the material world is a creation of the Devil. Cf. Mango, op.cit., 94-95; R. Browning, *Byzantium and Bulgaria, A Comparative Study Across The Early Medieval Frontier*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975, p. 162; Hussey, op.cit., 156-157.

The blessed Hilarion answered them thus[54]: "Obey Christ, who said in the Gospels: 'The word which ye hear is not mine, but is my Father's who has sent me.'[55] And I thus do not have anything to say of my own, but speak only from the Gospels of Christ; and you believe that you have based your arguments on the Gospels and also on the Apostles. If you want to listen to me, then put aside all pride. How can you say that the Blessed God is the Creator of the heavens only and that the earth and everything on it is [the work] of this other creator?

"Some of you claim that even heaven and all the creations in it are the work of the Enemy. If heaven is, as you say, the creation of the Evil One, how then can [our] blessed God be residing in a heaven made by the Devil? For our Saviour taught us to pray that wonderful and awesome prayer, which says: 'Our Father who art in heaven, Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.'[56] And also: 'For if you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you[57]' And also: 'For whosoever does the will of my Father, who is in heaven, is my brother, and sister, and father.'[58] Who can have anything to say about those things concerning the Heavenly Father which our Saviour preaches to us? What could be clearer than this word: 'I confess to you Father, Lord of heaven

---

[54] Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,534, fn.26, write: "From this passage on, the text of Patriarch Euthymius is lifted almost verbatum from the chapters [entitled] 'On the Manichaeans' and 'On the so-called Paulicians' from the treatise of Euthymius Zigabenus, the *Panoplia Dogmatica*." See also fn.46 above.

[55] The original text contains a slight variation on Jn 14.24. Both Codex Zographensis (Jagić, *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*, Berlin, 1879; reprint, Graz, Akad.Druck-U.Verlagsanstalt, 1954, p.165) and Codex Assemanianus (J.Kurz, *Evangeliarium Assemani [Evangelář Assemanův]* vol.2, Úvod, text v přepise cyrilském, poznámky textové, seznamy čtení. Prague: Nakladatelství československé akademie věd, 1955, p. 187) read: "i slovo eže slъšaste nestъ moe nъ poslavъšaego mą otca" whereas the original text reads here "moe učenie nestъ moe, no poslavšago mą otca."

[56] An excerpt from the Lord's Prayer contained in Mt 6.9-13; see also Lk 11.2-4.

[57] Mt 6.14.

[58] Mt 12.50. Note that the last word reads "father" and not "mother."

and earth'? He is proclaimed not only Lord of Heaven, but also Lord of the Earth as well.

"Do you not see how in believing yourselves to be strengthening your arguments with the words of the Gospels that you are actually destroying yourselves? For what did the Saviour say to Peter?: 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'[59] And He said other things also.

"Listen to this: 'And when Jesus was baptized, he went immediately from the water, and behold, the heavens were opened.'[60] How could the creation of the Devil open up for the baptised Son of the Blessed Father? Why and for what reason did [the heavens] open up? 'And I saw the spirit of God,' he said 'descending like a dove.'[61]

Behold I have exposed three of your impieties in just a few words. How could the spirit of God take on the image of the Devil's creation and descend on the Lord? Observe how yet a fourth impiety is exposed: 'And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased.'[62] Who is He Who was basptised in the water, for Whom the heavens opened, on Whom the Spirit of the Father descended from heaven in the form of a dove? Behold we have clearly revealed the truth: God is the Creator of both heaven and earth and all creation.

"How can you call the Immaculate Mother of God 'Jerusalem on High'?[63] From which scriptures [do you base this on]? From which saint or prophet or apostle? Who taught you such absurdity that you should throw yourselves over the precipice of evil? The apostle Matthew said these things most clearly and obviously: 'Now the birth of Jesus Christ took place in

---

[59] Mt 16.19. See also Lk 3.21.

[60] Mt 3.16.

[61] Jn 1.32. Cf. also Mt 3.16; Mk 1.10; and Lk 3.22.

[62] Mt 3.17. Cf. also Mt 12.18, 17.5; Mk 1.11, 9.7; Lk 3.22.

[63] Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,535, fn.40, write: "This name for the Mother of God is an expression of the Monophysite conception of the 'immaterial' existence of Christ, according to which there is ascribed to the Mother of God a significance only of a celestial symbol."

this way. When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit,'[64] and so on. And [Matthew] goes over in detail the birth of Christ, and when he comes to the [part about] the wise [kings], he says, 'And going into the house they saw the child with Mary his mother, and they fell down and worshipped him.'[65]

"Also Luke tells most wondrously how through the flesh of Mary, the Mother of God, [Jesus] was born of the Lord.[66] And you will find a lot of other proof from the Gospels and Books of the Apostles. These are the only books you accept and read, while you reject the other books[67], [which tell] how Mary, the Immaculate Mother of God, gave birth in the flesh to our Lord, Jesus Christ. Because of this, many times in the Gospels our Saviour calls himself the Son of man.[68]

"Behold we have revealed the truth also here, that nowhere do the Bearers of the Glad Tidings[69] refer to the Immaculate Mother of God as 'Jerusalem on High', as you claim. From where, once again, did you imagine this vile thing and this teaching which is hateful to God, and which, it is said, even the devils are terrified of?

---

[64] Mt 1.18.

[65] Mt 2.11.

[66] See Lk 2.4-21.

[67] The Paulicians, like the Manichaeans, rejected the Old Testament; but in addition to this, the Paulicians also rejected the book of Revelation and the two epistles of Peter (Mango, op.cit.,100).

[68] In the book of Matthew alone it appears in the following verses: Mt 8.20, 9.6, 10.23, 11.19, 12.8, 32, 12.40; 13.37; 16.13, 27; 17.9, 12, 22; 19.28, 20.18, 28; 24.27, 30, 37, 44; 25.13, 31; and 26.24, 45, 64.

[69] The Greek word "εὐαγγέλιον", means literally "good news" and is, of course, also the term applied to the Gospels of the apostles Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, who are referred to in Greek as the "οι εὐαγγελισταί". The Slavonic calques of these two Greek terms are, respectively, "blagověstie" and "blagověstnici".

"Because they called Christ the son of David[70] you shamefully dare to say that his flesh was brought down from heaven.[71] Oh, this is the ultimate stupidity! If the body of Christ were heavenly, then he would not have wanted to subject himself to perpetual human passions, such as hunger and thirst, sleep and work and sadness and tears and such things. If he were a heavenly man, who through his hypostasy was united with the Logos, then he would not be corruptible and mortal and earthly, for the dwellers of heaven are incorruptible and immortal. What would then be the need in his receiving incarnation through the Virgin?

"Not only [does this have to be considered], but also [one must consider the fact that] after the Resurrection, our Saviour assured his disciples that his flesh was neither a vision nor a dream. And he said, 'See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have.'[72] If it were a vision, whose ribs did Thomas bury?

"Thus listen also to the great Paul, who said to the Jews: 'Since therefore the children share in flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook of the same nature.'[73] Concerning the thought of heavenly flesh, he informed [us]: 'For surely it is not with angels that he is concerned but with the descendants of Abraham. Therefore he had to be made like his brethren in every respect.'[74] This is a verification of how Christ took on a corruptible and mortal flesh from Mary, the Immaculate Mother of God.

"Again I ask you, from what source did you acquire this soul-corrupting and cancerous [notion] of which you speak: that the Old

---

70 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,535, fn.41, write: "There is an imprecision here. The devils mentioned in the Gospels (Mt 8. 29, Mk 5.7) do not call Christ the 'Son of David.' This is [rather] how he is referred to by the people who pray [to him] for healing."

71 The Paulicians believed that Christ "acquired his body in Heaven, so that he neither was truly born of the Virgin Mary nor died on the cross. They consequently offered no honour to the cross, just as they spurned icons and worship of saints" (Mango,op.cit.,100).

72 Lk 24.39.

73 Heb 2.14.

74 Heb 2.16,17.

Testament was [a product] of the Devil?[75] Come out, men, from the darkness that surrounds you; wipe from your eyes this sleep of insensibility. If the Old Testament were [a product] of the Devil, how then, we ask, did our Saviour answer the [scribe who asked him] which of the commandments of the Old Testament was the most important and the greatest? [Our Saviour responsed thus:] 'The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one'[76] etc. And when [the scribe who had put the question to Christ] answered well, [Christ] responded: 'You are not far from the kingdom of heaven.'[77]

"Why then would the Pentateuch[78], if it were [a product] of the Devil, have decreed the knowledge of one Lord and God? If Moses preaches that there is one Lord and God, and that except for him he serves no one and bows down before no one, then where are these others who lead the Devil's council and those who laid down this Old Testament? But because the Old Testament is holy and is [a product] of the heavenly God, Paul, a true preacher, beckoned [to us], saying: 'What then shall we say? That the law is sin? By no means!'[79] And also: 'We know that the law is spiritual'[80]; for I delight in the law of God, in my inmost self.'[81] And also: 'So then, I of myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh

---

75 See fn.49.

76 Mk 12. 28-29.

77 The translation of this sentence has been lifted from the Spasova/Ivanova translation (op.cit.,95). Also on p.535, fn.46, they cite Mk 12.34 ("And when Jesus saw that he answered wisely, he said to him, 'You are not far from the kingdom of God.'")

78 The original text reads here "Moisejskoe zakonopoloženie". According to Sreznevskij (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, 921), "zakonopoloženie" means both "νομοθεσία" and "пятикнижие Моисеево". He cites this second usage in the Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1073: "Rodьstvo, isxodъ, leuitikъ, čisla, vъtoryi zakonъ: se sǫ pątery kъnigy, ježe i zakonopoloženije."

79 Rom 7.7.

80 Rom 7.14

81 Rom 7.22

I serve the law of sin[82] etc. This is why he said that the law is holy, and the commandments holy, righteous and blessed.[83]

"And in addition to all of these disgraces, you dare still to abuse the cross and to call it an enemy[84], for neither do you respect the Books of the Apostles[85], nor can you acquire knowledge. If you follow the bequest of the Apostles, as you assert, then why do you not swear by the cross; for Paul the apostle says: 'But far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world'[86], and also: "For the word of the cross is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God.'[87] If then the cross is the power of God, as it truly is, then why do you not believe in the power of God? Do you believe the sermons of the Apostles, who say: 'Abraham by means of his faith did such and such'?[88]

"Faith is an unfathomed and ineffable thing, and on the contrary it cannot be expressed with a tongue of flesh.[89] Acquire faith, by means of which all of the holy believers have received what they hoped for; and once you have acquired such faith, bow down before the cross, that is, the power of God. Every action and miracle of Christ is great, wondrous and divine, but of them all, the [greatest, most wondrous and most divine] is the immaculate, life-giving cross. By no other means except the cross can death be abolished and original sin be destroyed, can hell be annihilated, can the

---

82 Rom 7.25. See Kałużniacki, *Actus Epistolaeque Apostolorum Palaeoslavenice*, Vienna, 1896, p.122, for the Slavonic text.

83 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,535, fn.50 cite here Rom 7. 12 ("So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good").

84 See fn.71.

85 See fn.67.

86 Gal 6.14.

87 1 Cor 1.18.

88 See Heb 11.17.

89 The original phrase is "ązykomь plъtěnomь", "tongue of the flesh", or "corporeal language."

resurrection be given as a gift, can the power, which hates the things of this world, be given to us as a gift. How are we God's children and his successors if not from the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ? By means of [the cross] everyone is made whole. 'As many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death,'[90] says the holy apostle [Paul], 'and we have donned Christ.'[91] For Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God.[92] Behold the death of Christ, that is to say the cross, clothes us in the embodied power of God and in the wisdom [of God].[93]

"The power of God is the word of the cross, because through the [word of the cross] the power of God appeared to us as a victory over death, because the four stations of the cross are upheld and supported by the central component; thus through the power of God height, depth, length and also width--that is to say all visible and invisible creation--is supported.

"The [cross] serves as a mark on our faces, in the same way that circumcision is a mark for Israel; because of this we the faithful run from the heathens, and we recognize one another as the faithful. [The cross] is a shield and a weapon against the Devil and a victory over him; [the cross] is a sign which prevents the Destroyer from touching us. It is a reveille to those who sleep, a support to those who are standing, comfort to the sick, a staff to shepherds, a leader to converts, the tree of eternal life. Because that pure tree on which Christ was sacrificed for our sake was sanctified through its contact with His holy body and blood, we receive it with befitting [respect] and bow down most honorably before it. We bow down before the image of the pure cross. God forbid that we should honor the cross if it were the work of some other [power], rather [we honor it] only as the image and the depiction of Christ.

---

90 Rom 6.3. This is the hymn sung on feast days in place of the Trisagion.

91 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,535, fn.55 cite here Gal 3.27 ("For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ").

92 A reference to the Logos, which is represented by the second member of the Trinity, and symbolizes the reason or wisdom of God.

93 1 Cor 1.24

"Christ said to his disciples, 'then will appear the sign of the Son of man'[94], that is, the cross. Also the angel of the Resurrection said the same to us: 'I know that ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified'[95] And the apostle said, 'We preach Christ crucified'.[96] He did not say 'pierced'[97] but 'crucified'.

"The Tree of Life, which is planted in Paradise, prefigured this holy cross. And because death [resulted] on account of a tree[98], so on account of the tree, life and resurrection had to be given again. Jacob, making the sign of the cross with his hand, blessed the sons of Joseph[99]; Moses, making a sign of the cross in the water with his staff, divided the sea[100]; and, to put it simply, the salvation of the world has been accomplished by the cross."

VII. So the most holy Hilarion said these things to that evil council, all of whom spoke in vain. And being filled with shame, they stood there like voiceless fish and marvelled at the grace and power that came out of the mouth of this true pastor; and as they understood that they were not able to answer one word in contradiction, they wondered amongst themselves what to do. Once again taking the floor, Hilarion said to them: "If Christ took on a human form that was an apparition, as you maintain, or took his flesh from heaven, then how on the eighth day was he circumcized, according to

---

[94] Mt 24.30.

[95] Mk 16.6.

[96] 1 Cor 1.23.

[97] Slavonic "prǫbodenъ", see Latin confixus, transfixus, transfossus (from J.G. Sparwenfeld, *Lexicon Slavonicum*, Acta Bibliothecae R. Universitatis Upsaliensis, no.24. Upsalla: Upsalla University Press, 1987, vol.3, p.183.

[98] An allusion to the story in Genesis in which Adam and Eve eat from the forbidden Tree of Life, and subsequently they cause the fall of mankind from the Garden of Eden. Of course, one of the consequences for man after the fall was mortality.

[99] Heb 11.21 reads "By faith Jacob, when dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, bowing in worship over the head of his staff." There is no mention of the sign of the cross, nor is there, of course, any mention of it in the story of the parting of the Red Sea.

[100] See Ex 14.10-31.

the old law?[101] This alone is enough to discount the lies of the foolish. For circumcized flesh is kindred to our own flesh. For clearly he appeared, and in truth he took on the form of a human man from the pure blood of the Virgin.

"From [what source], O you impertinent men, do you say that the body of the Lord came from an evil source? If you still dare to attribute [Christ's human form] to the Devil, then how, my dear men, can something evil be considered holy, and how could [our] blessed God, with an evil body, manage to bring about the salvation of the world, or how could this [body] be placed on the throne of the Father? If the Devil is the Law-Giver of the Old Testament, then why does Christ say, 'Search the Scriptures; for in them you will find eternal life'?[102] He names the writings of Moses and those of all the other prophets, for these were not new books of grace. Where does one find eternal life? Does the Devil make laws and allow for this in these books? How could Christ speak the truth in them: 'If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me'?[103] And He did not say,'You should have believed some of the [books] of Moses'. Clearly [Moses] proclaimed the truth about [the Lord].

"If this ancient foundation [of the Old Covenant] were [a product] of the Devil, then how could the great Paul, in the beginning of his epistle to the Romans, say that it was proclaimed by God through His prophets in the Holy Scriptures that His Son was in body descended from the tribe of David?[104] If the prophets and the Holy Scriptures are of God, through which prophets and Scriptures He proclaimed [the coming] of His Son, then how can you think the Old Testament to be [the work] of the Devil? For Mark the Evangelist said, 'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the

---

101 See Lk 2.21

102 This is a paraphrase of Jn 5.39: "You search the scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life..."; Codex Zograph.: "ispytaite kъnigy ěko vъ nixъ mьnite iměti zivotъ večьny..." (Jagić,op.cit.,144); Codex Assem.: "ispytaite kъnigy i ěko vъi mьnite iměti v nix životъ večьnyi" (Kurz,op.cit.,19).

103 Jn 5.46.

104 See Rom 1.1-4.

Son of God; As it is written in the prophets.'[105] And many times it is written in the Gospels that what is said by the prophets will come to pass. If the truth of God has come to pass, as witnessed by the law and by the prophets according to the apostle Paul[106], then how can it be that the law and the prophets are not inspired by [our] blessed God and conceived of truth?

"Behold I have shown you from the Gospels and from the Book of the Apostles how God is the Creator of heaven and earth and all the creatures, and that the Old and New Testament were given by Him, and that He took up our corruptible and mortal flesh to heaven, and once he had sanctified [our flesh] he carried it up and placed it at the right hand of the Father, and that [Christ's] flesh was taken from the pure blood of the Virgin, and that Christ saved the world through the cross, and that every knee in all of heaven and the earth below will bow to him, and that every tongue will proclaim that Jesus Christ is the Lord in the glory of God, the Father.[107]

"Moreover, gain an understanding of the darkness that opresses you, abandon your vanities and lies, gain an understanding of truth through which you will be enlightened with light. For behold, the Lord now says of you: 'If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no excuse for their sin'[108] Go to the cathedral and receive the bath of the Holy Spirit[109] for the abandonment of sins. For behold, your heavenly Father rejoices in you and sacrifices a fatted calf for your conversion, and he calls together friends and neighbors [to tell them] about your return [to the fold]."[110]

---

105 See Mk 1.1-2

106 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,536, fn.68 cite here Rom 3. 21.

107 Phil.2. 10-11

108 Jn 15.22.

109 A circumlocution for "baptism".

110 The term used in the original Slavonic text is "obrětenie", which means, literally, "finding". The Czech Academy dictionary (See Kurz, ed., *Slovník jazyka staroslovenského (Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*, vol.22, p.493, Prague: ČSAV, 1972) defines as Greek "εὕρέσις, ἀνακομίδη" and Latin "inventio".

When they had heard this, they prayed with all their hearts and they prostrated themselves in all sincerity, asking of [Hilarion] the gift of holy baptism; and they cast aspersions upon and spat upon their [former] faith, and they went to the catholic church[111] and added themselves to the number of the chosen flock. When the [congregation] of the orthodox cathedral saw this, they rejoiced in inexpressible joy, and to God and to their own bishop [Hilarion] they offered up unceasing thanks for the acquisition of so many souls.

VIII. Seeing then these things, the corrupt and evil heretics, the representatives of the Armenian [Church][112], were filled with anger and hatred, and heaped on [Hilarion] various insults and injuries, and they called him a deceiver and a fraud, but they were the deceitful sons of darkness.

The blessed bishop [Hilarion], invincibly teaching and instructing [his people], never abandoned the True Word, and he was constantly adding to the number of orthodox believers a numerous number of people. The aforementioned Armenians instructed the people who had sided with them (of which there were many) to kill the saint. The holy saint like an innocent lamb in the midst of the filth of wolves walked around with this song from the Psalms on his lips: 'Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil; for thou art with me.'[113]

They paid frequent visits to him. They did this, of course, not for the sake of profit, but because they wanted to find some fault to reproach him with. They saw [that their evil deeds] had no effect -- such as [the time] when they hit him with slings -- and they departed, greatly enraged with anger.

This, of course, is an allusion to the story of the return of the prodigal son, who returns home repentent to rejoin his father's household. See Lk 15.11-24.

111 The Slavonic term is "sъbornaja crьkъvь", a calquing of the Greek "καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία", from the Nicene Creed.

112 This refers to the Armenian Monophysites who, along with the Syrian Monophysites, had been transplanted to Thrace by the Byzantine government.

113 Ps 23.4 (Slavonic Psalter 22.4).

Once while they were debating with him, they were unable to oppose the wisdom and the words that he had expressed, and they were seized with rage; and taking stones, they beat him unmercifully like [Stephen], the proto-martyr[114]; and believing him to be dead, they left him.

And voluntarily Hilarion showed himself to be a bloodless martyr.[115] When he had returned home, he understood what had transpired to be the work of the devil, and he rejoiced and returned to his cell, to a far and secluded place from the city where they had beaten him.

When the congregation of orthodox people found out about this, they all set out [to find the heretics] and kill them. But Hilarion, an imitator of Christ and a disciple of the Gentle Ruler, forbade them, saying: "No, my children, no! Remember the words which the Lord spoke to Peter: 'Put your sword back into its place; for all who take the sword will perish by the sword.'[116] And the apostles, who were beaten in the name of the Lord, went off, rejoicing before the assembly [of Sadducees].[117] 'Forgive them; for they know not what they do.'"[118]

That group [of Armenians] was indeed evil, and they were ready to spill blood when they found out what had happened; and they were perplexed when they heard some say of the Lord, "He is blessed," and

---

114 A reference to St. Stephen, one of the seven deacons chosen by the apostles to minister to the community in Jerusalem. See Acts 6-7.

115 The prototype for the "bloodless martyr", the one who wishes to be martyred but is not, therefore "bloodless", is St. Anthony. Chapter 46 of his life tells the story of how he wanted badly to be martyred that he went to the city of Alexandria during the systematic executions of martyrs that took place under Maximinus. Anthony goes out onto the streets, exposing himself as a Christian and praying to be martyred, but "the Lord was keeping him to help others."

116 Mt 26.52

117 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,536, fn.75, write: "See Acts 5.40, 41. The Sadducees were a Jewish sect which opposed the Pharisees and whose aim it was to hellenize Judah. The Saducees were supported by the Roman procurators, who saw in them the conduits for their policy."

118 Lk 23.34.

others say, "No, he is a deceiver and a seducer of the people."[119] And so there was much discord in opinion amongst them, and they took counsel amongst themselves.

IX. One time, [the heretics], being drunk with the disease of deceit, came to the saintly [Hilarion], all speaking at the same time and asserting their heresy, quoting this and that [source], bragging that their wisdom was orthodox and that they upheld all the teachings of the church, including the sacred service and fasting and all other orthodox things which are handed down to the church by the councils.

The meek-hearted and most humble and erudite Hilarion answered them:[120] "You have done well in remembering the ecumenical councils. For the ecumenical councils have taken their words from eye-witnesses, from the holy apostles; and [these words] are well established and decreed. The traditions have been well established; they are upheld steadfastly up to this very day. And so you too steadfastly upheld [them], up until the Fourth Council of Chalcedon.[121] But from that time [of the Fourth Council], you renounced the ecumenical councils through a certain Echanius, who bore also the name Mantakuni[122] and in addition to him through [other] evil heretics, for you accepted the evil teachings of Eutyches[123] and Dioscorus.[124] You upheld the will of such sinners and you say that Christ did

---

119 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit., 536, fn.77, cite here Jn 7.12 ("And there was much muttering about him among the people. While some said, 'He is a good man,' other said, 'No, he is leading the people astray'").

120 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit., 536, fn.78, write: "The following passages with the denunciation of the Armenian faith are taken from the treatise entitled 'Against the Armenians' by Euthymius Zigabenus.

121 Mango (op.cit., 95) says that the Monophysites "opposed the Council of Chalcedon (451) for dividing, as they saw it, the person of Christ into two natures and believed in the unity of the incarnate Christ." Euthyches was later declared a heretic by the Monophysites.

122 Echanius (John) Mantakuni or Mandakuni (born ca.415 - died 490) was the patriarch of Armenia from 478 to 490. He left an "Anthology of Discourse."

123 See fn.42.

124 See fn.40.

not acquire consubstantial[125] flesh for us, but rather [you claim that he acquired] some kind of incorruptible, unsuffering, incorporeal, uncreated, and heavenly flesh.[126]

"This impudent dogma [presented by your people at] the church council will never be accepted and will never be handed down. If the Lord's flesh were incorruptible, heavenly, and did not suffer passion, then being such, it could not have labored, nor slept, nor eaten, nor drunk, nor have been touched by hands. Who slept in the boat, if he was not of our nature?[127] Who wept for the city?[128] Who wept over Lazarus?[129] Who went into the home of Simon the leper?[130] Who washed the feet of his disciples?[131] Who handed down the sacrament to us? Who was bound and led into the court of Caiaphas?[132] Who was put on the cross? Who was put in the grave? Who said to the disciples after the Resurrection: 'handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have'?[133] Behold we have clearly demonstrated that in truth the Lord dressed himself in human flesh such as we have."

---

125 The original reads "ɘdinosǫštnǫ", which means "ὁμοούσιος", see Sreznevskij, op.cit., I, 814.This refers to the Nicene Creed, drafted at the Council of Nicaea (325), which includes the statement that Christ was not created but consubstantial with the Father, that is of the same essence or substance, and at the same time incarnate. This statement was made at the council as a counter-attack against the Arians.

126 This refers specifically to the Monophysite teachings of Julian, bishop of Halicarnassus, "who taught that Christ's body was incorruptible (that, is not fully human). His teaching, however, was repudiated by Severus of Antioch" (EEC, 621-22).

127 See Mt 8. 24.

128 See Lk 19.41.

129 See Jn 11.33-44.

130 See Mt 26.1-12.

131 See Jn 13.5.

132 The high priest of the Jews at that time. Cf. Mt 26.3, 57; Lk 3.2; Jn 11.49; 18.13, 14, 24, 28.

133 Lk 24.39. See also fn.72.

They then, oppressed by the true words of the blessed [Hilarion], responded with this contemptuous answer, saying: "That flesh of Christ that appeared was united with the divinity; Christ was of one nature."[134]

And that wise soul, [Hilarion], answered them: "If Christ was of one nature, and if that nature was the divinity, then the nature of Christ was indistinguishable from the Father, in reality; for the flesh of Christ, having united itself with the nature of Christ at the time of the Passion, was indistinguishable from the Father.

"And how could [his flesh] have suffered -- detained below [on the earth], wounded and pierced -- and [how could] he, in truth, have died and lay unmoving, a corpse in the grave? For if the flesh of Christ were divine, then why did Christ himself say, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me'?[135] How could he say to Mary: 'Mary, do not hold me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father'?[136] How could he say to the apostles after the Resurrection: 'handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have'?"[137]

"And many things of this kind testify to the incarnation of Christ more clearly than [the sound of] a trumpet. For again [I turn your attention to] that trisagion hymn which [says], 'he was crucified holy and immortal'[138]; and you are revealing clearly your stupidity and moreover your corruption. For if the flesh were immortal, incorruptible, and heavenly, how then was He crucified? And if they crucified Him, then how can you call [His flesh] divine?

"Moreover in the sacred [church] service, you do not bring leavened bread such as we bring, but unleavened bread. This [custom] of unleavened

---

134 They uphold the so-called Monophysite heresy, i.e. that Christ was really of one nature and had no human form.

135 Mt 27.46 and Mk 15.34.

136 Jn 20.17.

137 Lk 24.39. See also fn.72, 133.

138 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit., 536, fn.81, write that this hymn was modified by the Monphysites in accordance with their beliefs.

[bread] is entirely Jewish.[139] And moreover, the apostle Paul and Gregory the Theologian[140] proclaimed loudly: 'The old has passed away, behold, the new has come.'[141] And [St. John] Chrysostom said [by way of contrasting] the Old and New Testament: "There is the letter, here is the soul; there is the ark[142], here is the Virgin; there is Aaron's staff, here is the cross; there is the lamb, here then is Christ; there is the unleavened bread, here is the leavened bread.'"

---

139 This refers to the controvery of the unleavened bread (azymes). See John Meyendorff, *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and its Role in the World Today,* translated by John Chapin, New York: Pantheon Books, 1968, p.209, Meyendorff makes reference to "questions of an altogether secondary nature as the use of unleavened bread (azymes) in the Western mass, or fasting on Saturdays, which claimed the attention of theologians and controversialists..."

See also H-G Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich,* Munich, C.H.Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, p.312. Beck also affirms the importance of the azymes controversy in East-West relations of the period: "Im allgemeinen kann man sagen, daß in dieser unmittelbaren nachphotianischen Periode das Filioque eine viel geringere Rolle spielte als etwa die Frage nach den Azymen und dergleichen."

See also Harry Magoulias, *Byzantine Christianity,* Detroit: Wayne State University, 1982, p.112. He observes that the controversy began when the patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Keroularios (1043-1058), heard that the customs of the Greek Church were being repressed in the Latin West by the Normans "with papal blessing and by reforming synods throughout Italy." When Patriarch Michael heard of this, he retaliated by requiring that the Latin churches in Constantinople give up their practices and reintegrate the Greek customs into their services. When they refused, he had them shut down in 1052. As a strategy to save the Greek communities of Apulia and Calabria, Michael then sent a letter to John, the Latin Bishop of Trani, condemning the Latin practices in the Church. Michael enumerated them in his letter: fasting of Sabbath, obligatory celibacy of the clergy, eating strangled meat, and not singing "alleluia" following Septuagesima, the third Sunday before Lent. Magoulias then adds: "Although the filioque was not mentioned, a new charge appeared: the Latin use of *azyma* (the Greek term for unleavened bread) in Holy Communion. This latter practice became important to the patriarch of Constantinople because he was attempting at this time to integrate the Monophysite Armenian Church into the Orthodox Church of the Byzantine Empire. The Armenians followed two practices that were surprisingly similar to Latin usages: fasting on Saturdays and the azyma for communion. The Byzantine theologians considered these practices to be purely Judaistic, and it was primarily because of the Armenian question that Keroularios insisted that the Latin churches in Constantinople conform to Greek usages. "

140 i.e., Gregory Nazianzus.

141 2 Cor 5. 17

142 The original reads "ѥivotь" a slavonicized variant of the Greek "χιβωτός" (see Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, 1207)

They were greatly suprised by what [Hilarion] said and had nothing to answer in protest, for they were seized with shame. However somewhat later, they answered, saying, "The bread which Christ gave the apostles was unleavened and, therefore, not leavened bread, for it was common at this time. For this reason we too bring unleavened bread as an offering."

The blessed Hilarion answered them: "Let us say that the bread which Christ took because of the hardship of that hour was unleavened, lest the sacrament of the meal of the new [law] should not be handed down. [Christ] wanted [the sacrament] to be passed on immediately to the Jews, so whatever bread they could find, that is what they used. [This was done] so as not to deprive us in any way of salvation. His disciples and others amongst the church prelates, the holy fathers, when there was no more leavened bread, did not bring unleavened bread as an offering. Following their example, we bring [only] leavened bread as an offering.

"And Christ handed down many other things that the apostles and their followers said would come to pass; thus, they did not contradict Christ. And how was this so? Faith dispersed and grew, and so they also dispersed, encouraged by the sacrament Christ [performed for them], in His glory and majesty. When Christ wanted to be baptised, He did not turn to the west; He rejected Satan's people, nor did He speak of a description of faith, nor did He require prayers of baptism, nor was He baptised in the fountain, nor did He anoint himself with myrrh, nor, once baptised, did He partake in the body and blood of God.

"And furthermore, Christ did not give the sacrament of the Lord's body and blood during a service in a church, but rather in a simple room on a simple table, and first He ate and offered up some other food; and He was not dressed in the clothing of a priest, nor did He offer the prayers of our blessed acts in psalms and singing and spiritual songs.

"We then in churches perform the service on the spiritual sacrificial altar, which we call the sacred table; and desirous [of the sacrament], we stand dressed in priest's clothing, not [in the garments] of perdition of the aforementioned [heretics], and we perform the holiest ceremony.

"Thus the apostles, and the true pastors and righteous church teachers after them, are all led by the Spirit of God and thus have aureoles, destroying some things and cultivating others; from on high they have

received such beneficence, performing helpful deeds at all times, commanding and executing them in a way pleasing to God.

"Thus if we look carefully, we will find that the bread which Christ gave to his disciples was not unleavened. For regarding Passover law, He says the following: 'On the fourteenth day of the first month from sundown eat unleavened bread up until the twenty-first day, even until the evening; for seven days leavened bread should not be found in your homes.'[143] And such are the laws.

"Before the fourteenth day -- that is to say, on the thirteenth day -- Christ fulfilled the law of Passover, and then He prepared for them the Last Supper, on which day everyone partook of leavened bread, for it was not forbidden to do so. And if someone says, 'And in fulfilling the law of Passover, He Himself and His disciples ate unleavened bread, then from where did they get the unleavened bread?', we say to him that it was befitting for [the disciples] to prepare themselves according to the will of the Saviour, or according to the Providence of the house of God, for truly it is so.

"In the holy mass why do you not bring wine mixed with water, but only wine without water, proclaiming through this that Christ had one nature? Gregory the Theologian said that like blood, water too was poured forth from the rib of Christ, symbolizing the following: the first means man and the second means the highest [being] over man."[144] Moreover, when someone approaches the sacrificial altar and partakes of the blood of Christ from a cup, he should consider that he is putting his lips to the rib of Christ and from his rib is he drinking. For from the rib of Christ does not only the blood but also the water flow as an assurance of his dual nature, which we have demonstrated earlier.

"And the apostle, the divine brother Jacob, witnesses to the fact that the cup which Christ gave to the apostles was mixed with wine and water, and so does Mark the Evangelist in his own writings; both of them say the following: 'He took the cup and poured into it wine and water and, having

---

143 See Ex 12.17-20.

144 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit.,537, fn.96, attribute this passage to Gregory of Nazianzus' Easter Sermon.

given thanks and blessed [it] he gave [it] to them, saying: "Drink from it all of you; this is my blood which has been poured forth for you and for many."'[145] For in every possible way God speaks the truth and prophesies, and that which flowed forth from His rib is what He gave His disciples.

"And furthermore, you do not respect the cross, which is the substance of things, if you do not baptise him as a man and drive through nails in him and anoint with sacrifical blood. And also by making the sign of the cross with your hand on your forehead at baptism and during church services and on many other occasions, you think you are sanctifying yourselves. But, you Armenian men, the words of the prophets should suffice to you: 'Accept you this teaching so that the Lord shall never be angry, and accept the condition of your own perdition and blindness.' If then the cross depicted by the hand blesses everything on which it is placed (and this includes the water, i.e. the baptismal water, the oil and myrrh, and the face of believers, the eucharistic bread, the sacred chalice, and everything else) then how from any of these things can the depicted cross, if it is evil and loathsome, be sanctified by you through baptism, deeds, and blood? How then can the cross, sanctifying baptism and sacrifice, be sanctified by sanctified images?

"Even before Christ was crucified, the cross was a wretched instrument of death and its image was avoided and rejected. After Christ was nailed to it, he sanctified himself through the blood of God, and the image of his sanctification was established for all believers, killing first men then devils. In the same way, blessed [Bishop] Gregory of Great Armenia[146] put up wooden crosses in a few places[147], and commanded that

---

[145] Cf. Mt 26.27,28; Mk 14.23,24; Lk 22.19,20; 1 Cor 11.25.

[146] This is a reference to the Armenian St. Gregory the Enlightener (Sourb Grigor Loussarevich) who christianized the Armenians ca. 301 during the reign of King Tiridates III. (Pasdermadjian, cited here, places this date at either 228 or 301, see p.102). According to Armenian legend, the apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew visited the Armenians and preached the Gospels to them, but it is St. Gregory who is recognized as the evangelizer of these people. For historical sources, cf. David Marshall Lang, *The Armenians: A People in Exile*, London, 1981, p.47; also his book *Armenia: Cradle of Civilization*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1980, pp.155-159; H. Pasdermadjian, *Histoire de l'Arménie*, 2nd ed., Paris: Librairie orientale H. Samuelian, 1964, pp.101-117. For translations of legends surrounding St. Gregory and the christianization of the Armenians, see Hagop Nersoyan, *A History of the Armenian Church, with Thirty-Five Stories*, New York: Council for Religious Education Diocese of the Armenian Church of North America, 1963.

people bow and come to him as to a sanctifier, though he was not an appointed bishop[148], nor did he sanctify them with baptism or by deed or by blood as you do. How can you dare, having made three wooden crosses and placed them together, to invoke the name of the Holy Trinity and not be afraid to create an image of the Holy Trinity, which is one, uncreated, infinite, unknowable and incomprehensible?

"Again I ask you, why do you observe the Aradjavor fast?"[149] And they answered unanimously, saying: "We observe the fast of a certain Sergius, an Armenian, who suffered in our country." The saint answered, saying to them, "You are heathens, for where was it shown to you that Sergius was orthodox and suffered for the sake of Christ? We see that no prophet, nor any apostle, nor martyr, nor saint, nor Saint Gregory himself decreed to the great Armenians any such fast or holiday."

And the [Armenians], vexed [by his answer] said that it was a Ninevite fast which the Ninevites observed in an attempt to deliver themselves from terrible destruction.[150] The saint immediately responded, "Since [I] do not remember that the holy apostles nor any church council of the holy

---

147 Pasdermadjian, op.cit.,102, notes that according to Armenian sources, Gregory erected a church after he christianized the Armenian; the name of the church was Aschdichad. What Euthymius is probably referring to here is a fact that Gregory did simply erect crosses throughout Armenia in places that were formerly pagan temples. Lang (*Armenian: Cradle of Civilization*, 213) writes: "there are several references in the historical sources to the adaptation by St. Gregory and his disciples of pagan temples for the use of Christian shrines, and there can be no doubt that a number of these were adapted and elaborated as basilicas..."

148 St. Gregory was indeed appointed. King Tiridates III approved of Gregory to be the patriarch of Armenia, and he was consecrated as such by the arbishop of Caesarea. See Pasdermadjian, op.cit.,103.

149 See Malachia Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia: Her History, Doctrine, Rule, Discipline, Liturgy, Literature and Existing Condition*, London: Mowbray and Co.,1955, p.158. Ormanian explains that the Aradjavor is the first week of ten weeks which precede the Eastern festival in the Armenian Church. It is a preparatory fast, also known as Fast of the Forerunner. "The two following weeks are taken up with the festivals of the saints, the six other weeks constitute Lent, and the tenth is Holy Week."

150 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit., 537, fn.99, write: "The prophet Jonah predicted according to divine inspiration the destruction of the ancient city of Ninevah. The frightened inhabitants fasted for forty days in order to prevent the prophesied punishment, and God in truth showed mercy on them. See Jonah 3. 5-10."

fathers decreed [such a fast], who then commanded you to observe this pagan fast, which occured many years before the incarnation of Christ? If it were one of the Jewish fasts, which God commanded through Moses, we would be forbidden to observe it, like [those] of many other indecent peoples. "

"Thus, it is clearly revealed," they again answered, "that it was the fast of Adam, when he was driven out of Paradise." But the blessed Hilarion answered, "Moses wrote about the events of the world, about everyone, and also about Adam, and I do not remember anything about this fast; from what [source] do you have [the grounds] to say that it is a fast of Adam?" Once again they were perplexed, and they said that the fast is a great Armenian one, which Armenians who wanted to be baptised by Saint Gregory observed. The saint answered them immediately: "This is not so, for you were freed from devils before baptism, for you were ordered to fast for sixty days, and afterwards [St. Gregory], who wanted to baptise you, ordered you to fast for thirty days, just as it is written in the Armenian books; and not one of those fasts was called the Aradjavor fast."

They were filled with much shame and bewilderment, and they were perplexed as to what to answer; however, they had no other response, and they said, "Behold, it is the fast of Constantine the Great, which he kept, wanting to be baptised." The saint [Hilarion], with a smiling countenance and confident manner, answered them: "O what a ridiculous and convoluted doctrine [they] believe with all their hearts! Examine the Scriptures, and in them you will find that there is no imperial ecumenical fast, nor do I remember there being any in [honor] of Constantine the Great, nor did any sacred council nor anyone from the holy fathers establish the commemoration of such a fast. In this way you have stated various and contradictory things, for you have shown that your fast is lawless and loathsome and is not at all deserving of the ear of a Christian. And even if you should not wish it, I will tell you about your fast.

"As you yourselves well know, someone named Sergius, who was a teacher of the Armenian heresy, had a dog named Aradjavor. The aforementioned Sergius, assisted by the work of the Devil, had a messenger who would announce his arrival whenever he traveled. Whenever Sergius wanted to go to some city, village or town where teachers and followers of his destructive [heresy] lived, the locals would see the aforementioned dog

and they came out [of their houses] on that first day [of his sojourn] and walk several miles[151] to meet the teacher. One time, the dog was sent on [Sergius'] evil service and was eaten up by wolves. On the following day, Sergius arrived to the [place] where the dog had been sent. No one came out to meet him, and he was greatly offended. And he went up to the [people], for he saw that his dog did not come running to meet him, and he sent out [a search party] to look for [the dog].

"And when they recognized the bones of the dog and saw how he had been eaten up by wolves, all the Armenians were commanded to observe a fast in the occasion of his death and to grieve and mourn on the indicated day of the year. And they called this the fast of Aradjavor.

"Because of this, you, following the church rule, observe such a fast; and in the grip of this great shame, you do not want to recognize the truth. Not one of the prophets or the apostles in the ecumenical church decreed such a fast. Moreover, extract yourselves from the profound deceit which grips you, and wipe away the blindness from your eyes and come to Church and make for yourself a home with us. Combining both [of our groups] into one [Christian flock], let us praise piously the God of all [creation]. For it is a great folly for someone to know the truth and not to hasten after it."

X. [Hilarion] having inundated them with these [facts] and having exposed their heresy on all points, showed them to be cowards; and they were very much filled with shame and remained silent. When they had gone home, they held council amongst themselves every day, some praising Hilarion's utterances and words, and others standing up for their heresy.

And their heresies were so influential that the kyrios Manuel, the Greek emperor, would have been lost to our blessed faith had not the blessed Hilarion strengthened and fortified him with dogmatic words.[152]

---

151 See fn. 52 to the translation of *The Life of Ivan of Rila*.

152 This refers to the Byzantine emperor, Manuel I Comnenus (ruled 1143-1180). See Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, 163. Hussey writes: " The *Life* [of Hilarion] hinted that Manuel himself was drawn towards the heresies, which might reasonably be taken as only indicating the interest which was to be expected from the theologically-minded Emperor. The *Life* then went on to recount how Manuel urged the bishop to follow up his conversion of the monophysites and 'Manichaeans' by similar

And he chased their unclean will far away from his heart, for the seed of orthodoxy was all the more deeply [planted] in it. The emperor having understood this and delighting in the commands of the blessed [Hilarion], fortified himself with these things, and he was filled with ineffable joy, and he offered up to God songs of thanksgiving and exhibited absolute obedience to the bishop Hilarion and gave him various gifts; and anything else which he needed, he sent to him.

The aforementioned Armenians, all the while holding debates and discussions amongst themselves on the subject of faith, as was stated earlier, came to an understanding of their deceit, and they completely spat upon their heresy, zealously joining the holy, ecumenical church, partaking of the true body and the true blood of the Lord, adding themselves to the chosen flock. And from then on there was one flock and one shepherd.[153]

XI. The divine bishop [Hilarion], when he saw what had happened, was completely filled with joy and spiritual happiness. The pious emperor also seeing this, was very happy and informed everyone about the virtues and deeds of the good pastor. And he wrote a letter to [Hilarion], ordering the flock to be cleansed of all Bogomil heresy, to obey and zealously accept the [church] dogmas and to add themselves unto the chosen flock, not to subordinate themselves to their unclean and evil heresies but to drive them out somewhere far away from the flock of orthodox believers.

When they had heard this, they went to the church and they accepted baptism, spitting upon their own heresy. And it was seen how the number of orthodox believers was increased, and the throng of heathens was darkened with dishonor. Hilarion, the imitator of Christ, in whose ecumenical territory [those heathens], now eternal children [of God], had practiced the aforementioned heresies, erected a very honorable church with his monks in the name of the holy, glorious and celebrated apostles, the beauty of which astounded many and led many to the glorification of God.

---

work among the Bogomils. Hilarion was said to have been successful both with these and with the monophysites and 'Manichaeans', though this is hardly borne out by later events."

153 Cf. Mk 6.34; Jn 10. 16; and 1 Pet 2.25.

Having collected a large number of monks into the church, [Hilarion] mandated monastic rules and regulations; and he went to see them often, always teaching and instructing them to imitate the heroic deeds of the monk's life.

XII. [Hilarion's] mother seeing all of this, was overjoyed and offered up frequent [prayers] of thanksgiving to God. She had given her husband over to the Lord, and after this she lived only a few years, then she died, too. And the blessed Hilarion, performing all the burial rights, buried her in a grave.

And he was like the tree planted by the flowing waters of the spirit[154], growing and flourishing in all sacred dogmas, according to God's [will]. He taught and instructed everyone under him to uphold the sacred commandements [of God] and to shun and avoid infamous heresies.

XIII. Thus the horn of orthodoxy was lifted up. [Hilarion] extinguished impiety completely. Those who from wolves became sheep, transforming themselves with a good change, followed our pastor, like innocent lambs, obeying him in everything, insulting and spitting upon those who maintained those deceits and abusing and damning the leaders of such heresies.

The blessed archbishop [Hilarion] saw so many of the blasphemous and evil adherents of the Bogomil heresy accept the seed of piety, adding all of them to the orthodox fold; and he saw that many others remained obstinent, and he drove them away from the orthodox flock with banishment and expulsion. Thus he adorned his throne and thus he saved his flock, indeed not [tainting his throne] at all with anything evil or unsightly. Moreover, everyone in the area brought gifts, seeking the benefit of his blessings. The aforementioned group of monks, well directed and led by the good pastor, increased in size, flourishing in the glory of God.

---

154 Cf. Ps 1.3; Jer 17.18; Mt 7.17-18,12.32 (with parallel passages in Lk).

XIV. When much time had passed, Hilarion, having lived his [life] in perpetual adornment, understood that the time for his departure to the Lord was nigh. And having called together his group of monks, he carefully instructed them that they should live in subjugation to the love of the Father, that they should serve in every way and uphold tenaciously the law given by God, and that they should uphold all virtues with zeal. And he appointed a man named Peter as their leader, a virtuous and outstanding man, meek and wise like no other, whose virtue was known to everyone living in the area; and [Peter] had studied under the blessed Hilarion quite a few years and performed for him every service.

Thus having fortified and instructed them much, he gave peace to them and the whole flock, and he fell asleep in a blessed sleep.[155] His pious flock poured forth warm tears onto his relics, and having honored his relics with psalms and singing and songs, with incense and sweet-smelling aromats, they buried him honorably and piously. They said of him that in his youth, in the whole of his thirty years, he had never tasted wine.

XV. Much time had passed, and the monks were living together. Some of them began to be careless about the aforementioned [monastic] law, opposing Peter[156], introducing discord and heresies, and moreover teaching [their brothers] to be irreverent and impious.

The holy Hilarion understood their malicious and lawless intentions and was extremely displeased. He appeared to them in a dream; and he exposed their lawless deeds, spoke words of displeasure to them, and injured them mercilessly with his staff; to some of them he even delivered death. And when the aforementioned Peter found out about this vision, he related it clearly to all of the monks in the monastery. And those whom [Hilarion] had injured were in pain for many days afterward, and those

---

155 A circumlocution to describe his death.

156 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit., 537, fn.106, write: "Peter, who is referred to here, is considered by some scholars to be the first hagiographer of Hilarion of Moglena. There are, however, no facts either in Greek or in Slavonic manuscripts from which it is clear that he wrote a life of his teacher. This hypothesis is suggested by A. Solov'ov and is accepted without any reservation by Angelov (See Д. Ангелов, *Богомилството в България*, [София: Наука и изкуство, 1980] стр. 51-53)."

whom he had mortally injured were all dead, as if they had taken a fatal poison. When the other monks of that place saw what had happened, they were seized with fear and terror, and lived thereafter in the laws commanded of them, and the monastic order was observed thenceforth untransgressed.

News of this awesome miracle spread everywhere. And everyone was coming with increased faith and zeal. God, with the help of his saint, gave many signs and worked many miracles. Many came from all over to his grave, and they received various healings. Thus his grave worked innumerable miracles. And by a [decision] of the [Byzantine] imperial and ecclesiastical councils, the relics of the saint were taken and were placed in the holy church. But that which we have gone over in passing should not be consigned to the abyss of oblivion. When they opened the shrine of the saint [Hilarion] -- Oh, what a miracle! -- they found that springs of sweet-smelling myrrh were pouring forth from his eyes. And when the number of his disciples saw this, they were filled with inexpressible joy. All of the [people in the] nearby lands, when their ears had received the news, came zealously to the shrine, receiving various healings.

XVI. After much time had passed, the Greek empire became poor and decreased in size; the Bulgarian kingdom however became much greater, and the most pious Bulgarian tsar Kalojan[157] at that time was holding the scepter.[158] For he was very brave, and he took a large part of the Greek land called Thrace and Macedonia, Trivalia and Dalmatia, and to their number [he added] also Neada and Elada and also Aetolia.[159]

---

157 Bulgarian tsar from 1197 to 1207; he succeeded Asen and Peter who had led a successful revolt against Byzantine rule and restored to Bulgaria its independence, forming the so-called "Втората държава", or "Second Empire."

158 A circumlocution for "ruling the country."

159 Here some over-zealous patriotism has led to historical inaccuracies as to the territorial gains made during Kalojan's reign. In 1204, when Constantinople fell to the Latins of the Fourth Crusade, Kalojan and his forces took advantage of Byzantium's domestic problems to regain almost all of the Byzantine territory in Macedonian and Thrace. Further campaigns in 1205 won him the important cities of Adrianople and Demotika in Thrace; and the previous two years, he had annexed Niš from Serbia, as well as Beograd, Braničevo, and Vidin (See J.Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans*, 54-55).

And [the czar] heard about the miracles and signs of the blessed Hilarion, which God performed for him. And delighting in the will of God, and wanting to delight in the virtue of the saint, he sent [an envoy] in great haste; and he took the holy relics of the blessed Hilarion, and with incense and frangrances he carried him to his own glorious city of Trnovo.[160]

When the [Bulgarian] patriarch had heard this, he left with all the clergy to meet the saint with candles and incense, and he zealously kissed the relics of [Hilarion], the bishop of Christ. And having poured forth many tears, they placed [his relics] in the Church of the Forty Holy and Glorious Martyrs, where it remains today, giving healing unconditionally to everyone who comes with faith and love. For [Hilarion] loves everyone and he places himself before everyone; and as if alive, he gives himself to all; and neither does he eschew the young man, nor does he abhor the old man, but rather he loves the old men as an old man himself, and he embraces the young. He provides everyone with every need so that all might be converted.[161]

XVII. We shall bring something worthy before the shrine of his relics, such as an all-night vigil, sharp eyes, blessed zeal, an attentive ear. We shall imitate the father [Hilarion] so that we ourselves might be [spiritual] fathers. We shall strive [to imitate] such a life so that we may receive befitting gifts; we will receive them with great pleasure if we be zealots for [Hilarion] and ardently follow in his footsteps, for God delights in nothing other than to see someone striving for virtue even to the death.

In order to preserve the memory of Hilarion, we shall now bring in a choir, we will embrace the shrine, we will sing the funereal songs [written] by the hand of David: "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of a saint."[162] Blessed indeed and glorious and worthy of all praise

---

160 Spasova and Ivanova, op.cit., 537, fn.108, write: "The translation of Hilarion of Moglena's relics probably took place in 1205.

161 See 1 Cor 9.22.

162 This is a paraphrase of Ps 116.15 (Slavonic Psalter 115.6), which in the AV reads, "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints"; Sinai Psalter (Северьянов,

is the death of saints. Because of this not only during their lives did God bless them, but even after death with ineffable glory; and not only has He laid their souls to rest in the heavenly light, but also He has blessed their bodies on earth and through a miracle has given them the ability to drive out all the power and deeds of the Devil and to make these [things] disappear [from the hearts and minds] of the faithful.

XVIII. [Your] adornment of the bishopric, [your] deeds and name are sweet to me, Hilarion. Since you have assurance in God, look upon us from above; for now, having destroyed the mirror and divination, you see clearly the Holy Trinity.[163] Protect our flock securely from all the snares of our Adversary; through your beneficence, set [the flock] apart which has been given to you by Christ, our Saviour and Master-Shepherd.

With the sling of your wise words fend off the blasphemous wolves; disperse the slander of hostile enemies like weeds into the wind of munificence; bring about the fulfillment of the church; sympathize with us for our difficulties. You know how heavy is the burden of our office; you know the administration of the bishopric; you know well [what] to do and [how] to guide us to the harbor of God's desires and [how to] nourish us, if it be your wish, for you have expertise in all these things.

You have borne all of the burdens for the sake of Christ's church, you have quelled the uprisings of the heresies. You have turned those who oppose the piety of the dogmas to piety through your spiritual intelligence. You erected churches for Christ, our God; you turned your back on deceit; you healed those possessed by devils; you tore asunder the snares of heresies. Valiently you performed good, heroic deeds. You completed your course and maintained faith.

Because of this, though you have died, you live on even after death; and from the shrine of your relics, streams flow forth abundantly with various curative powers. Not only [does your shrine do this] but it also adorns our throne and encourages many of us to zealously imitate your

---

151): "Čьstьna prědъ gospodomь: sъmrъtь prépodobnyxъ ego." Compare this with the original text: "Čь|stna préd gospodomь sъmr|ъ|tь prépodobnaago."

163 1 Cor 13.12.

heroic deeds. For you did not perform heroic deeds in a small measure but [in great abundance] and up until your very death; and without [the shedding of] blood you revealed yourself to be a martyr. Moreover, you are now inducted into the angelic chorus, and you are delighting insatiably in those things which the eye cannot see and the ear cannot hear and the heart cannot know.[164] To Christ, our Lord, alone is the glory and the kingdom with the Father and Holy Spirit now and always, forever and ever, Amen.

[164] 1 Cor 2. 9.

Chapter 4:
The Life of Paraskeva

The Life and Deeds of our venerable mother Petka[1], in which it is told how she was brought to the glorious city of Trnovo[2], written by the kyrios[3] Euthymius of Trnovo[4]

I. If the law of love demands that we commemorate beloved people, that we contemplate their images and actions and words, and even paint many times their likenesses; then it will be very -- indeed, extremely -- fitting and desirable for those who please God to honor properly God's saints and to relate their memory and acts to some benefit. For a story about good [people and deeds] is in no small measure beneficial for its listeners.

Like the sun in the summer hours when it spreads it rays over the whole earth, all living things grow and blossom, flourishing more. For a celebration[5] of a saint's holiday brings regeneration [to those who

---

[1] See В.С.Киселков, *Патриарх Евтимий*, София, 1938, p.256. He writes that Paraskeva lived in the 10th-11th cc. according to some sources, or in the 12th century according to others. She is famous not only for her relics, which found their way all over the Balkan peninsula (Epivat, Vidin, Belgrade, Constantinople, Jaš), but she is also famous because of her name, which corresponds to the name of two other Christian martyrs, one of whom lived in the period of Emperor Anthony II and another who lived in the period of Emperor Diocletian. In addition to this, her name corresponds to the name of one of the folk saints, Petka (or Petnica), a name which the peasants associated with the fifth working day of the week, Friday.

[2] In the text A[3] of Kałużniacki there is added the following: "i ot tudu vъ slavnij grad Bdinъ i pady vъ préslavnejšuju zemlju Srъbskuju" ("and from there to the glorious city of Vidin and back to the glorious Serbian land").

[3] See fn.2 to our translation of the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena.*

[4] In the texts of the expanded redaction, second form (the versions expanded by Grigorij Camblak, See Kałużniacki,*Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393)*,Vienna, 1901; reprint, London:Variorum Reprints, 1971, pp.lxvi and lxxv), i.e. in the texts O, Ꙗ, L^1, T^1,Y^1, E^2, R^2, S^2 and U^2, there follows the addition: "Kъ koncu že slova i kako prénesena bystъ vъ slavnuju zemlju Srъbskuju, sъpisano Grigoriem Camblakom" ("and how at the end of the story she was taken back to the glorious Serbian land, written by Gregory Camblak").

[5] The word employed in the original is "sъborъ", i.e. "σύναξις", meaning a group celebration of a holiday.

participate], and a sacred tale provides a celebration for its listeners; for [such a story] dispells and chases away with ease the clouds of grief.

The memory of Petka will be like the brightest sun if we relate in detail the life, acts and the wanderings which she undertook on account of her love for Christ. [God] indeed accepts everything; and just like a mother who loves her child, [He accepts] even our childish baby-talk. And He will add strength unto zeal, for He rules over the best and the most blessed [of people].

If [we do] not [write this vita] with beauty, then we must introduce into it something good.[6] Everything [included here] will be fitting [of the saintliness of its subject]. It is an honorable story; it is a story for us before all others, for it leads even the corruptible [aspects of this world] to beauty, as much as is possible; and it pays a debt to [Paraskeva] who is incorruptible and gives thanks [to her]; but we are impoverished by our weakness with words.

Because our story is addressed to the brilliant [Paraskeva], the beginning will shine bright with a brilliant narrative. Who can relate in an honorable way her acts and miracles, who can tell of her blessed acts and defense [against evil], which she performed in Epivat, Thrace, Trnovo, Moesia and Dalmatia? Not only in these places, but everywhere you will find her name is known by all. The story of this blessed saint will be very long, and our intelligence is insufficient to be able to tell her story with beauty.

And although the government of Your [Majesty's] pious kingdom, being zealous [in its faith], calls upon our powerlessness [to pursue] this blessed work[7] which is pleasing to God; and although it is not fitting to

---

[6] Kałużniacki observes (*Werke*, 60, fn.8) that this whole sentence is missing in the manuscript G[1], "in what can only be an oversight" ("was aber nur ein Versehen sein kann").

[7] Euthymius is referring here to the fact that he was commissioned by Tsar Ivan Šišman to write this vita, as he mentions in the final chapter. According to Petar Dinekov (see П.Динеков, "Евтимий Търновский," *История на българската литература*, том I, 285-307; Стойко Божков, Петър Динеков, и.т.д. ред. София: БАН, 1963, p. 297), the vita was read on the occasion of her holiday in the church and in the presence of the tsar himself.

For an interesting study on the presence of the image of St.Paraskeva in the tradition of Balkan visual religious art, see E.Bakalova, "La vie de Sainte Paraskeve de Tirnovo dans l'art balkanique du bas moyen âge," *Byzantinobulgarica* 5 (1978): 175-209. For an

ignore the zeal and desire of Your [Majesty's] pious royal kingdom, I nevertheless think that it is much more useful to store up [such] divine zeal [and use it] for those souls who love God. How great will be the zeal that results from loving God and respecting his saints!

I in no way believe this venerable [woman] to have been singled out amongst the ancient and well-known saints.[8] But if someone were to tell of [her] deeds, which were better than [those of other saints], then because of these deeds she would shine out; and were someone to tell of her vision, which was loftier than theirs, then you would see how she would be adorned like the sun, which shines forth its rays everywhere.

For this reason, in accordance with Your Majesty's wish, I am now bringing about the existence of this story, [and I might add that I labor] not easily and freely, but with diligence and with great effort. Several people have lit up their souls just as they would light lamps with several candles, by gathering in the darkness of her lonely shrine[9]; and when each [returns home] and enters his own house, he feels the protection and shelter [that this home offers]. [These people] have a source of healing, and however much is ladled out, that is how much gushes forth, and however much gushes forth, such is the number of healings that flows forth [to cure any] illness that you can imagine.

Thus these [deeds and miracles] having been done for us [by Parasekva] at one time, we [now] run to her with haste, and because of such pious deeds we will praise her for an appropriate length of time, recounting and recreating all of her saintliness, and not leaving out one word or deed -- as has been requested of us -- so that our venerable mother

---

interesting textual study of the work, see К.Иванова, "Житието на Петка Търновска от Патриарх Евтимий: източници и текстологически бележки," *Старобългарска литература* 8 (1980): 13-36. Another study by N.Dragova examined the transformations that this vita has undergone in the hagiographic tradition of the sixteenth-eighteenth centuries; see Надежда Драгова, "Жанрова трансформация на Евтимиевото житие за света Петка Търновска през XVI-XVIII век," *Търновска книжовна школа*, том 4, 85-101, София: БАН, 1985.

[8] What Euthymius means by this is that, as far as he knows, there had not been written up till that time an account of the life of St. Petka-Paraskeva.

[9] See Mt 4.16: "[T]he people who sat in darkness have seen a great light, and for those who sat in the region and shadow of death light has dawned."

[Paraskeva] should not abhor us, seeing what is related herein, and also so that she should not reject those who so ardently come to her. Being the lover of her blessed Bridegroom, she will receive every blessing and forgiveness. For all she wanted in this world was to be betrothed to her Heavenly Bridegroom, so how could she be deprived of her request? For nothing else like a pure life and a life of brilliance leads to an angelic existence; and the angels, above others, rejoice in such a life; but more than anyone, so does God. [God is] true purity, and His face, as much as it is possible [to conceive of His face], forever gazes upon you, [Paraskeva].

But why should I draw out my words, making this story longer and, thereby, thwart the zeal of its listeners, and not turn my attentions to the life of the venerable [Paraskeva], and [present] her deeds [with the same reverence] as one would place [candles] on the candle holder, and proclaim the truth for all to hear? She intercedes for those who attempt to live [their lives] with diligence and to tread the path of sincerity and righteousness.

II. Thus, this venerable [Paraskeva] was from Epivat, and she had pious parents, who consistently followed all of God's commandments, adorning their whole lives with merciful and pious deeds. Thus having raised this good girl, and having brought her into life, an innocent dove of Christ[10] in character, and having taught her well and without error the law of God, they went to their heavenly dwelling places[11], leaving Petka as the heir to their home with her brother Euthymius, who later became the bishop of Madit[12] and performed many glorious miracles there. And after his death his glorious and miraculous relics gave forth a source of myrrh, a big

---

10 The word used in the original text is "golubica".

11 A typical circumlocution to express their death.

12 Klimentina Ivanova (К.Иванова, ред., *Стара българска литература*, том 4, Житиеписни творби, София: Български писател, 1986, p.579, fn.9) writes: "Euthymius of Madit, the brother of Petka of Trnovo [Paraskeva], was also canonized. Mention of him in the vita has a significant meaning as a precise dating of the time frame when Petka lived (10th century). His saint's day is celebrated on May 5. The details of [his life] we know from one panegyric which was dedicated to him by the Byzantine writer Gregory of Cyprus. The city of Madit, of which Euthymius was the bishop, is the present-day city of Maidos on the Dardanelles."

river of myrrh, and it flowed a mile[13] into the sea; and even up to this day there are many witnesses of his miracles who say that his miracles and acts were wondrous.

III. Thus the venerable one, having given up her parents to God[14], strove with much zeal to imitate the life of the apostles, exhausting her body with fasting, vigils, sufferings, and prostrations. Having fired herself up with a divine desire [to leave] that place, she could not bear to torture herself for long; but having left everyone, she fled; and having reached the desert, she led there an angelic and chaste life, void of material concerns, imitating completely and with no less zeal the life of Elias, the visionary of God, or better to say [John] the Baptist[15], maintaining fasting and vigils, eating desert grass -- and very little and meagerly at that -- withstanding intense cold and heat[16], looking to the Powerful One alone to save her from cowardice and from storms that rend the heart.[17] And she took neither grass nor water to the point of satiation but rather she partook of them very sparingly and only late in the day at that.

Who then will relate this [life], a source of tears? Who will tell of her frequent and constant weeping? Who will tell of her constant prostration and exhaustion? There was no one there other than that Powerful One to look down [upon her], only the Eye which sees everything.

She had there no care for the yokes of oxen, nor for golden-bridled horses, nor for clothing, nor for beds, nor for homes, nor for servants, but

---

13 The original Slavonic reads here "na edno pъpriště." See fn.52 to the translation of *The Life of Ivan of Rila.*

14 The original Slavonic reads literally "having sent her parents to God", which is a circumlocution to express their death.

15 This passage in the vita alludes to one of the central images in Hesychast mysticism, the Transfiguration of Christ, in which Christ appears talking with Moses and Elias before disciples Peter, James and John (Mt 17.1-3; compare also parallel passage in Mk and Lk, chapter 9). In Mt 17.10-13, it becomes clear to the disciples that Elias is John the Baptist (cf. also Mt 11.14,Mal 4.5).

16 John the Baptist chose the life of an anchoritic monk, withdrawing into the desert, eating only wild honey and locusts, and praying continually. See Mt 3.1-4, Mk 1.1-6.

17 This is a paraphrase of Ps 55.8 (Slavonic Psalter 54.9).

for spiritual purification and for the verdict of the Judgment to come, and for the meeting with her Bridegroom.[18] "I am looking for you, my Bridegroom,"[19] she said; and that which is in the Songs [of Solomon], she carried always in her mind, saying: "Make known to me 'him whom my soul loveth.'"[20] And she would often suffer over this: when would she adom the lamp, filling it with oil; when would she listen to the voice of her sweet betrothed; when would she rejoice together with the wise young women; when would she delight in a vision of her Betrothed, His beauty, His glory, His brightness, His gloriousness? Her heart would suffer over this, and her eyes were always darkened over with tears: "When will I go to appear before His divine face?"[21]

Thus she was occupying herself with these and such things and she become fired up by them, but the Evil One, [Satan], in no way stopped tempting her with dreams and visions, many times taking on the image of various beasts, which he did to create an obstacle to her course. And the brave Paraskeva, placed for herself a refuge in the One on High[22], bringing forth unceasingly a spring of tears from her eyes.

Thus she, being of a woman's nature, acquired the reason of a man[23], destroying all of the Devil's snares like some spiderweb, and like

---

[18] This refers to Christ. Biblical references of God as bridegroom found in the Song of Songs and also in Is 62.5; Mt 9.15, 25.1-10; Mk 2.19-20; Lk 5.34-35. For the significance of this image for the Hesychasts, see Section IV, chapter 2 of this work.

[19] K. Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 579, fn.13) writes: "[This phrase] is from the troparion of the general service for female martyrs."

[20] See Song 3.1

[21] Ps 42. 1-2

[22] K. Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 579, fn.16) cites here Slav.Ps 90.9 (RSV Ps 91.9 "Because you have made the Lord your refuge, the Most High your habitation...").

[23] Concerning the topoi in Byzantine hagiograpy about women that seek to find ways of justifying writing vitæ about women, see S.A. Harvey, "Women in Early Byzantine Hagiography: Reversing the Story", in *That Gentle Strength*, 36-59, Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1990. She writes (pp.40-41): "Here, in the language of the hagiography itself, we confront the heavy-handed presence of male writers at every level. We see it first at the basic level of literary formulas. The topoi used to distinguish hagiography about women from that about men are variations on a simple theme: although inferior to men as a lot, women can sometimes achieve lives worth imitating -- worth telling -- and this alone is cause for wonder...Each holy woman is presented as the exception to

David, she vanquished every day an imaginary Goliath.[24] And somehow it was seen to that this serpent, who bragged vilely on himself, was in no time trampled and thrown down by this wise young woman like some tiny bird. And having aspired to [imitate] the essence [of God], she thus adorned her own soul; and this [saying] of the prophets was fulfilled by her: "So shall the king greatly desire thy beauty."[25] And so through her deeds, she found [divine] ascent in the vision [of God][26]; and adorning her life with her words and deeds, she lived many years in the desert.

IV. One night, as was her habit, having given herself over to prayer and having extended her hand toward heaven in supplication, she saw a divine vision, of some bright youth, who came to her and said, "Leave the desert, return to your homeland; you should leave your body on the earth and bring your soul to its heavenly dwelling." Contemplating well the power of the vision and understanding it to be a vision from God, she rejoiced in this liberation from the corporeal yoke, but was saddened to leave the desert,

---

her kind, so much so, that she ceases to be one of her own kind, becoming instead an honorary male."

[24] See 1 Sam 17 for the story of David and Goliath.

[25] Ps 45.11 (Slavonic Psalter,44.12).

[26] The "ascent" which Paraskeva places in her heart refers to her observance of the steps prescribed by John Climacus in his work "The Ladder." The "vision" is a reference to the Hesychastic ideal of a vision (a result of contemplation, or θεωρία) of the Divine Light, or the Taboric Light. See Meyendorff, *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*, Crestwood,NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 1982, p.32. What Euthymius is implying in this passage is that Paraskeva attained the Hesychast ideal, which was a vision of the Divine, or Taboric, Light; that is, a vision of Christ in his Transfiguration.

According to Palamite doctrine, the nature of God consists of both his essence, which is unknowable and invisible, and his energy, which is that light that was seen by the disciples during the Transfiguration and can be seen by people if they follow carefully the steps of Hesychast mysticism.

Euthymius makes an important statement here concerning Paraskeva. In this one sentence, he presents her as a devoted disciples of Hesychasm, for through her deeds, which correspond themselves to the Hesychasts' ideal, she achieves the ultimate goal of the Hesychasts: the vision of the Taboric Light. See Section IV, chapter 2 of this work for more information on the Hesychastic content of the vitæ of Euthymius and on the processes of spiritual ascension according to the Hesychastic doctrine of Gregory the Sinaite.

for nothing cleanses the soul and leads to the prototypical state[27] like the desert and quietude[28].

Though not wanting to, she left the desert and returned to the world and arrived in the royal city and entered the magnificent cathedral of the Divine Word.[29] What she did not say and do, making frequent genuflections with her knees, crying streams of tears, letting loose from her heart frequent weeping; and remembering her desert life, she was consumed with bitter grief. And after these things, like the labor-loving bee [lights on] all the spring flowers, thus she went in a labor-loving way to all the holy places. She went to the Church of Our Most Brilliant Mother of Christ, which is called Blachernitissa even today, and there she fell before the holy icon[30], bitterly crying forth warm tears and said:

"Before you, Our Lady of the world, have I placed my whole life, and I put all my hopes in you, O Young Virgin. Do not reject me, wretched one that I am, and do not loath your servants, who from the time of their youth have followed your only-begotten Son. You know the powerlessness of woman's nature, O Young Virgin, and you know the bitterness of my soul. I have no other hope, I have no other protection, you

---

27 The term Euthymius uses here is "pъrvoobraznoe", which means literally "archetypical" (see И. Срезневский, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по посьменным памятникам*, 1893; reprint, Москва: Книга, 1989, vol.2, p.1764). This is a reference to one of the philosophical bases of Hesychast mysticism, namely that salvation of the soul is attained by a re-establishment of the primordial tie between man and God that had been broken by original sin. This primordial or archetypical connection between man and God is represented by Adam's relationship with God before sin; therefore, one of the Hesychast goals, as specified by Gregory the Sinaite, was for man to restore himself to the state of Adam, i.e. to a state of archetypal, primitive, or primordial perfection. For a discussion of this, see Д. Ангелов, "Към историята на религиозно-философската мисъл в средновековна България--исихазъм и варлаамистство," *Българското историческо дружество* 25 (1967): 73-92, esp.pp.77-78.

28 The term used here is "bezъmlьvie", the Slavonic translation for the Greek term "ἡσυχία", or "quietude, silence".

29 K. Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 579, fn.20) notes that this is the Hagia Sofia Cathedral in Constantinople.

30 K. Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 580, fn.21) writes: "The icon of the Mother of God in Blacherna is still revered today as miracle-working. All of the pilgrims in Constantinople indicate that it is one of the greatest jewels of the Byzantine capital."

are our teacher, you are our protectress, you are the preserver of my whole life. When I went to the desert, I had you as a helper; and today, now that I have returned to the world, what other help do I need apart from you? Thus today, Our Lady, appear before me, wretched one that I am, and be my companion, teacher, nourisher all the days of my life; I have no other hope besides you."

Thus having prayed with all her soul and having placed all her hope in the Mother of God, she set off for her homeland. Having reached Epivat, she was there quite a long time, adding labor unto labor and toil unto toil, adorning herself with fasting and vigils and always speaking to [God] alone.

Some time having passed, realizing it was time for her to leave this place, she immediately turned to prayer and watered her earthly countenance with tears: "O Philanthropic Ruler," she said, "do not have contempt for me, Your wretched slave, who because of Your most holy Name has left everything and has followed You. And today, most generous Lord, command your angel of peace to peacefully take my wretched soul, lest my path be impeded by unclean, bad, and evil demons; and deign graciously for me, though I am unworthy, to stand before your dread throne, for You are blessed forever and ever, Amen."

And thus she gave over her blessed soul to the hands of God. Her body was put in the grave by a few Christ-lovers. No one was present, for there was not anyone from anywhere around, and to this day it is unknown when she departed to the Lord.

V. These are the heroic deeds of the venerable Paraskeva, our mother's spiritual battles, through which she acted heroically and suffered in the short period of time she spent on this earth; and she receives great glory in heaven. But God did not forsake his slave that she should lie there long without memory, nor that her immaculate body should decompose with decay, but instead [He] worked a wondrous miracle.

Somewhere nearby there was a stylite[31] on a column, practicing quietude[32], concentrating on himself and God. Some sailor appeared, suffering from some serious illness, and this afflicted man died. [His corpse] began to give off an unimaginable stench, so that no one coming near was able to pass by him. Also the stylite himself was unable to tolerate the intolerable stench of [the dead man] so that he was forced to come down from his pillar. And he commanded a few men to dig a deep hole and bury the stinking corpse there. They then taking on what was commanded of them with zeal, succeeded in their task. Occupying themselves with this, they were digging a deep hole in the ground, and they found [another] body, [buried] and lying in the earth, but [this body] was not giving forth any stench!

An awesome miracle had just occurred, and the men greatly marvelled at what had just happened; however, they, being inexperienced and ignorant, dismissed the phenomenon as a small and insignificant matter; and they buried that stinking corpse somewhere near [the body of the saint]. They all went home and explained to everyone what had happened.

One of them, George, a reverent and Christ-loving man, was at home one evening, and as it was his habit to pray, he gave himself over to prayer and he prayed zealously to God on behalf of his entire household. Towards morning he was seized by a dream [of a woman]. Thinking her to be some kind of queen, sitting on brilliant throne, he saw a numerous number of brilliant soldiers standing around her. When this Christ-loving man, [George], saw them, he was immediately seized with terror, and he threw himself on the ground, not daring to gaze upon their brilliance and beauty. One of the brilliant men took him by the hand and lifted him up. "George," he said, "why do you hold in such contempt the body of the venerable Paraskeva? Take [her body] out [of the ground] and place it in a

---

31 See H. Delehaye's introduction to *Les saints stylites*, Subsidia Hagiographica, no.14. Brussels: Société des bollandistes, 1923.

32 The act of maintaining the mystical tenets of hesychasm appears here in a verbal form "bezъmlъvstvovati".

brilliant shrine; for the King greatly desires her beauty[33] and wants to glorify her on earth."

Then the brilliant [Paraskeva] said this to him: "Immediately take my relics, put them in a honorable place, for I cannot tolerate the vile stench of that other man, though I am a human being, having come forth from my mother's womb. My homeland is called Epivat, where you now dwell."

And on that night one of the reverent women -- Euthymia was her name -- saw a similar vision to that vision, and in the morning both [George and Euthymia] were relating to everyone the details of what they had seen.

And when the people had heard these things, they all set out running to unearth [the body] in great haste; and they greatly marveled at it, as if it were some rare and priceless treasure. Having taken the body with candles and incense, aromats and sweet-smelling fragrances, with great joy they placed her in the church of the Holy and Glorious Apostles, where she lay and gave many miraculous signs. And not only in that country, but also in all the neighboring countries her miracles and signs were well known to all. All in the area who were afflicted with disease and possessed by devils, who came to her with faith, received healing. And word about her spread around this whole country.

VI. Much time passed, and the scepter[34] of the Greek empire weakened and was taken up to God in assumption, I don't know how; and the Romans, whom the Holy Scriptures call the rod of iron, then suppressed the empire; and the Imperial City, [Constantinople] was now under their control.[35] They shamelessly took all the holy vessels and also the immaculate relics of the saints, all the church utensils, and all of the royal

---

[33] See Ps 45.11 (Slavonic Psalter, 44.12).

[34] A metonymical expression for "emperor".

[35] This refers to the taking of Constantinople by the Romans of the Fourth Crusade on April 13, 1204, which was the disastrous result of growing tensions between Rome and Byzantium. See John Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans, A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Empire*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987, pp. 60-63; Steven Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970, pp.1-5.

property, and, simply speaking, all the beauty of the city; and they sent everything off to Rome.[36]

The assembly of the pious, seeing these things, were covered by a cloud of grief and woe, and nothing was heard from them except: "O Lord, Who was resurrected, why do You sleep, why do You forget our lowliness and our grief?"[37], and so on. In these ways the cloud of grief seized the pious men.

At the same time[38], radiantly and brilliantly, piety was being upheld solidly by the pious Bulgarian tsar Ivan Asen, the son of the old tsar Asen, and who never frightened even a doe; but yet, when the right moment arrived, he attacked bravely the power of the infidels; and having taken all the Macedonian rule, he then took control of Serres[39], as well as all of Athos -- that is, more acurately, the Holy Mount[40] -- and to these things also the glorious Solun[41] and all of Thessaly, as well as Trivala [Serbia], Dalmatia, and Arvanitskaja. And they say he ruled over all these territories all the way to Durazzo [Dyrrhachium][42], in which he gloriously and

---

36 Regarding this historical detail, Fine (ibid.,62) says, "[The crusaders] massacred a large portion of [Contantinople's] population and thoroughly looted the city, whose treasures, accumulated over nearly a thousand years, were seized and many of which were taken back west."

37 Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit., 580, fn.27) cites here Slav.Ps 43.24-25 (RSV 44. 23-24).

38 The historical events of Ivan Asen II's reign (1218-1241) presented here were not at all concurrent ("vъ tože vrěme") with the taking of Constantinople by the crusaders, as the original text states, but rather occurred some twenty-five years after.

39 Modern-day Serrai, Greece

40 According to Fine (op.cit.,126), Ivan Asen II did conquer the Chalcidic peninsula in 1230, and later that same year he visited Mount Athos and announced his protection over the monasteries. He tried to put the Holy Mount under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Trnovo, but the monasteries protested and he abandoned this idea.

41 The ancient Slavonic name for Salonika, or present-day Thessaloniki.

42 See Kossev, et al., ed., *A Short History of Bulgaria*, Sofia: Foreign Language Press, 1963, p.72. It seems that Euthymius, in this passage, is drawing from the contents of an inscription that was ordered done by Tsar Ivan Asen II and placed in the Church of the Forty Martyrs. The inscription, which still exists today, commemorated the tsar's victory in the Battle of Kolotnica (1230, near present-day Plovdiv), in which he defeated Theodore, ruler of Epirus and de-facto king of Thessaloniki, who had invaded Bulgaria with the agenda of his own imperialistic designs.

piously appointed metropolitans and bishops, to which his glorious chrisobul kept in the Holy Lavra at Mount Athos actually testifies.

But he was not satisfied with this, but bravely he overmastered and took control of everything, and he even conquered and overmastered the Imperial City [Constantinople], putting the Phrygians, who were ruling there, under his thumb.[43] Thus having gained power and having conquered all these places, the glory of the venerable [Paraskeva] reached even him, which he received with much delight; his heart became emblazed "as the hart longs for the flowing streams"[44]; for he wanted somehow to delight in the holy relics of the holy shrine of the venerable [Paraskeva], an incorruptible treasure. Everywhere miracles were being requested, and everywhere rays of divine acts were being dispersed, and they lit up every end of the earth.

Having found precisely the right moment, the pious tsar took divine counsel, which is pleasing to God, useful, and worthy of praise. He immediately sent [a message] to those who were there in Constantinople, the Phrygians, saying that he was not looking for gold, nor jewels nor precious stones, but the glorious shrine of the saint. What more could he want other than the most cherished body of the venerable Paraskeva? Behold this instructive thing was always in his mind: "Even if they demand half of my kingdom, I am prepared to give everything--if [they demand of me] gold, or silver, or jewels, or precious stones[45], zealously will I give everything, deprive myself of everything; for indeed I will receive the treasures that I desire."

The contents of the inscription appear in Fine (op.cit., 125): "I waged war in Romania, defeated the Greek army, and captured the Lord Emperor Theodor Comnenus himself and all his boyars. And I occupied the land from Adrianople to Durazzo, Greek, Serbia, and Albania alike. The Franks hold only the cities in the vicinity of Constantinople itself. But even they are under the authority of my empire since they have no other emperor but me, and only thanks to me do they survive, for thus God has decreed."

43 Literally, "under the palm of his hand", "pod daniju".

44 Ps 42.1 (Slavonic Psalter 41.2).

45 Literally, "kamenie čьstnoje".

When the Phrygians had heard this, immediately they were ready for forgiveness with every diligence and ardor. And when they had heard all of this, they ordered that he should be granted his request, and they sent other things as well as a reconciliation; they also sent [a message], promising and announcing that they would give even their own souls if it were possible.

When the autocrat (Asen) heard this, it seemed to him as if he were flying in the clouds and there was no where to hide himself from his exceeding great joy. And immediately he sent there His Holiness Mark, the Metropolitan of Great Preslav, with much honor, to translate the [relics of] the venerable [Paraskeva] from Epivat to the glorious city of Trnovo. [Mark] went there in haste, and arranged everything for the occasion, and with honor he took the holy relics. And returning home in haste, he offered praise to God and to the venerable Paraskeva. And when he had traversed the Phrygian land and arrived in his own country, everyone in the area gathered around, and with candles and incense and sweet-smelling myrrh, they accompanied the shrine of the venerable one to the glorious and royal city of Trnovo.

And when the pious tsar Ivan Asen saw this, he came out of the city with his mother, the dowager tsarina Elena, and with his consort Anna and with all his noblemen, amongst whom was also The Most Reverend [Bulgarian] Patriarch kyrios[46] Vasilij with all of the clergy of the church, and also amongst them was an innumerably large number of people. The tsar and everyone with him walked on foot four miles from the city with much honor to meet the venerable one, whom, having taken with their own pure hands, they kissed lovingly with their soul and all their heart. And having brought her, they placed her in the royal church, where she lies up to this very day, giving various healings to those who come to her glorious shrine with faith and love.[47]

---

[46] See fn.2 to the translation of *The Life of Hilarion of Moglena*.

[47] Kałużniacki writes (*Werke*, 72, fn.8) that in the manuscripts O,Ꙗ,T[1], Y[1], E[2], and A[3] there follows here under the heading "O svetěj Petcě Camblakovo", or just "Camblakovo" the narration of the translation of the relics of St. Paraskeva from Trnovo to Vidin and from there to Serbia. This narration, published many times, is also included in the appendix of Kałużniacki's publication, pp.432-6. The narration is not included in this translation.

VII. I am bewildered as to what to bring [to her]. All that is honorable in the world is not worthy of her. But even if it is [done] without merit, I will proclaim what must be said on the occasion of an encounter with you, [Parasekva].[48] Although we were not then prepared, O venerable Paraskeva, for such an encounter, today however, O mother, I will proclaim what should have been said then.

Like a proud mother who loves her children[49], you accept sweetly the last gift like the first. But what gift should I present to you, O pure Paraskeva? For you are above all earthy gifts. So although I was deprived of that earlier encounter [when your relics were first brought to Trnovo], now I gaze upon you as on a very valuable treasure; and because [I am] inspired, I speak to you from the heart what I would have said to you then:

Welcome, O beautiful bride of Christ [Paraskeva], a pure innocent dove, covered in gold by the Holy Spirit, the glory of the Virgin, the desert-dweller, the confidante of the angels, jewel of paradise, beautiful home of purity. God desires your goodness and has adorned you with various miracles on earth; your soul is housed in the heavens with the host of angels. The angels have praised you; men glorify you, O young maiden; and having loved you, they followed in the fragrance of your myrrh. You are the honorable bride of the True Bridegroom, you are the "lily among the thorns"[50], human races glorify you because you followed your Bridegroom. You are the protectress [of those] in peril; for those who are beleaguered by the storm, you are the port; your shrine gives forth gracious streams, chasing away the Devil's hosts; your church is a router of diseases, sight for the blind, cleanliness for the lepers.

In this way I praise your body, Petka, a vessel of those consecrated; I also praise your bodily remains; I praise your sweet-speeched tongue, for it constantly glorified God; I praise your eyes, which never became drowsy

---

48 The word used in the original is "srětenie", which means literally "meeting".

49 The Slavonic reads literally "like a child-loving mother," "Ąko čedoljubivaa bo mati".

50 Song 2.2.

with sleep that leads to death; I praise your hands, which performed heroic acts, never resting; I praise your legs, which throughout all-night vigils never weakened. You are a vessel which has received the true myrrh, which is the Holy Spirit; you are the protectress of the throng which comes to the shrine of your relics. Because of this your glory, the actions of your miracles, will spread over all the earth just as lightning lights up the whole world. Kings thus honorably incline to you, lovingly they kiss you and pour forth rivers of tears for the remission of sins.

You are a sweet joy for the archbishops, beauty for the priests; because of this with pure hands they embrace you and carry you into the impenetrable "Holy of Holies."[51] I consider this deed to be of the divine Providence, that upon death your venerable body enters inside the impenetrable. You are beauty to the Bulgarians[52], our protectress and preserver. Through you our tsars are praised. Through your protection, we instill fear in all those who fight us. Through you, our city is strengthened and achieves a brilliant victory. How many numerous kings and barbarians have wanted to do evil -- and do it surreptitiously -- to your glorious city of Trnovo in which your ever pure body rests! But you, like some brave soldier, have chased out the shamed faces of these people by means of the force given to you by your Bridegroom Christ. Everybody comes to you bearing gifts and kneeling before you. The council of tsarinas makes way for you, and they stand before your shrine with reverence; for you are a tsarina, though not an earthly one, but the chosen bride of the Heavenly Tsar.

You are glory to women, beauty to maidens, an icon of apostolic life, an encouragement to the desert-dwellers, a defender of the young, a preserver of those in matrimony, a provider of every need. You perform acts of miracles, and abundantly you give to everyone what they need without having contempt for them.

---

51 See Latin "sanctum sanctorum", Greek "τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων"; the most sacred chamber of the temple, or the bema in an Eastern Orthodox church.

52 Kałużniacki writes (*Werke*, 74, fn5): "Also in F[3]; in O,R, T[1], Y[1], E[2], R[2], S[2], and U[2]: 'jazyku' ['to the people'], respectively 'ązyku Srъbskomu' ['to the Serbian people']; in A3: 'xristianom' ['to the Christians']".

VIII. Because we have brought, as many [gifts and laudations] as possible for the encounter with your pure body, and because we proclaimed the inexhaustible source[53] of your blessed deeds and the abundant spring of your holy shrine, it will be neither surprising nor overbold if we deliver over to your spirit these very things so that they may accompany you. Even if nothing of our [labors] is sought after by you, we [still] will not put aside our duty [in proclaiming your glory].

What will we send to your spirit, what songs, what laudations, what praises? You transcended all of these things, flew above all of these things, escaped corruption, delivered yourself from filth.[54] You left us your body on the earth, and you freed yourself of corporeal bonds. The heavenly choirs stand before you to accompany you, to praise you, to bless you. What more?

Go, mother, go, go to the peaceful dwellings, to the heavenly halls, to the brilliance of the saints, to ineffable joy, to incorruptibility, to tranquility [enjoyed by] the righteous. Satiate yourself, take joy in your Lover, take joy in the countenances of the prophets, the apostles, the words of the venerable saints. Enter with the wise maidens into the heavenly mansion, into a heavenly existence, into the eternal dwelling. Take joy in the glory, beauty, existence, brightness, brilliance, joy of your Bridegroom of your Creator, [who is] sweet, beautiful, bright, unchangeable, invisible, ineffable, eternal, compassionate, kind, immeasurable, philanthropic, forgiving, and merciful.[55]

---

53 The word used in the original is "pučina", which according to Sreznevskij (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, 1741), has, in addition to the literal meanings "море, залив, пучина", the figurative meaning "неиссяаемый источник".

54 The original Slavonic reads here "kalъ", which Sreznevskij (Срезневский, vol.1, 1183) translates as Greek equivalents πηλός, κύλισμα and the Latin coenum, volutabrum, lutum.

55 The word used in the original text is "blagoutrobnyj", from "blagoutrobie" which is calqued from the Greek "εὐσπλαγχνία", which appears in the Greek texts of Eph 4.32 and 1 Pet 3.8.

On the subject of common symbols for the heart employed in Byzantine literature, see С. Аверинцев, *Поэтика ранневизантийской литературы*, Москва: АН СССР, 1977, p.63. He writes: "Среди этих символов [сердца] должна быть названа еще и 'утроба' прежде всего, конечно, это в муках рожающая материнская утроба (rehem), которая представляет собой в библейской семантике синоним всяческой милости и жалости ('благо-утробия',

You received the riches that were prepared [for you] in advance, since the creation of the world, and you lived piously. You heard, and you saw and inclined your ear to what the eye does not see and the ear does not hear and what does not enter the hearts of men[56], things which God has prepared for those who love him. Forget your own people, fleshly thoughts, and your father's house, a mortal body created from the earth.[57] And I sing from Solomon: "And the king shall greatly desire your beauty.[58] The king hath brought me into his chambers: we will exult and rejoice in you.[59] How have thy cheeks adorned themselves like a turtledove?[60] You are all fair, my love; there is no flaw in you."[61] Behold, for you do not speak with corporeal language[62]; rather with deeds, with

---

εὐσπλαγχνία, как у Библии научились выражаться византийцы и затем крещенные византийцами славяне): символика 'теплой' и 'чревной' материнской любви...". (= "Amongst these symbols [for the heart] we should also mention the 'womb'; it is, of course, that maternal, life-giving womb in the pains of birth that represents in Biblical semantics a synonym for every kindness and compassion (благоутробия', εὐσπλαγχνία, as the Byzantines learned from the Bible to express it and later from them the Christianized Slavs): a symbol of 'warm' and 'embryonic' motherly love..."

56 1 Cor 2.9.

57 Ps 45.10 (Slavonic Psalter 44.11)

58 Ps 45.11 (Slavonic Psalter 44.12)

59 Song 1.4. The original text reads: "vъvede te carь vъ kletь svoju", "the king has brought *you* into his chamber", whereas the Slavonic Bible (MSB) reads: "vvede mą carь vъ ložnicu svoju", "the king has brought *me* into his bedchamber". The LXX reads: "Εἰσήνεγκέν με ὁ βασιλεύς εἰς το ταμίειον αὐτοῦ."

60 This seems to be a poetic reworking on the part of Euthymius of Song 1.15 (RSV:"your eyes are doves"/MSB:"oči tvoi golubinė") and Song 4.1 (RSV:"your eyes are doves behind your veil"/MSB:"oči tvoi golubinė, kromė zamolčanią tvoego").

The image in the Euthymian text is unclear without some knowledge of the bird itself. The turtledove is, according to Webster's Third International Dictionary (unabridged), "an Old World wild dove of Streptopelia or related genera; a common European bird (S. turtur) noted for its plaintive cooing and being mostly cinnamon brown with a white-bordered black patch on each side of the neck and white-tipped outer tail feathers." This explains the "adorned cheeks" of the turtledove.

61 Song 4.7

62 The original reads: "Tъčiju se ne glagolješi ezykomь plьtěnomь..." See fn.89 to the translation of *The Life of Hilarion of Moglena*.

trumpets you call out most clearly that which is in the Songs [of Solomon]: "With great delight I sat in his shadow, and his fruit was sweet in my throat[63], for I am sick with love.[64]" Because of this the Bridegroom with sweetness announces to you: "Come with me from Lebanon, my spouse, with me from Lebanon[65]: pass from the beginning of faith, be calm and delight in and celebrate the true sabbath."

IX. Well, O venerable mother and beautiful Paraskeva, mercifully look down upon us from above; and now you gaze upon Him whom you desired, Christ, not by means of mirrors and divination, but face to face you converse purely with Him.[66] Pray for the humility of the world and preserve our harmless and merciful tsar[67], who moved us [to compose] this story about you. We place our hope in you, and because of this we have

---

[63] An excerpt from Song 2.3. The original text and the MSB read, respectively, "plod ego sladьkъ vъ grъtani mojemъ"/ "plodъ ego sladokъ vъ gortani moemъ", which translates as "and his fruit was sweet in my throat." The RSV text reads " his fruit was sweet to my taste."

[64] Song 2.5.

[65] Song 4.8. The differences in content of the various biblical texts is worth noting.
The RSV reads: "Come with me from Lebanon, my bride; come with me from Lebanon. Depart from the peak of Amana, from the peak of Senir and Hermon, from the dens of lions, from the mountains of leopards."
The MSB reads: "Grądi ot Livana nevěsto, grądi ot Livana: priidi i prejdi iz nacala věry, ot glavy sanira i aermona, ot ogradъ lьvovyxъ, ot gorъ pardaleovъ".
The original text reads here "Gredi ot Livana, nevěsto, gredi ot Livana; priidi i proidi ot načela věry; upokoj se, nisladi [sic, nasladi] se, subotstvuj istinnoje subotstvovanie.".
The one line "pass from the beginning of faith" is taken directly from the LXX ("Δεῦρο ἀπὸ Λιβάνου, νύμφη, δεῦρο ἀπὸ Λιβάνου. ἐλεύση καὶ διελεύση ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς πίστεως, ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς Σανιρ καὶ Ερμων, ἀπὸ μανδρῶν λέοντων, ἀπὸ ὀρέων παρδάλεων"), but the rest of the original text diverges from the biblical sources.

[66] 1 Cor 13.12.

[67] Kałużniacki (*Werke*, 76, fn.4) observes that the texts T^1, Y^1, E^2, R^2, S^2 and U^2 have instead the words: "blagočestivago gospodina našego despota Gjurьga nevrednaą i nenavětnaą" ("our pious lord, [our] harmless and benign despot George"), while A^3 on the other hand has "blagočьstivyix i xristoljubivyix carej našix nevrědnyix i nenavětnyix" ("our pious, Christ-loving, harmless and benign tsars").

striven to express to everyone your position as protector. Defend them with your holy mediators, fence off their flock from all opponents; grant longevity and peaceful days to the kingdom; and defend everyone who has come today to your holy church, with the power which was given to you by the Saviour, Christ. And place us, of the original flock, above the temptation of the Enemy; intervene [for us] directly, so that having saved well the entrusted flock, we may lead it to the heavenly pasture and bring it into the heavenly fold where the voices of celebrants are [heard]. And we will house you and and will take pleasure in the eternal blessings of grace and philanthropy of our Lord, Jesus Christ, whose is the glory and kingdom with the Immortal Father and the Brilliant and Blessed and Live-Giving Spirit, today and always, forever and ever, Amen.

Chapter 5:
The Life of Philothea[1]

The Life and Deeds of our venerable mother Philothea[2], written by Euthymius, patriarch of Trnovo

I. The path which leads to virtue instructs well the souls of those who love God and sends them to their home in heaven. Thus this story blesses those who have striven for virtue, who have cleansed their spiritual conscience. What else could be more blessed or praiseworthy than the soul which has given itself completely over to God and which follows His law? Because of this, those wise young maidens[3] who, having abandoned everything, prepare their spiritual lamps for their meeting with their Bridegroom, [Christ], are worthy of praise; moreover they rejoice together over their Bridegroom and delight in ineffable glory. The blessed Philothea was a diligent zealot, and she imitated such blessedness [in her own life].

She has called us together today and has bountifully laid upon our table many of her miracles, and she turns [to God] in prayer to ask that help may be rendered to us straightaway in order that we may fulfill and carry out to completion that which you [holy sisters] requested us to do[4],

---

1 See В.С.Киселков, *Патриарх Евтимий*, София, 1938, p.250. He writes that Philothea lived in the 3rd century A.D. and that she was amongst those Greek saints whose relics were translated to Trnovo during the period of the Asens in order to augment the significance and the prestige of the new capital.

2 See I.Dujčev's introduction to E.Kałużniacki, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393)*, Vienna, 1901; reprint, London:Variorum Reprints, 1971, p. iv. Dujčev refers to her as "a Byzantine saint unknown in Greek hagiography."

3 See Mt 25.1-6 for the story of the five wise maidens and the five foolish maidens. Euthymius employs the image of the bride and the bridegroom throughout the vita. The use of this theme by the Hesychasts is discussed in more detail in chapter 2 of Section IV of this study.

4 Euthymius was requested by the nuns of the Our Lady of Temnishka convent in Trnovo to write a life of St. Philothea. See П.Динеков, "Евтимий Търновский," *История на българската литература*, том I, 285-307, Стойко Божков, Петър Динеков, и.т.д. ред. София: БАН, 1963, p.297. In Bulgarian, St. Philothea is referred to as "Филотея Темнишка," or "Philothea of Temnishka".

that is, to write this account of [Philothea's life]. For this account will offer much benefit to those who wish to go over it diligently, and it will lead them to zeal.

II. Because from the beginning of time the Evil Enemy, who was seized with hatred, could not tolerate [Adam], the first man, to be in paradise, he, having no other means for pouring forth his evil, found the woman [Eve], the simplest member [of creation], the most powerless vessel, completely naïve to his snare, and he seduced her into believing that she was equal to God.[5] She, being completely naïve to his snare, believing him, obeyed the death-bearing counsel. Then after the crime, she received just punishment and was deprived of the food of paradise and deprived of God. And she [and Adam] were thenceforth banished from [the Garden]: Hence the punishment to the whole race, hence various diseases and temptations, hence must the woman to the man turn, hence [man] rules over you, hence was the woman condemned to bear in grief, and thus this punishment came upon the whole of womankind!

What [were] the other miracles of God? He came down from heaven, and as He himself says, He was born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God. He took His flesh from her pure blood, and was made God and Man, so that He should honor men and correct the female sex, which was made mortal by [Eve's] ancient crime; and he gave the gift of victory to all humanity, not only to the male sex, but also to the female, to trample and to humiliate the Enemy completely, the Master of Evil, who deceived woman in paradise, and all of his satanic power.

Thence those blessed myrrh-bearers[6] who are filled with the Holy Spirit and though possessing a woman's nature possess also the strength of a

---

[5] See Gen 3. 5 ("For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil").

[6] Klimentina Ivanova, *Стара българска литература*, том 4, Житиеписни творби, София: Български писател, 1986, p.583, fn.3, writes: "The myrrh-bearers [or 'bringers of spices'], according to the texts of the Gospels, are women who go to the tomb of Christ. In numbering them, there is a discrepancy in the four Gospels; cf. Mt 28.9; Mk 16.1; Lk 24.10; Jn 20.15-16. Amongst the myrrh-bearers are numbered: Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, Salome, Joanna and others. According to John, only Mary Magdalene saw Jesus Christ directly after his resurrection."

man -- and they followed Christ the Ruler even to the cross and to the death; not only this, but also after the blessed passion and the resurrection of the Saviour, they were the first to be granted a vision: "Hail!"[7] they heard from the Saviour. Because of this these wise young women, whom the books of the Gospels commemorate, prepared themselves wholeheartedly for the meeting with their Heavenly Bridegroom, and they despised the beauties of this world.

Each of them placed their own lamp before them -- that is to say, the purity of their bodies -- making sure it was never extinguished so that when they would hear the voice: "Behold, the Bridegroom", they would be ready to run and meet him; and having shown him both corporeal and mental purity, whole and complete, with great glory they entered with him into the heavenly mansion.

Pursuing zealously these things with all her heart, the blessed Philothea strove to please her Bridegroom and to bring to him the purity of her body, pure and undefiled. That is why she offered up incessant prayers to God, and she served him with the spirit and the truth. She brewed the sweetest beer with spiritually pure faith, not at all like the intoxicating drink[8] we call beer made from many and various seeds, but rather according to a God-given recipe was it made; for all insidious drinks are made by means of heretical snares.

Thus she was like a tree, according to [the words] of David, "planted by the rivers of water"[9], forever preserving her purity and casting up her gaze to the [peak] of supreme blessedness.

---

[7] Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit.,583, fn.4) cites here Mt 28.9.

[8] The word used in the original is "sikerъ" (from Greek "σίκερα" = fermented liquor, strong drink), which Sreznevskij (И.Срезневский, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам*, 1893; reprint, Москва: Книга, 1989, vol.2, p.348) defines as "хмельной напиток," or "intoxicating drink". See a more detailed discussion of this passage on pp.354-355 of this work.

[9] See Ps 1.3, Jer 17.18; Mt 7.17-18,12.32 (with parallel passages in Lk).

III. The home town of the blessed Philothea was the city Molivot[10], as it is usually called, and was in the country of Pamphilista. Her parents names were Ivan, who was a patrician[11], and Irina; and they were children of noble parents. And they lived always in the passion of God, spending night and day in the house of God, feeding the hungry and giving to beggars whatever they needed.

They had always desired very much to have a child. They prayed for this diligently, and they poured forth warm tears from their eyes, never losing hope. Thus this saintly one was born, and they named her Philothea; and as a result of this, their hearts were filled with ineffable joy, and they offered up songs of thanks to God.

When three years had passed, the blessed Irina, having left her spouse and also her child, went to her immortal home.[12]

Thus Ivan, the patrician, saw how from her very birth [Philothea] would take no milk from her mother nor from any other woman, and he was in a state of utter bewilderment; however she was fed by means of divine Providence and flourished from the beginning.

[Her father] waited until she was six years old, and then he gave her over to the priests to learn the Divine Scriptures. And she succeeded in mastering so much learning, that she knew the entire Scriptures by heart; and everyone greatly marvelled at her, and her glory spread everywhere.

How she blossomed under abstinence, and every week she spent both Saturday and Sunday without food, during which time she would partake of communion, eating only a little bread and some lentils and also some kvass, and so she maintained the first [monastic] rule[13], listening to God's law night and day and sating her soul with the Holy Scripture.

---

10 Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit.,583, fn.6) writes: "There is no city by that name in Thrace. It is possible that what is meant here is Polivot."

11 The word used in the original text is "patrikъ", from Greek "πατρίκιος" (see also Latin "patricius").

12 A circumlocution to describe her death.

13 The "first rule" refers to the monastic rule of St. Athanasius (i.e. Athanasius of Trebizond, 920-c.1000). Athanasius in 963 organized the Great Laura (monastery) on Mount Athos, and he organized a rule (typicon) for cenobitic societies of monks, which were in turn based on a similar rule established by Basil of Caesarea and the 9th-century reformer, Theodore the Studite.

IV. Having reached the age of fourteen, she was given against her will in earthly[14] marriage. Her groom also was a nobleman and similar to Philothea in all respects, and had reached his seventeenth year. That God-pleasing woman [Philothea], seeing in truth [the situation] she was in and not wanting to be given in marriage, was greatly perplexed: by means of what craft could she preserve herself undefiled? And she offered up this attentive prayer to the Lord with all her heart and soul: "Lord God," she said, "Look down upon my humility and give me the gift of strength to maintain my purity, undefiled, until You take me." Thus she prayed this every hour and was gripped by indescribable sadness.

When the right time came, she was given to him in matrimonial bond, and they withdrew to the wedding chamber. Suddenly she fell to the ground and wept inconsolably, wetting the floor with her tears and beating her head with her fists: "Woe is me," she said, "woe is me. What [a terrible thing] I have suffered! Open your mouth, O earth, and swallow me up alive, miserable one [that I am]!"

When Constantine saw her crying inconsolably (this was the name of her groom), he lifted her up from the floor by force and asked her why she was crying unconsolably. After a while she stopped crying, having overcome her shame, she said to him: "My lord, behold, I am completely in your hands; but, if you wait and hear me out and take my advise, and if in advising you we save our souls, then we will be of benefit to others."

And he said to her, "If you want, speak, for I have put aside all doubt and fear." And the God-pleasing [Philothea] said, "In reading sacred books I found an ancient story which relates the following:

"Some young, pious girl was given to a young man in marriage. His name was Amoun and he was born a nobleman from a noble family.[15]

---

[14] The Slavonic reads literally here "plъtskomu braku", i.e."fleshly", or "corporeal marriage".

[15] W.H.C.Frend in his book *The Early Church*, Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1965, pp.203-204, gives us this description of Amoun: "[St.] Anthony had many imitators, among whom was another Copt, a close friend named Amoun. In about 320 the latter had left his wife with whom he had been living for eighteen years in a celibate union and went to the mountain of Nitria in the southwest of the Delta.

When the time came to give himself to his bride, he said to her with a soft voice and sweet manner: 'Sweet spouse, do you know the temptations of men?' She said to him: 'My Lord, I know nothing of it.' Then he said to her: 'Listen to me carefully, and I will tell you in detail everything that one can expect to happen, if we are united to one another [in marriage].

'You will afford me many troubles and yourself immeasurable grief and continual torment. In addition to these things, when you conceive in the womb, unbearable pains will take you, so that you will not be able to enjoy eating food, and your sons will be bearers of tears. And when you begin to have children again, you will be sick, you will be moaning and weeping all the time, and [your body will become] stretched out. And I will tell you in short that an unexpected death will overtake you; you will lift up your eyes and there you will not find the help of the Powerful One.

'If you have children, you will have yet countless other troubles and toil: milking, spinning, shopping, cooking, working, endless worrying over your husband, the princes, the churches, garments. And if it happens that you foolishly have a child, then your grief and the troubles concerning your [new-born] gift will be twofold. If we find ourselves gripped by poverty, then we can very much count on death from such a life.[16]

Soon a fast settlement grew up. There were upwards of 5,000 monks, each living in a separate cell. Amoun and his wife visited each other twice yearly."

The story of Amoun's wife appears in Palladius's *The Lausiac History*, edited by R.T.Meyer, Ancient Christian Writers, vol.34, Westminster,Maryland: Newman Press, 1964, chap.8, pp.41-43. For the original Greek text, see Palladius, *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, ed. by Cuthbert Butler, 2 vols., Reinheim: Georg Olms Verlangsbuchhandlung Hildesheim 1967, pp.26-29. The following passage can be recognized within the context of Euthymius's own text:

"Since [Amoun] was not able to withstand his uncle's pressure, it seemed best to him to be crowned [wedded] and to take his place in the bridal chamber, and to go through with the whole marriage ceremony. After they had all put the couple on the couch in the bridal chamber and departed, Amoun got up and closed the door. Then sitting down, he called his saintly companion to him and said to her: 'Come here, my lady, and I will explain this matter to you. The marriage which we have just gone through is not efficacious. We will do well if henceforth each of us sleeps alone so that we may please God by keeping our virginity intact.'"

16 This monologue against marriage is reminiscent of St. Gregory of Nyssa's treatise "On Virginity", especially the sub-section entitled "A reminder of the difficulties of marriage and proof that the author was not unmarried." See Gregory of Nyssa, *Saint Gregory of Nyssa: Ascetical Works*, Fathers of the Church, vol.58. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1967, pp.3-78. St.Gregory writes (p.16): "Let us assume that...the mother survives the pains of childbirth and a child is born, the very image of the springtime of his parents; what then? Is the supposition of grief lessened because of this, or is it not rather

'Thus, listen to me who am telling you good things, and let us continue to live in purity during this short life so that we can inherit the future life, from which every sadness, grief and sighing is driven away. There there is no darkness, nor stars, nor summer, nor spring, nor winter, nor heat; but all is light, all is joy. Christ is there, the Tree of Life, and all saints delight [in this Tree] for its value: that Someone cleansed themselves [for their sake]. Thus being zealous, we [should] strive to achieve these things.'

"When the bride heard this from the bridegroom [Amoun], her eyes filled with tears and she said, 'My lord, if the [people of this] world lead such lives, then I am ready to listen to you in this matter. Do what you wish, and I shall not go against your will.'

"Both [Amoun and his wife] having convinced themselves of these things, and having strengthened [their resolve] with a vow, they continued to preserve their virginity and chastity. And they lived there quite a long time like this, maintaining their mutual agreement to separate themselves immediately from the world and to live in isolation, fearing lest one of the evil and corruptible men might deceive them and set them again to passion or to the ruination of the soul through the body.

"According to the advise of the great Anthony[17], they went to the top of a mountain, the Nitria Mountain, and there, in the desert, they built a modest shack, living there many years, controlling the body with frequent genuflections, fasting and vigils.

---

increased? In addition to their earlier fears, they have added those in behalf of the child lest he encounter something unpleasant, lest some disagreable chance befall him with regard to his upbringing, some unwished-for casualty of suffering or mutiliation or danger. They are shared by both parents. But who could enumerate the special worries of the wife? I pass over the ordinary factors known to all, the discomfort of pregnancy, the risk of childbirth, the toil of educating the child, and the special heartbreak caused by a child. And if she becomes the mother of more than one, her soul is divided into as many parts as the number of her children, since she experiences in her own being whatever happens to them. What can we say to all these things we know so well?"

[17] A reference to Anthony the Great (3rd century, Egypt), whose vita has been attributed to Athanasius. Anthony is considered the founder of anchoritic monasticism. Cf. C. Mango, *Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome,* New York: Scribner, 1980, pp.105-8; J. Meyendorff, *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality,* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 1982, pp.11-17.

"The Devil, hating good, did not tolerate for long their chastity and the virtue of these divine saints, and placed lustful thoughts into [the woman's head], and she suffered much from this and was constantly exhausting herself [with fasting, prayers and vigils]. She was a wise woman, for she was Christ's bride; and when she understood the [cause] of her sufferings, she wisely and thoughtfully told the blessed Amoun about it and begged him to make a little separate place for her in the hut. He fulfilled her request. And so it was for all of eighteen years, [they lived] preserving their purity and chastity.

"When a little time had passed, the blessed woman fell asleep with a blessed sleep and went to Christ[18]; and desiring [the Lord], she went off to [meet] Him. The virtuous Amoun, himself a dwelling place of the Holy Spirit[19], lived a few days more, and then came to the end of his life; and Anthony the Great saw the angels carrying his soul to heaven on the very day [that it happened] from a distance that would have taken fifteen days to travel.[20]

"And many other such lives were presented [in the books I read], and if we be imitators of [such holy lives], we will receive a gift such as theirs. Thus now, if my advise be pleasing to you, my lord and husband, let us then live in chastity, preserving our bodies undefiled, for momentary pleasure can in no way benefit us. Even if we live long lives, we must

---

18 A circumlocution to describe her death.

19 See 1 Cor 6.19.

20 In chapter 60 of *The Life of Anthony*, Anthony witnesses Amoun's ascent into heaven. For the Greek text of this passage, see *Patrologia Græca*, edited by J.-P.Migne, vol. 26, pp.929-932. An English translation of this passage is found in *Early Christian Biographies*, The Fathers of the Church, no.15, edited by R.J. Deferrari, New York: Fathers of the Church, 1952, pp.188-189. It reads: "On another occasion, also, as [Anthony] was sitting on the mountain, he looked up and saw one being borne along in the air, and there was great rejoicing among all who met him...Immediately, a voice came to him that this was the soul of the monk Amun in Nitria, who had persevered as an ascetic until old age. Now, the distance from Nitria to the mountain where Anthony was is thirteen days' journey...The monks to whom Anthony spoke of Amun's death noted the day, and when, thirty days later, the brethren came from Nitria, they inquired and learned from them that Amun had fallen asleep on the day and hour when the old man [Anthony] had seen his soul carried upward. Both they themselves and the others wondered at the purity of Anthony's soul, that he should learn at once what had happened at a distance of thirteen days' journey, and should see the soul being led heavenward."

return again to dust. Henceforth let us live in God's passion and we will receive the riches prepared [for us] with all God-fearing people."

And when Constantine had heard his bride's [words], he took his turn to speak, and said to her: "If I believed what you say to be the truth, I would gladly do it, but I fear lest it be some devilish deceit, and we would not be able to rid ourselves of the disgrace."

She then immediately answered: "The Righteous Judge, whom it pleases to judge the living and the dead, is [my witness] that I have told you the truth, and even till death will I maintain my body undefiled, until I meet the darkness of death." When he believed that he had been told the truth, he immediately resigned himself to her advise, and fortifying themselves with vows, they abode thenceforth in purity and chastity.

V. When a little time had passed, Constantine was chosen for the office of the clergy. A few days later, the blessed Philothea's father died. And they abode in all of God's commandments, feeding the poor, clothing the naked, remaining in the church day and night. And everyone imitated [them] and profited much from [the example of] their lives. And they lived under such circumstances for six years, and then Constantine came to the end of this life.

The blessed Philothea, when she saw her husband go to the Lord[21], made all the funeral arrangements in good order, and she sent up to God songs of thanksgiving. And when the time was right, she freed all the male and female slaves [belonging to her family's estate] and distributed the remainder of their property and riches amongst the poor and the poverty-stricken, according to that which has been said: "Distribute and give to the poor, and your righteousness will endure forever."[22] And having spread much of the wealth also amongst the holy churches and monasteries, she adorned them considerably. And taking one of the female slaves with her, she then left her home.

---

21 A circumlocution to describe his death.

22 See Ps 112.9.

VI. There is a lake near the city of Molivot, and there is an island in the middle of it, and there she went and made a small cell, and lived there, ridding herself of all turmoil, maintaining fasting and vigils and prostrations. And she zealously roused herself to such passion [through abstinence of food], that her skin was sticking to her bones.

Now the Devil hating good, would not tolerate for long to leave her untempted, but sent various troops [of devils] against her, plaguing her heart at times with terrifying things, at other times with various tortures; and at times he would frighten her, appearing as a serpent, and at other times as a beast. She kept that verse from the Psalms on her lips: "Depart from me, all you workers of evil."[23]

One of the nights, having stood up for prayer, as was her habit, and extending her hands toward heaven, the whole place suddenly began to quiver, and she heard cries and commotion from outside, as if the emperor himself had arrived. And some men tried to remove the door, and others started to tear down her hut. [And she heard them say], "Take her quickly and throw her in the lake."

The pious Philothea, understanding this to be work of the Devil, began to pray and offered up yet another prayer: "Jesus Christ", she said, "the only-begotten Word of the Father, it pleased You to become incarnate [through the flesh] of a woman, [the Virgin Mary], so that You could purify the sin of woman; indeed, you took your flesh from the pure Virgin and Mother of God. Look down on me, Your humble servant, who because of You has isolated herself. The Enemy, the originator of evil, like some lion on the prowl, wants to swallow me up.[24] Usually he pursues the female sex and always brings great shame upon women. But You, who have taken Your nature from the Virgin Mary, who shone forth with indescribable radiance, and You who have taken away the shame of woman, help me now, Your humble [servant], so that the Devil himself will suffer shame

---

[23] Ps 6.8 (Slavonic Psalter,6.9).

[24] See 1 Pet 5.8 ("Be sober, be watchful. Your adversary the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking some one to devour"); and also the *Life of Anthony* ("Neither did the Enemy cease laying snares...for again he went about like a lion", chap.7, 141).

and so that all his evil power will be destroyed, for You are praised forever and ever, Amen."

So she made the sign of the cross, and all of a sudden all these dreams disappeared. She sang and praised God without ceasing till the morning hour, and she added accomplishment unto accomplishment and placed constantly the ascents in her heart.[25]

How can I tell of her spring of tears, her constant sighing, her beautiful quietude[26], her constant prayer, frequent kneeling, her endless stoicism[27], her love for God, her angelic life, and such things which she showed in divine love?

VII. Living in this manner, she spent her life in an incorporeal body. It did not please God to conceal for long such a life as hers; and [people] in the surrounding areas were proclaiming her life, and her glory spread throughout the land, and through her God was praised. Many of the pious people came to her and they were strengthened by her divine words.

At that time the Hellenic deception[28] was very strongly upheld everywhere, and the Devil's schools were always full of fire and smoke.[29]

---

25 The "ascent" which Philothea places in her heart refers to her observance of the steps prescribed by John Climacus in his work "The Ladder."

26 The word used in the original is "mlъčanie", which, along with the Slavonic "bezmlъvie/ bezmъlvie, is a translation of the Greek "ἡσυχία" (see Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, 203), or "quietude, silence"; thus, what Euthymius is referring to is her practice of the contemplative discipline of the Hesychasts.

27 The term used in the original Slavonic is "bestrastie", from the Greek "ἀπάθεια", which means "insensibility, freedom from emotion, immunity" (Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 1940; reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989, p.174)

28 This refers to the social debate in Byzantium that began as early the 9th century and continued into the 14th century, with a particular resurgence during the so-called Palaeologan Renaissance of the 13th century, of the place of the knowledge of Classical antiquities (the Outer Learning) alongside with Christian theology (the Inner Learning).

There had begun in Byzantium, around the 9th century, an active revival of classical literature and philosophy. This movement sought in form and content the "re-establishment of contact with classical, non-Christian past" (R. Browning, *Byzantium and Bulgaria, A Comparative Study Across The Early Medieval Frontier*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975, p.172), that is a way of combining secular knowledge with Christian knowledge. Another faction of Byzantine society, however, rejected the "Christian-Classical synthesis". Browning says, "For them, the adoption of Christianity meant the rejection of the pagan, classical part."

And a great multitudes of monks were married, and the believers greatly faltered in storms [of deceit] and confusion. Philothea heard it said that these things were happening every day, and she was wounded by bitter grief; and she instructed in the Holy Scriptures all who came to her, and she advised them to rout out completely this Hellenic deception.

Having acquired the gift of healing, many people afflicted with disease and many lepers were cured by her. She had learned the content of the Holy Scriptures completely, and she feared God and led everyone to a knowledge of God, just as by nature a magnet draws iron.

Some woman, gripped by some awful disease, came to her. Her breasts were completely ravished by this illness, and she had given quite a fortune to doctors, but for naught. But when the one who loves God, Philothea, when she saw [this woman] suffering so, her heart was deeply wounded, and she took pity on her. Suddenly she turned to prayer, and she poured forth a spring of tears: "God," she said,"Ruler of all[30], have mercy on your creation and do not leave her to be tortured long." And having taken some oil from the incense burner of the Mother of God, she rubbed [it on] both of the breasts of the woman, and with her hand she made the sign of the cross over them. And in no time, she sent her home, completely healed.

During the Palaeologan Renaissance of the 13th century, which began after the retaking of Constantinople from the Latins, the debate of the extent to which a student could delve into the pagan, classical past while not jeopardizing his faith was resumed. See S. Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970, pp.22-29.

This debate, however, came to a climax during the 14th century, particularly after the Scholasticism of the West had fostered an environment the Roman Church was now not opposed to: the marriage of Christian faith and a knowledge of classical scholarship. Ironically, in Byzantium, on the very soil on which the masterpieces of classical Greek literature and philosphy were produced, there was a conservative approach to the mixing of the study of the ancient pagans with Christianity. See Meyendorff, "Les débuts de la controverse hésychaste," p.89.

29 See *The Life of Anthony*, chapter 42: "Then we shall see the antics of the demons to be like smoke."

30 The word used in the original Slavonic text is "vъsedrъžitelь", from the Greek "παντοκράτωρ".

When some time had passed, word of this miracle spread, and some man, whose name was Euthymius and whose leg[31] was infected, came to the saint on the island to receive healing. When the blessed one, Philothea, saw him, she asked the sick man what was the purpose of his visit. He then showed the ulcer on his leg, and he lowered his gracious voice and he poured forth tears from his eyes. Then the good woman, Philothea, asked him the same thing that Christ had once asked a sick man: "Do you want to be healed?"[32] He then immediately answered: "I want to be, my lady, I very much want to be; have pity on me, a poor man; for I believe, that if you ask for things, God will grant them to you." And she said to him: "This which you suffer, you suffer because of your own tongue. [Your tongue] was given to you by God for worshipping and praising Him, but you use it for idle talk, for pleasure and for vile words. Give me your word that you will not dare to do such things to Him, and also that you will renounce the Hellenic myths, and their service and the thought of those hostile words, and the thought of those things which are damaging to the mind, and immediately my Lord will make you whole."

He immediately did joyfully what was demanded of him, and he gave his word that he would never dare to do such things against [the Lord] again. Suddenly the saint, Philothea, touching his leg, called out the blessed name of Christ, and in a few days she sent him home completely well; and he was overjoyed and was praising God and giving thanks to Him. And when news of this miracle had spread everywhere, everyone glorified God and offered up praises. The blessed Philothea in no way attempted to take credit for such miracles, but she was forever mindful of the words of David and those too of the Holy Spirit: "Not to us" she said, "not to us, but to thy name give glory."[33] And she soaked her bed with her endless

---

31 In Slavonic, "noga" can mean both "leg" and "foot". See the story of Asa, 2 Cor 16.12.

32 A quotation from Jn 5.6. The original text reads "Хošteši li zdravъ byti". Compare with the Codex Zographensis (Jagić,143): "хošteši li živъ byti"; and the Codex Assemanianus (Kurz, 28): "хošteši li cěl bъiti".

33 Ps 115. 1.

tears[34]; and there passed before her eyes [a vision] of the Last Judgment, of the incorruptible Judge and the merciless angels, and of those [dwelling] places of tortures and shame which will consume the sinful. And bitter and final is [God's] response: "Depart from me, you cursed!"[35]; and from her loud groaning, she forgot to eat her bread.[36]

VIII. She had already been living and conducting her life this way for quite a long time when she [understood that the time had come for] her departure from this world. And, as usual with her, she had great concern for the church dogmas, and she judged and understood things well, having been taught by the Holy Spirit; and throughout her life she fortified the Church [by following] the commandments.

Thus so as not upon her death to leave the church without [imparting her thoughts], she called together the entire church clergy, and she said to them these sacred and mellifluous words: "The time," she said "of my departure is come, and it is right that I should remind you of the Orthodox faith which has been handed down and established by the Holy Apostles and from the Church Fathers; for just as it is impossible for the blind to walk straight, so it is impossible to live without observing piety according to the will of God. Know that faith is the pious leader of our lives. The apostles strove zealously for faith, suffering various forms of death for our sake in order to hand down [the faith to us], pure and unblemished. Thus, with all awe and trembling, you ought to preserve and maintain and observe the Church's tradition pure and unblemished, which is unchanging [and constant]; and not to let yourselves be carried off here and there by different winds. For if the Enemy can use our lives to spread evil and unclean Hellenism, then he makes gains in destroying our Orthodox faith. But our Lord, Jesus Christ, who spilled his blood for us, will not leave his Church to decay in the end, but will render help, and he will lead the court to victory. For I, a wretched poor person, was raised from my youth in

---

[34] Ivanova, (Иванова, op.cit., 584, fn.20) cites here Slav.Ps 6.7 (RSV Ps 6.7).

[35] Mt 25.41

[36] See Ps 102.4-5: "My heart is smitten like grass, and withered; I forget to eat my bread. Because of my loud groaning my bones cleave to my flesh."

piety, and I received this piety from my parents like some priceless treasure.

"And I pray to your blessed leader not to forget the bequest of the holy prophets and the apostles. The great apostle Paul wrote to Timothy: 'Child, Timothy, those things which you heard from me, tell these things to faithful men, who will then be satisfied and teach others.'[37] For it behooves you to adhere to the correct faith and not to pay attention to any Hellenic deceptions. If they insult us by the thousands, and if by the thousands they revile us, still no lie will be able to conquer the truth, nor can evil bring an end to wisdom.

"They [the Greeks] introduced the name of God into images of men and dogs which they made with wood and stone. Oh what blasphemy! And being in no way ashamed for this and thinking that creation itself was their [handy work], they exercised their impiety and wisdom under evil [influences], not understanding the inconceivable, how everything was brought into being from non-being by the one and true God, who created heaven and earth and all things visible and invisible.[38]

"The gods thus who did not create the heaven and earth will indeed perish[39], as will all those who created them and all who put their faith in them. In this way the Hellenes pursue vanity, and their hearts, which understand not, have been cast into darkness. They, thinking themselves to be wise, lack understanding; they exchange the glory of the one God for the likenesses of four-legged reptiles and birds.[40] And these miserable [pagans] look around, [wondering] where the heavenly and earthly [creatures] came from: the things in the air and things in the waters; and, moreover, those things that existed even before these other things: the heavens and the earth and the air and the nature of the waters. Who mixed

---

[37] Ivanova, (Иванова, op.cit.,584, fn.23) cites here 2 Tim 2.2.

[38] Col 1.15-16

[39] Ivanova, op.cit.,584, fn.24, cites here Jer 10:11 ("Thus shall you say to them: 'The gods who did not make the heavens and the earth shall perish from the earth and from under the heavens'"). See also Ps 135.15-18.

[40] See Rom 1.22-23 ("Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles").

them and divided them? What relation do these things have to one another, what [is their] hierarchy and harmony? Who moves and controls these elements? What is the nature of the phenomenon that caused contrary elements to join together without disaster to form one world? How did [these elements] harmonize, and how do they harmonize now, [considering that] they cannot take counsel?

All these things are the thoughts of God. And [the Greeks], having abandoned the Creator, honor and serve creatures[41], and in vain they make fun of the Maker, not knowing the truth of our pious faith and the piety which the Christians maintain.[42] But [the Greeks] heap on them unmerciful tortures, rejecting those who have need of the sweet name of Christ. Do not heed their threats -- even if they lead [you] to the wheel, or the kettles, or the sword, or the fire, do not be afraid of them. Another life awaits us, another epoch, where we will not grow old, where the prophets sing together, where the apostles rejoice together, where groups of venerable monks dwell with the angels, with the archangels, with the martyrs and with all the saints.

"Think of this constantly, write these things in your hearts, heed yourself and the whole flock of which God has made you shepherd and teacher, in order that you and they may preserve yourselves pure and chaste.[43] Everything of this world which is beautiful and beloved will return to dust and will be gone without a trace; virtue alone will abide, enduring for centuries upon centuries. Hasten to keep yourselves pure and lead the flock which has been entrusted to you to life-giving pastures, so that the Lord, seeing your zeal in all matters, will reward your labors with a befitting reward and confer His kingdom."

IX. When she had said these things to all the clergy and fortified their hearts, she sent them home and commanded them to come back on the fourth day. The venerable Philothea, locking herself up in her cell, lived

---

[41] See Rom 1.25

[42] Actually, Rom 1.32 states: "Though they know God's decree that those who do such things deserve to die, they not only do them but approve those who practice them."

[43] Ivanova, (Иванова, op.cit., 584, fn.28) cites here Acts 20.28.

four days, eating no food, but spent these days [keeping] vigils, [shedding] tears, and [praying] with frequent genuflections.

On the fourth day, as stated above, all of the church staff came to her and delighted in her usual instruction. And having taught them well, she led them all to fear God in their hearts. When she had fallen asleep that night, she understood that the hour of her departure was nigh; she beckoned everyone to pray [with her]. She said, "The time for my departure is come[44], and it behooves you to labor with me a while. I hope, as you know, through your prayers to receive mercy on that day of the Last Judgement, in that terrible hour." And she said many other things like this to the holy clergy.

When they heard these things, their hearts were deeply wounded, and they let forth a wailing cry to the heavens. There was much praying and weeping. The venerable one, Philothea, gave a sign with her hand, bade them cease their unconsolable weeping: "My rulers and lords," she said, "do not upset my soul, for I am with you still and I will spend this time with you, as much as pleases the Lord. So be with me a while, and offer up prayers to God for me."

They, hardly containing their sobbing, all turned to prayer, and in one voice they offered up hymns for her. While they were singing, she gave her soul over to the Lord. And they grieved over from this unexpected event; weeping suddenly interrupted their singing, and great were their sobbing and wailing; and weeping voices filled the air. Everyone around, seeing this, gathered together and cried over their common loss.

They reverently laid out the body of the venerable Philothea and honored her in the utmost decorum with a funeral service; and they placed her in the cathedral of the Immaculate Mother of God, which was called the Church of Saint Sofia, and she worked wonderful and glorious miracles, which are so numerous that were we to begin to tell [of them] in detail, it would take me a year to relate them. Well, so that we should not make this story unnecessarily long, we will tell about some [of her

---

[44] 2 Tim 4. 6.

miracles] in brief; and you will gain enough understanding from these to believe completely the other [miracles which I have not related here].

X. Someone named Naucratius, a famous and glorious man, from the city of Amoria, was stationed as an officer[45] in Greece by the man who held the royal scepter[46] at the time. And it happened that he fought with the heretics, the Agars.[47] When the two factions began their battle -- by what divine fate I know not! -- he and his entire host were defeated; and some were killed and others were taken and brought to Sikelia. With them was taken also a military commander[48], whose name was Artavan, from the city of Philomilia. And having been taken away by these heretics, they were locked up in a dark dungeon and with were guarded with great caution along with everyone else. They were held there and were completely perplexed as to what to do and what to think. And they were seized with immeasurable grief, and they called on the all-powerful God and His eternal saints for help.

Artavan, preserving the memory of Saint Philothea, started to tell them about the glorious miracles of this blessed woman, and how people received the gift of healing for every disease and various sicknesses. When he heard these things, the heart of the war commander was emblazed, and he called upon her help with all his heart. When he was filled with divine desire and fired up with burning faith, he could not bare to hide this for long; and standing up, he immediately and zealously urged everyone to pray, pouring forth tears and crying forth a river of tears from his eyes.

They all, with a sincere heart, hastened to prayer together and called upon the God-loving Philothea for help: "Eternal servant of God," they said, "undefiled bride, pure innocent creature[49], dwelling place of the Holy

---

45 The word used in the original text is "voevoda".

46 A circumlocution for "ruling the country", i.e. the Byzantine emperor.

47 i.e., the Arabs.

48 The word used in the original text is "stratilatъ", a slavonicized form of the Greek "στρατηλάτης".

49 The word used in the original Slavonic is "golubica", literally "dove."

Spirit, lover of Christ, turtle-dove of the desert, if you are looking, gaze down upon us humble and desperate people, and free us from this dark prison. We will be the trumpets [that proclaim] your innumerable miracles. We will tell of them with a booming voice, and henceforth we will live chastely and purely all our lives. Oh, venerable mother, do not despise us, we who live in all this bitterness and poverty. And everyone spent the whole night [saying] prayers, letting warm tears fall and weeping from their heart. And when they had finished their all-night vigil and ceased praying, they lay down to relax and give their body some rest in sleep.

When they were seized with sleep and each lay in his place, the venerable Philothea appeared to them and made their hearts happy with these soothing words: "Your prayer was heard," she said, "and God does not hold your lamentation in contempt. Henceforth go in peace, and when you have reached your homes safely, attentively offer up prayers to God, who leads forth with courage those [bound] in shackles."

They were thus moved with joy, and when they saw their iron [shackles] lying there unfastened, and seeing the prison [door] completely opened, they believed these things to be true visions. And immediately they left the unlocked prison and the prison guards, who lay there as if dead, and they took flight. But they did not go home first, but rather they went to Philothea's island and gave befitting thanks to her. When each had said sufficient [prayers of thanks], they went to their homes and told everyone about the glorious miracles of the venerable Philothea.

XI. Thus [news] of these things spread, and everyone heard the stories. Some leper, when he had heard these things, was filled with faith and burning zeal, and he went in haste to the church of the venerable mother [Philothea], and he was moved to prayers and prostrated himself [so that he might receive] holy mercy. And he spent many sleepless nights, exhausting himself with fasting and suffering; and he sat there without leaving the holy cathedral. The blessed [Philothea], when she saw how he stayed there diligently for a long time, in no time freed his body completely of leprosy. He immediately knelt down for mercy, and then the ecclesiarch of the cathedral appeared in a dream, and commanded him to anoint himself with oil from the holy incense of the pure Mother of God all over his body. He then, when he had woken up from his dream, did what he was commanded

to do in great haste. And after a few days, he was sent home, completely healthy; and [the man] praised and gave thanks to God and to His saint, Philothea.

XII. Much time having passed and many miracles having been worked, the Greek empire had become extremely weakened, and those holding the scepter were beleaguered. The Romans having found the right time, ruthlessly attacked them, reducing the Greek power to unbearable destitution.[50]

At that same time, the Bulgarian kingdom was very solid and strong, and [Bulgaria] was seizing all the surrounding lands and conquering them. At that time [in Bulgaria], the royal scepter was being held by the pious and glorious Tsar Kalojan.[51] And he seeing the Greek empire completely weakened, courageously rose up against it, capturing and destroying many cities and villages. And all objects there of beauty he took and transported back to his glorious city of Trnovo, transplanting all the [captive] people and even the cattle to his kingdom.

While transferring all these [things and people from Byzantium to Bulgaria], he heard of the miracles of the venerable Philothea, and a great flame stirred within his heart. And the souls of the God-loving people became accustomed to pursuing virtue and displaying zeal. When [Kalojan] had conquered the whole country, and built it according to his command, he came to the place where the body of the venerable [Philothea] lay, and he was filled with ineffable joy, offering up to God praise and attentive thanksgiving. He fell before the relics of the pure venerable Philothea, and he poured forth many tears, and he sincerely and piously kissed the relics. And [Kalojan] commanded that there be an all-night vigil, and he gave [generously] to the poor and to the destitute.

---

50 This refers to the taking of Constantinople by the Romans of the Fourth Crusade on April 13, 1204, which was the disastrous result of growing tensions between Rome and Byzantium. Cf. J. Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans, A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Empire,* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987, pp.60-63; and S. Runciman, op.cit., 105.

51 Bulgarian tsar from 1197 to 1207; he succeeded Asen and Peter who had led a successful revolt against Byzantine rule and restored to Bulgaria its independence, forming the so-called "Втората държава", or "Second Empire". For other references by Euthymius to Tsar Kalojan see fn. 157 to the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena.*

In the morning, after the service was performed, the tsar was overjoyed and very delighted, and so too was his entire host [of soliders]. And thus having taken divine counsel, [the tsar decided] to bring the body of the venerable Philothea to his kindgom. However, he was pleased to have this idea and he deigned to have his princes and keepers appear to carry out the task. When they heard the tsar [state his decision], they opened their mouths in unison [to say]: "The heart of the king is in the hand of God.[52] Carry out, oh Tsar, what you have in mind to do, for we believe that if we carry out this task, our souls will profit greatly; not only this, but also our land and our city will benefit from this great benefaction."

XIII. After a few days, Tsar [Kalojan] commanded the body of the venerable [Philothea] to be brought to the glorious city of Trnovo with honor and reverence. Three hundred chosen soldiers were placed there, and Theodore was commanding them, a reverent and honest man, pious and faithful like no other, brave in war and tall in stature. He had, however, a white film on his left eye for many years[53], and had given much of his property to doctors, but received no help whatsoever [from them]. When he had received the final answer from the tsar and had collected the host [of soldiers] together, [Theodore] went immediately to the relics of the saint and, kissing them ardently, he poured forth tearful drops from his eyes, and begged to receive mercy on his damaged eye.

The fire of faith burning within him, [Theodore] took the left hand of the saint and put it on his eye. And oh what a miracle! All of a sudden the white film on his eye disappeared and he saw clearly with clean eyes, and he rejoiced in exceeding great joy over his glorious sight. And when [news of] this miracle spread, everyone praised God and the venerable Philothea.

Theodore with the entire host, honorably took the relics of the God-loving Philothea, and he went along his way, being joyful and singing

---

52 See Prov 21.1.

53 The word used in the original Slavonic is "belьmo", which translates as Latin "albugo".

praises, just as Father of God had at some time before the shrine.[54] And then God revealed many and various healings in the translation of her relics to believers who accept them with faith and strive for virtue. But it is impossible to tell of these healings in detail [because they are so numerous].

XIV. When [Tsar Kalojan and his retinue] began to approach Trnovo, the patriarch saw them and summoned together the entire church clergy, and he went out to meet them with all the people, with candles and sweet-smelling incense and myrrh; and he piously kissed the pure relics of the venerable one; and with heart-felt zeal, he cried forth tears. And in the grief of his heart, he said these joyful words:

"Sincere servant of Christ, O virtuous home, dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, desert-dweller, you who live with the wise virgins, bride of Christ, turtle-dove of the desert, O you of a gilded soul, how did you fly from the east and to reach even us humble people? Welcome to our land, and do not merely visit us, but live forever with us and teach the ignorant to follow your divine path and to strive to imitate your God-given purity. You have put your body here as an assurance [to us], and your soul delights in heavenly beauty, not with mirrors and divination, but face to face you see your Bridegroom[55], sweet Jesus, Jesus your Lover, for whom you have prepared yourself, and were not ashamed; you do not speak to Him plaintively but as if to your own kin, and you carry prayers to Him on our behalf. Pray thus constantly for us, your flock, that our lives should progress peacefully to piety and truth. Do not become impoverished visiting us, watching, acting, helping, teaching, protecting [us] from hostile slander; for we believe that the things that you ask of God, He will grant. We are thankful for you, and we rejoice in you, that you, our defender, have saved the throng."

And immediately they took the body, carried it into the glorious city of Trnovo and placed it in the church of the Immaculate Mother of God,

---

[54] Ivanova (Иванова, op.cit.,584, fn.37) writes: "The father of God [bogootec] refers to David, who dances before the shrine of the Testament in order to honor God (See 2 [Sam] 6.14)."

[55] 1 Cor 13.12.

the true Mother of God, Mary the Perpetual Virgin, called the Church of Temnishka[56], where it rests up to this very day[57]; and her body works wondrous and glorious miracles, which are innumerable, and everyone comes to her with faith and love.

XV. Thus, this is the life of our venerable mother, these are the miracles of the chaste bride of Christ, who immediately roused herself zealously to fasting and vigils and prayers and tears and other sufferings. She will forever and ever rejoice with ineffable joy where there are pure voices of her celebrants, where there is praise of God, where everything is light, where there is no grief nor lamentation.

Though she lives on this earth only in body, now her soul, however, rejoices in heaven. Now she delights in those things that the human mind cannot express, that the human eye cannot see[58], and the ear of the lazy man cannot hear and which does not enter the mind of man. But God has prepared these things for those who love him. And she sees these things, considers these things, and she hastens [to help us], having ridden herself of an earthly death.

The branch of a noble root brought forth countless fruits of various virtues; and with wise maidens [she] entered the heavenly mansion, and there she now rejoices in spirit, having left her body to us on the earth, just as Elijah at one time left his sheepskin to Elisha.[59] Not only this, but also today, with her spirit, she stands amongst us, giving in return for our labors sufficient recompense and forgiveness to all the faithful [people], healing diseases, cleansing lepers, chasing away devils, driving away all slander [uttered by] our Enemy and all machinations of the Evil One; and

---

56 See fn.4.

57 Apparently the relics of Philothea were brought back to Vidin from Trnovo in 1394 (the year after Trnovo fell to the Ottomans) by Joseph of Vidin, one of Euthymius's pupils who became appointed Metropolitan of Vidin in 1392. See Moser, *A History of Bulgarian Literature*, 29.

58 See 1 Cor 2. 9.

59 See 2 Kings 2.14-15.

preserving our city unharmed and watching over the tsar in piety and harmony.

Oh you nuns [of Temnishka], strive to imitate this good mother, and you who live in the desert, young, middle-aged and old alike. Lead a pure and chaste maidenhood, praying constantly and maintaining proper zeal from a pure heart. For the sake of this, renounce all uncleanliness. Give over your souls [to the Lord], and with the blessed Philothea enter the heavenly mansion, which God has prepared for those who love Him, which we will all receive, thanks to the love that our Lord Jesus Christ had for man; and to [Christ] is the glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit now and always, forever and ever, Amen.

Section III

Style and Structure of the Vitæ: Word-Weaving Redefined and the Establishment of Narrative Patterns

Chapter 1:
The Legacy of Classical Rhetoric in Medieval Byzantium & the Origins and the Redefinition of "Word Weaving"

> The history of art abounds in "renaissances" -- in a rebirth of poetic languages of the past--which are then perceived as being innovative.[1]
> -- *Lotman*

This section will examine the saints' lives by Euthymius on the levels of style and structure. By style, we mean Euthymius' use of rhetoric, which rhetorical devices--linguistic and poetic--Euthymius uses and how he uses them. By structure, we mean the organizing principles by which Euthymius constructs a narrative for the vitæ. Chapter 2 of Section IV will examine the content of the Euthymian saints' lives and its connection with Hesychasm. With the findings from these three levels of consideration, we will be able to determine which elements, if any, of Euthymius' hagiographic works can be considered original or innovative.

This first chapter aims to redefine the style that we now refer to as "word-weaving," a necessary step to any study on Euthymius, as much of the scholarship that deals with him attributes to him the innovation of a hagiographic style, referred to as "плетение словес" ("pletenie sloves"), or the weaving or plaiting of words. Before we attempt this, it is helpful first to take a cursory glance at the development of Byzantine rhetoric, as this is the tradition out of which Euthymius' own hagiographic works evolved. Because we are concerned with Euthymius' own use of rhetorical devices and methods, it is appropriate to trace in brief the development of the theoretical and practical approaches to rhetoric which medieval Byzantium inherited.

---

[1] Ю.Лотман, *Структура художественного текста,* 1970; reprint, Brown University Slavic Reprint Series, no.9. Providence: Brown University Press, 1971, p.24: "История искусств изобилует "ренессансами"--возрождением художественных языков прошлого, воспринимаемых как новаторские."

Classical Rhetoric and Its Byzantine Reflections:

During the period spanning the sixth to the second century B.C., Greece underwent a period of rapid cultural development. During this period, as described by Kennedy, there arose for the first time in Greece a new intellectual discipline: to theorize about rhetoric and to find ways to describe in words a tradition of oral rhetoric that was already centuries old. Kennedy refers to this as the process of the "conceptualization" of rhetoric.[2]

Of course, even in the ancient, pre-literary period, it must have been obvious to people that language could be used for various and differing social functions, such as the public oration, on the one hand, and the recitation of Homeric epics, on the other; but there is no attestation of abstract thinking about rhetoric until the period under discussion.

Briefly stated, there arose during this period three different schools of rhetoric: the technical, the Sophistic, and the philosophical rhetoric. The technical rhetoric, largely associated with jurisprudence and civic oration, was to have a large influence on the development of rhetorical theory in the Latin West; whereas, the Sophistic rhetoric was to have a much greater influence in the East.[3]

Sophistic rhetors, such as Isocrates and Gorgias (both fifth century B.C.)[4] left a permanent stamp on the secular and Christian rhetoric of middle and late Byzantium. Under their influence, long, complex

---

[2] See G.Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980; pp.6-8, and 15-16. Kennedy states (p.7) that only the Greco-Roman tradition conceptualized rhetoric to the point that it did; and this development was concurrent "with the rise of Greek philosophy and other forms of conceptualization in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C."

[3] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 16-17. Mulić has acknowledged the importance of Isocrates on the developments in the "pletenie sloves" style. See M. Mulić, "Srpsko 'pletenije sloves' do 14 stoljeća," *Radovi zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 5 (1963): 117-29, p.127; and "Сербские агиографы XIII-XIV вв. и особенности их стиля," *ТОДРЛ* 23 (1968): 127-142, p.140.

[4] For some general information on both, see Богдан Богданов, Анна Николова, *Антична литература: енциклопедичен справечник*, София: Държавно издателство "Д-р Петър Берон," 1988, pp. 78-79 and 51, respectively.

constructions with several dependent clauses and antithetical statements became the sought-after style.[5]

During the intellectual movement of the Second Sophistic[6] there was a significant rise in this already strong tendency to conceptualize rhetoric and to make distinctions of genres. The oration, an ancient, pre-literary genre, was broken down into different sub-genres in the hands of the rhetors of the Second Sophistic, and the categorization of the sub-genres was determined by the social function of the oration: there was an oration that was delivered at festivals (panegyric[7]), orations on the occasion of weddings (gamelian), birthdays (genethliac), funerals (epitaphios), and addresses to rulers (prosphonetic).[8] All of these epideictic (occasional)[9] forms of the Second Sophistic had in common certain structural features; for example, they all contained a section of praise (ἐγκώμιον) and a section of reproach or blame (ψόγος).[10]

In the early centuries of Christianity, the Second Sophistic passed on to the Patristic writers the legacy of classical rhetoric that it had preserved and elaborated. Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom

---

5 Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 29-36.

6 For general discussions on the movement, cf. G. Kustas, "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric," *Viator* I (1970): 55-73, esp. pp. 55-57; and Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 39-40.

7 Evidence that the panegyric (a sub-genre of the epideictic genre) comprised a part of the most basic curriculum is found in Theophylact's *Life of Kliment of Oxrid*. He comments in bewilderment that in the Bulgarian tongue, before the period of Byzantine religious and literary influence, "there were not even panegyrics" (XXII.65 [sic.66],118 = "ὡς μὴ ὄντος Βουλγάρων γλώσσῃ πανηγυρικοῦ λόγου" [XXII.66, 132,lines 4-5]).

8 Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 39. Cf. also George Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983, pp.23-26; and T.C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902): 166-194.

9 "Epideictic" is one of the categories of rhetoric devised by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric*. It is the only category of rhetoric in which the listener is not in the position of acting as a judge and is, therefore in Aristotle's opinion, less satisfactory than the other forms of rhetoric in which the listener is acting in such a capacity. The other two are judicial rhetoric (in which the listener is judging past events) and deliberative rhetoric (in which the listener is judging future events). See Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 72-73.

10 See Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 39; and Kustas, op.cit., 58.

took from the Second Sophistic the literary forms through which they expressed their chosen Christian content.[11] For example, the encomium (ἐγκώμιον) --as we have seen, originally one formulaic component of the Sophistic orations--was borrowed for sermons written about the Eastern bishops and for martyriæ[12], stories about the martyrdom of Christians. Delehaye asserts that it was in the works of these early Christian writers that we can study "if not the first panegyrics specifically on the death of martyrs then at least those which definitively solidified the laws for a new branch of the epideictic genre."[13] He summarizes that it was through these men that "profane art was adapted for the service of the Church."[14] Of the early Christian writers, Previale writes that they "strongly influenced the enormous hagiographic production in its two sub-species, the ἐγκώμιον and the βίος καὶ πολιτεία."[15]

Once the classical form of the encomium was applied to martyria, applying this form to the saint's life was a small step away. Alissandratos points out that one of the ways in which the classical encomium entered Byzantine hagiography was through the martyria.[16] Kustas recognizes three forms in which the encomium was transmitted to the Christian world: 1) in its traditional, pagan form; 2) with the main structure retained but applied to Christian models; and 3) in the form of martyriæ, sermons and hymns. He writes:

---

[11] See Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 39; and Kustas, op.cit., 59.

[12] J.Alissandratos, *Medieval Slavic and Patristic Eulogies*, Studia Historica et Philologica No. 14, Sectio Slavica, Florence: Le Lettere, 1982, p.8.

[13] H. Delehaye, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, Brusells: Bureaux de la Société Bollandistes, 1921, p.184.

[14] ibid.,190.

[15] L. Previale, "Teoria e prassi del panegirico bizantino," *Emerita: Boletin de linguistica y filologia clasica* 17 (Madrid, 1949):72-105; reprint, Schmidt Periodical, 1989, p.87.
For a discussion on the difference between the two sub-species, see K.Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur: von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)*, Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung, vol.9.1. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Oskar Beck, 1897, pp.176-206.

[16] Alissandratos, op.cit., 8.

> The third is more useful, for it uses the resources of the encomium to guide and adorn other forms of literature. One thinks of the panegyrics composed by the Cappadocians and later Fathers in honor of Christian martyrs; the catalogues of praise that are a vital ingredient of the saints' lives...and, not least commonly, the praise of the Lord of Heaven and other persons of the Christian pantheon through homily or hymn.[17]

The early Christian writers were employing the genres and rhetorical forms that they learned through the Second Sophistic, and the conceptualizing tendency continued to flourish on Byzantine soil. The treatises of rhetors of the Second Sophistic, such as Hermogenes (2nd-3rd cc., A.D.), Menander of Laodicea (3rd century, A.D.) and Aphthonius of Antioch (4th-5th cc.,A.D.) formed, along with the writings of other theorists of their day, the basis of late Byzantine theories on the subject of rhetoric, and these writings made up the basis of the medieval Byzantine school curriculum for the teaching of rhetoric.[18] C. Mango writes the following:

> The continuation of erudite literature was made possible by the survival of secular education in its antique, i.e. rhetorical form. The curriculum, based on a combination of pagan and Early Christian authorities, remained unchanged and no textbook later than the sixth century was introduced. The privileged Byzantine boy learnt his...rhetoric from Hermogenes of Tarsus and Aphthonius.[19]

Hermogenes' Περὶ ἰδεῶν, which described seven qualities of good writing, became a standard pedagogical manual in Byzantine schools. Kennedy comments on the importance of Hermogenes for the Byzantine literary tradition:

> [Hermogene's treatise Περὶ ἰδεῶν] constituted a comprehensive account of those aspects of rhetoric which were of interest and use to Byzantines...the "ideas" of style were useful to the composition of...homilies, and other forms of sermons, in religious polemic, and in the secondary rhetoric of literary compositions, especially in letters, in the lives of saints...His great rhetorical model is Demosthenes,

---

[17] Kustas, op.cit., 60.

[18] Kustas, op.cit., 56-57.

[19] Cyrill Mango, *Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror*, Inaugural Lecture, University of Oxford, May 1974, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975; reprinted in *Byzantium and its Image*, London, Variorum Reprints, 1984, as article 2, p.9.

> who more than any other writer seemed to combine all "ideas" of style.[20]

And of the *progymnasmata* (compositional exercises)[21] of Aphthonius, Kennedy writes the following:

> These forms of exercise directly influenced composition in almost all literary genres, being incorporated into homilies or histories or saints' lives as a writer felt moved to do so.[22]

In order to trace the development of stylistic trends specifically in the hagiographic genre in Byzantium, we must, of course, devote some words to the stylistic reforms of Symeon Metaphrastes. During the eighth century A.D. Byzantium underwent a Classical revival, the so-called "Macedonian Renaissance", during which schools endeavored to teach an elaborate style based on what was perceived at the time to be an accurate recreation of Attic conventions of prose and poetry and combining rhetorical categories learned from the writers of the Second Sophistic.[23] This revival paved the way for a formal stylistic revision of hagiographic texts by Symeon Metaphrastes in the tenth century in Byzantium.

Symeon paraphrased over one hundred and thirty-five saints' lives and published his revisions in ten volumes arranged in order of the church calendar. He was, in a sense, continuing the work begun a few decades before by Nicetas the Paphlagonian who, in about 900, had paraphrased about fifty saints' lives "without, however, gaining much acclaim."[24] In paraphrasing Byzantine saints' lives, Symeon Metaphrastes' primary intention was probably not a formal stylistic reform *per se* but rather to compile a convenient and stylistically, doctrinally and ideologically homogenous collection of hagiographic texts. The result of this task was that Symeon introduced into the Byzantine hagiographic tradition a

---

20 Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 165.

21 See G.Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, p.54-73.

22 Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 164.

23 C.Mango, *Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome*, New York: Scribner, 1980, p.137.

24 ibid., 250.

circumlocutious and ornate literary style that then became the norm for the genre.

These stylistic revisions stood in stark contrast to the straightforward and unadorned idiom of the earlier martyriæ and vitæ. Mango writes that these earlier texts "were written in simple language, sometimes verging on the vernacular, but more often reflecting the normal linguistic uses of the Church."[25]

Symeon Metaphrastes developed a rhetorical style for hagiography which had already begun to develop during the eighth-century Classical revival and which involved, specifically, the "suppression of detail" in favor of elegant, paraphrastic terms.[26] Both the Macedonian Renaissance and the Metaphrastic stylistic reform were a result of a rediscovery of the ancient Greek tradition of classical rhetoric outlined above. Ševčenko comments on the influence of classical rhetoric on the eighth-century revival and on Metaphrastic reforms and the hagiographic style which resulted from these:

> ...through schoolmasters, textbooks and reference works [the first Byzantine Humanism] resumed the traditions of antique rhetoric and reshaped, in the 9th century and the 10th century, the biographical and encomiastic genre and thus helped shape the new hagiography[27]

One of the results of this "first Byzantine Humanism" was the importance placed on the beauty and the elegance of the words chosen in composing a piece of writing, of whatever genre. According to the aesthetic principles of the middle Byzantine period, the loftiness of the subject could only be expressed by the loftiness of the language.[28]

---

25 ibid., 249.

26 ibid., 250.

27 I.Ševčenko, "Hagiograpy of the Iconoclast Period," in *Iconoclasm*, 1-42, Papers given at the 9th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies (University of Birmingham) 1975; reprinted in *Ideology, Letters and Culture* as article 5, p.22. For a general study, see also P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin, Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au Xe siècle*, Paris, 1971.

28 Mango, *Byzantium*, 249.

Mango suggests that the ascendency of the ornate classical-revival style in Byzantine literature had attained such a strong position that in instances where it was abandoned for the premise of clarity, as in a technical treatise, an apololgy was in order:

> Thus, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in introducing his *De administrando imperio*, finds it necessary to say: "I have not been studious to make a display of fine writings or of an Atticizing style, swollen with the sublime and the lofty, but rather have been eager by means of everyday and conversational narrative to teach you those things of which I think you should not be ignorant.[29]

In the hands of most Byzantine writers, this "loftiness" of language often took the form of an incomprehensible and obscure prose, characterized by a tendency to "pile adjective upon adjective, to line up a string of nearly synonymous phrases or else to entangle their constructions...with comical results."[30]

The aesthetic principles and stylistic practices discussed above are, as we shall see, most reminiscent of the features of rhetoric that many scholars have identified as the "word-weaving", or "pletenie sloves" style of medieval Slavic writing.

This is merely a cursory glance at the tradition which formed the basis of the education of men of letters of Euthymius' day and of Euthymius himself. More discussion will follow below on how some of the treatises by rhetors of the Second Sophistic on the use of the ἐγκώμιον contributed to the solidification of the topoi in the hagiographic genre. For the sake of clarity, we have intentionally placed this discussion immediately following a general decription of the structure of a saint's life. For the time being, let us turn our attention to the question of Euthymius' own style and how it relates to this earlier Byzantine tradition.

The Role of Euthymius and the Origins of "Word-Weaving":

Much scholarship has been devoted over the last forty years to corroborating or disproving the theories formulated on the period of Slavic cultural development known as the Second South Slavic Influence.

---

[29] ibid., 235

[30] ibid., 236

One of the seminal works that brought to the attention of the scholarly community the importance of the fourteenth century for the cultural development of the Slavs was D.S. Lixačev's paper, "Некоторые задачи изучения второго южнославянского влияния в России," presented at the Fourth International Congress of Slavists in Moscow in 1958.[31] In this article, Lixačev brought Euthymius into the forefront of a scholarly debate on the nature of the Second South Slavic Influence that has since prompted many responses from the community of Slavists. Some of the questions surrounding Euthymius' role in this fourteenth-century cultural influence of South Slavs on East Slavs have become obscured due to the aims of some to promote a nationalistic agenda, to determine which Slavic group's influence was the greatest. Nevertheless, many important steps have been made towards an understanding of the role played by the South Slavs as cultural middle-men in the transmission of Byzantine culture to East Slavdom.[32]

That Euthymius was an important medieval Slavic writer is beyond question. In fact, we would posit that Euthymius represents the apex in the gradual development of the Slavic hagiographic genre towards an imitation and perfection of Byzantine high-style rhetoric. We know that Euthymius developed as a hagiographer under heavy Byzantine influence, for he received a formal education at the hands of Theodosius, his spiritual father, who was closely associated with the circle of the Hesychast patriarchs of Constantinople, especially Kallistos[33]; furthermore, if the primary literature from the period is to be believed, Euthymius received much of

---

31 Д.С. Лихачев, "Некоторые задачи изучения второго южнославянского влияния в России," *Исследования по славянскому литературоведению и фольклористике, Доклады советских ученых на IV Международном съезде славистов,* 95-151, Москва: АН СССР, 1960.

32 For a sample bibliography, see Section I, Chapter 2, fn.55 and fn.58.

33 See Section I, Chapter 1, pp.24-26. See E.Turdeanu, *La littérature bulgare du XIVe siècle et sa diffusion dans les pays roumains,* Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves, no.22, Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1947, p.68. Also, the "poxvalno slovo" written by Camblak in honor of Euthymius tells us that Euthymius travelled to Constantinople with Theodosius: "kupno sъ otcĭъĭmь vъ velikyj prixodit Konstantinovь grad" (Kałużniacki, *Aus der panegyrischen Litteratur der Südslaven,* Vienna, 1901; reprint, London: Variorum, 1971, p.34 [chap.V, lines 19-20]).

his formal education abroad--in Constantinople, the Studion Monastery, and Mt. Athos.[34] These connections figured greatly in the development of Euthymius' own career. Furthermore, the royal Bulgarian court had been undergoing a steady process of Byzantinization since Tsar Boris' acceptance of Christianity in the mid-ninth century.[35] There was an especial blossoming of Byzantine literary, iconographic, and architectural models under Tsar Symeon during the period of the First Empire and later

---

[34] See Gregory Camblak's "Poxvalno Slovo" in honor of Euthymius, contained in Kałužniacki, ibid., pp.28-60. According to Camblak, Euthymius travelled to Constantinople with Theodosius (V,34, lines 19-20). Kallistos, in his *Life of Theodosius* (published by Zlatarskij as *Житие и жизнь преподобнаго отца нашего Теодосия*, Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжина [СбНУНК] 20 [1904]: 1-41) also mentions Theodosius' arrival in Constantinople (chap. XXIV, pp.31-32); but Euthymius is not mentioned specifically as being a member of the entourage. Camblak then tells of Euthymius' travels to the Studion Monastery and Mt. Athos (VI,35,lines 11-20).

The most overt reference to the education Euthymius received while travelling in the Byzantine Empire is found in chap.VIII, p.39, lines 4-10 in which Camblak writes: "I poneže dovolno vъ tuždej vrěmą sъtvori, mnogim sǫštimъ drъžąštim ego i sъ nimi prěbyvati moląštim, ot vъsěx prěpočъteno sǫdivъ otčъstvo, i kъ tomu paky vъzvraštaet są, različnoe bogatstvo prěmǫdrosti že i razuma nosą, egože jakože někyj kupecъ na dalnix stranax, uskusenъ javilъ są, kupiьstvova."

Petar Dinekov, for example, ascribes to this passage of the "Poxvalno Slovo" a certain documentary value and concludes that Euthymius must have received his education abroad. See П.Динеков, "Личността на Евтимий Търновский," *Старобългарска литература* 7 (1980): 3-21. On page 8 he writes: "За нас е по-важно да узнаем какво е научил Евтимий. Отново Григоий Цамблак си е послужил със сравнение: Евтимий се отправя към отечеството си,'носещ различни богатства от премъдрост и разум, които накупи като някой търговец, проявил способността си в далечни страни'...Тези знания ще са били твърде разнообразии, от различии области: богословие, философия и литература, устройство и управление на черквата, културен живот; тук Евтимий се е запознал основно с византийския културен живот."

[35] Dimitar Angelov, perhaps overstating the point, writes the following in his article "Humanism in Medieval Bulgaria," *Études balkaniques* 3 (1980):3-20, p.17: "The penetration of elements of the ancient philosophical heritage into Old-Bulgarian literature between the ninth and tenth centuries gives us grounds to claim that in that respect Bulgaria had a chronological priority before the remaining Medieval European countries. The closeness to classical antiquity which was observed in the West European Medieval world much later and which was known under the name of the Renaissance is observable, even if on a limited scale, among the educated circles of Bulgarian society during the first early years after the introduction of Slav letters and the creation of the Ohrid and Preslav Schools. Very early indeed, regardless of the domination of a religious world outlook, Bulgaria got in touch with antiquity, forming a link which was never to be broken; a link reflected on the material and spiritual level in works created by the Bulgarian people during the Middle Ages."

under Tsar Ivan Alexander during the period of the Second Empire that coincided with Euthymius' own life. That Euthymius should have mastered the forms of Byzantine high-style rhetoric is, then, no surprise, given his education and social position. But the question of Euthymius' role in the formation of a Slavic hagiographic style has not been exhausted in the scholarship to date.

As we have examined in Section I, Chapter 1, it is maintained by many scholars that Euthymius founded a school of manuscript making and orthographic reforms in the Bulgarian capital, Veliko Trnovo. This aspect of Euthymius' activities has been handled in the past by many scholars: Sobolevskij, Syrku, and Lixačev among them. Our own study, is concerned with the claims about Euthymius and his literary school in Trnovo: 1) it is claimed that Euthymius, his spiritual mentor, Theodosius, and his own pupils were Hesychasts themselves and supported the spread of Hesychasm in Bulgaria; 2) it is also claimed that at this school, Euthymius and his disciples innovated and developed a particular style of writing, known as "pletenie sloves"[36], or word-weaving; and 3) and lastly, it is said that this word-weaving style employed by Euthymius was developed with the deliberate purpose of finding a literary expression for the tenets of Hesychast mysticism.[37]

---

[36] See Д.С. Лихачев, "Некоторые задачи". On page 98 he writes: "С изменениями в области орфографии и литературного языка связано также появление в России перенесенного из южнославянских стран «плетения словес»--особого литературного стиля, возникшего в Болгарии в Евфимиевскую эпоху и устойчиво сохранявшегося в России вплоть до XVII в."

The main works before Lixačev which established the notion in scholarship that Euthymius and his literary school in Trnovo developed a new hagiographic literary style are: К.Радченко, *Религиозное и литературное движение в Болгарии в эпоху перед турецким завоеванием*, Kiev, 1898; А.И. Соболевский, *Западное влияние на литературу Московской Руси XV-XVII веков*, Санкт-Петербург, 1899; А.И.Соболевский, "Южно-славянское влияние на русскую письменность в XIV-XV веках," *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV-XV веков*, Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности, 74, №1, Санкт-Петербург, 1903 ; and П.А.Сырку, *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV веке*, 2 тома, Санкт-Петербург, 1890; reprint, London: Variorum Reprints, 1972.

[37] In his article "Pletenije sloves i hesihazam," pp.141-142, M. Mulić points to three main ideas as having developed out of scholarly inquiries into the Second South Slavic influence, begun by Sobolevskij and continued by Radčenko and Lixačev: 1) The word-

A discussion of this first point begins in Section I, Chapter 1, and is continued in Section IV, Chapter 2; and our conclusion regarding this question is that Theodosius and Euthymius were unquestionably Hesychasts themselves. We shall now focus on the other two claims; and in order to do so properly, we must first look briefly at the origins of "word-weaving" as a rhetorical phenomenon and establish a definition for word-weaving within the context of medieval Slavic writings.[38]

---

weaving style began in Bulgaria; 2) Euthymius developed his style under the influence of his contemporaries: Byzantine hagiographers, especially Patriarch Kallistos of Constantinople, Euthymius' personal friend, and the Hesychast, Gregory the Sinaite; and 3) Word-weaving as a literary style is closely tied with the Hesychasm of Gregory the Sinaite and Gregory Palamas and their pupils; and that without Hesychasm, 'word-weaving' obviously would not have appeared.

The original passage of his article reads as follows: "1) Pletenije sloves nastalo je u Bulgarskoj...2) Jevtimije je izgradio svoj stil pod utjecajem svojih suvremenika--bizantijskih hagiografa, osobito carigradskoga patrijarha Kalista, Jevtimijeva ličnoga prijatelja i hesihasta, učenika Grigorija Sinaita...3) Pletenije sloves kao književni stil usko je povezano s hesihazmom Grigorija Sinajita i Grigorija Palame, odnosno njihovih učenika, te se bez hesihazma ni pletenije sloves, očito, ne bi pojavilo."

Other scholars after Lixačev have repeated this notion of a specifically Hesychastic attitude or philosophy toward language. Picchio regards "word weaving" as a "result of the hesychast theory of knowledge" (R.Picchio and H.Goldblatt, "Old Russian Literature," in *Handbook of Russian Literature*, 316-322, edited by Victor Terras, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, p.319). K.Ivanova writes that the hagiography of the Euthymian period is written in a new style, modeled on Metaphrastic prototypes but modified in the spirit of the "abstract psychologism" of Hesychastic teachings (К.Иванова, "Патриарх Евтимий и агиографската традиция в средневековната литература," *Литературна мисъл* 10(1977): 90-99, p.92.) M.Iovine (op.cit., 191) begins from the point of departure that there exists a purely "Hesychastic attitude" toward language: "According to the Hesychastic attitude to the language, an attitude clearly inspired by the Neoplatonic tradition, the sense of the word was contained in the word itself that is, in the combination of sounds and graphic signs which made up the word (either spoken or written)."

[38] I am grateful to Professor Mathiesen who has made me aware of a very important distinction concerning the interpretation of the term "slovo" in this context. Mathiesen advises me that "λόγος" and "слово" both can mean "speech", "word" in the broad sense, also "sentence." "Word" as a grammatical term is "λέξις", "речение." If one takes "pletenie sloves" as referring to grammatical units, it is to be translated "weaving of sentences." In medieval texts, "слово" almost never means "word" as a grammatical unit, but "sentence." More likely, it is not used as a grammatical term in the phrase "pletenie sloves", in which case it might even mean "weaving of thoughts" or something similar. Professor Mathiesen's interpretation actually corroborates our findings that are to follow below: that "word weaving" is actually more accurately defined as not the "weaving of words", but the "weaving of themes." Professor Mathiesen also advises that some of the confusion here comes from the fact that слово = λόγος = verbum = word in theology, but in theology "word" is not specifically a term of grammar.

First of all, it should be pointed out that the very concept of "word-weaving" as a metaphor to describe a kind of rhetoric is not a phenomenon originating from fourteenth-century Slavic theories of aesthetics nor is it a concept resulting from modern scholarship; rather its origins lie in the ancient Greek and Roman rhetorical tradition.[39] Greek writers and rhetors referred to a certain stylistic approach to writing that they called πλοκή ("twining, twisting,braiding"), or πλέκειν λόγον ("to braid or weave the word"). It is mentioned by Aristotle, Theophrastus, Plutarch, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Philodemus, Hermogenes, Alexander, and Phoebammon, all of whom use the term metaphorically to express a complication of dramatic plot, an interweaving of rhetorical devices, or contortions of speech.[40] Both Lucretius and Horace, as M.Roberts notes, advance the image of a poem being like a garland woven from flowers.[41] Furthermore, the knowledge of this metaphoric way of describing the art of rhetoric had obviously been disseminated to other parts of Europe other than Byzantium, for by the high Middle Ages in Provence, well before Euthymius, the twelfth-century troubadour Marcabru and several after him refer to a stylistic technique of "entrebescar los motz," or "plaiting or braiding words,"[42] thus attesting to a continuation of the Greek tradition in medieval Western European cultural circles.

---

[39] Mulić ("Pletenije sloves i hesihazam", 145) emphasizes the role played by ancient Greek and Hebrew literature in the formation of a Byzantine style. He writes: "Moreover, in Byzantine literature--which consituted the biggest influence on and helped in the creation of Slavic writing and literature--there was a conjoining of the stylistic principles of ancient Greek prose and Hebrew literature" ("Prema tome, u bizantijskoj književnosti, koja je najviše utjecala i pomagala stvaranju slavenske pismenosti i književnosti, sastali su se stilistički principi antičke grčke proze i hebrejske književnosti...")

[40] Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 1940; reprint, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1989, p.1422. See also Iovine, op.cit.,326-27, for more examples of references to πλοκή from all periods of the Greek tradition (classical, Patristic, and Byzantine)

[41] Michael Roberts, *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989, p.49.

[42] Marianne Shapiro, "Word-Weaving in Medieval Romance Lyric," in *Figuration in Verbal Art*, 83-112, by Michael Shapiro and Marianne Shapiro, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988. p.83, fn.1.

Birnbaum draws the connection between the use of "word-weaving" in Slavic writing and its use in Byzantine writing by positing that the devices associated with "pletenie sloves" are taken from the Byzantine tradition of πλοκή[43], and, he states, these devices were used very early on by the Eastern Slavs, as in Hilarion's "Sermon on Law and Grace" and by Kiril of Turov, and in some of the tales of the Kievo-Pečerskij Paterik.[44] As for South Slavic literature, he quite correctly points out that the features of word-weaving found in Euthymius' writings appear well before in earlier Serbian vitæ.[45]

The Slavonic expression "pletenie sloves" used to refer to a style of writing is most commonly associated with the fourteenth-century *Life of Stefan of Perm'* by Epiphanius the Wise; but J. Børtnes points out that it

---

This phrase "entrebescar los motz" -- according to Emil Levy's *Petit dictionnaire provençal-français*, Heidelberg, 1973, p.154 -- means "enlacer des mots d'une manière ingénieuse." Given this translation, "motz" is meant to be understood in the Provençal phrase in the grammatical sense and not in the other senses discussed above in fn.38.

43 H. Birnbaum, "Old Rus' and the Orthodox Balkans, Differences in Kind, Extent, and Significance of the Early and Later Cultural Impact," *Cyrillomethodianum* 8-9 (1984, 1985):1-15, esp. p.13.

44 See also J.Børtnes, "Hesychast Doctrine in Epiphanius' *Life of Saint Stephen, Bishop of Perm'*," *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 31/32 (1985): 83-87. On pp.83-84, he writes: "The device of 'word-weaving' was taken over from the Greeks by the Orthodox Slavs centuries before Epiphanius wrote his Life of Saint Stephen. It is a stylistic technique which in the last resort can be traced back to a set of rhetorical principles worked out by the orators of ancient Greece and to the Old Testament in its Greek translations, in particular to the Psalms. The Greek Church Fathers cultivated this technique in their panegyrical and liturgical writings, and in its Slavonic variant it produced an early masterpiece in the eleventh-century Kievan *Sermon on the Law and Grace*."

45 Mošin and Mulić have done much to show the connection between the earlier Serbian hagiographic tradition and the development of "pletenie sloves." Cf. Mošin, "Stil stare srpske proze," in *Stara književnost*, edited by Djordje Trifunović, 181-197, Belgrade, 1965; Mulić, "Jevtimije Trnovski i uloga njegove škole u stvaranju stila 'pletenija sloves' u srpskoj i ruskoj književnosti," *Zbornik za slavistiku* 3 (1972): 99-113; "'Pletenije sloves' i hezikazm," *Radovi zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 7 (1965): 141-56; "Сербские агиографы XIII-XIV вв. и особенности их стиля," *ТОДРЛ* 23 (1968): 127-42; "Srpsko 'pletenije sloves' do 14 stoljeća," *Radovi zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 5 (1963): 117-29.

appears much earlier in Slavic translations of early Byzantine hymns.[46] There are differing interpretations of what Epiphanius meant by it within Slavic scholarship. M. Iovine, referring the research of R. Picchio on Epiphanius the Wise[47], makes special note of the fact that the references to "pletenie sloves" in the Life of Stefan of Perm' have been completely misinterpreted.[48] Iovine summarizes Picchio's conclusions by stating that on the one hand, Epiphanius' remarks indicate that a highly elaborate rhetorical style, if inspired by God, can serve as the appropriate vehicle with which to praise a holy figure in panegyric. On the other hand, when Epiphanius is referring specifically to "pletenie sloves," he does so, according to Picchio and Iovine, in order to name precisely that style which should be avoided, a deceptive, uninspired and heathen approach to language. [49] Iovine also gives examples of passages in classical texts where πλοκή has a negative meaning.[50] Picchio and Iovine conclude that while hagiographers of the fourteenth century such as Epiphanius certainly used an elaborate, high style rhetoric, the term "pletenie sloves" is clearly not what these writers used to refer to their own style.[51] While Iovine has presented a convincing argument to support the notion that "pletenie sloves," as used by Epiphanius, actually refers to an undesirable and dangerous approach to rhetoric, there are other interpretations which are equally convincing.

---

[46] J. Børtnes,"The Function of Word-Weaving in the Structure of Epiphanius' Life of Saint Stephen, Bishop of Perm'," in *Medieval Russian Culture*, 311-342, California Slavic Studies no.12. Los Angeles: UCLA Press, 1984, p.312.

[47] See R.Picchio, "L' 'intreccio delle parole' e gli stili letterari presso gli Slavi ortodossi nel tardo Medio Evo," in *Studi slavistici in ricordo di Carlo Verdiani*, edited by A.M.Raffo, 245-262, Pisa, 1979.

[48] Iovine, op.cit., 378-79, fn.564. See Iovine, op.cit., 322-23, for quotations of these passages in English translation.

[49] Iovine, op.cit., 325.

[50] Iovine, op.cit., 327.

[51] Iovine, op.cit., 328; 378-79, fn.564.

Mathiesen[52] has suggested that the absence of such a style in Slavic letters was perceived to be a short-coming, putting Slavic below the level of Greek:

> The stylistic modification [of the fourteenth century] and the search for a foregrounded language[53] are connected with the dissemination of the notion that ecclesiastical Slavic lacked art (τέχνη, хытрость) and was therefore not as valuable as Greek.

He also interprets the statements made by Epiphanius in the introduction to the *Life of Stefan of Perm'* as a stated desire to acquire such a language.[54]

D. Freidank also offers a positive interpretation of the term "pletenie sloves" or πλέκειν λόγον.[55] He gives a most thoughtful explanation of what Epiphanius and other medieval Slavic writers who used the term had in mind. Freidank observes a connection in Christian literature between the classical image of πλέκειν στέφανον ("to weave a crown") in honor of a victor in a competition and the acts of praising or celebrating a holy figure.[56] We have observed in the *Life of Daniel the Stylite* and the *Life of*

---

52 See R.Mathiesen, "Nota sul genere acatistico e sulla letteratura agiografica slava eclesiastica nel XIV e XV secolo," *Ricerche slavistiche* 13 (1965): 57-63.

53 Mathiesen defines this as a language "which calls attention to its formal aspects." Mathiesen, ibid., 57, fn1.

54 ibid., 58.

55 Cf. Д.Фрайданк, "К сущности и предпосылкам стиля 'плетения словес'," *Търновска книжовна школа*, том 2, Ученици и последователи на Евтимий Търновски, 89-93, София: БАН, 1980.

56 This connection is made earlier by Mulič in his article "Pletenije sloves i hesihazam." On p.143, he writes: "The very notion of 'word-weaving' came to the Slavs from Greek. It is met with in Homer's 'Odyssey' (VIII,171): there the [notion] is employed in the phrase 'ὁ θεὸς μορφὴν ἔπεσι στέφει...' As is known, the very στέφω means 'to crown' and similarly, 'to decorate', 'adorn', 'make ornate' as well...and finally 'to weave a wreath'. In the ancient period a wreath, as is well known, was awarded to oustanding people as a prize for their service about which many ancient writers inform us."

The original passage reads as follows: "Sam pojam »pletenije sloves« došao je Slavenima iz grčkoga jezika. Već se u Homerovoj Odiseji (VIII,171) susrećemo s njime: ondje je upotrebljen u rečenici 'ὁ θεὸς μορφὴν ἔπεσι στέφει...' Kao što se zna, glagol στέφω znači 'ovjenčati,' a isto tako i 'kititi, ukrašavati, dati na ukras'... i napokon 'isplesti vijenac.' U antičko se doba vijenac, kako je već poznato, dodjeljivao istaknutim ljudima kao nagrada za njihove zasluge o čemu nam svjedoče mnogi antički autori."

Gregory the Sinaite passages that employ this image[57], and Freidank equates this metaphor of weaving a crown for someone with praising that individual with encomiastic words.[58] The metaphor between "weaving" and "praising" is even more obvious, Freidank points out, in two passages from the *Life of Athanasius of Athos* which read "τὰ τῶν ἐπαίνων πλέκειν"("плести похвальное слово", or "to weave an encomium").[59] As Freidank puts it, the term, then implies not a "stylistic manner" but rather a "communicative goal."[60]

The fact still remains that the classical tradition of rhetoric that Epiphanius was either embracing or eschewing in these passages nevertheless defines his style and the style of Euthymius, among others. Therefore, we will not dispense with the term "pletenie sloves" to refer to the style employed in the Euthymian hagiographic texts.

Let us first continue our discussion of "word-weaving" by focusing on our stated purpose of defining what is or constitutes precisely "word-weaving" style. Many scholars have written on the language used by Euthymius and his pupils, and there are differing definitions of it resulting from these studies.[61] It is worth summarizing some of them here in order

---

57 See the *Life of Daniel the Stylite* ; Greek text, edited by Hippolyte Delehaye, in *Analecta Bollandiana* 32 (1913): 121-229; reprinted in *Les saints stylites*, edited by H. Delehaye, 1-94, Subsidia Hagiographica, no.14. Brussels: Société des bollandistes, 1923. The passages read as follows: "διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ πλέκεται σοι στέφανος" (54, 53,lines 13-14) = "for this reason [your endurance] a crown is being woven for you" (54,38); and "ἀφ' οὗ δὲ ἤρξατο πλέκεσθαι ὁ τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ στέφανος" (101, 93,lines 10-11) = "at the time when the crown of his endurance began to be woven" (101,70).

In the *Life of Gregory the Sinaite*, one finds this passage in the introduction: "καὶ στέφανους ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν πλέκειν" (1,1,lines 5-7), from И. Помяловский, "Житие иже во святых отца нашего Григория Синаита," *Записки историко-филологического факультета Имп. Санктпетербургского университета* 35 (1896): 1-64. A summary of this life may be found in Радченко, op.cit., 259-267.

58 "Желание удостоить добрых мужей похвальных слов и похвал и плести венцы над ними--полезное дело," (Фрайданк, op.cit., 90).

59 Фрайданк, op.cit., 90

60 Фрайданк, op.cit., 90: "Следовательно, словосочетанием 'плести слово' Епифаний выражает не какую-нибудь стилистическую манеру, а коммуникативную цель: составить похвалу."

61 Iovine (op.cit., 197-203) gives an excellent summary of most of these attempts by Lihačev and his predecessors.

to gain an appreciation for the extent to which the meaning of the term has been obscured within much of the existing scholarship.

Lixačev was not the first to write on the subject of the high style that appeared in Russian hagiographic works of the fourteenth century. He acknowledges a debt to Ključevskij, Petuxov, Speranskij, Gudzij, and Vranska, just to name a few.[62] But he is the first of these sources to try to outline the salient features of "word-weaving":

> 'Pletenie sloves' is based on the most careful relationship to the word: to its phonetic aspect (alliteration, assonance, etc.), to the etymology of the word (a series of words with the same root, etymologically identical endings, and the like), to the subtleties of its semantics (synonymous and tautological series, and so forth); [it is also based] on the love for neologisms, compound words, calques from Greek, etc. The incentive for calquing from Greek was the same as that which forced translators to follow Greek constructions to the letter (see above). The quest for the word, the piling up of epithets, synonyms, etc., derived from the very same ideas regarding the identity of the word and its essence, of the Holy Scriptures and divine grace that lay at the basis of the reform. An intense search for emotional expressiveness and striving for a mode of expression were based on those very convictions that the life of a saint should reflect a part of his essence, should be written with "befitting" words, and should express the same piety which he [the saint himself] evoked."[63]

---

[62] See Lixačev's bibliographical references (Лихачев, op.cit., 115, fn.58-62).

[63] Лихачев, op.cit., 114. The original passage reads as follows: "Плетение словес' основано на внимательнейшем отношении к слову: к его звуковой стороне (аллитерации, ассонанцы и т.п.), к этимологии слова (сочетания однокоренных слов, этимологически одинаковые окончания и.т.п.) к тонкостям его семантики (сочетания синонимические, тавтологические и пр.), на любви к словесным новообразованиям, составным словам, калькам с греческого и пр. Кальки с греческого образуются из тех же побуждений, которые заставляли переводчиков буквально следовать греческим конструкциям (см.выше). Поиски слова, нагромождения эпитетов, синонимов и т.д. исходили из тех же представлений о тождестве слова и сущности, божественного писания и божественной благодати, что лежали и в основе реформы. Напряженные поиски эмоциональной выразителности, стремление к экспрессии основывались на том же убеждении, что житие святого должно отразить частицу его сущности, быть написанным 'подобными' словами и вызывать такое же благоговение, какое вызывал и он сам."

J.Børtnes ("The Function of Word-Weaving," p. 311) rejects Lixačev's definition of word-weaving in the context of the hagiographic works of Epiphanius: "His interpretations of Epiphanius' style rely on empathy rather than on analysis, and like other definitions of poetry as the language of the emotions, Lixačev also runs the danger of ignoring structure."

Riccardo Picchio, in discussing the use of word-weaving in Old East Slavic literature says succinctly that "this technique consisted in combining words to form paranomastic series marked by a dense network of phonic correspondences."[64]

Čiževskij[65] offers a more detailed list of rhetorical devices to identify the ornamental style: 1) compounds (composita); 2) the use of participles; 3) pleonastic expressions; 4) pleonastic expressions related to paranomasis of various kinds; 5) epithets, substantives and verbs, forming word-chains; 6) in such word-chains synonymic expressions are often joined together leading to a kind of word-play; 7) concrete ideas replaced by abstract constructions; 8) complex and archaic syntactic structures; and 9) the reintroduction of archaic grammatical categories, such as the aorist, the imperfective and the dual.

Serge Zenkovsky[66] basically repeats those features of word-weaving already discussed by Lixačev in the context of Old Russian literature (although one should speak more properly of Old East Slavic literature for the period before the татарское иго, or Mongol Yoke): 1) bookish words, 2) compounds (composita), consisting of two or three words put together, 3) complex syntactic structures with a multitude of subordinate clauses, 4) numerous epithets, 5) repetition of the same sound at the beginning of each rhythmical unit, and 6) archaic forms.

Ilya Talev in his doctoral dissertation[67] identifies sixteen basic elements of the high style associated with the Euthymian school and which he was able to identify in Bulgarian works that predated Euthymius: 1) synonyms, 2) genus-species relations, 3) paranomastic phrases (a string of words denoting close but not identical concepts), 4) epithets expressed by

---

64 Picchio and Goldblatt, op.cit., 319.

65 D. Čiževskij, *History of Russian Literature, From the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque*, 3d ed., The Hague: Mouton, 1970, pp.149-150.

66 S. Zenkovsky, ed. and trans, *Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles and Tales* , 2d ed., New York: E.P. Dutton, 1974, p.23.

67 See I.Talev, "The Impact of Middle Bulgarian on the Russian Literary Language (Post-Kievan Period)," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1972, pp. 35-36 and 44-57.

compound adjectives, 5) epithets expressed in gradation, also employing compound adjectives, 6) apposition, expressed by short adjectives to substantives with long adjective modifier, 7) paraphrase, 8) antithesis, 9) lexical anaphora (the repetition of a word or expressions at the beginning of successive phrases, clauses, sentences, or verses), 10) tautology (the repetition of a word or root in a phrase), 11) compound words and neologisms, 12) personification, 13) metonymy, 14) synedoche, 15) metaphor, and 16) simile.

In his doctoral dissertation on the hagiography of Patriarch Kallistos, Robert Richardson correctly emphasizes the connection between Slavic "pletenie sloves" and Byzantine πλοκή, but his definition of the device is worked out in impressionistic terms, based on the acoustic effect of the device on its audience:

> One of the most characteristic features of the hagiography of the period of the Second South Slavic Influence is the employment of the so-called "word-weaving" (pletenie sloves). Basically the device is of Byzantine origin and associated with Byzantine writings. In its simplest elements, pletenie sloves consists of using words as a tour de force and employing every imaginable literary device in such quantity and in such a way as to force the reader or listener to eventually understand or at least heed the intended message, simply through inculcation of it from no other reason.[68]

Joseph Manson, in his doctoral dissertation on the subject of Russian hagiography of the period of the Second South Slavic Influence, defines "pletenie sloves" in terms of the semantic impact that it makes on the audience, and he couches his definition in terms of the Formalists' concept of "rendering strange"[69]:

> The fundamental principle underlying the creation of this "hieratic" language was similar to what structural critics of modern literature have referred to as "estrangement" (otstranenie). The principle had three general components: ordinary phenomena could be made "strange" by naming them in a new, abstract way; ordinary words could be made "strange" by connecting them in striking composita and neologisms; ordinary morphology and syntax could be made "strange" by disrupting

---

[68] R. Richardson, "Hesychasm in the Hagiographic Works of Patriarch Kallistos," Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1969, p.138.

[69] See В. Шкловский, "Исскуство как прием," *О теории прозы*, 7-23, Москва, 1929.

normal word order, using archaic forms and imitating Greek patterns.[70]

In her article on word-weaving and manuscript ornamentation in the Russian tradition of the fourteenth century, Konovalova defines "word-weaving" as "a *sui generis* verbal ornamentation which is characterized by combinations of words of the same root and homophonic words, synonymity, rythmical prose, complex syntax, and a forcing together of homogenous comparisons and epithets."[71]

In her book on the history of Bulgarian literature, the Polish scholar Dąbek-Wirgova[72] defines "splatanie słow", or "word-weaving" through the following characterization of Euthymius' texts:

> In [Euthymius'] lives and panegyrics, there abound quotes from the Holy Scriptures, allegories and symbols; there are many exclamations and rhetorical questions; long synonymic series of epithets, elaborate comparisons and metaphors interwoven into an intricate cycle; and tautological and paranomastic phrases are piled up into unending tirades.[73]

All of these contributions are helpful inasmuch as they contribute to an understanding of some the most salient linguistic and impressionistic features of "word weaving." It is clear from the works cited above that the

---

70 J.Manson, "*Studies in Russian Hagiography During the Period of the Second South Slavic Influence*," Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1968, p.185. Also quoted in Richardson, ibid., p.87. The notion of word-weaving as "rendering strange" is also expressed by Lixačev as being one of the main characteristics of "abstraction" in medieval literature. In Лихачев, *Поэтика древнерусской литературы*, Ленинград: Худож.лит.,1971, p.126, he writes: "Тому же абстрагированию служит обычная манера говорить об известном как о чем-то неизвестном."

71 О.Ф. Коновалова, "«Плетение словес» и плетеный орнамент конца XIV в.," *ТОДРЛ* 22 (1966):101-111, p.102. The original passage reads: "Плетение словес--это своебразный словесный орнамент, представляющий собой сочетание однокоренных и созвучных слов, синонимики и ритмики речи, сложного синтаксиса и нагнетания однородных сравнений и эпитетов."

72 T. Dąbek-Wirgova, *Historia literatury bułgarskiej*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolinskich Wydawnictwo, 1980.

73 Dąbek-Wirgova, ibid., pp.45-46. The original passage reads as follows: "W jego żywotach i słowach pochwalnych roiło się od cytatów z Pisma świętego, alegorii i symboli, mnożyły się wykrzyniki i pytania retoryczne; długie łańcuchy synonimicznych epitatów, wyszukanych porównań i metafor splatały się w zawiłe okresy, w nie kończących się tyradach piętrzyły się tautologie i pleonazmy."

"word-weaving" style is marked by the presence of certain rhetorical devices, complex -- indeed at times impenetrable -- syntax, and a tendency to abandon stating of something clearly when it can be expressed instead in elaborate circumlocutions. It must be pointed out, however, that every rhetorical device listed above can be found in certain Slavic vitæ *before* the period of a supposed stylistic innovation of Euthymius, even in those that are marked, generally speaking, for their use of a simple style.[74]

Birnbaum has already convincingly argued a case for the fact that the late twelfth-century and early thirteenth-century Serbian vitæ were reflective of the growing tendency in Slavic to imitate the high-style Byzantine rhetoric.[75] But even the earliest known vitæ written in Slavic, the *lives* of evangelizers of the Slavs, SS Constantine (Cyrill) and Methodius (hereafter referred to as LC and LM, respectively), which are characterized for their simplicity of style when compared to later, more flowery works, contain an abundance of such devices. For example, one can find in the LC at least ten examples of metaphor, sixteen examples of tautological constructions, six examples of simile, seven examples of paraphrase (where a word or phrase intended is not stated overtly but rather is suggested by the use of circumlocutions), six paranomastic phrases, at least eight epithets (and many more contained within the form of fixed biblical parallels according to the topoi of ancient Jewish poetry,

---

[74] See Professor I. Sevčenko's comments in his article "A Shadow Outline of Virtue: The Classical Heritage of Greek Christian Literature (Second to Seventh Century)," in *Age of Spirituality: a Symposium*, 53-73, ed. Kurt Weitzmann, New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1980; reprinted as article II in *Ihor Sevčenko: Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1982. He writes: "We would also detect in other early lives of saints [in addition to the *Life of Anthony*], even those that do not affect a high style, the use of antique devices. These lives, we would find, adhered to the same blueprint made for a pagan laudation by Menander, the third-century theoretician of rhetoric, which had been so closely followed by the Cappadocians."

[75] See H.Birnbaum, "Byzantine Tradition Transformed: The Old Serbian *Vita*," in *On Medieval and Renaissance Slavic Writing*, edited by C.H.van Schooneveld, 299-340, The Hague: Mouton, 1974; appeared originally in *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change*, edited by H.Birnbaum and S.Vryonis, Jr., 243-284, Mouton: The Hague, 1972. See D.Obolensky's discussion of Sava of Serbia in his book *Six Byzantine Portraits*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988, pp.115-172; and also H.Birnbaum, "Serbian Models in the Literature and the Literary Language of Medieval Russia," *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 23 (1979): 1-13.

such as the pattern of the name of a ruler/his title[76]); four examples of lexical anaphora, six compound words used with recurrence, seven examples of antithesis, and some impressive examples of complex syntactic structures (in which of a paragraph-length sentence, there may be contained within only one aorist, present tense, or imperfect verbal form, the rest being participles). The figures for the LM are similar.

The early Moravian (so-called "first") version of the *Life of Wenceslas* (Vjačeslav) is stylistically much simpler than either the LC or LM, yet it too has metaphors, similes, tautological devices, compound words calqued from Greek, paraphrase, epithets, antithesis, and even alliteration.

Indeed, none of the rhetorical features nor the ornamental high style used by Euthymius and his scions in Bulgaria and East Slavic territories were new to them. Most of the metaphors and similes, for example, used by Euthymius in his vitae are either lifted from biblical verses or from other vitae. The roots of this style of writing, as already discussed, lay in the Byzantine tradition of rhetorical instruction. Some rhetorical features, such as tautology, just to name one, would have naturally entered into the medieval Slavic rhetorical repertoire from the Old Testament alone, and one need look only as far as the book of Genesis to find examples of tautology: "Ἰδοῦ δέδοκα ὑμῖν πᾶν χόρτον σπόριμον σπεῖρον σπέρμα." (Gen 1.29); and "Οὐ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε" (Gen 3.4).

Furthermore, other liturgical or paraliturgical literature that was translated for the Slavs from Greek or read by them in the original Greek would have acquainted them with these rhetorical devices. Encomiastic sermons of the early Byzantine period were resplendent with amplificatory epithets and lexical anaphora. Furthermore, there were vitæ known to the Slavs during the period shortly after their Christianization that were written in the post-Metaphrastic hagiographic high style, such as the Latin version of the Life of St. Wenceslas[77] and the Greek life of Kliment of

---

76 See S.Gevirtz, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 32, Chicago: University Press,1963, p.48.

77 The so-called "second" life, written by Gumpold, bishop of Mantua, ca. 980 A.D. and thought to have been translated into Slavonic ca. A.D.1000. See F.Mareš, *An Anthology of Church Slavonic Texts of Western (Czech) Origin*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1979, p.123, for information on manuscripts and editions.

Oxrid, written by Theophylact. The latter is certainly as elaborate as anything written by Euthymius and was probably known by the medieval Bulgarian men of letters since its composition, given the subject of the work. Its author, Theophylact Hephaistos (originally from the Greek island of Euboea) was appointed to the archbishopric of the Macedonian town of Oxrid after having studied the art of rhetoric under Michael Psellos in Constantinople.[78] Furthermore, Euthymius' education gave him access to any of the Greek originals of texts, thus making it even more likely that as a writer looking for literary models, he was culling not only from all available Slavic vitae, but from Greek vitae as well.

When comparing, however, the *Life of Constantine* and the *Life of Methodius* side by side with those by Euthymius, it is clear that there is something quite different and much more complex going on in the Euthymian texts. But what are these differences precisely? One difference is patently obvious and has been pointed out by almost every scholar who has worked on this question in the past: the Euthymian and other high-style "word-weaving" texts of either Byzantine or Slavic origin are characterized not by the presence alone of such rhetorical features, but rather by their abundant use of such devices. As Richardson puts it so well in his aforementioned dissertation, "The distinction is rather in degree than in kind."[79]

This brings us one step closer to distinguishing the levels of language used in hagiographic composition. As a result of our own research, we would posit a redefinition of the phenomenon of word-weaving in the hagiographic genre: that while an abundant use of some or all of these rhetorical devices does add a richness to a text (for example, piling one simile or metaphor on top of another), giving the reader the impression that language is being "woven" or "braided" to create images, even their abundant use, however, is not the only feature that distinguishes "high style" texts from simpler examples.

---

[78] See D.Obolensky, *Six Byzantine Portraits*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988, p.37.

[79] Richardson, op.cit., 117.

The other feature that we are positing as an addition to the definition of "word-weaving" within the context of the hagiographic genre is that of weaving of themes, or to put it more specifically, the weaving of subthemes. In order to explain what we mean precisely by the "weaving of subthemes", some words must first be said regarding the basic structure of the vita genre.

The Structure of the Saint's Life:

The basic structure of a saint's life is made up of an introduction, the main body, and an epilogue. The content of the introduction and epilogue will depend on the level of language employed in the text. In vitæ of simple style, the introduction will usually include a "modesty topos" in which the author assures the reader or interlocuter of his unworthiness to undertake the task of writings this saint's life. Also included is usually something that I term the "benefit topos", a statement of all the spiritual edification that can be had from imitating the life contained herein.

The epilogue usually contains a prayer or supplication to the saint. In addition to this, many of the vitæ considered for this study have embedded either within the body of the text or have included at the end of the main body, but before the epilogue, a panegyric to the saint. In some of the Euthymian vitæ, the panegyric is a pronounced part of the composition, but the device of introducing into a vita the panegyric is not an innovation of Euthymius. It occurs as early as the *Life of Anthony*. This is shown in detail in Chapter 3 of this section.

The main body of a saint's life is usually composed of five major themes: the theme of origins of the saint, the theme of birth, the theme of training, the theme of deeds, and the theme of death (the theme of death will include, according to my analysis, posthumous deeds and miracles).[80]

---

[80] See Evelyne Patlagean, "Ancient Byzantine Hagiography and Social History," in *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History*, edited by Stephen Wilson, 101-120, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.105. In her study of hagiography, she obseves three basic typological patterns of the vita narrative that typify the hero's relation to his world, relations that are encompassed within the exposition of deeds: the *demonic model* which encompasses the subtheme of harmony restored; the *scriptural model*, "in which the terms of the relationship closely follow the characters and events of the Gospels or occasionally of the Old Testament"; and the *ascetic and moral model*, "which differs from the previous one in that the terms of the relationship are consciously transposed on to a plane of asceticism, virtue and sin."

A sixth category should also be addressed: the comparison theme or the comparison topos, whereby the hero of the vita is compared favorably to a biblical or holy predecessor, or some natural phenomenon, such as an animal or a celestial being.[81] These images are often taken from the Bible and are expressed in various ways: as a simile ("and like David, she vanquished every day an imaginary Goliath"[82]); as an expression in which the saint "imitates" the figure ("and imitating in everything the great monastic founder, Theodosius"[83]); as an expression in which the hero is stated to be the "second" so-and-so ("Thus this second Joseph"[84]); or as an expression where the hero is said to "surpass" the figure he or she is being compared with ("her vision was loftier than theirs" [i.e.those other saints][85]). The comparison topos generally is employed in those places of the narrative that describe or elaborate upon the deeds of the saint. In fact, the comparisons are used in order to amplify his or her deeds.

Accompanying each of these themes, there are subthemes that are associated with them, and in turn, there are thematic phrases and formulaic images that are associated with the subthemes. Many of the formulaic images employed in the hagiographic genre are, predictably, lifted from the Bible and are expressed in the form of metaphors and similes. In the next chapter, we present an exhaustive inventory of these poetic devices employed by Euthymius and document occurrences of these same images in earlier, pre-Euthymian texts of both Slavic and Greek origin. In order to

---

81 In a fascinating study Picchio posits a double semantic nature of biblical references in medieval literature; according to his analysis, biblical references in medieval literature are meant to be interpreted both literally (that is as allusions to verses that are to be understood within their Scriptural content) and as a set of signs that relate to the sanctity of the hero and contribute towards an amplification of the subject's glory. In the latter context biblical references function as "thematic clues." See R.Picchio, "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavic Orthodoxa'," *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 1 (1977): 1-31.

82 "i jakože Davidъ na kъždo dьnь mysьnago nizlagaše Goliata" (LP, III, 64).

83 "i vъ vъsemъ podražavaą velikaago onogo Teodosia obštežitelě" (LHM, III, 30).

84 "Sice ubo vtoryj Iosifъ" (LHM, III, 30).

85 "ašte viděniemъ vysočajše těxъ" (LP, I, 61).

define the structure of "word-weaving", however, we are concerned here more with the role of thematic phrases in reshaping the narrative pattern of the genre in the post-Metaphrastic period. Such thematic phrases are often, but not always, formulaic.

With the theme of origins, for example, there are the subthemes of the saint's parents (with thematic phrases expressing their piety or nobility, or both) and the saint's city and/or country of birth.

With the theme of birth, one finds commonly the subthemes of the mother's difficulty in conceiving a child (with thematic phrases of her barrenness or her divine vision in which she is told the news that she will give birth to her long-desired child) and the subtheme of the greatness or saintliness of the child presaged (with thematic phrases of visions, or the child quoting Scriptures from a very young age, or even his/her singing out from the mother's womb).

With the theme of training, the common subthemes are religious instruction (with thematic phrases of memorizing the Scriptures, reading from the Scriptures with diligence, singing from the Psalms, quoting the Scriptures, or receiving a good and pious upbringing at the hands of the parents), academic instruction (thematic phrases include learning to read or write, and then excelling, or being sent away to a monastery or going voluntarily to do the same), the subtheme of innate qualities of the saint's mind or soul (e.g. self-discipline, obedience, reason, intelligence, virtue, humility, love).

With the theme of deeds, the common subthemes are acts of piety and virtue (with accompanying thematic phrases of the saint's retreat from the world to a monastery, or the wilderness or cell to be a hermit; the saint's maintenance of fasting, vigils; the renunciation of worldly possessions or riches; the acts of piety of the hero expressed in increasing intensity [i.e. "and adding labor unto labor"]; phrases of the saint surviving famines or shortages of food; phrases of the saint "adorning" his or her life or position through pious deeds and miracles), the subtheme of the saint as a good teacher or pastor (some thematic phrases involve the saint leading people to God, shepherding the flock well, instructing followers to maintain orthodoxy, followers being increased or added to the orthodox fold, etc.), the subtheme of the saint drawing a following by virtue of his/her piety and holiness (accompanied by thematic phrases of God not

wanting the saint's virtue to be concealed, of people coming to the saint with zeal, of people wanting to receive blessings or healings from the saint, of his/her reputation and glory spreading throughout the land, or the saint having to reject the adulation of men and retreating again, etc.), the subtheme of battles or struggles with the Devil, demons and/or heretics (with thematic phrases such as "the Devil, not being able to tolerate the good deeds of the saint," phrases of the heretics or demons tormenting or tempting the saint, phrases of the demons or heretics wanting to get the saint off the track from the pure faith, etc), whereby the saint overcomes these torments through various means[86] (with thematic phrases of the saint overcoming their torments, the saint driving out the demons or heretics, the demons/heretics being "filled with shame", or the heretics repenting or rejecting their former faith); and there is also the subtheme of divine visions accompanying the deeds of the saint (with thematic phrases of the visionary "contemplating the power" of the visions just seen).

With the theme of death, there is the subtheme of the saint's death foreshadowed (with thematic phrases of the saint's illness, phrases of the saint presaging the death through visions or revelations, and the saint making preparations for his/her death [through final admonitions and instructions to the community, or carrying out a special ritual]), the subtheme of the saint's actual death (with thematic phrases of the date, year, place of death; circumlocutions to state the saint's death), the subtheme of the adoration of the relics (with thematic phrases of honoring the relics with fragrances and pomp, phrases of people crying tears onto and kissing the relics, and phrases of relics being likened to some priceless treasure), the subtheme of the translation of the relics (thematic phrases can include placement of the relics into the the church or cathedral and a patriotic topos ascribed to the city where they are brought or to the ruler who commands that they be transferred), and the subtheme of posthumous deeds (with thematic phrases of the relics giving off myrrh, the incorruptibility of the relics, the relics continuing to perform miracles, the impossibility of detailing all of the posthumous miracles performed, the

86 This is what Alissandratos refers to as the topos of "harmony restored." See Alissandratos, op.cit., 8.

saint appearing in visions to people, and the saint intervening in defense of good after death).

This is more or less a complete inventory of all the subthemes and thematic phrases that appear in the vitæ examined for this study. It should also be pointed out that all of the main structural and narrative components of the hagiographic genre can be traced back to the classical tradition which was passed on to Byzantium through the movement of the Second Sophistic and is not new to the Metaphrastic period. As Alissandratos points out, the basic themes of the main body of a saint's life -- the themes of origins, birth, training, deeds, comparison, death -- are all a part of the "encomiastic disposition."[87] The prescriptions for their use in the hagiographic genre can be traced back to treatises like Hermogenes' and Theon's (2nd c., A.D., Alexandria) *Progymnasmata* [88] and Menander of Laodicea's Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν. Hermogenes in his Περι ιδεων prescribes the form of the encomium which one must use if one wishes to praise a person. The list reads almost exactly like an outline of any saint's life: 1) marvelous events at his birth, 2) his upbringing, 3) his training and education, 4) nature of his soul (qualities of mind and spirit), 5) nature of his body (physical description), 6) his pursuits and deeds, 7) external resources, 8) how long he lived, 9) the way he died, and 10) posthumous events.[89]

---

[87] See Alissandratos, op.cit., 7-9. Lixačev has written extensively on the formulaic nature of Old Russian literature, including hagiography, though largely in the theoretical framework of Old Russian literature as a contained system. On page 103 of his book *Поэтика* (ibid.), he writes about the "stencilling" patterns of the literature's structural organization: "Словесное выражение этого трафарета может быть различным, точно так же, как и различных других трафаретов ситуации в описании жизни святого--его рождения, от благочестивых родителей, удаление в пустыню, подвигов, основания монастыря, благочестивой смерти и посмертных чудес."

[88] There is apparently some controversy surround the authorship of the progymnasmata usually ascribed to Hermogenes. See D.A.Russell's entry on Hermogenes in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, edited by Hammond and Scullar, 1970; reprint. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976, p.505.

[89] Quoted in J.J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974, p.41.

In his Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν Menander proffers a similar formula for how the ἐγκώμιον should be applied to the eulogy, or the καθαρὸν ἐγκώμιον.[90] It is easy to recognize in this outline, as well as in Hermogenes', all the formulaic components of the hagiographic genre. Delehaye points out that the structure is clearly that of the βασιλικὸς λόγος[91], the official ceremonial panegyric of the Byzantine Empire. According to Menander, there should be in the main body various topoi in the following order: a section on the country, city and people to whom honor should be given for producing our hero (πατρίς, πόλις, ἔθνος); something on the hero's family (γένος); his birth, particularly if it is accompanied by any miraculous signs (τὰ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως); the hero's qualities (τὰ περὶ φύσεως); his education (ἀνατροφή); his childhood (παιδεία); his way of life, his occupations and habits (ἐπιτηδεύματα); his deeds (πράξεις), his fortune (τὰ τῆς τύχης); and comparisons (σύγκρισεις).

The introduction to the main body of the saint's life finds its roots in classical Greek oration as well, which included an introduction, or proemium, that sought, as Kennedy writes, "the attention and goodwill of the audience."[92] Delehaye writes that the προοίμιον (introduction), as prescribed by Menander, should be essentially an amplification (αὔξησις) emphasizing the importance of the hero.[93]

The modesty topos of the hagiographic genre can be traced back to the ancient Greek rhetorical system of public oration, which, Kennedy notes, possessed a category in which the speaker "indicated his lack of

---

[90] What follows from the treatise of Menander is cited by Delehaye, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, 196-197.

[91] ibid., 196.

[92] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 12.

[93] Delhaye, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, 196. See also L.Previale, op.cit., 80-81. Previale writes that the "fundamental elements of the βασιλικὸς λόγος, according to Menander, are αὔξησις (amplification), σύγκρισις, τάξις, but truly essential in the panegyric is only αὔξησις, that is, a deliberate and for the most part a hyperbolic amplification of the good qualities and successes of the celebrated person."

knowledge or fitness to speak."[94] Menander stresses that the προοίμιον must include a section in which the orator states the difficulty in treating the subject with decorum and skill and feigns helplessness in his task.[95]

As we have seen above, the comparison topos of the vita, a structural device that Euthymius uses with particular frequency, was one of the standard components of Menander's encomiastic eulogy and of the panegyrical composition of the Aphthonian *progymnasma*. In such compositions, the comparison was referred to as the σύγκρισις. The following comment by Kustas reveals the identical function of the σύγκρισις of the panegyric of the progymnasma and the comparison topos of the vita:

> Σύγκρισις is indispensable to the encomium (how better to stress the virtues of your subject than by comparing him to a lesser man)...Although the comparison appears in many of the genres of Byzantine literature, it is particularly effective in the homilies with their exhortations to the good life: the works of the devil are contrasted with the works of God, the grossness of heathenism with the beauty of the Christian revelation, the way of the sinner with the way of the pious.[96]

In almost every one of Euthymius' lives, every theme is developed through the use of several subthemes, which are in turn made up of thematic phrases and formulaic images; but it is important to point out any of the thematic phrases, subthemes or even themes mentioned above can be omitted from a vita except for the theme of deeds, which, of course, is required by virtue of the genre's very purpose, i.e. to retell the life and deeds of a particular hero. For example, the *Life of Anthony*, the *Life of Constantine* and the *Life of Ivan of Rila* do not develop the theme of birth; the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* does not develop the theme of origins or the theme of birth. Furthermore, when a life-writer develops more than the theme of deeds in the composition, the sequence of themes is usually fixed in the order given above (origins, birth, training, deeds, death), but

---

[94] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 7. This statement appears in a section where Kennedy compares several aboriginal rhetorical customs of Oceana that correspond to those of ancient Greece.

[95] Delehaye, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, 197.

[96] Kustas, op.cit., 61.

this is not always the case: the Serbian *Life of Symeon* by Sava develops the themes of birth, training, deeds and death, but the theme of birth appears at the end of the text, after the theme of death.

A Redefinition of "Word-Weaving":

In previous studies on the literary tradition of Euthymius and other texts of the period of the Second South Slavic Influence we have seen that scholars have focused almost singularly on the fact that the texts of the "word-weaving" style are marked by a more abundant use of certain rhetorical devices, such as complex syntactic structure, metaphors, similes, tautological devices, paraphrase, etc. While these observations are certainly correct, they fail to touch upon the characteristics of these texts that make them, structurally, completely different from those texts which were written in the earlier tradition.

We maintain that the texts Slavists refer to as being written in a "word-weaving" style are actually texts which were written according to the stylistic norms that became fashionable in Byzantium during the Macedonian Renaissance of the eighth century and later incorporated by Symeon Metaphrastes into his paraphrases of saints' lives. Viewed this way, the "word-weaving" technique of such writers as Patriarch Euthymius -- who, along with Epiphanius the Wise is the best Slavic representative of this phenomenon -- is nothing more than the Slavic realization of stylistic trends that were already alive in the Byzantine hagiographic genre for five hundred years.[97]

---

[97] I.P. Eremin recognized that early, pre-Euthymian medieval Slavic hagiography followed the pattern of pre-Metaphrastic models. See И.П. Еремин, "О византийском влиянии в болгарской и древнерусской литературах IX-XII вв.," *Литература древней Руси (Этюды и характеристики)*, 9-17, Москва-Ленинград: Наука, 1966. On page 16 Eremin writes: "Всякая литература в какой-то мере связана с предшествующей ей литературной традицией. Это имело место также в Болгарии и на Руси. Ориентация на классиков старохристианской литературы здесь не могла так или иначе не проявиться и в местном оригинальном творчестве. И она действительно сказалась, особенно ярко в агиографии. Относительная «историчность» в обрисовке центрального героя, внимание к разного рода бытовым реалиям, простота изложения, почти полное отсутствие декоративной риторики--все это свидетельствует о том, что болгарские и дренерусские агиографы примкнули к дометафрастовской традиции. И это неудивительно, если учесть, что образцами для них были в первую очередь такие произведения, как «Житие Антония Великого» Афанасия Александрийского (в переводе

Because we maintain that Euthymius and his scions were fulfilling in Slavic letters a Byzantine style that was firmly in place since the time of Metaphrastes, it then follows that we maintain that the origins of this style in Byzantine and Slavic letters had nothing to do with the Hesychasts, as their fourteenth-century revival in Byzantium occured long after Metaphrastes' literary activities. Logically, it must also follow that, based on our association of the Euthymian style with the Metaphrastic style, that there can be identified tangible differences between the pre- and post-Metaphrastic styles in both the Byzantine and Slavic traditions. Indeed, redefining "word-weaving" actually entails the task of defining and characterizing the salient features of the post-Metaphrastic hagiographic genre and differentiating it from pre-Metaphrastic examples. The most important difference between the two traditions, we posit, is not that the pre-Metaphrastic texts use certain rhetorical devices sparingly while post-Metaphrastic texts use them abundantly. The main difference between the two traditions, rather, lies in their narrative structure.

Like post-Metaphrastic texts, pre-Metaphrastic texts such as the *Life of Anthony* (a fourth century Egyptian life in Greek, attributed to Athanasius the Great) and the *Life of Daniel the Stylite* (early sixth century Greek text) contain a narrative structure that is built around the development of most or all of the main themes or topoi associated with the encomiastic genre: those of origins, birth, training, deeds, comparison, and death. Furthermore, in both traditions, various subthemes are associated with each theme (see above). In the *Life of Anthony*, for example, the whole focus of the narrative and the whole basis of Anthony's sanctity lies in his ability to fend off the Devil and evil forces and to lead other people to God. There are numerous separate tales or anecdotes of Anthony's encounters with the Devil and his valor in overcoming his torments; and most of the main body of the text consists of a sermon that he gives, which demonstrates his skill for teaching people to follow Christianity and renounce heresies.

пресвитера Иоанна--болгарского книжника X-XI вв.), как творения крупнейшего классика греческой дометафрастовской агиографии Кирилла Скифопольского. Господствующей в то время в византийской агиографии «украшенный» стиль Симеона Метафраста е его последователей стал прививаться в Болгарии и на Руси значительно позже, в XIV-XV вв."

In the *Life of Daniel the Stylite,* there are more than fifteen separate stories within the vita in which Daniel performs some healing or exorcism. The focus of his sanctity, then, is on his miracle-working. Both texts develop subthemes associated with the deeds of the saint (triumphs over evil in the case of Anthony and miracle-working in the case of Daniel) through a narrative structure that is nothing more than a composite of numerous tales or anecdotes about the saint. Any of these short tales, could, in fact, stand alone as one incident out of the life of that particular saint.

The thematic phrases and formulaic images that are associated with the subthemes, while they do appear in these texts, are used sparingly by comparison with later, post-Metaphrastic texts. In the early texts, the anecdote is the most productive narrative component, with thematic phrases interspersed from time to time as a way of unifying these otherwise separate anecdotes into a single, comprehensive text.

In the later, post-Metaphrastic tradition, however, the opposite obtains: anecdotes of the aforementioned sort usually number no more than three or four, and the device of repeating and interweaving thematic phrases is used as the main vehicle by which the author creates an image of sanctity and holiness out of the hero. In the later tradition, only a handful of anecdotes are included; and the thematic phrases, interwoven and strung together throughout the texts, serve to repeat a particular subtheme without having to restate it with an anecdote.

In post-Metaphrastic texts, then, the subthemes are developed in a completely different way. Let us take, for example, the subtheme of Anthony's ability to lead people to God and see how this same subtheme is developed in post-Metaphrastic examples. As stated above, this subtheme of his deeds is developed in the text through the vehicle of an actual sermon of considerable length that is inserted into the main body of the text. In Euthymius' *Life of Hilarion of Moglena,* for example, there are repeated three times thematic phrases that emphasize the same subtheme, phrases like "he taught them to maintain carefully the correct faith" and "teaching and convincing them to keep the orthodox faith."

In all of Euthymius' texts, the *Life of Ivan of Rila,* the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena,* the *Life of Paraskeva,* and the *Life of Philothea,* this same subtheme dominates. Euthymius, however, relates only a few tales of miracle-working in each text and, instead, relies on thematic phrases that

are interwoven throughout the texts to communicate the same message. In each of these texts there are repeated four, five, sometimes six times thematic phrases such as "and he/she worked innumerable miracles", "many miracles", "the relics worked wondrous miracles", "working wondrous and glorious miracles", and the like. This is true not just of the Euthymian texts. In the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid,* Theophylact develops the subtheme of Kliment's outstanding academic ability. As is mentioned below in chapter 3 of this section, this same subtheme of training is the focal point of the *Life of Constantine*, a ninth-century Slavic text that is nevertheless written according to the norms of the pre-Metaphrastic hagiographic tradition. The subtheme of academic excellence is underscored by three separate incidents in the life of Constantine, told as three separate tales within his life. In the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid*, this subtheme is developed instead through the use of phrases that merely suggest and keep recalling this subtheme without Theophylact having to relate several incidents from his life.

This tendency is already visible in the Slavic tradition by the thirteenth-century in the Serbian vitæ, such as the *Life of Symeon* by his son St. Sava. In this saint's life, the main subtheme that is developed is that of the saint as a good teacher and pastor. Chapter 3 will cite the use of certain thematic phrases and formulaic images that run throughout the work. In terms of both style and narrative structure, this Serbian life falls well within the category of post-Metaphrastic texts; but by the Euthymian period, one finds many more subthemes developed in the same way within one text. In chapter 3 we will see that the Euthymian texts contain several subthemes each that become "leitmotifs," as it were, in the texts through the use of interwoven phrases.

The life-writer of the post-Metaphrastic tradition not only employs thematic phrases and formulaic images to take the place of recounting anecdote after anecdote, but he also piles them one on top of another to give the impression of a braiding or a tapestry of these thematic phrases. To put it another way, the hagiographer laboring according to the stylistic norms of the post-Metaphrastic tradition prides himself not on creating vivid and detailed stories of the saint, as his predecessors did, but on the creation of a text that is a dense string of formulaic clichés. For example, instead of relating as separate tales the various subthemes associated with the theme of the saint's training (such as his good upbringing, the death of

his parents, his academic and spiritual instruction, and his innate qualities of mind and soul) and deeds (such as his acts of piety), the post-Metaphrastic hagiographer can intimate or imply all of these in just two sentences through a skillful combination of phrases, as in this example from the *Life of Ivan of Rila* :

> After much time had passed, and his parent having died, he was always in fear of God, under no circumstances being absent from church, but listening with great attention to the divine words of the sacred teaching; and it was his habit to please the Lord with fasting and prayers. And he was entirely captivated by the love of God; and like one of the seraphims, his soul burned for the Lord, his God; and he bore fruit, in truth, a hundred-fold, like a tree which has been planted by the streams of water.[98]

In this passage, Euthymius employs the convention of comparison, likening Ivan to one of the fiery, six-winged angels that guard the throne of God; and he also includes a Biblical reference, another feature that becomes more prevalent in the post-Metaphrastic hagiographie style. In this next passage from the *Life of Ivan of Rila*, we see that Euthymius is able to communicate in just a few phrases several of the subthemes that are associated with the theme of the saint's deeds: his acts of piety and virtue (through tears, prayers, and fasting), his battles with agents of the Devil and subsequent victory, and his ascending virtue. In most pre-Metaphrastic lives, these subthemes would each be developed through story-telling; here they are merely implied through the careful selection of phrases, with rhetorical questions and similes added for intensity:

> Who then can tell of the works he then did? He would not take enough of that desert plant to fill him, but rather very little of it and in great scarcity, and he also took only a little water; and after sunset, [when it grew cold], he nearly froze. Who is worthy to inform of his "fountain of tears," and also his all-night vigils and prayer? In multitudes demons would come to him, taking on the shapes of various beasts, wishing to frighten him and chase him away. But he was brave and unshakeable in the face of such tortures, and like a hard stone, he beat them off and deflected all the

98 "Vrěmeni ubo ne malu prěšedšu, i roditelemь ego umeršemъ, tъ bě vъ strasě gospodьni vynǫ, ot crьkve nikako otstǫpaą, nǫ sъ vъnimaniemь poslušaą božьstvnyix slovesь svąštennaa učenia, postomь i molitvami blagougoždaaše gospodevi. I bystъ vьsь plěnenь vь ljubovь božiǫ, jako edinь ot Serafimь gorą duxomь kъ gospodu, bogu svoemu, i tvorą plodь, po istinnomu storičnyj, jakože drěvo, nasaždenno pri istočnikox vodnyx" (LIR, II, 7-8).

waves that came upon him; or, to put it more precisely, [he was] like an adamant, [uncorrupted] by any iron.[99]

These types of constructions abound in the saints' lives of Euthymius and other "high style" vitæ, such as *The Life of Symeon* by Sava, the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* by Theophylact, and the *Life of Theodosius* by Patriarch Kallistos; while the saints' lives written in the pre-Metaphrastic style, such as the *Life of Constantine*, the *Life of Methodius*, the *Life of Wenceslas*, the *Life of Daniel the Stylite* and the *Life of Anthony* are all built on the compilation of story-telling, with thematic images and formulaic phrases reduced to a minimum. The *Life of John the Almsgiver* seems to be an example of a transitional style between the two ways of approaching life-writing; but as Delehaye's manuscript dates from the late twelfth/early thirteenth century, it is impossible to determine to what extent this may simply be later, post-Metaphrastic interpolation.[100]

By way of summarizing, the narrative structure of pre-Metaphrastic texts is, simply speaking, a composite of separate stories, tales or anecdotes about the saint: how he or she resisted the temptations of the Devil; what miracles they performed, his or her ability to lead people to God. This is what we term a "linear" narrative; the whole text reads like an uninterrupted string of tales. Phrases that become commonplace in the post-Metaphrastic period do appear, but seldom more than once or twice in the entirety of the text and never as a replacement of the anecdotes lifted from the biography of the hero. The specific incidents in this kind of narrative are more important in communicating the message to the reader. In post-Metaphrastic texts, the reader or interlocutor is inundated with a repetition

---

99 "Kto ubo sъkazati vъzmožetь togo ąže togda tvoréše trudy? Ni bo to samoe bylie pustynnoe do sytosti priimaaše, nǫ malo zělo i skǫdno, i se po zaxoždeni slъnьčněmь, i vodǫ že takožde, eliko tъčiǫ vъnątrъnéa proxladiti. Slъznyj že paky togo istočnikь kto po dostoaniju izvestitь, vъsenoštnaa že takožde stoania i kolenopréklonenia? Množiceǫ bo, préobrazuǫšte sebe, vésu prixoždaaxǫ, zvérej raličnyx obrazy ustrašiti i otgnati togo xotąšte. Nǫ doblyj nepokoléblemь prébyvaaše téx kъznьmi, jakože někyj kamenь tvrъd vъsą prixodąštąą na nьvlъny razbivaą i otražaą, ili, istinnée rešti, jakože adamantъ ne ątь byvaaše nikakovémь želézomь" (LIR, II, 9).

100 See footnotes 4 through 20 to Chapter 2 of this section for the information on edited and published texts of manuscripts used for this study.

of thematic phrases or formulaic images. The writer of post-Metaphrastic, or "word-weaving", texts, uses such phrases to take the place of anecdotal, "linear" narration. According to this literary sensibility, the distilled qualities, truths and acts of the saint expressed by means of thematic phrases interspersed throughout the text become more important than a detailed account or relation of a particular act or deeds. This is similar to what Lixačev has described as "абстрагированность" or "абстрагирование", although he makes no statement on how it ties in with the Metaphrastic or "word-weaving" tradition *en gros*. Of this concept he writes the following:

> For hagiographic literature, another feature is characteristic, and this feature appears especially clearly in later hagiographic literature of the 14th and 15th centuries, but it can already be observed in the 11th- and 12th-century examples. This is the feature of "abstraction" [абстрагированность]. The essence of this feature of abstraction is that the author deliberately avoids definitions, precision, and any details which would reveal any uniqueness of the described situations. This is not by chance, but is rather a premeditated attempt to regard the life of the saint, as it were, as being outside of time and space, as a standard of aesthetic norms, eternal and universal.[101]

"Word-weaving," more accurately described, is not just an interlacing and piling up of rhetorical devices but is also a weaving of themes and subthemes. Moreover, we posit that the component of interweaving textual subthemes is the most important structural characteristic of

---

101 See Д.С.Лихачев, *История русской литературы X-XVII вв.*, Москва: Просвещение, 1980, p.107. The original passage reads: "Для агиографской литературы характерна и еще одна черта, которая особенно ярко проявится позднее в житийной литературе XIV-XV вв., но дает о себе знать уже в житиях XI-XII вв. Черта эта--абстрагированность. Суть ее в том, что автор нарочито избегает определенности, точности, любых деталей, которые указывали бы на частность, единичность описываемых ситуаций. Это не случайность, а омысленное стремление рассматривать жизнь святого как бы вне времени и пространства, как эталон этических норм, вечный и повсеместный".

A discussion of "abstraction" also appears in Lixačev's earlier study: Лихачев, *Поэтика дренерусской литературы*, Ленинград: Худож. лит.,1971, p.123; in which he writes: "Абстрагирование вызывалось попытками увидеть во всем 'временном' и 'тленном', в явлениях природы, человеческой жизни, в исторических событиях символы и знаки вечного, вневременного 'духовного', божественного." Lixačev points out that hagiography, along with hymnography and chronicle-writing were the genres that were most strongly influenced by the tendency toward "abstraction".

post-Metaphrastic texts. It is this latter feature that gives "word-weaving" texts their character of repetition and lexical "wrapping." One should, in describing the style of these texts, speak not of the "weaving of words" but rather the "weaving of themes," or, more specifically, the "weaving of subthemes."

In addition to the device of "weaving of subthemes," we have identified three other features that are found typically more abundantly in those texts of high style and complex narrative: 1) a markedly greater use of the device of lexical anaphora; 2) a frequency of long appositional series[102]; 3) the abundant use of the comparison topos (whereas in texts of simple style they are used sparingly); and 4) use of the rhetorical question by the author to advance the narrative in those sections dealing with deeds of the saint (e.g. "And so, what were they to do?" [LKlOxr, II], "And what did God do Who wants His saint to be glorified?" [LTheod, XVI, 22], "Who can tell of the works he did?" [LIR, II], "Well, what then? [LIR, III]", "And so what did He do, He Who does everything to some benefit?"[LIR, V], etc.).

The narrative structure of "weaving of subthemes" and the use of rhetorical questions are the only features of life-writing that are specific to the post-Metaphrastic style. The other rhetorical devices listed above and examined in detail in the next chapter do appear in an abundance in the later, post-Metaphstic texts, but they are not exclusive to these texts. They all appear to some extent in the earlier, pre-Metaphrastic texts as well.

Refutation of the Connection between "Word-Weaving" and a "Hesychastic" Euthymian School:

Having defined "word-weaving" more specifically to mean the weaving of subthemes rather than the actual weaving of words, we can now address the assumptions that have been made about Euthymius and his style. First, we will address some notions which previous scholarship has maintained: that Euthymius and his Hesychast disciples innovated and developed a new style of writing, that Euthymius' use of language represented an innovation in the hagiographie tradition.

---

102 See Section III, Chapter 2 for more information on points 1 and 2.

Since Lixačev, there have been many scholars who credit Euthymius with these distinctions. Contemporary Bulgarian scholarship in particular has been devoted to propogating Lixačev's assessment of Euthymius as a stylistic innovator.[103] This is done with the motive of preserving a unique place for medieval Bulgarian letters in the sphere of study on the Second South Slavic Influence. This impulse on the part of our Bulgarian colleagues is understandable when one considers the bias established in the work of some Soviet scholars to downplay the contribution made to Russian cultural development by what had become for much of the second

---

103 See, for example, P.Dinekov, "Outlines of Old Bulgarian Literature," in *Kiril and Methodius: Founders of Slavonic Writing*, edited by Ivan Dujčev, 1-36, East European Monographs, no.172, Boulder, 1985 (originally published in *Похвала на старобългарска литература*, София, 1979), pp.26-27.

In this article, Dinekov echoes Lixačev's statements made in his "Некоторые задачи." He says "D.S.Likhachov subjected the stylistic and linguistic techniques of Evtimiy and his school to a profound and original analysis in order to demonstrate that in old Bulgarian literature there appears a new style which spreads as far as Russia and gives grounds to speak of a new intellectual movement in the history of the southern and eastern Slavs. D.S. Likhachov termed it 'a Byzantine-Slavonic pre-Renaissance' and claimed the sphere of its influence to involve various realms of culture such as architecture and painting. Likhachov's study again vividly disproved the traditional concept of old Bulgarian literature as stagnant and static and concretely noted the new elements appearing in its ideological content, genres and styles. "

See also К.Иванова, "Патриарх Евтимий и агиографската традиция в средновековната литература," *Литературна мисъл* 10 (1977): 90-99. Ivanova cautiously stands between two points of view, wanting to demonstrate simultaneously Euthymius' innovations in the Bulgarian hagiographic tradition in matters of style while, at the same time, underscoring his debt to the Byzantine tradition that preceded him. On p.92 she writes: "Euthymius tried out his talented pen in the most typical genres--hagiography and hymnograpy, for he created brilliant examples of the classical Byzantine canon, modified in the contemporary Hesychast 'abstract psychologism' [абстрактен психологизъм] and at the same time he gave them a corresponding literary form, establishing the beginning to a new style -- brilliant and rhetorical, expressive and heavily saturated with complex rhetorical ornamentation."

See also Д. Косев, *Кратка история на България*, София: Наука и изкуство, 1969. Kosev explains on p.78 how Euthymius took the Byzantine high-style and crafted out of it something purely Bulgarian, apart from the Byzantine tradition: "Although influenced by the models of Byzantine literature, [Euthymius] displayed in his own works a significant independence both in choice of material and in their elaboration. His style is distinguished by its artistry, by its richness of contrasts and by its poetic descriptions of nature."

half of the twentieth century dependent satellite countries. Consider, for example, this illustrative passage from Lavrov[104]:

> But hardly another Slavic people acquired the Cyrillo-Methodian heritage to such a degree as the Russians in their acceptance of Christianity from the Greeks through the medium of the whole wealth of the first Slavic writing and its continued development in Bulgaria...We Russians were especially strongly enriched by the elements of the Church-Slavonic language...and there is no other Slavic language in which there remains in the present day so many elements of Old Slavic as ours.[105]

In order to prove the point that Euthymius innovated a new literary style, many scholars are fond of pointing to Euthymius' own stated purpose to write "po lěpotě", or "with beauty" in his hagiographic texts.[106] This

---

104 П.А. Лавров, *Материалы по истории возникновения древнейшей славянской письменности*, 1930; reprint, The Hague: Mouton,1960, p.ii. Moreover, as Iovine has observed (op.cit.,38-39), the willingness of Soviet scholarship to recognize the role played by Bulgaria and other Slavic countries in the cultural development of Russia has changed with the political tides. She points out that the subsequent editions of Gudzij's *История древнерусской литературы* have had deleted from them the section on the Second South Slavic Influence that was included in the original 1938 edition.

105 For a good illustration of how nationalistic aims have marred the Soviet scholarship done on early East Slavic writing and literature, see H.Lunt, "History, Nationalism, and the Written Language of Early Rus'," *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 34 (1990): 1-29.

Alissandratos (op.cit., 3) cautions specifically against such an approach to scholarship: "Establishing whose influence was strongest is less important than recognizing this [the period of the Second South Slavic Influence] as a period of intense mutual cultural and literary interaction. This lays the groundwork for comparative literary analysis and frees the comparison from conforming to preordained national goals."

Dujčev, moreover, maintains that the notion of nationalism is in itself anachronistic in its application to the culture and period under consideration. See I. Dujčev, "A Nationality-Building Factor: The Role of the Slavic Script for the Bulgarians," in *Kiril and Methodius: Founders of Slavonic Writing*. On page 40 he writes: The Middle Ages still had no proper sense of nationality and national consciousness. The Byzantine Empire itself, until its last two centuries, was a polyethnic entity in which no Byzantine nationality in the true sense of the word was ever formed." For general information on the question of a developing sense of Bulgarian nationality in the medieval period, see M. Pundeff, "National Consciousness in Medieval Bulgaria," *Südost-Forschungen* 27 (1968):1-27.

106 Cf., for example, К.Станчев, "Евтимиевата школа в контекста на европейското духовно развитие," *Старобългарска литература* 11 (1982): 8-18, p.9; П. Русев, "Реформата на Евтимий Търновски: характер, особености, разпространение," *Търновска книжовна школа*, том 2, Ученици и последователи на Евтимий Търновски, 49-54, София: БАН, 1980, p.50; and T. Dąbek-Wirgowa, op.cit. p.45. She writes: "Patriarcha tyrnowski wzorem hesychastów żywił lęk, że nie zdoła wysławić świętości 'po lěpotě', czyli dostatecznie pięknie, i tym kunsztowniej 'splatał słowa'." ("Following the model of the hesychasts,

extract from Euthymius' texts cannot, however, be held up as proof that Euthymius consciously crafted a *new* language to express with sufficient beauty the chosen themes of his hagiographic works; rather, one must attribute this stated desire on the part of Euthymius to contemporary Byzantine notions about what constituted "good writing." In Tomaševskian terms, this stated desire to write with beauty could be termed a function of the "normative poetic" of the period.[107]

A conscious concern for and effort to write with "beauty" stems at least as far back as Longinus[108], and this concern was passed on to Christian writers through such writers of the Second Sophistic as Hermogenes. In Hermogenes' treatise Περὶ ἰδεῶν he elaborates seven important characteristics of good style: σαφήνεια (clarity), ἀξίωμα λόγου (loftiness), γοργότης (speed or conciseness), ἦθος (character), ἀλήθεια (verity, truth, sincerity), δεινότης (gravity, decorum, force), and κάλλος (beauty).[109] Moreover, the famous Byzantine writer Michael

---

Patriarch Euthymius was afraid that he would not be able to praise the saints "po lepotě", that is with sufficient beauty, and all the more artistically he 'wove words'.")

107 Tomaševskij refers to this as the "нормативная поэтика" in Russian. See Б. Томашевский, *Теория литературы, поэзия,* 4th ed. Москва-Ленинград: Государственное издательство, 1928; reprint, Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1971, p.7: "Каждая литературная школа имеет свои взгляды на литературу, свои правила, и, следовательно--свою нормативную поэтику."

108 For an interesting discussion of the historical development of the aesthetic category of beauty, beginning with Longinus, see В.В.Бычков, "Образ как категория византийской эстетики," *Византийский временник* 34 (1973): 151-167. He writes on p.154: "Из античных эстетических категорий в ранний христианский период часто используются «красота» (τὸ κάλλος) и «прекрасное» (καλός)" ("Amongst the ancient aesthetic categories in the early Christian period one often uses 'beauty' and 'the sublime'").

109 Cf. Kustas, op.cit., 65; and D. Shuger, *Sacred Rhetoric, The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988, p.259.

Byzantine writers throughout the Macedonian and Palaeologan Renaissance set for themselves a goal of recreating what they thought was Attic style; and, they belived, the way to achieve this was to follow the stylistic prescriptions of Hermogenes. See Kustas, op.cit.,64-65.

Runciman also writes about this period in the development of Byzantine stylistic norms in *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*, 15: "The Byzantine child had to 'hellenize' his tongue (as Anna Comnena words it); that is to say, he had to learn to write Greek in a classical style with a classical vocabulary. The study of rhetoric, as this discipline was called, was a necessary part of a full education. But the language taught in it was far removed from the

Psellus (1018-1078), in his encomium to Symeon Metaphrastes, writes that earlier hagiographers (i.e., those before Metaphrastes) should be rebuked for not adorning their works with beautiful words.[110] And in the Latin West, Cicero (106-43 BC) includes in his *Rhetorica ad Herennium* "dignitas" as one of the virtues of writings, which means distinction, or "ornamentation of style and consists in the use of figures."[111]

Anyone who has read the saints' lives of Euthymius will require no further proof that he was a conscious writer and strove to write with elegance and skill; but to claim that Euthymius, under the influence of Hesychasm, was reponsible for a new style of writing within the hagiographic tradition runs contrary to the facts. There is nothing about the use of language or the structure of the vitæ of Euthymius that can be called either new, innovative, or Hesychastic, despite many claims to the contrary that seek to forge an intimate tie between an ornamental style and the expression of Hesychast mysticism.[112] Radčenko has recognized that

---

spoken tongue. It aimed at Attic purity but it became far too often an artificial kathareuousa, flowery and verbose."

In the 14th century, during the Palaelogan Renaissance (which was contemporary with the career of Euthymius), there ensued a famous debate between two Byzantine writers, Theodore Metachites and Nicephorus Chumnus. One of Chumnus' attacks on Metachites is that the latter's style lacks ἦθος and κάλλος. See Kustas, op.cit.,70-71, and I.Ševčenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos*, Brussels, 1962.

110 Quoted in C.Mango, *Byzantium*, p.250.

111 Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 99.

112 Picchio, in his article, "Old Russian Literature," 319, regards the 'word-weaving' style as a "result of the hesychast theory of knowledge."

Charles Moser in *A History of Bulgarian Literature*, The Hague: Mouton, 1972, p.8, states that "the literary tone [of 14th-century Bulgaria]...was set by an ill-defined mystical movement: Hesychasm."

K. Stančev (Станчев, "Евтимиевата школа," pp.9-10) writes: "The style which Euthymius used and which later acquired the name "pletenie sloves" has as its main goal the maximal use of the word as a means of uncovering the divine being/essence of the thing in the spirit of Hesychasm" ("Стилът, който Евтимий налага и който по-късно получава названието "плетение словес", има за основна цел максималното използуване на словото като средство за разкриване на божествената същност на нещата в духа на исихазма.")

A.E. Tachiaos in his article "Mount Athos and the Slavic Literatures," *Cyrillomethodianum* 4 (1977): 1-35, p.16, writes: "This movement of which we speak [Hesychasm] had very strong repercussions in Byzantine literature. It quickly spread to neighboring Bulgaria and Serbia, and eventually to far off Russia. The chief characteristic

Euthymius wrote his vitæ partly under the influence of Metaphrastes and partly under the influence of Patriarch Kallistos.[113] While many similarities can be found between Euthymius' and Kallistos' hagiographic works in the poetic images they employ and the themes they develop (particularly Hesychastic themes), it must be remembered that Kallistos himself, as a hagiographer, wrote according to the Metaphrastic examples that came before him. Kallistos may have been the most influential writer in Euthymius' own formation as a hagiographer; but even if this is so, it must be emphasized that the tradition that got passed on to both of them is a Metaphrastic one and not a specifically Hesychastic one.

A call to re-examine the assumed role of Hesychasm on the development of a literary style during the period of the Second South Slavic Influence has been made before us by other scholars in the field, such as Birnbaum[114], Ivanova[115], Iovine[116], Meyendorff[117], Børtnes[118],

---

of the period was a revival of the mystical and ascetic literature of Byzantine, a return to the sources of mysticism. At the same time we find a blossoming in liturgical texts and hymnology while hagiography created a new style..."

See also Ian White, "Hesychasm and the Revival of Bulgarian Literature in the Fourteenth Century," in *Bulgaria, Past and Present*, 249-254, Columbus: AAASS, 1976. On page 250 he writes: "The Bulgarian literary revival of the fourteenth century was to a certain extent nourished by a religious movement known to modem historians as Hesychasm; Evtimij's work is informed with the spirit of this movement. The most noteworthy features of Evtimij's writings are their novel language and style. It is possible that these features of his work cannot be explained without reference to Hesychasm." White implies but does not committ himself to the notion that the "novel language and style" employed by Euthymius is tied to the spread of Hesychasm in Bulgaria.

113 Радченко, *Литературное и религиозное движение*, 259.

114 See our discussion above on Birnbaum's contributions to the problem of identifying the Byzantine roots of the "word-weaving" high style and his contribution to identifying this style in pre-Euthymian Serbian texts.

115 In her article 'Патриарх Евтимий и агиографската традиция в средновековната литература," Ivanova underscores, and quite correctly so, Euthymius' debt to the stylistic reforms of Symeon Metaphrast. On pp. 93-94 she writes: "In the monastic libraries of Athos and Constantinople, where he had access to classical examples of the vita-panegyric genre, Euthymius received a full understanding of Byzantine hagiographic literature in all the brilliance of its several centuries-old development. A no less significant moment in the hagiographic 'education' of Euthymius is his contact with the Metaphrastic codices--the reading menaea collections, containing saints' lives written or edited by Symeon Metaphrast. Throughout the 14th century, copies of these poured into the holdings of all the biggest monastic and church repositories...In the hagiographic-panegyric work of Euthymius of Trnovo, we find two traditions: Bulgarian hagiography -- inasmuch as he is a

and Kitch.[119] Furthermore, many have correctly observed Euthymius' debt to the stylistic reforms in hagiography brought about by Symeon Metaphrastes in the tenth century and the debt owed in general by late medieval South Slavic writing to Byzantine models.[120] Popov, for example, observes:

---

representative of the Byzantino-Slavic cultural community -- and the Byzantine hagiography."

116 Iovine, op.cit., 201, writes: "No serious scholar of the Second South Slavic Influence would insist that either the orthographic reforms or the style called 'pletenie sloves' was created *ex novo* by Patriarch Euthymius and the Hesychasts."

117 See J. Meyendorff, "Society and Culture in the Fourteenth Century: Religious Problems," *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines* (September 6-12, 1971), vol.1, 51-65, Bucharest, 1972; reprinted in *Byzantine Hesychasm* as article 8. On page 58 he writes: "...hesychast spirituality may have had quite a different impact on art in the slavic [sic] countries and in Byzantium. There is no evidence, for example, that any major figure of Byzantine hesychasm...manifested any peculiar interest for art."

118 Børtnes, "Hesychast Doctrine," 84, writes: "There is nothing inherently mystical in this rhetorical mode of expressions [of 'word-weaving'], and the attempt to identify Epiphanius' *pletenie sloves* with Hesychast theology is contradicted by the writings of the great Hesychast mystic Symeon the New Theologian (949-1022) and by those of his successor Gregory Palamas, the leader of the Hesychast revival in the fourteenth century."

119 See Faith C.M. Kitch, *The Literary Style of Epifanij Premudryj: Pletenije Sloves*, Slavistische Beiträge 96, Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1976. On pages 28-29 she writes: "Emotion was conveyed through the medium of rhetoric. But there is no specific hesychast style, no special relationship between rhetoric and Hesychasm. Rhetorical style had always been in Byzantium the elegant clothing for all genres, hagiography included. Lives by both hesychasts and their opponents were elegantly composed."

120 Radčenko (Радченко, *Литературное и религиозное движение*, pp. 248, 258) suggests that Bulgarian and Byzantine hagiographic literature of the fourteenth century was under the influence of both Hesychasm and Metaphrastes. Both Speranskij (М.Н. Сперанский, *История древнерусской литературы*, том 2, Московский период, 3d. ed., Москва,1921); and later Dujčev (И.Дуйчев, "Итальянская книга по истории дренерусской литературы," *ТОДРЛ* 18 [1962]: 552-568) articulated the necessity of looking at trends in Byzantine literature when studying the developments of word-weaving in Slavic literature of the period of the Second South Slavic Influence. Talev (op.cit., 42) writes: "The new style typical of South Slavic literature [of the 14th century] fully reflects the Byzantine style dominant after the firm establishment of Christianity." In retaliation of Lixačev's assumptions regarding the role played by Euthymius in the elaboration of a high style in 14th-century South Slavic writing, Talev also writes on p.34: "But it is definitely incorrect to state that 'the connection between the reform (of Euthymius)...and the new style of 'weaving of words,' characteristic of the 14th-15th centuries, is beyond doubt."

> This new [style] in Bulgarian literature was not created in Bulgaria, but was borrowed from Byzantium...Euthymius, as a well-educated man of his day, incorporated not only the spirit of contemporary Byzantine literature, but also the style and even the structure of its rhetoric...His own works were created according to Byzantine models: he preserved medieval Byzantine artistic devices and interwove [преплитал] the main ideas with rhetorical phrases.[121]

Lixačev himself in his aforementioned article writes: "The question of Byzantine influence in the area of the 'word-weaving' style has been very little studied, but its influence here is unquestionable."[122] But so far a detailed comparison of the lives written by Euthymius with those of earlier Byzantine and Slavic authors has not been made in order to prove this point. In this study we hope to elucidate the position of Euthymius in relation to the Byzantine and Slavic tradition that came before him.

That Euthymius was part of a circle of Hesychasts is certain. His own hagiographic texts abound in references to Hesychast mysticism (this is the subject of Chapter 2 of Section IV); also, Grigorij Camblak in his "Poxvalno slovo" of Euthymius gives ample examples of Euthymius' involvment with the Hesychastic movement, complete with references to his fulfillment of the stages of "πράξις" and "θεωρία" taught by Gregory the Sinaite.[123] There is also archaeological[124], historical[125], and literary

---

Cf. also Димитър Кенанов, "Симеон Метафраст и търновската книжовна школа," *Търновска книжовна школа*, том 4, 26-36, София: БАН, 1985; and К. Станчев, "Нормативност на средновековната естетика и поетика," *Старобългарска литература* 6 (1980): 3-10. Stančev makes an interesting point concerning the "normalization" of hagiographic texts and their entrance into the ranks of high literature. He maintains that this process happened in Byzantine literature only with the advent of the Metaphrastic reforms; and he draws a parallel between Metaphrastes' reforms and Euthymius' reforms in their role in "normalizing" the hagiographic genre in their respective literary traditions.

121 Х.И. Попов, *Евтимий, последен Търновски и Трапезицки патриарх (1375-1394)*, Пловдив: Печатница на Хр. Г. Данов, 1901, p.123.

122 Лихачев, "Некоторые задачи," 6. The original passage reads: "Мало изучен вопрос о византийском влиянии в области стиля 'плетения словес', но и здесь это влияние несомненно."

123 See E.Kałużniacki, *Aus der panegyrischen Litteratur der Südslaven*, Vienna, 1901; reprint, London: Variorum, 1971. The text of the "poxvalno slovo" is contained in pp.28-60. For references to Euthymius as a Hesychast, see especially chap.IV, p.33, lines 5-18; chap.V, p.34, lines 25-29; and chap.IX, p.39-40, lines 3-31 and lines 1-2, respectively.

evidence[126] that demonstrates unequivocally the strong presence of the Hesychasts in medieval Bulgarian society; nevertheless, the only component of Euthymius' texts that is specifically tied to the Hesychasts is the content. In other words, the language and structure of the Euthymian vitæ are borrowed from an earlier Byzantine tradition that developed completely independently of the Hesychasts. The category of religious content is the only sphere in which Byzantine Hesychasm had an influence in the composition of Euthymius' saints' lives. As we have stated above, the literary style which Euthymius employed was already established in Byzantine writing well before his lifetime and before the influx of Hesychastic mysticism in Byzantium and on the Balkans.

We do not imply by this that Euthymius did not contribute much to the development of the genre; on the contrary, Euthymius is one of the

---

124 See Стоян Маслев, "Пустинножителска Мадара," *Арехеология*, 1, кн.3-4 (София, 1959):24-34, esp. 24-30. Maslev maintains that archaeological findings in Madara, Bulgaria corroborate the existence of religious hermits in 13th-14th century Bulgaria. He says that the period of the 13th and 14th century -- esp. after the fall of the tsardom of Ivan Asen II (1218-1241) -- witnessed foreign invaders, and the Bulgarian countryside was laid waste. As a result there was a new wave of anchoritic monasticism: "Such were the conditions which prepared the soil for the spread of the religious movement of Hesychasm, by far the most rudimentary form of mysticism." Cf also К. Шкория, "Мадаро-Могилското плато," *Byzantinoslavica* 4 (1932):103-4, fig.12,13,14; C. Diehl, *L'art byzantin dans l'Italie meridionale*, Paris, 1894, p.24.

125 See E.Bakalova, "La société et l'art en Bulgarie au XIVe siècle (L'influence de l'hésychasme sur l'art)," *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines* (September 6-12, 1971), vol.2, 33-38, Bucharest: Editarai Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975. On page 36 Bakalova discusses the benefaction which the hermit monks received from the Bulgarian tsar for the construction of their cenobitic community at the caves of Ivanovo. She writes that the fact that Tsar Ivan Alexander had a private chapel constructed far away from Tmovo in the caves where colonies of ascetics and anchorites had been established and commissioned for its decoration a remarkable artist--who in all likelihood had trained in a studio in Constantinople--all testify to the importance that Hesychasm had in the spiritual life of Bulgaria. For a reworked English version of the same study, see E.Bakalova, "Society and Art in Bulgaria in the 14th Century," *Byzantinobulgarica* 8 (1986): 17-72.

126 Cf. Д.Ангелов, "Към историята на религиозно-философската мисъл в средновековна България--исихазъм и варлаамитство," *Българското историческо дружество*, 25 (1967): 73-92, esp.pp.78-87; and К.Иванова "Някои моменти на българо-византийските литературни връзки през XIV в.," *Старобългарска литература* 1 (1971): 209-42, pp.211-212.

most talented life-writers in the Slavic tradition whose mastery of all the formulaic rhetoric and thematic topoi of the genre was extraordinary. For this reason, Picchio rightly confers onto him the distinction of being one of the few medieval Slavic authors whom we can consider as "writers in the modern sense of the word, that is, masters of verbal art."[127] The focus of our research, however, is to point to the origins of the devices that Euthymius used so abundantly and artfully and to underline the fact that everything he brought into his vitæ he learned from an earlier tradition, a tradition that predates the fourteenth-century Hesychastic Revival. He neither invented nor innovated the style he used. In a word, "word-weaving" in Slavonic literature reaches a high point in its development with Euthymius, but it was not a new product of him or his scions. The content of his hagiographic works -- that is, the subjects he chooses for his saints' lives and how he describes their spiritual ascent -- is, however, intimately tied with Hesychast mysticism and the tenets of the movement.

The absence of stylistic innovation in Euthymius' writing in no way stigmatizes him; rather, it is in perfect accord with the aesthetic of his day. A learned medieval audience would have viewed Euthymius as a good writer not for his ability to innovate but for his ability to perfect a received style and to recombine skillfully a formulaic repertoire of literary tropes and images. In this context, it is useful to remember a point made by the theorist Jan Mukařovský. Concerning the definition of poetic language, he stresses that individuality is not one of its prerequisites:

> Not even individuality...characterizes poetic language in general. Regardless of the fact that a distinctly individual style is possible outside of literature (in scientific discourse, for example), we should keep in mind that there are entire developmental periods in which poetic language avoids individuality of expression.[128]

---

127 R.Picchio, "Isometric Semantic Markers in the Prose of Patriarch Euthymius of Trnovo," *International Journal for Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 31-32 (1985): 309-318, p.309.

128 See J. Mukařovský, "On Poetic Language," first published as "O jazyce básnickém" in *Slovo a slovesnost*, 6 (1940); English translation in *The Word and Verbal Art, Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*, translated and edited by John Burbank and Peter Steiner, Yale Russian and Eastern European Studies, 13, Yale University Press, 1977, p.3.

Euthymius was working with fixed formulae and topoi to construct the narrative of his saints' lives, and reliance on fixed formulæ is one of the principles on which many ancient art forms were built. In such contexts, the skill of the creator-author was not a function of his ability to innovate new forms and themes but of his ability to manipulate and recombine fixed and prescribed topoi.[129]

All of the points raised in this chapter, of course, have to be supported by textual evidence. There are basically three levels of consideration that we must examine. In order to prove the statement that the style and structure of the Euthymian vitæ are neither new nor tied in any way to the Hesychasts, we must examine in detail both components of his works. First of all, we must identify what the components of his style are (i.e. the rhetorical devices he employs, both linguistic and poetic) and then examine each one to determine the extent of its originality. Secondly there is the structure of the vitæ to consider; we must demonstrate whether the presence of weaving of subthemes, the interplay of formulaic phrases of emotion, and the use of rhetorical questions in the hagiographic genre are original to Euthymius. Within the category of "structure" one of the most important considerations is that of the intermixing of the genres of the vita

---

129 Quoting Jousse, Mukařovský writes (ibid.): "In *Studies in Linguistic Psychology* [M.Jousse, *Études de psychologie linguistique*, Paris,1925, p.13], Jousse [observes]: 'The narratives of the guslars, similar in this respect to the narrative of Homer, the prophets and the rabbis, to the Epistles of Baruch, St. Peter and St. Paul...are a juxtaposition of relatively few clichés. The development of each of these clichés happens automatically according to fixed rules. Only their order can vary. A good guslar is one who plays with his clichés as we play with cards, who arranges them in different ways according to the effect which he wishes to produce from them.' Thus individuality in such poetic configurations is obviously relegated to a secondary position, and what is left to it is merely an influence on the arrangement of a priori given formulae."

Lixačev comments specifically on the tendency of medieval art to be composed of prescribed themes and expressions (*Поэтика*, pp.126-7): "Для 'высокого' стиля XIV-XV вв. характерны трафаретные сочетания, привычный 'этикет' выражений, повторяемость образов, сравнений, эпитетов, метафоров, и.т.д... Литературный язык средневековья полон условно приподнятых трафаретов, тесно связанных с теми, которые привычны читателю по языку богослужебному, языку священного писания и сочинений отцов церкви. Эти условно приподнятые трафареты, закрепленные неподвижным, не подлежащим измению 'основым фондом' чисто церковной литературы, переходят из произведения в произведение. Заимствования и компиляции, стремление избегать индивидуальных особенностей стиля составляют характерную черту литературы церковных жанров."

and the panegyric in Euthymius' writings. It has been pointed out by Klimentina Ivanova that the presence of the panegyric in Euthymius' vitæ is not an innovation of his own but the result of an earlier Byzantine tradition.[130] This is correct, and this point will be examined in our inquiry on the structure of the Euthymian hagiographic works in chapter 3 of this section. Lastly, there is the question of content in Euthymius' vitæ: the claim that Euthymius' connection with the Hesychasts reveals itself solely in the content of his hagiographie works has to be demonstrated with proof from the primary texts. The subsequent two chapters of Section III and Chapter 2 of Section IV are all devoted to proving these claims.

130 К. Иванова, "Патриарх Евтимий и агиографската традиция," 95.

Chapter 2
Euthymius' Style: An Examination of the Rhetorical Devices in the Vitæ

As we have stated in the previous chapter, Euthymius and the Hesychasts did not invent the style they employed. All of the rhetorical devices Euthymius uses in his hagiographic works are used in other post-Metaphrastic texts of the period before the Hesychast Revival in Byzantium and Bulgaria (e.g. the *Life of Symeon* by Sava and the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* by Theophylact). All of these devices can, furthermore, be found in texts of the pre-Metaphrastic period, though there is a noticeable increase in the extent to which these devices are used in texts of the post-Metaphrastic period.

A definition then of "word-weaving" that focuses on the rhetorical devices tells, as it were, only half the story. It describes the differences between the texts in terms of the extent to which the same elements are employed across texts. We agree completely with Iovine's assessment that studies that focus on the rhetorical devices of "word weaving" texts do not go beyond the general nature of the questions at hand.[1] In fact, the only other large study done of the stylistic features of Patriarch Euthymius' works does not go beyond mere considerations of specific rhetorical devices.[2] It is, however, necessary to examine individually all the rhetorical components of Euthymius' style and compare them with earlier texts in order to prove our claim that there is nothing about the style of the Euthymian vitæ that is either new or that can be attributed specifically to the Hesychasts or Hesychasm. This chapter will be devoted to this task. Before we look at the origins of Euthymius' repertoire of rhetorical devices employed in his hagiographic texts, we should first give some information regarding the other texts employed in this study.

---

[1] M.Iovine, "The History and Historiography of the Second South Slavic Influence," Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1977, p.199: "This type of analysis [that focuses on the individual stylistic devices and figures used by Euthymius] still remains within the realm of the general and fails to clarify the unique peculiarities of the style and its rhetorical function within the context of the individual lives and panegyrics themselves."

[2] See Цветана Вранска,"Стилни похвати на Патриарх Евтимий," *Сборник на Българската академия на науките и изкуствата* 37, 2 (1942): 107-280.

Hagiographic Texts Employed for the Study:

For a complete list of the hagiographic texts that were examined for this study, one should consult the bibliography at the end of this dissertation under the section entitled "Primary Sources." Only those texts, however, that we have scanned for rhetorical devices/poetic images *and* outlined for narrative structure are discussed in greater detail here.

Before we can employ edited versions of hagiographic texts to prove the theory posited in this work, we must, when dealing with high-style texts, first be sure that we are either working with exemplars of the texts that date from the period *before* Euthymius; or, if they date from the period after Euthymius, then we must be working with several exemplars of texts in order to compare the content. If the only extant manuscripts of a vita date from the period after the fourteenth century, and if the content varies insignificantly over several copies of the same text (provided they are not done by the same scribe or by scribes of the same scriptorium), then this is evidence that the scribes who penned the manuscripts tampered very little with the content of the prototype. The reason this is important primarily for the high-style texts is that in the revision of a hagiographic text, it is possible that the text might undergo a transposition from low style to high style, as did happen in the period following the Metaphrastic reforms. If one is using a post-fourteenth-century manuscript of a high-style text presumably written before the Euthymian period, the data cannot be used to make any definitive statements about the use of language or the development of the hagiographic genre up to the time of Euthymius because the high-style features could well have been added at a later date.

Assuming the approximate time range of the prototype of the manuscript can be determined, the case where a pre-Euthymian low-style text exists only in a post-fourteenth-century exemplar is not necessarily cause to dismiss the data collected from such a text. The reason is that the kind of stylistic transposition from low-style to high-style just discussed does not generally travel in the other direction, so that if you have a post-fourteenth-century manuscript of a low-style text, the possibility for stylistic interpolation is much less likely than in the first case. Some words should be said regarding the editions used for this study.

Greek Hagiographic Texts:

1) The *Life of Anthony* (hereafter referred to as LAnth) is a fourth-century life, presumably written by St. Athansius between 356 and 357, not long after the saint's death. This vita is perhaps the most widely distributed and the best known in the hagiographic tradition. It exists in hundreds of copies of many different translations across many centuries, including Latin, Syriac, Arabic, and Slavonic, the contents of which varies little across texts. For the purposes of this study, we consulted J.-P. Migne's *Patrologia Græca*, which also includes the Latin translation done by Evagrius in 384.[3]

2) The *Life of Daniel the Stylite* (hereafter referred to as LDanStyl) an early sixth-century Byzantine text, was edited by Hippolyte Delehaye.[4] He employed primarily three eleventh-century manuscripts and one twelfth-century manuscripts, and he includes all of the textual variants in the annotation to his edition. While there are some differences in content across texts, stylistically they are homogenous, exhibiting pre-Metaphrastic, simple style and a linear narrative structure.

3) The *Life of St. John the Almsgiver* (hereafter referred to as LJohnAlm), an early seventh-century composite work by Leontius of Cyprus and Sophronius was also edited by Delehaye.[5] For this edition, Delehaye used a late twelfth-century/early thirteenth-century manuscript found in the Library of St. Mark of Venice, a menology for the month of November, and the texts of the vita is found under the date 12 November.[6]

---

[3] See *Patrologia Græca*. vol. 26, 835-976, edited by J.-P. Migne, Paris: Garnier, 1887.

[4] See the *Life of Daniel the Stylite* ; Greek text, edited by Hippolyte Delehaye, in *Analecta Bollandiana* 32 (1913): 121-229. This text has also been reprinted in *Les saints stylites*, edited by H. Delehaye, 1-94, Subsidia Hagiographica, no.14, Brussels: Société des bollandistes, 1923. All quotes from the LDanStyl are given by us with page and line numbers based on the edited text in *Les sains sylites*. In Delehaye's introduction to the text, he discusses the manuscripts used for the edition.

[5] See Leontius and Sophronius, *Life of St. John the Almsgiver*; Greek text, edited by Hippolyte Delehaye, in *Analecta Bollandiana* 45 (1927): 5-74. All quotes from the text are taken from this edition. See also Dawes and H. Baynes, *Three Byzantine Saints*, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977, pp.195-96, on the history behind the composite text.

[6] See Delehaye's introduction to the edition for full information on the manuscript.

Because Delehaye was working with one manuscript only of this vita, it is impossible to know to what extent the original was interpolated. This life, however, is not used by us as one of the examples of high-style life-writing. As it appears in this manuscript used by Delehaye, it seems to be a transitional example, employing at times certain features of high-style texts (such as flowering and abundant metaphor, simile); but the narrative structure is definitely pre-Metaphrastic, relying entirely on anecdotal exposition of the hero's sanctity.

4) The *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* by Archbishop Theophylact of Oxrid (hereafter referred to as LKlOxr) -- also known as the *Пространно Клементово житие* or the *Legenda Bulgarica* [7]-- was written in the late eleventh century. In his edition of the text, Aleksandar Milev cites five extant manuscripts of the life (only one of which is a full text), all of which date from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. When comparing the content of all of the texts, Milev writes that they do not differ very much from one another. The most essential difference, he writes, is the year cited for the Christianization of Tsar Boris.[8] Because the texts do not show a significant discrepancy in content, we can assume that the extant exemplars of the vita are a good representation of the content of the original work as Theophylact wrote it.

Slavonic Hagiographic Texts:

1) The *Life of Constantine* (LC) and 2) the *Life of Methodius* (LM) are ninth-century Slavic vitæ, the authorship of which is still disputed by scholars. Vaillant writes that they were both originally composed in Greek and then translated into Moravian Church Slavonic.[9] There are

---

[7] See А. Милев, *Гръцките жития на Климент Охридски*, София: БАН, 1966, p.9. See also our fn.58 to Chapter 2 of Section I.

[8] Cf. Милев, ibid.,p.12: "Петте запазени сега ръкописа на житието не се различават много един от друг. Най-съществена е разликата в годината за покръстването на българите и княз Борис."

[9] See A. Vaillant, *Textes vieux-slaves*, vol.2, Textes publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves, no.8/2, Paris: Imprimérie nationale, 1968, p.25.

approximately thirty extant manuscripts of the LC.[10] All of these manuscripts date from the fifteenth century and after. In his edition of the LC and the LM, Vaillant writes the following concerning the extant East Slavic manuscripts of the LC:

> They are numerous but all recent, from the fifteenth century at the earliest. The majority of them are Russian redactions: they are various copies from the Menology of the Russian Church, which [copies] give the same text with some small variants between them. It is not ordinarily possible, nor useful, to make a choice [amongst them].[11]

As with the LKlOxr, several extant manuscripts of the same text, when compared with one another, reveal no significant difference in content, thus pointing to the conclusion that the original text is well represented in these later exemplars. Concerning the extant South Slavic manuscripts of the LC, Vaillant writes that some of them (and he includes the one by Vladislav the Grammarian used by Kantor for his English translation) have been significantly reworked and therefore have not been employed by him in a reconstruction of the original text:

> Some of the copies give a reworked text: this is the case for two manuscripts of 1469 and 1479 of Vladislav the Grammarian, which are curious as works of revision by the Serbian scholar of the fifteenth century; but they cannot be employed for the purposes of reconstructing the Old Slavonic texts of the *Life of Constantine*.[12]

Concerning the LM, there is a manuscript of the Uspenskij Cathedral in Moscow which dates from the twelfth-thirteenth century, published in the *Успенский Сборник* (i.e., the *Uspenskij Compilation*). Vaillant used

---

10 See Marvin Kantor, *Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes*, Michigan Slavic Translations, no. 5, Ann Arbor: Michican Slavic Publications, 1983, p.17.

11 Vaillant, op.cit., 26. The original passage reads: "Il sont nombreux, mais tous récents, depuis le XVe siècle au plutôt. La plupart sont de rédaction russe: ce sont diverses copies du Ménologe de l'Église russe, qui donnent le même texte avec quelques petites variantes entre lesquelles. Il n'est pas ordinairement possible, ni utile, de faire un choix."

12 See Vaillant, op.cit., 26. The original passage reads: "Mais certaines d'entre elles donnent un texte remanié: c'est le cas pour les deux manuscrits de 1469 et 1479 de Vladislav le Grammairien, qui sont curieux comme travail de révision d'un savant serbe du XVe siècle, mais dont il ne faut *tenir aucun compte* pour l'établissement du texte vieux-slave de la *Vie de Constantin*."

this manuscript as "le texte du base" for the edition.[13] Also employed was a manuscript dating from the fifteenth-sixteenth century.

3) The *Life of Wenceslas* (Václav) (hereafter referred to as LW) is a West Slavic text, the protoype for which probably dates from the tenth century. There are several extant manuscripts for this vita; the oldest one is the Vatican Breviary copy, dated 1387. The other copies, none of which are West Slavic in origin, are from the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The content, however, of these manuscripts varies little from one another.[14]

4) The Serbian *Life of Symeon* (Stefan Nemanja) (hereafter referred to as LSym(Sav)), was written by Symeon's son, Sava (Rastko) in the early thirteenth-century. The Czech scholar Šafařík writes that the vita was composed between 1208 and 1215.[15] He writes that the manuscript employed for this edition is the only one extant and is dated 1619. It comes from the St. Sava Chapel at the Studenica Monastery.[16] Although the manuscript dates from the early seventeenth century, Šafařík points out that it contains a heading that reads:

> Sii tipikъ siréčь obraznikъ svetago savy srьbьskago prépisa se vъ léto 7127 [1619 A.D.] vъ peštere svetago savy postinca. bé bo préžde nasъ sьpisanъ rukoju svetago savy. vъ léto reče 6708 [1200 A.D.][17]

---

13 ibid. See Vaillant's notes on p.43.

14 F. Mareš, *An Anthology of Church Slavonic Texts of Western (Czech) Origin*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1979. See pp.104, 110, and 116 for full information on the manuscripts. In his edition, one can compare the three different versions of the Slavonic prototype, the Vostokov variant, the Croatian Glagolitic variant, and the Menology variant, pp.104-123.

15 See P.J. Šafařík, *Památky dřevního písemnictví jihoslovanův*, Prague: Nákladem B. Tempského, 1873, p.iii of his introduction to the LSym(Sav).

16 ibid. Šafařík writes: "Život sv. Symeona, světsky Stěpána Nemane, knížete srbského, sepsaný mezi 1. 1208-1215 od sv. Sávy, arcibiskupa srbského, a teď ponejprvé z vazby rukopisu vyproštěný a šťastně na světlo vyprovozený, najden mnou v rukopise na papíře v malém oktávu, psaném 1. 1619 v tak řečené Postnici sv. Sávy (domek to poustevníka s kaplí a jeskyní) obíží kláštera Studenice v Srbsku."

17 ibid. "This tipicon, i.e. historical account, of Saint Sava the Serb was copied in the year 1619 in the cave of the Postnik of Saint Sava; and before us it was written by the hand of Saint Sava in the year 1200."

As Šafařík points out, one can deduce from this heading that this manuscript dated 1619 was probably taken directly from the original manuscript of St. Sava.[18]

5) The *Life of Theodosius* by Patriarch Kallistos (hereafter referred to as LTheod) was edited first by Bodjanskij[19] and then by Zlatarski.[20] In his introduction, Zlatarski explains that the text used by Bodjanskij was an eighteenth-century copy of a fifteenth-century manuscript, the only one known to be extant. The fifteenth-century manuscript was written in 1479 by Vladislav the Grammarian[21], who also copied the LC, mentioned above. Given Vaillant's comments on the reworking of the LC done by Vladislav, there is reason to believe that this manuscript of the vita may have also been reworked to some extent by him. Without another exemplar, it is impossible to tell. Were one or several more manuscripts of the LTheod to be discovered and were they to reveal significant differences in content, some of our data might change regarding the common use of metaphors and similes between the LTheod and the Euthymian texts. The proof supporting our theory on the redefinition of "word-weaving" does not, fortunately, hinge on this text, and none of our conclusions regarding the use of language or the structure of the Euthymian hagiograpic texts would have to be changed by excluding this text from the body of sources.

All of the manuscripts employed by Kałużniacki for his edition of the saints' lives by Patriarch Euthymius are discussed in detail in the introductory chapter to Section II. At this juncture, we may proceed with

---

18 ibid.:"Z toho domýšleti se lze, že přepis náš přejat snad z původního rukopisu sv. Sávy"

19 See О.Бодянский, Чтения в Импер. Обществе истории и древностей российских при Московском Университете, кн.I, 1860.

20 See В.И.Златарски, *Житие и жизнь преподобнаго отца нашего Теодосия,* Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжина (СбНУНК) 20 (1904): 1-41.

21 ibid., 4. Zlatarski writes: "Отъ тия думи на о. Спиридона се ясно види, че като оригиналъ за написаното отъ него житие му е послужило едничкото за сега известно житие на св. Теодосия Търновски, което се намира въ прочутия, принадлежещъ на Рилския манастиръ панигирикъ, написанъ отъ Владислава Граматикъ въ 1479 г."

our inquiry into the rhetorical devices used in the Euthymian vitæ and an anlysis of them based on a comparison with the other hagiographic texts listed above.

Inventory of Rhetorical Devices Employed in the Euthymian Hagiographic Texts and Comparison with Other Texts:

In the saints' lives of Euthymius one can identify at least seventeen broad categories of rhetorical devices: 1) complex syntactic series, 2) composita (compound words), 3) metaphor, 4) simile, 5) tautology, 6) alliteration and assonance, 7) appositional series, 8) synonyms (or nearly synonymous phrases), 9) antithesis, 10) epithets, 11) paranomasis, 12) paraphrase, 13) lexical anaphora, 14) personification, 15) metonymy, 16) litotes, and 17) hyperbole.

There is, as stated, a rise in the extent to which rhetorical devices are employed in the texts; but more importantly, there is a structural principle that appears only in texts of the post-Metaphrastic period, the principle of the "weaving of subthemes" as defined in the previous chapter. Including the category of "weaving of subthemes" into a definition of the style employed in post-Metaphrastic high-style texts is important because it is precisely this category which differentiated the narrative structure of the texts under consideration.

In order to prove from the primary texts the fact that the rhetorical devices used by Euthymius can all be found in earlier pre- and post-Metaphrastic hagiographic texts or in Scriptural sources, we will present here a comprehensive inventory of devices, as used by Euthymius in his saints' lives, and give similar examples from the earlier hagiographic texts included in this study. Where metaphors and similes are borrowed from scriptural passages, the Bible will also be cited.[22] All quoted passage from texts are taken from the editions that appear in the footnotes above. The editions in which the original texts appear as well as the editions from which their translations may be found appear in the bibliography at the end

[22] All quotes are taken from the Revised Standard Version. For the sake of comparison, some passages are also given from the King James Bible. The abbreviations for each are, respectively, RSV and AV (Authorized Version). The abbreviation for the Septuagint is LXX.

of this work under the heading, "Primary Sources." Citations are followed by the abbreviated title of the vita, the chapter number as it appears in the edited version, the page number, and the line number where the editor gives them in the margin. The lives of Euthymius are referred by the abbreviations LIR (the *Life of Ivan of Rila*), LHM (the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena*), LP (the *Life of Paraskeva*), and LPh (the *Life of Philothea*). Translations of all the cited passages are given in the footnotes from edited versions, except in the case of the Euthymian texts and the LTheod, which appear in our own translation.

1) Complex syntactic series.[23] Simply put, these are very long sentences that acquire their length through the piling up of one dependent clause onto another. Consider these examples from the four vitæ by Euthymius:

> Vъ lěpotu ubo kto namъ ponosilъ by, jako ne tъcio o dobryix lěnivě imąštimъ i neradivě, nǫ i zavidąštimъ edinoplěmennym dobryixъ pričąstiu, ašte mlъčaniemъ blažennago Ioanna žitie prěišli byxom i ne vъsěcěmъ tъštaniemъ, po vъzmožnomy namъ napisano, jakoze načalnoobraznyj obrazъ predložili ize dobryą želaǫštimъ i revnuǫštim dobrodětěli na nas i sice prěžde inyx poiži vъsxodąsci? (LIR, I, 5)[24]

> Edinomu bo bǫdetъ tъčiǫ udobъ ta povědati Ilarionu, iže i dušeǫ i čjuvstvomъ ta obilně naslaždaǫštomu są, egovǫ nlyjně prizvavše blagodlějt, ašte i ne po lěpotě, obače po vъzmoznomu togo sъpověmy děanie i žitie. (LHM,I,28) [25]

---

[23] See Professor Picchio's study on the poetic and semantic function of complex syntactic series as used by Euthymius in his Panegyric to Constantine and Helena in "Isometric Semantic Markers in the Prose of Patriarch Euthymius of Trnovo," *International Journal for Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 31-32 (1985): 309-318; and in another study he applies the same principles of textual analysis to a broader selection of texts: Рикардо Пикио, "Върху изоколните структури в средновековната славянска проза," *Литературна мисъл* 3 (1980): 75-107.

[24] "If we were to pass over in silence the life of the blessed Ivan, and if we were not to offer with all possible diligence what has been written for us as a primary example unto those who desire and are zealous for the virtues which are good, then could not someone indeed justifiably revile us, [saying] that we are not only indolent and negligent towards our goods but also that we are envying our fellow countrymen their share of the goods inasmuch as we have profited before others?"

[25] "It will be easy only for Hilarion to relate such things. He delights abundantly in these things both in soul and feeling, he whose beneficence we have called upon today. If [we do

Ašte ubo ljubovnyj obyče zakonь, eže ljubьznyix pameti pominati i těxь sьzrьcovati obrazy i děania že i glagoly, množiceju ze i těxь podobia živopisovati, mnogo, pače množaje ključimo budetь i zělo želateino bogoljubьznymь, eže božiix ugodnikь čьstně počitati i těx pameti i děania na polzu pověstvovati (LP,I,59)[26]

Complex syntactic series can be found in examples from the early medieval Slavic period as well, as in the *Life of Constantine* and the *Life of Methodius*, both texts that chronologically date from the post-Metaphrastic period but stylistically fall into the category of simple style, pre-Metaphrastic texts:

Gospodi Bože moi, iže esi angelьskyą vsą činy i besplotnya sьstavilъ sily, i nebo raspenъ, zemlju osnovalъ, i vsą suštaą ot nebytia vъ bytie privelъ, iže esi vьsegda bezde poslušalъ tvorąštix volju tvoju, bojaštix są tebe i xranąštix zapovědi tvoa, poslušai moea molitvy, i věrnoe tovoe stado sъxrani emuže mą bě pristvilъ neključimago i nedostoinago raba tvoego, izbavląa vsą ot vsąkyą bezbožnya i poganьskya zloby i ot vsąkogo mnogoréčivago i xulnago eretičьskago jazyka glagoljuštago na tą xulǫ (LC, XVIII, 39).[27]

Bogъ blagъ i vьsemogai, iže jestь sъtvorilъ ot nebytija vъ bytije vьsąčьskaja vidimaja že i nevidimaja i ukrasilъ vьsąkoju krasotoju, juže kъto ramyšląja, pomyšląja i po malu, ot čąsti možetь razuměti i togo poznati iže jestь sъtvorilъ sicą děla divьna i mnoga--otъ velikoty bo i dobroty dělъ po razmyslu i roditelь ixъ [sъmotrimъ] estь--,iže pojutь angeli trьsvątyimь glasomь i vьsi pravověrьnii, slavimъ v svątei Troici, siréčь vъ trьxъ upostasьxъ, ježe možetь kъto tri lica rešti, a vъ jedinomь vožьstvě. (LM,I,41)[28]

---

not succeed in writing this] with beauty, then we will, however, relate to the best of our ability the life and deeds of this man."

26 "If thus the law is loved, then it will be very, indeed extremely, fitting and very desirable for those who please God to remember the memories of cherished people and to contemplate their images and actions and words, to paint many times their likenesses, to honor God's saints purely and to relate their memory and acts to some benefit. For a story about good [people and deeds] is in no small measure beneficial for its listeners."

27 "'O Lord,my God, who hast created all the ranks of angels and incorporeal powers, stretched out the heavens and founded the earth, and brought all things into being from non-being, who hast always heeded those that work Thy will, fear Thee and keep Thy commandments, heed my prayer and preserve Thy faithful flock which Thou appointed to me, Thy useless and unworthy servant. Deliver them from the godless and heathen malice of those speaking blasphemy against Thee" (XVIII, 77-79).

28 "Gracious and almightly is God, who from non-being called into being all things visible and invisible, and adorned them with all beauty, so that he who contemplates it with

There are, of course, examples of complex syntactic series, too, in pre-Euthymian texts written in the post-Metaphrastic high style, such as the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* by Theophylact, an eleventh-century Byzantine text:

> Οἴονται γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς καιροὺς μὴ ἄν τι τῶν ἀρχαίων χωρῆσαι, ἀλλὰ τοὺς μὲν προτέρους χρόνους καὶ θαύμασι λαμπρυνθῆναι καὶ βίοις ἀνδρῶν κοσμηθῆναι, ἀσωμάτος σχεδὸν ζησάντων ἐν σόμασι, τῇ δὲ ἡμετέρᾳ γενεᾷ μηδὲν τοιοῦτον δωρηθῆναι παρὰ θεοῦ, ὅθεν καὶ πρὸς τὸν σπουδαῖον βίον, ὡς τῆς νῦν φύσεως μὴ δεχομένης τοῦτον, ἐλεεινῶς ἀπενάρκησαν, κακῶς γε εἰδότες ἐκεῖνοι καὶ λίαν ἐπισφαλῶς; (LKlOxr, I.2; p.76 line 18-20; p.78, line 1-5)[29]

Therefore, we can conclude that the feature of complex syntactic series is a feature of both high and low style in text written well before the time of Euthymius and the Hesychasts.

2) composita (compound words). Composita, or compound words, likewise appear in texts of both high and low styles. The LC has such composita as vъsedrъžitelь (XII,28), blagověrna (XIV,31), dobrorodenь (II,2), životvorąštago duxa (IX,15), blagoslovenie (X,21), mnogomlъvnago žitia (I,1); the LM has such composita as blagověrьnago (VIII,48) and pravověrьnъ (XII,52); and the LW has the following composita: blagosloviti (105), dobrotvorąti (106), bogočetě (108), and xristoljubec (108). All the texts examined have composita of the type blago-, bogo-, dobro-, xristo-, živo-. The nature of the compound words found in the Euthymian texts is the same. There are

---

reverence might in time perceive and recognize the One who called forth such abundant and wondrous works. For in reflecting upon the greatness and goodness of the works, one senses their Maker, whom the angels praise in thrice-holy voices, and all we Orthodox glorify in the Holy Trinity, namely, in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, that is, in three hypostases--which can be called three Persons--but in one Deity." (I,99-101)

29 "Many think that our age is in some respects a step back from antiquity's miracles and the lives of men who, though dwelling in the flesh, lived almost entirely in the spirit, and that nothing like this has been given to our generation by God. Therefore, people with a poor and uncertain knowledge of the reality of God have become most ignominiously unfit for a righteous life, since present human nature could not conceive of it." (I.2,93-94)

compounds in blago-[30], bogo-[31], dobro-[32], xristo-[33], and živo-[34], all of which, as the information contained in the footnotes shows, are attested in earlier pre-Euthymian texts of the period before the Hesychast Revival. Euthymius employs many other compound words, mostly calqued from Greek, which can all be found in earlier, pre-Hesychast sources as well.[35]

---

[30] In the LP one finds the compound "blagoutrobnyj" (VIII,75) = "compassionate", an adjectival form of the noun "blagoutrobie", which is a calque from the Greek εὐπλαγχνία. Sreznevskij (И.Срезневский, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам*, 1893; Reprint, Москва: Книга, 1989, vol.1, p.108) cites an attested use of this compound word in its noun form in Služebnik prepodobnago Variama XII v.

[31] In the LHM one finds "bogonenavistnoe učenie" (VI,36) = "teaching which is hateful to God". This is a calque from the Greek θεοστύγης. Sreznevskij (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, p.133) cites an attested use of this compound in the Izbornik Svjatoslavov of 1073 and the Kormčaja Kniga Efremovskaja, written around 1100.

[32] In all of the Euthymian vitæ the word "dobrodětelь" appears throughout. Sreznevskij (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, p.676) cites its earlier appearance in two pre-Euthymian and pre-Hesychastic texts, e.g. the Pandekt Antioxa (11th c.), the Kormčaja Kniga Efremovskaja. Similar forms (dobrodějanije, dobrodějanъ, dobrodětelьnъ) can be found in the Euchologium Sinaiticum and the Codex Suprasliensis (see Sadnik, Aitzemüller, *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten*, The Hague: Mouton, 1955, p.20.

[33] In the LP one finds "ot někotoryix xristoljubьc" (IV,67) = "by a few Christ-lovers". This compound is also found in the LDanStyl: a) "οἱ τῆς πόλεως φιλόχριστοι" (40, 36,line 22) = "the Christ-loving inhabitants"(chap.40,p.30); and b) "ὅτι ἡ φιλόχριστος Αράδνη" (91, 86,lines 1-2) = "Christ-loving Ariadne" (chap.91,p.640; and the *Life of Wenceslas* (9th century Moravian) "xristoljubec" (108). According to F.von Miklosich, *Lexicon paleoslavenico-graeco-latinum*, Vienna, 1862-5); reprint Aalen, 1963, p.1098, this compound word can be found in a 14th-century patericon of the Zograph Monastery and a 14th-century patericon of the Krka Monastery in Dalmatia.

[34] In the LP, one finds "životvoréštiimь duxomь" (IX,77) = "[by means of] the Life-Giving Spirit." This is a present active participle of the verb životvoriti, which is calqued from the Greek ζωοποιεῖν. Sreznevskij (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, p.866) cites an attested use of the whole phrase "Životvorąi Duxъ" in the Izbornik Svjatoslavov of 1073. Sadnik and Aitzemüller (op.cit., 169) cite the appearance of this compound in the Euchologium Sinaiticum and the Codex Assemanianus.

[35] In the LIR, one finds the following composita:

a) "mirodržьca" (II,9) = "[of the] ruler of the world". The Slavonic word is calqued form the Greek κοσμοκράτωρ, and there is an attested earlier use of the word in the 12th-century Slavonic translation of Eph.6:12 in the Codex Christianopolis: "kъ mirodьržiteljemъ", (Kałužniacki, *Actus Epistolaeque Apostolorum Palaeoslavenice*, Vienna, 1896, p.196). According to Miklosich (op.cit.,370), also found in a 13th-century

Chronicle of Perejaslavl'-Suzdal'. According to Sadnik and Aitzemüller (op.cit., 56), it is also found in the Euchologium Sinaiticum.

b) "kolěnopřěklonenie" ="genuflection" (LIR,II,9). Sreznevskij (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.3, p.142) cites an earlier appearance of this compound word (calqued from the Greek γονυκλισίαν) in an 11th-century Slavonic translation of the letter of St. Basil the Great to Bishop Gregory, contained in the Evfremovskaja kormčaja. It can also be found in the LDanStyl: "γονυκλισίαν ἐτελῶν καὶ εὐχήν" (14, 15,line 10) = "making genuflections and prayers" (XIV,15).

c) "pustynnožitelь" (VIII,18,line 37) = "desert dweller". Compounds in "pustyno-" obviously serve those writers whose subjects choose an anchoritic life. A similar compound word is found in the LSym(Sav), "pustynoljubnye grьlice" (VII,8) = "desert-loving", or "solitude-loving turtle dove." Sreznevskij cites a 12th-century appearance of the phrase "pustyneljubivaja gorlice" in the Žitie Alekseja čeloveka Božija, from a 12th-century manuscript of the "Zlatostruj", (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, p.1733). According to Miklosich (op.cit.,755), this compound is also found in an East Slavic Triodium dated before 1100.

d) Similar to the compound in "a", one finds in the LIR a calque from the Greek παντοκράτωρ, "vъsedrъžitelь" (IX,21) = "ruler of all". This compound is found the LSym(Sav) "gospodi vъsedrъžitelu" (IX,11,line 14-15); and Sreznevskij cites its use in the Izbornik Svjatoslavov of 1973 (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, p.468).

e) "prъvopřěstolniki" (VIII,20) = "the ruling heirarchy of the Church", is cited by Sreznevskij as appearing in the Služebnaja mineja za nojabrь po rukopisi Tipografskoj biblioteki 1097 g., (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, p.1764).

f) "slavoslovie" (LIR,X,21; also LPh,VII,88) = "service, worshipping" can also be found in the LSym(Sav) ("krasnymь slavosloviemь" XII,14,line 19) as well as in the Hesychastic text of Patriarch Kallistos, LTheod ("slavoslovia", XI,18, line 5). In the LPh, there is also an antonymic compound word "praznoslovie" (VII,88), which means "idle talk". This is calqued from the Greek κενοφωνία, which can be found in the New Testament verse I Tim 6:20 as "sujeslovie" (Moscow Synod Bible). There is also a similar compound found in the LTheod, "blądoslovąšte" (XIX,25,line 6 СБ).

In the LHM, one finds:

a) "člověkoljubie" (III,30), which is calqued from the Greek φιλανθρωπία. Sreznevskij cites an attested earlier use in the Stixirarь XIIv. biblioteki Imp. Akademii nauk (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.3, p.1534).

b) "žitonosьnyi" is cited by Sreznevskij as appearing in the in the Služebnaja mineja za oktjabrь po sp. 1096 g. (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.1, p.880).

c) "zakonopolagaetь" (VII,40) = "[he] makes laws". Sreznevskij (see the supplement to the dictionary contained in volume 3, p.111) cites an earlier attested use of the noun form "zakonopoloženie", which is calqued from the Greek θεσμοθεσία. Sreznevskij cites its appearance in the Pravila Vtorogo Nikejskago vselenskago sobora, contained in the Efremovskaja Kormčaja of the 11th century. The verbal form is found also in the LTheod, "zakonopolagaetь " (I,9,line 7).

d) "pastyrenačalnika" (XVIII,58) = "[of] the Master-Shepherd"; Sreznevskij cites an attested earlier use of this compound word in its adjectival form "pastyrenačalьnyi" in the Služebnaja mineja za oktjabrь po sp. 1096 g. (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, p.887).

Lastly, in the LPh one finds:

There is one compound word in the Euthymian vitæ which I have only been able to find in the hagiographic works of Kallistos, another Hesychast: "otlьlceljuběznymь čadomь" (LHM,I,28) = "a child who is loved by his father". A similar compound word "bgoljubъznu" is found in the LTheod (VII,I4, line 10); and according to Miklosich, it is also found in a fourteenth-century patericon of the Zograph Monastery.[36] This, however, does not provide any proof that these compounds were original to Kallistos or his Hesychastic circle. They may well appear in other Byzantine non-Heysychastic works contemporary to or antedating Kallistos and Euthymius. Another compound word cannot be found in any other text consulted for this study or in Sreznevskij: "dostojnoslyšatelna ispravlenia", "deeds worthy of note", or literally, "worthy to be heard" (LHM,III,30). This, however, does not provide conclusive evidence to state that these words constitute neologisms on the part of Euthymius. Like those compound words common only to the texts by Euthymius and Kallistos, they could appear in pre-fourteenth-century works. Furthermore, the absence of an earlier attested appearance of these words in Sreznevskij does not prove anything, as his work, though vast, does not even come close to exhausting the body of extant Slavonic, let alone Greek, manuscripts.

3 & 4) metaphor and simile. Of the poetic devices used by Euthymius in his vitæ, the most commonly found are metaphors and similes. Hagiographie texts written under the influence of stylistic norms introduced by Symeon Metaphrastes, such as the LKlOxr, the LSym(Sav),

---

a) "ony mironosica" (II,79) = "those myrrh-bearers", which is calqued from the Greek μυροφόρος. Sreznevskij cites an earlier attested use of this compound in the *Ostromirovo Evangelie*, ca.1056 (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, p.146).

b) "celomǫdrie" (IV,84) = "chastity". Sreznevskij ((Срезневский, op.cit., vol.3, p.1455) cites earlier attested uses of two forms of this compound word in earlier sources. He cites the use of célomudrьstvo (calqued from the Greek σωφροσύνη) from an 11th-century translation of the 13 Sermons of Gregory Nazianzus (XIII slovъ Grigorija Nazianzina) and in the Pravila Truiьskago vselenskago sobora, contained in the Kormčaja kniga Efremovskaja (ca.1100); and he cites the use of "célomudrьcь" (calqued from the Greek σώφρων) in the 11th-century Pandektъ Antioxa Voskresenskago monastirja. Compare this with the verbal form of the same compound word in the LTheod: "célomudriti" (I,9,line 8).

36 Miklosich, op.cit., 36.

LTheod and the vitæ by Euthymius himself, all employ many more metaphors and similes than texts of the pre-Metaphrastic tradition, e.g. LAnth, LDanStyl, the LC, the LM and the LW. By the way of demonstrating Euthymius' debt to the Slavic and Byzantine tradition that came before him, I have compared every instance of metaphor and simile with those from the LAnth, the LDanStyl, the LJohnAlms, the LC, the LM, the LW, LKlOxr, LSym(Sav), LTheod and the Bible. The exhaustive comparison of the Euthymian vitæ with those other texts yielded interesting results: almost every metaphor and simile employed by Euthymius can be traced to one or more of these earlier texts. At times (especially from the LTheod) the images are lifted completely, at other times, the images are borrowed and then modified in some way.

If one is to speak at all of originality in Euthymius' poetic imagery, it is only in the context of his variations on old, familiar images that this notion could be considered correct; for what constituted Euthymius' appeal to his medieval audience was not his talent for devising new images but rather his talent for taking well-known images from earlier works and reusing them with modifications. Those images drawn from the Bible and the liturgy would have been readily recognizable by a wide audience, while those images culled from other hagiographic texts could have been more esoteric, unless the texts were very well known to Slavs, as were the LAnth and the LC.

Because metaphor and simile are the most often-used poetic devices in the Euthymian texts (and in all texts of the high, post-Metaphrastic style), it can be said that it is precisely these two devices, more than the others, that give the texts their lofty character, resplendent with poetic imagery. In his book on Byzantine rhetoric, George Kustas comments on the importance of metaphor in Byzantine theories about language in the expression of the sacred: "Metaphor provided not only comparison but also transcendence in a link which raised events from the secular to the divine."[37] And we have already seen that simile, in addition to adding poetic imagery to the text, was employed by the author to increase the sanctity of the hero through the convention of the comparison topos.

---

[37] G. Kustas,*Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*, Analecta Vladaton 17, Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1973, p. 149.

Tracing the earlier occurrences of these devices is valuable in demonstrating how Euthymius' style (i.e. his use of linguistic and literary devices) actually stems from an earlier tradition. We will now present each example of metaphor and simile in Euthymius' vitæ and show earlier appearances of them in Byzantine and Slavic vitæ and the Scriptures. Also, we will comment on those examples -- where they occur -- in which Euthymius has reworked the image in a way that is original.

It is convenient to treat the categories of metaphor and simile together because most of the examples of metaphor and simile found in the vitæ of Euthymius can be grouped into categories of poetic imagery. The main categories we have identified are images of food, plants, animals, water, meteorology, light/dark, hunting, precious objects, captivity, and clothing. There are several examples of metaphor and simile that cannot be grouped into categories, and these are treated at the end of this section.

Food Imagery: In the introduction to LIR, Euthymius presents an image of the life of this holy person as representing "spiritual food":

> Elma ubo oboimъ, sъpověduǫštimъ javě jako i slyšǫštiimъ, prilagaet są duševnaa pišta, i lěčba k spaseniju takovoe žitie javit są... (LIR,I, 6) = Spiritual food is being offered to both those who relate clearly this story and to those who listen to it; and this life represents the cure of salvation."[38]

This image of food as representing righteousness and spiritual health can be found in four of the sources examined for this study: 1) the Bible[39]; 2) LJohnAlm,[40] 3) the LKlOxr [41]; and 4) in the LTheod.[42]

---

[38] Also contained within the excerpt above from the LIR is the image of christianizing forces as a cure, implying the diseased state of impiety. This image is found in the Bible (Jer 33.6, "Behold, I will bring to it health and healing, and I will cure them, and will reveal to them the abundance of prosperity and security"). See also Eccles 6.2, in which vanity is equated with a disease (AV: "...this is vanity, and it is an evil disease"/RSV: "this is vanity; it is a sore affliction").

[39] Ps 104.15, "...and bread to strengthen man's heart"; 1 Cor 10.3-4; AV: "And did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink"/ RSV: "and all ate the same supernatural food and all drank the same supernatural drink."

[40] The LJohnAlm contains the metaphor "spiritual hunger" ("καὶ τῶν κατὰ ψυχὴν λιμαγχονουμένων" [8,22,cf.lines 28-30]

In the next example, Euthymius borrows the biblical metaphor of "spiritual food" and extends it by drawing the analogy that if "spiritual food" represents salvation and righteousness, then the state of perdition is represented by "material" or "bodily food"; and also by analogy, he speaks of "divine hunger", which is satisfied by "spiritual food":

> Bezměstnějše bo bǫdeth, eže o veštestъvnějі tekǫštoj piště tělesnějі vъsegda tvoriti namъ promyšlenie, jako množajšee namъ vъvodąšti tъštanie, pače že i vąšte měry tǫ priemati kъ pišti popiъzaǫštim są, o neveštestъvnějі že i neistъštiměj i dušǫ polzuǫštej i vynǫ prěbyvaǫštoj niže malo popečenie tvoriti, glademъ božestъvnymъ svoǫ dušǫ taǫštǫ prěziraǫšte. (LIR,I,6)[43]

A similar example can be found in the LPh, in which Euthymius says Eve was deprived of the "food of paradise", or eternal life: "i rajskǫą liši są pištǫ" (LPh,II,79) = "and [Eve] was deprived of the food of paradise."

In another example, the image of food is merely suggested by the use of a metaphor, but unlike the previous example, whereby spiritual food represents salvation and righteousness, here the beverage "wine" represents sin. In chapter XIV of LHM, Euthymius writes the following of Hilarion:

> Glagolaaxǫ že i se o nemъ, jako vъ junosti svoej vъsěx tridesątix lětěx vina nikakože vъkusi (LHM,XIV,55) = They said of him that in his youth, in his whole thirty years, he had never tasted wine.

In this example from the LHM, food is a metaphor for the abstract notion of sin. Another example where food is associated with an abstract notion is found in the LSym(Sav), where rest or repose is equated with a food that

---

41 "ἠμέλει δὲ καὶ τοῦ σωματικῶς τρέφειν ὅσους τοιαύτης τροφῆς ἐπιδεεῖς εὕρισκεν;" (XXI.64,130, line 20-21) = "But did he ever omit to also feed the bodies of those who he knew needed spiritual food?" (XXI.64,117)

42 "i sice dxovnago pitia nasyštenъ bě, jakože někyi telьcь sъsei svoju materь" (VI,13,line 29-30) = "He was filled with spiritual food like the calf sucking on its mother" (VI,3); and another example, "podajuštee emu pištu pravednuju" (XXVI,33,line9) = "giving him the food of righteousness."

43 "It would be most unseemly for us to have thoughts of material and ephemeral nourishment, which does nothing but create toil for us. Rather, we can profit beyond all measure by finding our nourishment in immaterial and inexhaustible [food], for such food profits the soul and is always in abundance and requires no toil or pains from us, who are emaciated in our hunger for things divine."

one can taste of or savour: "i několiko malo pokoa vъkusiti," literally, "to savour some rest."

The metaphor of food is also suggested by the image of a table that is abundantly laid out. Euthymius employs this image to represent the generosity of his heroine in the LPh, who wishes to help those who follow her:

> jaže i dьnesь nas sъzvavšia i trapezǫ namь obilnǫ predloživši mnogyix eǫ čjudesь (LPh, I, 78) = She has called us together today and has bountifully laid upon our table many of her miracles

The same image can be found in the introduction to the LJohnAlm:

> εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν τῶν ἐπαίνων καλεῖ πανδαισίαν, ὡς ἀδάπανον τρυφὴν προτιθεὶς εἰς κοινὴν ἑστίασιν τὰ τῶν ἰδίων κατορθωμάτων καὶ πλεονεκτημάτων ἥδιστα διηγήματα (1,19,lines 6-8) = this [John]...invites us to the present banquet of praise, and as a dainty and free fare he sets before us for our common feast most pleasing tales of his achievements and his triumphs" (1,199)

Some biblical metaphors employing the image of the Messianic banquet, the table of God, are found in the Bible in Ps 23.5 ("Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies") and Lk 22.30 ("that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom").

Euthymius chooses the image of the sweetness of honey to represent the value of the words of advice of his saintly heroes. In Chapter VIII of LIR, the Bulgarian tsar writes to Ivan of Rila in a letter:

> i velmi tvoe vъždeléx viděti prěpodobie i tvoix medotočnyix nasladiti są glagolъ, ne malǫ ot tvoego zrěnia mněvь priploditi polzǫ (LIR,VIII,18) = And I desired very much to see your venerableness and to delight in your mellifluous words, for I have thought of how much benefit would flower forth from seeing you.

Compare this with example found in the Bible: Ps 19.9-10 ("...the ordinances of the Lord are true, and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold; sweeter also than honey and drippings of the honeycomb"), Ps.119.103 ("How sweet are thy words to my taste, sweeter than honey to my mouth!"). Furthermore, one can find this exact same metaphor used in LC: "do syti vъsěxь ny naslaždь medotočnyixь slovesь otь svetyxь knigь" (X,24) = "...delighting each of us in full with the mellifluous words from the Holy Scriptures" (X,59). The same image is used again by

Euthymius in LPh: "svąštennaa i medotočnaa těmь dovolьno izglagola slovesa" (LPh,VIII,89) = "and she uttered forth to them these sacred and mellifuous words".

The image of intoxicating wine or drink is used twice by Euthymius to symbolize dangerous heresies. The first examples appears in chapter IX of the LHM: "Někogda že, paky nedǫgomь prělьsti ix piani sǫšte" (LHM,IX,43) = "One time [the heretics], being drunk with the disease of deceit..." This metaphor, which equates an abstract notion (here, "deceit") with an intoxicating drink, is also found in the Bible, Is 63.6 ("...and I made them drunk in my wrath"). The second example is an unusual metaphor. Euthymius uses the image of "sweet beer" as a contrast to "intoxicating drink," which symbolizes heresy and deceit:

> i duxomь i istinnoǫ tomu služaaše, o zdravěj že věrě sladčajšee rastvaréaše pivo, ne jakože sikerь glagolemoe pievo, ot mnogyx i različnyx sěmenej sъtvoreno, nǫ bogoprědannymi vъobraženii rastvoreno i vъsěko pitie smǫtnoe, eretičskymi kъznьmi sъstroenoe, vъzražaǫšte. (LPh, II, 80) = She brewed the sweetest beer with spiritually pure faith, not at all like the intoxicating drink we call beer made from many and various seeds, but rather according to a God-given recipe was it made; for all insidious drinks are made by means of heretical snares.

This image is an intriguing reworking of a biblical metaphor that occurs in the book of Isaiah.[44] The Slavonic word used here by Euthymius, "пиво" (pivo), in the medieval period meant either "drink, beverage" (ποτής, πῶμα) or "fermented liquor, strong drink, beer" (σίκερα). The pair "wine/strong drink" ("οἶνος/ σίκερα") is a fixed lexical pair in biblical Hebrew poetry.[45] In those biblical verses where the pair "οἶνος/σίκερα" appears in the Septuagint[46] "οἶνος" is, of course, translated as "вино"; however, "σίκερα" is sometimes translated as "сікеръ" --a slavonicized

---

[44] See Is 28.7; 29.9; 51.22.

[45] See S. Gevirtz, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 32, Chicago: University of Chicago Press,1963, p.39.

[46] See, for example, LXX Lev 10.9 ("Οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ πίεσθε"); Num 6.3 ("ἀπὸ οἴνου καὶ σίκερα, ἁγνισθήσεται"); Deut 14.26 ("ἐπὶ οἴνῳ ἢ ἐπὶ σίκερα ἢ ἐπὶ παντὸς, οὗ ἐὰν ἐπιθυμῇ ἡ ψυχή σου").

form of the original Greek word--and sometimes as "квасъ,"[47] a fermented bread drink, but never as "пиво." In the biblical verses where this fixed lexical pair "οἶνος/σίκερα" does occur, in every instance both are referred to in a negative context, as things to avoid inasmuch as they impede man's path to purity.[48] In this passage in the LPh, Euthymius is taking one member of the fixed lexical pair, "σίκερα" (which he translates as "пиво"); and he is using it in a positive sense, replacing its usual negative connotation with a positive one.

In addition to the evidence that the metaphor of "beer" used here is taken from the fixed biblical pair "wine/strong drink," the use of the Slavonic "пиво" (as "σίκερα") in a positive context is not original to Euthymius. Sreznevskij cites an earlier attested use of "пиво" in pre-Euthymian texts that is very similar to the passage above. He cites the use of "piva nьsnago" ("heavenly beer") in an eleventh-century Slavonic text.[49]

Plant imagery. In the lives of Euthymius, plant imagery is used with frequency. There are several passages in which the righteous man is likened to a tree. In one passage, Euthymius likens Hilarion to an olive tree[50], which is lifted from Ps 52.8 (Slavonic Psalter 51.10): "But I am like

---

47 Compare, for example, Lk 1.15 from the Codex Assemanianus and the Codex Zographensis. The first reads: "i vina i sikera ne imatъ piti"; in Kurz, *Evangeliarium Assemani (Evangelář Assemanův)*, Vol.2, Úvod, text v přepise cyrilském, poznámky textové, seznamy čtení. Prague: Nakladatelství československé akademie věd, 1955, p.299. The second reads: "i vina i tvorena kvasa ne imatъ piti"; in Jagić, *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*, Berlin, 1879; reprint, Graz: Akad.Druck-U.Verlagsanstalt, 1954, p.81.

48 Lev 10.9: "Drink no wine nor strong drink"; Is 24.9: "No more do they drink wine with singing; strong drink is bitter to those who drink it"; Is 28.7: "they are confused with wine, they stagger with strong drink".

49 See Sreznevskij (Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, p.931; this is in the Služebnaja Mineja of 1096 (Oct.).

50 "I bě jako maslina plodovitaa vъ domu božii, jakože drugyj Isaak vъ vъsemъ svoemu pokaréą są otcu" (LHM,III,29) = "And he was like a green [fruitful] olive tree in the house of God, like a second Isaac, obeying his father in everything"

a green olive tree in the house of God..." In three passages, Euthymius likens Ivan, Hilarion and Philothea to a tree planted by a watery source.[51] This is taken from Ps1:3 which likens a righteous man to a tree planted by the waters ("He is like a tree planted by the streams of water"). A third example of the righteous man likened to a tree appears in the LIR in which Euthymius likens Luke, Ivan's nephew, to a cedar growing in Lebanon.[52] This simile is borrowed from Ps 92.12 ("The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree, and grow like the cedar in Lebanon"). This simile also appears in the LTheod:"jakože stъblie pri rěkaxъ i jako kedri eže vъdruzi bogъ." (XI,17,line 28) = "[He was] like reeds by the rivers and like a cedar which God has erected."

The deeds of the impious and evil are likened to weeds in the LHM: "sъpostatnyix navěty jakože plěvely razvěj tvoeǫ blagodl̥ěl̥ti větromъ" (XVIII, 58) = "disperse the slander of hostile enemies like weeds into the wind of munificence." This simile, too, is taken from the Bible. Job 21.18 reads: "That they are like straw before the wind, and like chaff that the storm carries away"; Ps 1.4 reads: "The wicked are not so, but are like chaff which the wind drives away"; and Ps 35.5 reads: "Let them be like chaff before the wind; with the angel of the Lord driving them on!"

---

51 LIR: "...i tvorją plodъ, po istinnomu storičnyj, jakože drěvo, nasaždenno pri istočnikox vodnyx." (LIR, II, 8) = "...and he bore fruit, in truth, a hundred-fold, like a tree which has been planted by the streams of water"

LHM: "I bě pročee jako drěvo saždennoe pri osxodištix vod duxa, rastǫ i prěspěvaą po bozě vъ vъsěx blagočьstia dogmatox" (LHM,XII,53) = "And he was like a tree planted by the flowing waters of the spirit, growing and flourishing in all the sacred dogmas according to God's [will]"

LPh: "Sice ubo běše jakože drěvo, po Davl̥idu nasaždennoe pri isxodištix vod, čistotǫ po prěmnogu xraną i kъ vyšnemu prisno vъziraǫ blaženstvu" (LPh,II,80) = "Thus she was like a tree, according to [the words] of David, 'planted by the rivers of water', maintaining her purity for a long time and always looking up to the highest bliss [to maintain her strength]."

The same simile is also found in an eliptical variant in the LTheod: "prěbyvae jakože pri istočnikox vodnyx" (III,12, line 3) = "and he lived as if by the streams of water."

52 "Togo ubo zrą prěpodobnyj sъ soboǫ sǫšta, jakože někyj kedrъ iže vъ Livaně množǫšt są" (LIR, III, 10) = "And the venerable one, seeing [Luke] with himself like the cedar which grows in Lebanon"

Spiritual ascent through ascesis is likened to the growing, flowering, and budding of plants. One example is from the LHM, which equates the process by which faith and Christianity spread to the growth of a plant:

> "kako bo?--nǫ, uprostranéǫšti są i rastǫšti věrě, uprostranéaxǫ i ti sъ vъsécémъ bestrašiemъ Xristova tainstva vъ slavǫ i veličъstvie ego." (LHM, IX, 46) = "And how was this so? Faith dispersed and grew, and so they also dispersed, encouraged by the sacrament Christ [performed for them], in his glory and majesty."

A similar example appears in the LPh in which spiritual gains are equated with the blossoming of a plant:

> Toliko bo vъzdrъžaniemъ procъvte..noštiǫ že i dьnіǫ božьstъvnomu vъnimaaše zakonu i svąštennymi pisanii svoǫ nasyštaaše dušǫ. (LPh,III,81) = How she blossomed under abstinence...listening to God's law night and day and sating her soul with the Holy Scripture.

And in the LPh Euthymius utilizes plant imagery to describe Philothea's aristocratic background and her achievements. Her family stock is equated to a good root that was noble. Her own life's training is equated with the "branches" of the plant or tree, and her virtuous deeds are equated with the fruits of the plant:

> Blagorodnago sǫšti korene větъvъ, dobrodětělej različnyix neizčъtenyą iznese plody (XV,99) = The branch of a noble root brought forth countless fruits of various virtues.

In general, the images of faith growing, blossoming, flourishing or flowering abound in the Scriptures (e.g. Num 17.5; Is 27.6; Ezek 7.10; Ps 92.12-14; Mt 7.16-20); and plant imagery is common both in the Bible and in hagiographic literature of all stylistic levels. In LSym(Sav) one finds, for example: "xristova že ljuby rastěaše vъ njemъ" (III,3,line 13-14) = "But love for Christ grew in him" (III, 263). The metaphor of the root, the branches and the fruit can also be found in the Bible and earlier hagiographic texts: Prov 12.12 (AV:"The root of the righteous yieldeth fruit"/ RSV: "but the root of the righteous stands firm"); Ezek 17.8 ("he transplanted it to good soil by abundant waters, that it might bring forth branches, and bear fruit, and become a noble vine"); and twice in the LSym(Sav): "korěnъ blagy izъšьdъ izъ utroby moee" (IV,4, line 17-18) = "a good root has issued from my loins [said of his son Stefan] (IV,267); and

"vĕtvь otь ploda ego i cvĕtь otь korĕne ego" (VII,9,line 1-2) = "the branch from his fruit and the flower from his root" (said of Rastko [Sava], his other son) (VII,279). Examples of this in the pre-Metaphrastic tradition can be found in the LDanStyl: a) "πολλοὶ καρποὶ ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης σοῦ ἔχουσιν ἐξανθῆσαι" (53,52,lines 13-14) = "many fruit-bearing branches are to blossom from your root" (53,38); and b) "Ὃν παραγενόμενον πολλαῖς καὶ διαφόροις παραινέσεσιν ὁ ἅγιος ἀνὴρ ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἀρδεύσας, δένδρον ἀειθαλὲς καρποφόρον ἀπέδειξεν" (60, 59,lines 6-8) = "on his arrival the Saint watered him with many and divers counsels from the Holy writings and proved him to be an ever-blooming fruit-bearing tree" (60,43).

There are many examples in the vitæ of Euthymius where the images of fruit and seed are employed. In the LIR and the LHM, Euthymius equates ones offspring or child with fruit of a seed.[53] One can also find such images in the LDanStyl.[54] The image of both fruit and seed in reference to God's children and their acquisition of righteousness is used throughout the Bible; some examples are Gen 21.13; Prov 12.12; Ezek 17.8; Mt 13.38, 22.24; Lk 1.42.

In the Bible, the seed is equated with the word of God in Lk 8:11. Euthymius uses this metaphor twice in LHM. In one example, he speaks of the "seed of orthodoxy,"[55] and in the other example, he speaks of the "seed of piety."[56] In the LDanStyl, the image of sowing seeds is employed to

---

53"tvoego sĕmene plod" (LIR,III,10) = "the fruit of your seed"; and, "vъzmi svoego sĕmene plod" (LIR,III,11) = "take the fruit of your seed"; and "i vъzždelĕtelno imĕsta kako polučiti plod" (LHM,II,28) = "and wanted with all their hearts to receive fruit [i.e. be blessed with a child]"

54 "καὶ παράσχου καρπὸν τῇ ἐμῇ κοιλίᾳ" (2,3,line 2) = "grant me fruit of my womb" (2,8)

55 "i nečьstivoe onĕx velĕnie ot srьdca ego daleče nĕgde progna, pravoslavia že sĕmą vъ nemь ugłębi" (LHM,X,52) = "And he chased their unclean will far away from his heart, for the seed of orthodoxy was all the deeper in his heart."

56 "Bogomilskyą eresi poklonniky, eliky blagočьstia priemšę sĕmą božij arxierej vidĕ" (LHM,XIII,54) = "The blessed arbishop [Hilarion] saw so many of the Bogomil heresy accept the seed of piety."

communicate a negative meaning: "ὁ ἀεὶ φθονερὸς καὶ βάσκανος διάβολος μῖσος ἄδικον ἐνέσπειρεν" (68,65,lines 22-23) = "the ever envious and malignant Devil sowed the seeds of unjust hatred" (2,19). A similar metaphor is used in LSym(Sav): "bože otьcь našixь, avramovь, isaakovь, jakovlь i sěmeni pravednago" (IX,11) = "God of our fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of the seed of righteousness" (IX, 285,lines 15-16).

Another example in which Euthymius employs images of flowering fruit to represent a hero's spiritual progress is found in the LIR: "i klasy dobrodětělnyą procvitaą" (LIR,V,13) = "and flowering forth the fruits of grace" (lit.: "flowering forth virtuous ears of grain"). Similar images of flowering fruit can be traced to Prov 12.12 ("but the root of the righteous stands firm") and Mt 7.17 ("every sound tree bears good fruit"); however, it is most likely that with the specific image of "ears of grain" employed in this passage, Euthymius had in mind Gen 41.5 ("...and behold, seven ears of grain [AV: corn], plump and good, were growing on one stalk"). Compare this with an example from the LDanStyl:

> ὥσπερ γῆ ἀγαθῆ δεξαμένη ὑετὸν καρποφορεῖ οὕτως καὶ ὁ θαυμάσιος ἀνὴρ οὗτος Τίτος κατηχητικοῖς λόγοις τοῦ ὁσίου καὶ δικαίου φωτισθεὶς τὴν διάνοιαν (60, 59, lines 9–12) = and just as good earth when it has received the rain brings forth much fruit, so this admirable man Titus was illuminated in mind by the teaching of the holy and just man (60,43).

Another example where fruit is a metaphor for the results of spiritual deeds and ascesis is found in chapter VII of LIR, "i vъsenoštьnymi bděnii i vъzdyxanii vъ sto trudy plodą" (LIR,VII,16) = "and through his all-night vigils and sighs, he produced the fruit of his labors a hundred-fold". This passage is based on biblical verses, Mt 13.8 (Lk 8.8): "Other seeds fell on good soil and brought forth grain, some a hundredfold..."; and can also be found in these examples from the LDanStyl: a) "οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐν σοι καρπὸς ἀγαθῶν ἔργων" (76,74,lines 7-8) = "for in you there is no fruit of good works" (76,54); and b) "καὶ εὐθέως τῆς πίστεως τοὺς καρποὺς ἀπελάμβανεν" (88,83,lines 9-10) = "he received the fruits of his faith" (88,61).

The image of fruit also serves as a metaphor for repentance in the LIR: "plody pokaania ot sǫdu otslem" (LIR,VIII,18) = "we send from

here worthy fruits of repentence." This is taken from Mt 3.8 (Lk 3.8): "Bear fruit that befits repentence".

Animal imagery. Animal imagery is the largest category of metaphors and similes in the vitæ of Euthymius. There are of course, as in almost all hagiographic texts looked at in this study, metaphoric references to the chosen flock as a metaphor for Christians and to the pasture as a metaphor for heaven[57], and the innocent lamb and shepherd[58], all of which have their roots in biblical passages.[59]

One finds again references to the bee. Under food imagery we found references to the words of righteous men likened to sweet honey; here, in both the LIR and the LP, we find passages in which Euthymius employs a simile that likens the endless toil of holy figures to the labor of the bee:

"sъlagaą jakože ljubodělnaa pčela medъvnyą sъty i polagaą vъ

---

57 The third metaphor in the poučenie (instructive section) contained within the LPh equates heaven with a "life-giving pasture": "Čisty ubo sebe potъštati są sъbljusti i vъrǫčenǫą vamъ pastvǫ na pažiti izvesti živonosnyǫ" (LPh,VIII,91) = "Hasten to keep yourselves pure an lead the flock which has been entrusted to you to life-giving pastures."

A similar metaphor appears in the LP, in which heaven is equated to a "heavenly pasture": "xodatajstvuj nexodatajstvně, jako da dobrě vъručennoe upasše stado, izvedemъ na pažity nebesnyje i vъ ogradu vъvedemъ nebesnuju" (LP,IX,77) = "intervene [for us] directly, so that having saved well the entrusted flock, we may lead it to the heavenly pasture, and bring it into the heavenly fold."

The LSym(Sav) contains the metaphor of heaven as a pasture, and it is developed much more elaborately: "i dostignuvъ požiti pokoa vъ krasna dréva vъzrastomъ i plody, i sladkye ptice pojušte vъ njemъ." (VII,8, line 32-33) = "Thus he acquired a pasture of peace with its beautiful, full-grown, fruit-laden trees and sweet-singing birds" (VII,279); and "i poči na pažiti krasněi, na neiže pojaše ptica, izměnjajušti glasy...(VII,9,line 2-3)" "and he rested in this beautiful pasture in which a birds sang with various voices" (VII,279).

58 "I bě sъ nimъ vъ pustyni jakože agną nezlobivo, istinnyimъ pastyremъ pasomo, jakože drugyj Avelъ ili Isaakъ" (LIR,III,10) = "And [Luke] was with him in the desert like an innocent lamb, shephereded by a true shepherd just as Abel or Isaac had been..."; and "Božij že ugodnikъ jako ovčą nezlobivo po srědě vlъkъ nečъstia xoždaaše i psalomskoe ono vъ ustěx obnošaaše pěnie" (LHM,VIII,42) = "The holy saint like an innocent lamb in the midst of the filth of wolves walked around with this song from the Psalms on his lips". See Mt 9.36.

59 See Is 5.17; Jn 1.36; 21.15; 1 Pet 1.19.

skrovištex srĭъdečnyx" (LIR,III,9) = "storing them up as the labor-loving bee does honeycomb and putting them into the treasure chests of his heart"

"jakože ljubodělnaa pčela vъse prolětnyje cvěty, sice iže tamo vъsa svetaa ljubotrudně obšъd města" (LP,IV,65) = "like the labor-loving bee [lights on] all the spring flowers, thus there she went in a labor-loving way to all the holy places."

This simile does not appear anywhere in the Scriptures, but it does appear in three of texts we examined: the *Life of St. Anthony* ("ὡς ἡ σοφὴ μέλισσα" [3,844])[60], Cyrill of Turov's Service to St. Olga ("nyně jako pčela dobro razumiva daleče cvětuštee xristovy věry vъzyskaja")[61], and the *Life of Theodosius*.[62] In the introduction of the LIR, Euthymius likens the vita itself to a bee's sting which rouses the slothful:

..i pamątiǫ xranimo jakože někoe žǫlo byti i po malu podstrěkati těx kъ podražaniu (I, 6) = and...being preserved in memory, [this life], being like a sting, will in due time incite people to imitate [the life of Ivan].

This echoes the image found in the introduction of the LKlOxr:

ὡς πιστεύομεν, ὅσα γὰρ ἂν ἐπαγγείλωμεν ἢ λαλήσωμεν, ὑπὲρ ἀριθμὸν ἐπληθύνθησαν τὰ λειπόμενα. ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ῥᾳθυμοτέροις πρὸς τὴν τοῦ καλοῦ ἐργασίαν ἀπονυστάζουσι διυπνισμός τις γίνεται ἡ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ θαυμασίων κηρυττομένη μεγαλοπρέπεια (I.1,76, line 13-17) = as we believe--for, much as we may witness and proclaim, the things unsaid are many more--but also because the proclamation of the greatness of God's wonders becomes a prod unto wakefulness for the more careless ones are drowsy when it comes to the doing of good deeds (I.1,93).

---

60 "like a wise bee" (3,136).

61 "now, like the bee who knows well what is flowering far away, [she was] seeking the Faith of Christ". See Н.К.Никольский, *Материалы для истории древнерусской духовной письменности*. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. Имп. академии наук, 1907, p.89.

62 The following passages can be found in the LTheod: "nъ jakože někaa ljubodělnaa pčela cvěty obъxodešti različnye i vъsesladkyi sъbyrajušti med" (IV,12, lines 8-9); "sъbrav že ubo otonudu ljubotrudně jakože ljubodělnaa pčela" (X, 16, lines 16-17); "nedouměaxuse čto i sъtvoretь, pčelamь ubo upodobišese nravomь, jakože bo one vъnjegda ne obrětajutь blizu prěbyvališta medь sъbrati" (X,17, lines 10-12).

Compare these with the following passage from the LDanStyl:

> Ὁ δὲ δεξάμενος καὶ γνοὺς κατιέναι αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διάγειν, τῷ κέντρῳ τῆς δειλίας ληφθεὶς ἀντδηλοῖ αὐτῷ (73,71, lines 13-15) = When [the Emperor] received the letter and found that [Daniel] had come down and was in the church, he was stung by the prick of fear (73,52).

The next simile is also lifted from the Psalter. It likens the arduous desire for the truth of God to a deer, or hart, which longs for the water (Ps 41.2: "As the hart longs for flowing streams, so longs my soul for thee, O God"). Euthymius borrows this simile three times, twice in the LIR[63], and once in the LP.[64] This simile is also employed three times in the LTheod.[65]

There is also bird imagery in the vitæ of Euthymius. In one passage in the LIR, Euthymius likens happiness to flying. This simile occurs in both the LIR and the LP; it does not appear in any of the sources consulted for this work and may be original:

> mnéx są ot radosti po vъzduxu jakože lětati (LIR,XII,23) = "I thought myself to be as if flying in the air from joy!

> Sia že jako uslyšavъ samodrъžьcь, mněše sebe po nebesi lětati i ot zělnyje ne iměaše kamo děnuti se radosti (LP,VI,71) = When the autocrat (Asen) heard this, it seemed to him as if he were flying in the clouds and there was nowhere to hide himself from his exceeding great joy.

---

63 "Vъzbъnǫvъ ubo ot sъna i rasmotrivъ silǫ vidénia, raspali są jakože elenь kъ istočnikomъ vodnyimъ..." (LIR,II, 8) = "...he became fired up with excitement over it, as the hart longs for the flowing streams..."; and "tečaše jakože elenь vъ žotъvnyą časy kъ istočnikomь vodnyimь" (LIR,VIII,17) = "he hastened away as the hart hastens in the hours of harvest to the water brooks."

64 "prispé i do njego slava prěpodobnyje, juže vъ slastь zělo prijemь, raždeže se srьdcemь i jakože elenь, palimь na istočniky vodnyje" (LP,VI,70) = "the glory of the venerable one reached even him [the tsar], which he received with much delight; his heart became emblazed as the hart panteth after the water brooks"

65 "nь jakože želaetь elenь na istočniky vodnye...glaaše sice želaetь dša moa otca nasladitise molitvь i s toboju vъdvaratise vynu" (IX, 15, lines 17-19); "jakože žeždušteі elene na istočnikь vodnyi" (XVI, 23, lines 5-6); "imže obrazomь glagol-juste želaetь elenь na istočniky vodnye, sice želaetь dša naša k tebé bože" (XXI, 29, lines 4-5).

and in another he likens the Devil, in his powerlessness, to a "tiny bird":

> Sice ubo toj vъ ženъskomъ jestьstvé mužъskyj stežavši razumъ ...I bé někako vidéti iže vъ zlobé xvaleštago se velmi smia xudé niziagaema i popirajema ot mudryje seje dévy jakože xudu někotoruju pticu (LIP,III,64) = Thus she, being of a woman's nature, acquired the reason of a man...And somehow it was seen to that this serpent, who bragged vilely on himself, was in no time trampled and thrown down by this wise young woman like some tiny bird.

This simile is taken from the Bible. In Job 41.5 the bird is used to symbolize a powerless creature: "Will you play with him as with a bird?"

Animal imagery is used several times in the vitæ of Euthymius to characterize the heretics who oppose the saints. In two passages of the LHM, the heretics are likened to wild beasts:

> i tъštǫšte są sъstrélěti vъ mracé pravyą srьdcemъ, razvraštaǫšte pravoslavnoe i rasxyštaǫšte stado jakože divii něcii zvérie (LHM,V, 33) = and they were trying to cast [lit: to shoot] the upright in heart into darkness, corrupting the orthodox people and tearing the flock to bits like some awesome beast.

> Prédrečenyą že eresi, sia čąsto ot nego glagolema slyšąšte, raspyxaaxǫ są srьdcy i jakože divii zvérie skrežetaaxǫ na nь zǫby, pakosti emu tvorąšte i ljuboprěimi i sъtązanmi sъpiraǫšte są sъ nimъ (LHM,V,33) = The aforementioned heretics, hearing the things frequently said by him, set their hearts ablaze, and like wild beasts they gnashed their teeth at him, playing dirty tricks on him, and quarrelling beligerently with him.

This image appears many times in the Bible: Job 16.9; Ps 35.16; 37.12; 112.10; Lam 2.16; Mk 9.18; Acts 7.54.

In chapter V of the LHM and chapter III of the LP, Euthymius employs a simile which likens the snares of heresies to a spider's web.[66] This same simile apears in Job 8.13-14 ("Such are the paths of all who

---

[66]"Nǫ dobryj slovesnyix ovec Xristovéxъ pastyrь, Ilarionъ, vyšnégo položi prebéžište sebé i vъsą téx kъzni i šeperania jakože paočinaa tkania udobь razdiraaše i vъse vérnyix veseléše ispluъnenie" (LHM,V,33) = "But the good pastor of God's sheep, Hilarion, made the One on High a refuge for himself; and he brushed away easily, as one would a spider's web, all their snares and idle talk; and he continued to rejoice in the fulfillment of the faithful"; and "Sice ubo toj vъ ženъ skomъ jestъstvé mužъskyj stežavši razumъ, vъse vražie jakože někotoruju paučinu razaraaše kъzni" (LP,III,64) = "Thus she, being of a woman's nature, acquired the reason of a man, destroying all of the Devil's snares like some spiderweb."

forget God; the hope of the godless man shall perish. His confidence breaks in sunder, and his trust is a spider's web").

Euthymius borrows another simile from the Bible for the LHM in which he likens the snares of heretics to the ferocity of wolves:

> Božij že ugodnikъ jako ovčą nezlobivo po srědě vlъkъ nečьstia xoždaaše i psalomskoe ono vъ ustěx obnošaaše pěnie (LHM,VIII,42) = The holy saint like an innocent lamb in the midst of the filth of wolves walked around with this song from the Psalms on his lips.

Euthymius employs this same simile again in chapter XIII of LHM, manipulating it with rather poetic results to describe the process by which the Manichaeans (Paulicians) renounced their former faith and accepted Christianity:

> vъsi bo iže ot vlъkov byvšei ovčą, prěměnše sebe dobryimъ izměneniemъ, poslědovaaxǫ svoemu pastyrju, jakože agnъci nezlobivi (LHM,XIII,54) = "Those who from wolves became sheep transforming themselves with a good change, followed our pastor like innocent lambs.

And a third example can also be found in the LHM: "Praštǫ mǫdryix ti slovesъ vlъky nečьstia otženi"(LHM,XVIII,58) = "With the sling of your wise words drive off the blasphemous wolves. "This metaphor can also be found in both the Old and New Testaments: Ezek 22.27; Zeph 3.3; Mt 7.15; 10.6; Lk 10.3. It is also employed in the LDanStyl: "καὶ λαοῦ σκορπιζομένου ὑπὸ ἀνημέρων λύκων" (72, 69,line 13) = "the people are scattered by fierce wolves" (72,50)

In the LPh, Euthymius likens the Devil to a lion on the prowl.[67] This image can also be found in the LAnth ("οὔτε ὁ ἐχθρὸς, ὡς ἥττηθεις, ἐπαύετο τοῦ ἐνδρεύειν. Περιήρχετο γὰρ πάλιν ὡς λέων" [7,852]).[68] In both instances, the source of the image is the Bible, 1 Pet 5.8 ("Be sober

---

67 "Se bo zlonačąlnyj vragъ jako lьvъ rykaą xoditъ, isky poglъtiti mą" (LPh,VI,86) = "The Enemy, the originator of evil, like some lion on the prowl, wants to swallow me up."

68 "Neither did the Enemy cease laying snares...for again he went about like a lion" (7,141).

and be watchful; your adversary the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking some one to devour").

In the LP Euthymius equates the burdens of this life to an animal's yoke.[69] This image of the yoke for burdens or cares is used throughout the Bible (e.g. Gen 27.40; Lev 26.13; 1 Kings 12.4,9,10,11,14; 2 Chron 10.4,9,10,11,14; Is 9.4; 10.27; 14.25; Jer 2.20; 5.5; 27.8,11,12; Lam 3.27; Ezek 34.27; Mt 11.29; Acts 15.10). The last example of animal imagery is an unusual one. Euthymius likens the Manichaeans (Paulicians), whose flimsy arguments have just been put to shame by Hilarion's profound erudition, to "voiceless fish".[70] Earlier usages of this image can be found in classical literature ("ἀφωνότερος τῶν ἰχθύων"), by which, according to Liddell and Scott, is meant "a stupid fellow".[71] A similar image is also found in the LTheod: ("jakože bezglasni" [XV,22,line 14]= "as if mute").

<u>Water imagery</u>. There are four examples in the vitæ of Euthymius of water imagery. In the first example, tears are symbolized by springs of water and the act of crying tears of deep emotion is symbolized by the image of watering a field:

> slъznyą istěkaǫ istočniky i napaaą duševnyą brazny i klasy dobrodětělnyą procvitaą (LIR,V,13) = crying forth springs of tears and watering the furrows of his soul, and flowering forth the fruits of grace.

The first metaphor, "slъznya istočniky" can also be found in Ps 119.136, ("...streams of tears"), Jer 9.1 ("...and my eyes a fountain of tears"), Lam 3.48 ("rivers of tears"). The second metaphor, "giving his spiritual furrows to drink" with his tears, is based on the image in Ps 65.10: "Thou waterest its furrows abundantly...softening it with showers." Furthermore,

---

69 "radovaaše se ubo o tělesnomь raspreženi" (LP,IV,65) = "she rejoiced in this liberation from the corporeal yoke".

70 "I studa mnoga ispluъnše są, stašą jakože ryby bezglasny i čjuždaaxǫ są blagodlějti i silě, isxodąštij izъ ustъ istinnago pastyrě" (LHM,VII,40) = "And being filled with shame, they [the Manichaeans] stood there like voiceless fish and marvelled at the grace and power that came out of the mouth of this true pastor"

71 Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 1940; reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989, p.846.

a similar image can also be found in the LDanStyl: "ὥστε τὸ ἔδαφος ῥαντισθῆναι τοῖς δάκρυσιν αὐτῶν" (58,57,lines 16-17) = "They watered the ground with their tears" (58,41).

The second example of water imagery likens God's protection of men to a harbor.[72] This is a biblical image that can be found in Ps107.30 ("...and he brought them to their desired haven").

The third example has already been presented above in the section on animal imagery; it likens the knowledge of God to "flowing streams" to which the deer hastens.[73]

The fourth and last example of water imagery seems to be an original image on the part of Euthymius:"iže vъ mori sego suetnago vlaǫštix są žitia" (LIR,VIII,18-19) = "those of us who are floundering in the sea of this vain life."

Meteorological imagery is also abundant in the poetic language of Euthymius. In the LIR, the Bulgarian tsar, in his letter to Ivan, begs him to alleviate his sadness by granting him an audience so that he may receive the blessings of the saint. Such an opportunity would, writes the tsar, "cool the intense heat of sadness."[74] Heat is used metaphorically in the Bible as well to intensify the effects of an undesireable state; but in Is 25.4 God is likened to a "shade from the heat," and in Lam 5.10 one finds "the burning heat of famine." In the same letter to Ivan, Tsar Asen symbolizes his struggles and grief in this world with the image of storms and the weakness of his heart with clouds:

> Věstь bo, věstь tvoe prěpodobie. eliky burą mira i mątežej oblaci carskaa oburevati obykošą srlьdca (VIII,19) = For you know, your venerableness, you know how many storms of the world and clouds of uprisings have caused my royal heart to become upset!

---

72 "věsi bo dobré praviti i napravlěti, ašte xošteši, nas i vъ pristanište božiix xotěnij okrъmiti" (LHM, XVIII, 58) = "and you know well [how] to guide us to the harbor of God's desires and [how] nourish us, if it be your wish."

73 See Ps 42.1.

74 "molą są i pripadaǫ tvoemu prěpodobiu otradǫ někoǫ utěšenia kъ namъ poslati i pečali prostuditi znoj" (LIR,VIII,19) = "I...pray that you might send us some comfort of consolation and cool the intense heat of sadness."

A similar image is used in the LPh, in which Euthymius writes that the Christians, in their confusion, listened to the words of heretics, and they "greatly faltered in storms of confusion."[75] Both of these passages borrow metaphors from Is 25.4 which employs the image of the storm as a pitfall in the righteous path to God ("For thou hast been a...shelter from the storm...for the blast of the ruthless is as a storm against a wall"). The image of the storm is also employed in the LDanStyl:

> Ἵνα σώσῃς μετὰ θεὸν διωκομένην πίστιν καὶ ἐκκλησίαν χειμαζομένην καὶ ποίμνιον σκορπιζόμενον καὶ ἱερέα σὺν πολιαῖς αναιρούμενον (72,69, lines 20-22) = That you with God's help should save the faith which is being persecuted, save a storm-tossed church and a scattered flock, and save our priest who, despite his grey hairs, is threatened with death (72, 51).

In chapter VIII of LPh, there is a poučenie (or instruction) given by Philothea on her deathbed in which Euthymius symbolizes heresy and impiety with winds that carry away the righteous:"a ne obnositi są sǫdu i sǫdu različnymi větry" (LPh,VIII,90) = "and do not let yourselves be carried off here and there by different winds." This same image can be found in Eph 4.14 ("so that we may no longer be children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the cunning of man, by their craftiness and deceitful wiles").

<u>Imagery of captivity</u> is employed three times in the lives of Euthymius. In chapter II of LIR, Euthymius writes of Ivan that he was "entirely captivated by the love of God" ("I bystъ vьsь plěnenь vь ljubovь božiǫ" [LIR,II, 8]). The Slavonic word "plěnenь" can also means "taken prisoner", from "plěnъ", which means "captivity" (Greek, δέσμιος). The metaphor of a captive or prisoner for God or Christ appears many times in the epistles of Paul: Eph 3.1 ("For this reason I, Paul, the prisoner for Jesus Christ on behalf of you Gentiles"), Eph 4.1 ("I therefore, the prisoner for the Lord, beg you..."), Philem 1.1 ("Paul, a prisoner for Christ Jesus"), Philem 1.9 ("...and now a prisoner also for

---

[75]"věrnii že vъ buri i mąteži velicé kolébaaxǫ są" (LPh,VII,87).

Christ Jesus"), Philem 1.23 ("Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus").

The second example symbolizes the state of mortal man to being in shackles: "bogovi...izvodąštomu okovanyą mǫžьstvomь" (LPh,X,94) = "to God, who leads forth with courage those [bound] in shackles." A metphoric use of chains or shackles can be found in the Bible: Ps 116.6; Jer 5.5; 36.8; and Nahum 1.13.

In the last example of this kind of imagery, Euthymius employs a metaphor that is lifted from the book of Mark: "vъ skorě ązyka ego ǫzy razrěši i blagoglagolьna paky togo ustroi" (LIR,XI,22) = "and so in short time [he] undid the knot on his tongue and restored back to him his speech."

Compare this with Mk 7.35 (AV: "...and the string of his tongue was loosed").[76] In chapter II of LHM, he employs a variation on this metapor: "mogǫštoj neplodstva moego razdrěšiti ązy [sic. ǫzy[77]]" (LHM,II,29) = "you who have the power to loosen the bonds of my barrenness." This can be traced to other biblical examples, such as Job 30.11; Ps 116.16; and Lk 13.12.

Hunting imagery. There are four examples of hunting imagery in the Euthymian texts, and each one is associated with the fight against heretics and evil. The first example symbolizes the process by which Christians are taken in by heresies with the stinging of their hearts by means of the "arrow of unbelief".[78] The metaphor of the arrow as an instrument of deceit or evil can be found in the Bible: Ps 11.2 ("for lo, the wicked bend the bow, they make fitted their arrow to the string"); Ps 64.3-4 ("who whet their tongues like swords, who aim bitter words like arrows, shooting from ambush at the blameless"); Jer 9.3 ("And they bent their

---

[76] In this case the RSV translation is not a precise rendering of the Greek: "his tongue was released" for "ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ."

[77] See fn.10 to our translation of the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena*, Section II, chapter 3.

[78] "nenavidaj že dobra diavolъ ne sъtrъpě na mnozě slaviti są prěpodobnomu, no nevěria strěloǫ srlъdce episkopa grada togo uězvi" (LIR,XI,22) = "Now the Devil, hating good and not tolerating for long their glorification of the venerable saint, [but] stung the heart of the bishop of the city with the arrow of unbelief"

tongue like a bow"); Jer 9.8 ("their tongue is a deadly arrow"); and Ezek 5.16 ("deadly arrows of famine, arrows for destruction"). Euthymius employs another variant on this metaphor in the LHM:

> i tъštǫšte są sъstrěléti vъ mrace pravyą srlъdcemь, razvraštaǫšte pravoslavnoe i rasxyštaǫšte stado jakože divii něcii zvěrie (LHM,V,33) = and they were trying to cast [lit: to shoot] the upright in heart into darkness, corrupting the orthodox people and tearing the flock to bits like some wild beast.

The next two metaphors are similar. In the first one, one finds a poetic reworking of a biblical metaphor (see Ps 141.10 and Eccles 9.12), whereby deceit is equated with a net.[79] The next one represents the deceits of the Devil with the image of a "snare."[80] This image appears in many verses of the Scriptures (e.g. Job 18.10; Jer 5.26; 2 Sam 22.6; Ps 18.5; 116.3; Eccles 7.26).

The last metaphor under this category uses the image of a sling to symbolize a defense against heresies: "Prašteǫ mǫdryix ti slovesь vlъky nečьstia otženi" (LHM,XVIII,58) = "With the sling of your wise words fend off the blasphemous wolves." The metaphor of righteousness as a sling is found in 1 Sam 25.29 ("...and the lives of your enemies, he shall sling out as from the hollow of a sling"). In the same category, the metaphor of the cross as a weapon against evil is also found in the LDanStyl: "Καὶ ἔχων τὸ ἀκαταμάχητον ὅπλον τοῦ σταυροῦ" (14, 15, line 9) = "And holding the invincible weapon of the Cross" (14,15).

<u>Imagery of Precious Objects</u>. The most common image in this category likens the relics of the saint to a priceless treasure. As is shown below in chapter 3 of this section, this image abounds in the hagiographic works of Euthymius. The image of a rare and priceless treasure is found in another context in the LIR. In referring to the Bulgarian tsar's reaction to

---

79 "Nǫ slъga nepravda sebě, i vъ sěti, ąže sъkryšą, uglъboša, i lъža istinoǫ oblićena bystь" (LHM,VI,34) = "But falsehood, lying to itself, becomes deeper entrenched into the net which it conceals, and the lie was clothed in truth."

80 "eresemь kъzni razorilь esi" (LHM, XVIII, 58) = "you tore asunder the snares of heresies"

Ivan's letter to him, Euthymius employs a simile which equates something holy to a valuable treasure:

> i ljubezně to lobzavь. iměše to vъ nědrox svoixь jakože někoe mnogocěnnoe skrovište (VIII,20) = [the tsar] kissed it tenderly [i.e. Ivan's letter]; and he kept it near his bosom as if it were some very valuable treasure

The image is then used again in the LP: "nь nlyjnja jako skrovište mnogocěnnoje te zru" (LP,VII,73) = "now I gaze upon you as on a very valuable treasure."

This image of treasure can also be found in the Bible: Is 33.6 ("...the fear of the Lord is his treasure") and Mt 13.44 ("The kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hidden in a field..."). There is also a metaphor in the LTheod where Theodosius is equated with a treasure ("božstvnyi že mužь i dobrodětěljei skrovište Teodosie" (XXII,31,line 3) = "This blessed man, Theodosius, a treasure house of virtue."

There is a passage in the LIR in which Euthymius employs a metaphor that equates the human heart with a treasure chest, a repository of righteousness: "i polagaą vъ skrovištex srlъdečnyx" (LIR,III,9) = "and putting them into the treasure chests of his heart." This is taken from the book of Matthew (with parallel passages in Luke): Mt 12.35 (Luke 6.45): ("A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things"); and Mt 6.21 (Luke 12.34) implies an innate relationship between "treasure" and the "heart" ("For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also"). A similar passage from the LIR has been cited above in the section on bee imagery.[81]

In a passage of the LIR, in Ivan's letter to the Bulgarian tsar, Ivan instructs the tsar on pious living and tells him to "let the oil of your compassion pour forth onto everyone."[82] This exact image is in the LDanStyl in which it is written in conclusion to the vita, "keep the lamp of

---

81 "sъlagaą jakože ljubodělnaą pčela medъvnyą sъty i polagaą vъ skrovištex srlъdečnyx" (LIR,II,9) = "storing them up as the labor-loving bee does honeycomb and putting them into the treasure chests of his heart"

82 "Da prolivaet są na vъsěx tvoego milovania maslo" (LIR,VIII,20)

faith unquenched, carrying the oil of sympathy in our vessels" (102,71).[83] Also, metaphoric use of oil is found in Ps 45.7: the "oil of gladness" (LXX, Ps 44.8: "ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως").

In another passage, labors of sincerity and love are likened to another luxury item, incense.[84] A similar image can be found in Ps 141.2 ("Let my prayer be counted as incense before thee"). Also, in the LSym(Sav), there is a passage that likens the labors of the desert monks to fragrant desert flowers.[85]

In several places in his hagiographic works, Euthymius uses a popular metaphor in the vita genre: that of the hero "adorning" his or her life through deeds or "adorning" his or her position. The implied image is that one adorns one's life or position with pious deeds as one would adorn oneself with precious jewels. This image is employed by Euthymius seven times.[86] In the Bible, one finds in Is 61.10 a metaphor whereby the

---

83 "...καὶ ἄσβεστον τὴν λαμπάδα τῆς πίστεως διατηρεῖν, ἐπιφερόμενοι ἔλαιον ἐν τοῖς αγγειοις ημων συμπαθειας" (102, 94, lines 1-3)

84 "trudъ ubo tvoj i prědiožénie jako kadilo blagovonno bogovi prinesošą są i priąti byšą" (LIR,VIII,18) = "your labor and proposal come to me and is received like a sweet-smelling incense from God."

85 "pride množьstvo črьnьcь, jako blagovonyxь cvětьcь cvьteštixь vь toi svetěi pustyni" (VIII, 10-11, lines 37,1). = "there came a multitude of monks like fragrant blossoms, blooming in the holy wilderness" (VIII,285).

86 a)"i arxierejskyj ukrasiti prěstolъ" (LHM,IV,31) = "and adorn the archbishop's throne." (i.e. serve as archbishop)

b) "Sice svoj ukrasi prěstolъ" (LHM,XIII,54) = "Thus he adorned his throne"

c) "Nǫ, o arxiereomь udobrenie i mně sladkaa vešti i imą, Ilarione" (LHM,XVIII,57) = "[Your] adornment of the bishopric, [your] deeds and name are sweet to me, Hilarion"

d) "ne tьčiǫ že, nǫ i našь ukrašaetь prěstolъ" (LHM,XVIII,58) = "Not only [does your shrine do this] but it also adorns our throne"

e) "roditelje že blagočьstivy, xodešte vъ vsěxь božiixь zapovědexь neuklonno, milostynjami i blagotvorenii vьsu svoju ukrašajušte žiznь" (LP,II,62) = "and she had pious parents, who consistently followed all of God's commandments, adorning their whole lives with merciful and pious deeds."

f) "I sice ubo podvigše se na jestьjstvo i sice svoju ukrasi dušu, jakože i na toj ispьniti se proročьskoje ono...i děloms žitie ukrašьši, prěbystьj iěta dovolna vь pustyni" (LP,III,64-65) = "And thus having aspired to the essence [of God], she thus adorned her own soul, and this [saying] of the prophets was fulfilled by her...and adorning her life with her words and deeds, she lived many years in the desert."

acquisition of righteousness is equated with adornment ("as a bride adorns herself with jewels"); and in Tit 2.10 we find, "that in everything they may adorn the doctrine of God." In addition to these biblical roots, one can trace this metaphor to the LKlOxr, a post-Metaphrastic vita, as well: "Μεθόδιος, ὃς τὴν Πανόνων ἐπαρχίαν ἐκόσμησεν" (II.4, 78, lines 20-21) = "Methodius who adorned the Panonian diocese" (II.4, 94).

Light/Dark Imagery. There is only one example of each in all of the hagiographic texts of Euthymius. In one, Euthymius equates a sinful, irreligious existence with darkness.[87] Examples of this metaphor can be found in the Bible: Ps 18.28 ("...the Lord my God lightens my darkness"), Ps 107.10 ("Some sat in darkness and in gloom"). Also in LTheod, one finds mention of "mrakъ duševnyi" (= "spiritual darkness" [XXVII, 33, line 30]) and also in LTheod, one finds "prěbyti vъ mracě svoego nečьstia" (= "to live in the darkness of ones own sinfulness" [XX, 26, line 29]). Other examples of this metaphor are found in the LHM.[88] In the other example, the light of a lamp is a symbol of purity and chastity.[89] This image is taken Prov 31.18, which refers to the lamp of a virtuous

---

g) "Tvoej bo vъždelě bogъ dobrotě i različnymi ukrasi te čjudesy na zemli" (LP,VII,73) = "God desires your goodness and has adorned you with various miracles on earth."

87 "čąstyimь pročitaniemь sego mlъvy mirskyą otganěaše tъmǫ" (LIR,VIII,20) = "with frequent readings of this letter he chased away the darkness of the world."

88 a) "Vъznikněte, člověci, ot naležǫštago vamь mraka, ottrąsěte ot očiju vašeju nečjuvstvia sъnъ" (LHM,VI, 37) = "Come out, men, from the darkness that surrounds you; wipe from your eyes this sleep of insensibility."

b) "Těmže vъznikněte ot glǫbokyǫ prělьsti, iže vas odrъžǫštǫą, i ottrąsěte naležǫštǫą očima vašima slěpotǫ" (LHM,IX,51) = "Moreover, extract yourselves from the profound deceit which grips you, and wipe away the blindness from your eyes."

c) "Pročee priiměte čjuvstvo odrъžǫštǫą vas tъmy i suetnaa i lъžo ostavite, poznajte istinǫ i toǫ ozarite są světomь" (LHM,VII,41) = "Moreover, gain an understanding of the darkness that opresses you, abandon your vanities and lies, gain and understanding of truth through which you will be enlightened with light."

89 "edina kaažđo svoemu presěděše světilniky, ne ugasimь tъ xranąšti, siréč těla svoego čistotǫ" (LPh,II,80) = "Each of them placed their own lamp before them -- that is to say, the purity of their bodies -- making sure it was never extinguished."

woman ("her lamp does not go out at night"). Consider also Prov 20.27, which refers to the spirit of man as "the lamp of the Lord."[90]

Clothing imagery. Clothing imagery is employed in three passages in the hagiographic texts of Euthymius. In the LHM, one finds the following poetic reworking of biblical metaphor, whereby abstract notions such as emotions are equated with garments or raiments that one can don (cf. Job 29.13; Ps 93.1; 109.19; Is 59.17):

> Nǫ slъga nepravda sebé, i vъ sěti, ąže sъkryša, uglъbošą, i lъža istinoǫ obličena bystъ (LHM,VI,34) = But falsehood, lying to itself, becomes deeper entrenched into the net which it conceals, and the lie was clothed in truth.

In the next example, the metaphor is lifted from Ps 109.19 ("He clothed himself with cursing as his coat"):

> Sia ubo jako onъ slyšavъ, obléče są vъ nenavistъ jako vъ rizǫ (LIR,III,11) = When [Ivan's brother] heard this, he clothed himself with hatred like as with his garment.

A similar image can be found in Is 59.17 ("he wrapped himself in fury as a mantle"). Of special note is that the passage "and the lie was clothed in truth" appears also in the LTheod: "i jako ubo istinnymi obličena byš lъža" (XV, 22, line 17). Euthymius employs this kind of metaphor again in the LHM:

> my že vъ crlъjkvax služby sъvrъšaemъ i na duxovné žrъtъvnicé svąštennyǫ glagolą trapezy i alčni stoǫšte vъ svątitelъskǫą odeždǫ oblъčeni, ne vъ razorenie prědrečenyimъ. nǫ čъstnějši tvorąšte činъ (LHM,IX,46) = We then in churches perform the services on the spiritual sacrificial altar, which we call the sacred table; and desirous, we stand dressed in priest's clothing, not [in the garments] of perdition of the aformentioned [heretics], and we perform the holiest ceremony.

---

[90] Professor R. Mathiesen has pointed out to me in one of our many discussions of this work that in view of the role of "light" in Hesychast thought and practice, one might have expected more light metaphors if style were truly under the influence of Hesychasm. Their rarity, he suggests, supports our argument that style was not influenced by Hesychast mysticism.

Clothing imagery is also employed in the LDanStyl: a) "ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄνθρωπος εἰμι καὶ σάρκα περιβέβλημαι" (62, 61, lines 19-20) = "I too am a man and am clothed with flesh" (62, 45); and b) "σπεύσωμεν κατ' ἴχνος αὐτοῦ προβαίνειν καὶ ἄσπιλον φυλάττειν τὸν χιτῶνα τοῦ σώματος" (102, 93, lines 31-32) = "let us do our utmost to follow in his step and to preserve the garment of our body unspotted" (102, 71).

There are several metaphors Euthymius employs to express strong emotion. Some of these metaphoric phrases -- e.g."filled with envy"[91], "seized/gripped with sadness"[92], "fired up with zeal"[93]-- are used so often that they become formulaic phrases in the texts. All of these, as the information in the footnotes indicates, have biblical roots and are employed in pre-Euthymian hagiographie texts. The other metaphor which Euthymius employs in this category seems to be original:

---

91 "grъdyj i veleréčivy vragъ...isplъni są zavisti" (LIR,III,10) = "the proud and bombastic Enemy...was filled with envy", has its roots in the biblical and earlier Slavic hagiographic tradition. In Acts 13.45 we find: "they were filled with envy". Similarly, in the LSym(Sav) we find "srama isplъnenъ", or "filled with shame" (VIII,10,line 26).

92 "Nécii že, zavistiǫ održimi, lénivi sǫšte na blagoe, dosadami i ukoriznami togo oblagaaxǫ, licemérna naričaǫšte i nepotrébna do konca mirskago prébyvania." (LIR,II,8) = "Some, seized by envy, being indolent toward goodness, heaped on him injustices and humiliations, calling him a hypocrite and an evil man to the end of his earthly life."

The metaphoric use of "seized" is found in the Bible: Jer 49.24 ("panic seized"); Job 3.6 ("let their darkness seize it"); and also in the LDanStyl: "...φόβῳ...καταλαμβάνει" (49, 47, lines 12-13) = "seized with fear" (chap.49,p.35); LTheod: "obъjeti byše préiъstiu" (XIV,19,line 27-28) = "seized with deceit", and "obъjetъ studъ" (XV,22,line18) = "seized with shame."

93 "Božъstъvnoǫ ubo revnostiǫ ražděg są carъ i radosti obъątъ ego oblakъ" (LIR,VIII,17) = "The tsar became fired up with divine zeal and a cloud of joy seized him." The image of "divine zeal" can be found in LTheod: "Togo vidévъ velikyi bžstvnuju revnostъ" (VI,13,line 32); and "vъ božestvnuju (podvigъ) revnostъ" (XXI,27,line 17). The image of becoming "fired up" or "kindled" can be found in many bibilical verses in expressions of anger or wrath (Gen 30.2; Num 11.10; Deut 6.15; Josh 7.1; 1 Sam 11.6; 2 Sam 6.7; 1 Chron 13.10; Job 32.2, Ps 106.40, 124.3; Is 5.25, just to cite a few examples).

Euthymius employs this clearly in LHM: "eretici že zavistiǫ i gnévomъ raždiǯaaxǫ są" (LHM,IV,33) = "The heretics were fired up with hatred and wrath." Furthermore, in the LSym(Sav) one finds images close to that employed by Euthymius: "razъgaraaše srъdce ego" (III,3,line 14) = "ignited in his heart" (III,263), and "i vъzgorévъ se duxomъ" (VI, 7, line 28) = "and with his heart enkindled" (VI,275).

I po molitvě sěděše, skrъbą i tǫžą o lišeni otroka...sъpletet są vъ žitijskyx pečalex (LIR,III,11) = And after the prayer, he sat down, saddened and grieved over the loss of the child...and absorbed himself in worldly sorrows [lit: and wove himself about in wordly sorrows].

There are a few metaphors and similes which Euthymius employs that involve images for the human heart. One metaphor speaks of the "depths of the heart."[94] Two passages compare the heart to stone tablets.[95] These images, as indicated in the footnote, appear in earlier hagiographic texts. Euthymius employs a simile in the LIR which likens the steadfastness or resolve of man to a hard stone, or adamant (diamond), and this has its origins in scriptural texts.[96]

There are a few examples of sleep and blindness being equated with a lack of knowledge of God. Here are two examples which equate spiritual indolence with sleep:

---

94 "pade na zemlą i, iz gląbiny srъdca vъzdъxnǫv" (LIR,VI,15) = "[Ivan] fell to the earth, and from the depth of his heart he sighed."The exact metaphor is also found in the LKlOxr ("ἐκ βαθέων καρδίας ἐξομολογήσεως" [XXVIII.77, 144, line 4] = "He cried from the depths of his heart" [XXVIII.77,123]) and the LSym(Sav): "iz glubiny srъdъca" (III, 3,line 9).= "from the depths of his heart" (III,263).

95 "ne k tomu na skrižalex kamennyix, nǫ na skrižalex srlъjdca, slъzami omakaą kamenъ" (LIR,VII,16) = "Moreover, it was not tablets of stone but the stone of the tablets of his heart that [Ivan] wet with his tears". This is also found in the LSym(Sav): "napišita na skrižali srъdъca vaju" (IV, 4, line 34-35).= "write them upon the tablets of your heart" (IV, 267)

A metaphor contained in Philothea's poučenie equates the heart of the believer with tablets or scrolls, but only by suggestion through use of the verb "napisati": "sia napisujte vъ srlъjdcix vašix" (LPh,VIII,91) = "engrave these things in your hearts". This same image appears in Clement of Oxrid's Sermon on Constantine: "napišemъ na sъrdci našemъ" (See Vaillant, *Textes vieux-slaves*, vol.1, p.86). Compare also this metaphor with the preceding example in which there is an explicit metaphor equating the heart with a tablet.

96 "jakože někyj kamenъ tvrъd vъsą prixodąštąą na nъ vlъny razbivaą i otražaą, ili, istinée rešti, jakože adamantъ ne ątъ byvaaše nikakověmъ želězomъ" (LIR, II,9) = "and like a hard stone, he beat off and deflected all the waves that came upon him, or, to put it more precisely, like an adamant, not containing any iron." The same simile can be found in two different biblical verses, Ezek 3.9 ("Like an adamant harder than flint have I made thy forehead...") and Zech 7.12 ("Yea, they made their hearts like an adamant stone...")

> i se nlyjně jako ot sъna někoego glǫboka vъzbъnǫvъ, vъsxotěx tvoǫ svątostь viděti (LIR,VIII,19) = and so now as if having woken up from some deep sleep, I wanted to see your saintliness.

> Vъznikněte, člověci, ot naležǫštago vamь mraka, ottrąsěte ot očiju vašeju nečjuvstvia sъnъ (LHM,VI,37) = Come out, men, from the darkness that surrounds you; wipe from your eyes this sleep of insensibility.

The metaphor of spiritual lassitude or impiety equated with sleep is taken from the Bible, and both examples from Euthymius refer to these: Rom 13.11 ("Besides this you know what hour it is, how it is full time now for you to wake from sleep"); 1 Thess 5.6 ("So then let us not sleep, as do others; but let us keep aware and be sober"); Ps 13.3 ("...lest I sleep the sleep of death"); Ps132.4 (Prov 6.4) ("I will not give sleep to my eyes, or slumber to my eyelids"); and also Prov.19:15 ("Slothfulness casts into a deep sleep..."). In another example, Euthymius equates spiritual sloth with blindness:

> Těmže vъznikněte ot glǫbokyǫ prelьsti, iže vas odrъžǫštǫą, i ottrąsěte naležǫštǫą očima vašima slěpotǫ (LHM,IX,51) = Moreover, extract yourselves from the profound deceit which grips you, and wipe away the blindness from your eyes.

This, too, has its roots in biblical verses. It comes close to the metaphor in 1 Jn 2.11, which also recalls the first of these two examples ("But he that hates his brothers is in the darkness, he does not know where he is going because that darkness has blinded his eyes"). Cf. also Is 42.18; 59:10.

There are also several miscellaneous examples of metaphor and simile in the hagiographic texts of Euthymius that cannot be grouped into larger categories. Most of these, too, can be traced to earlier biblical and/or hagiographic sources.[97]

---

97 a) "oblěče są vъ brъnǫ pravdy, vъzlagaetь i šlemь spasenia, božlьjstvnyj pokrovь"(LIR,II,8) = "[Ivan] dressed himself in the armour of righteousness, taking up the shield of salvation, the divine protection." All of these metaphors are taken from the Bible: the armour of righteousness" and the "armour of God" are found in several verses. Cf. 2 Cor 6.7; Is 59.17; Eph 6.11,13,17; 1 Thess 5.8). The shield of salvation is found in Ps 18.35, and the Psalter abounds in images of the shield as a source of protection (Ps 3.3; 28.7, 33.20; 59.11; 84.9, 11; 115.9,10,11; 119.114; and 144.2). Note also that the phrases "shield of salvation" and "the divine protection" are juxtaposed in paranomastic

5) tautology:

In all of the four vitæ of Euthymius there are a total of eighteen examples of the rhetorical feature of tautology, i.e. the repetition of a word

---

relationship. A similar rendering of these biblical images is also employed in the LTheod: "Oblъkse ubo doblyi sъ mužь vъ oca mitvy jakože vъ brъnje i šlémь i tvrъdoe vъseoružъstvo" (VIII,14,lines 28-29) = "This valient man dressed himself in the prayer of the father or in an armour and shield, a firm protection".

b) Euthymius also borrows from the Bible the metaphor which equates the abolishment of sin with cleansing: "Napisa že kъ nemu i pisanie, povelévaǫštee vъsą Bogomilskǫą eresь ot stada očistiti i pokarévǫštǫą są ubo blagočьstia dogmatomь usrъdno priemati i izbrannomu sъčetavati stadu" (LHM,XI,52-53) = "And he wrote a letter to [Hilarion], ordering the flock to be cleansed of all Bogomil heresy, to obey and zealously accept the piety of the [church] dogmas and to add themselves unto the chosen flock." Some scriptural examples of this metaphor are to be found in Ps 51.2 ("Wash me thoroughly from my iniquity and cleanse me from my sin!"); Ezek 36.25 ("and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from your idols I will cleanse you"); 2 Cor 7.1 ("...let us cleanse ourselves from every defilement of body and spirit").

c) "Sice ubo pravoslavnyix vъznese są rogъ, nečьstie že do konca ugase" (LHM,XIII,54) = "Thus he lifted up the horn of orthodoxy. He extinguished impiety completely." The first part of the metaphor is found in numerous biblical examples: the image of the "horn of salvation" is found in 2 Sam 22.3; Ps 18.21; Luke 1.69; "lifting up" or "exalting the horn" is found in Ps 75.4-5; 89.17, 24; 92.10; 112.9. The other half of the metaphor, which equates impiety to a fire or flame that is stamped out or extinguished is not found in any of my other sources.

In chapter X of LPh Euthymius employs a metaphor that equates the proselytizers of Christ to trumpets: "bǫdem i my trǫby bezčislъnyix ti čjudesь" (LPh,X,94) = "We will be the trumpets [that proclaim] your innumerable miracles." This is a biblical metaphor. There are several verses which speak of the trumpet proclaiming the truth of God, e.g. Ps 47.5; 150.3; Is 58.1; Jer 51.27.

d) "A eže jako vъ mimotečeni préidoxomь, ne podobaetь to zabьvenia glǫbinam otslati" (LHM,XV,56) = "But that which we have gone over in passing should not be consigned to the abyss of oblivion." There is a similar image in the LKlOxr: "καὶ λύχνος ὢν ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην τῆς ἀφανείας τιθοῖτο" (III.10, 84, lines 5-6) = "and being a lamp, is put under the bed of oblivion (Lk 8.16)" (III.10, 96).

e) "jako čądoljubivь otьkъ maldenečnaa naša némotovania" (LHM,I,28) = "Like a loving father who delights in the meaningless babble of his own baby" (I,44). This also seems to be original.

f) A simile is found in LPh likens the force which draws people to God to the force by which a magnet attracts metal: "vъsé vъ bogorazumie privlačaaše, jakože magnidé estъstvo obyče privlačiti želézo" (LPh,VII,87) = "and [she] led everyone to a knowledge of God, just as by nature a magnet draws iron." This exact same image is found twice in the LTheod: "jakože magnitь kъ sebé privlačitь želézo..." (VI, 13, line 20); and "jakože magnitь ot različnyix privlačaaše méstь..." (XII, 18, line 25).

or root in a phrase or sentence. What follows is a comprehensive list of them:

a) "načąlnoobraznyj obrazъ" (LIR,I,5) = lit: "the original image"

b) "ostavlěetь zemnaa zemnymь i pepelnyim prъstь."(LIR,II,8) = "leaving the things of this world to the worldly and the dust to the ashes "

c) "isxoditь mira i mirodrъžca" (LIR,II,8-9) = "he left the world and the Ruler of the world [i.e. the Devil]"

d) "i vodǫ, ąže neskǫdno istočnici istěkaǫtь" (LIR,II,9) = "and water which the springs abundantly poured forth"

e) "prilagaą trudy kъ trudomь i kъ želaniu želanie" (LIR,III,9) = "adding labor unto labor and desire unto desire"

f) "istinnyimь pastyremь pasomo, jakože drugyj Avelь ili Isaakъ" (LIR,III,10) = "shepherded by a true shepherd just as Abel or Isaac had been"

g) "aggelskoe ono, eže vъ vyšniix pěvaemoe vъspetь pěnie" (LHM,II,29) = "he sang out that angelic song which is sung on high"

h) "no i osirěvšee stado svoimь prosvětiti světomь" (LHM,IV,31) = "to enlighten his own orphaned flock with his light"

i) "i prilagaaše są prisno kъ čislu pravoslavnyx množьstvo mnogo ljudij" (LHM,VIII,42) = "and he was constantly adding to the number of orthodox believers a numerous number of people"

"zrěti i množьstvo mnogo světlyix voinь" (LP,V,68) = "he saw a numerous number of brilliant soldiers"

"sь nimiže i množьstvo mnogo bezčislьnago naroda" (LP,VI,72) = "and also amongst them was an innumerably large number of people"

j) "Kako že iže i krlьštenie i žrьtvǫ osvąštaaj krlьštь ot osvąštaemyixь obrazъ osvąštaet są?"(LHM,IX,48) = "How then can the cross, sanctifying baptism and sacrifice, be sanctified by sanctified images?"

k) "vъsěkǫ posluži službǫ" (LHM,XIV,55) = "and performed for him every service"

l) "Elma že kъ iže sice světloj namъ slovo, i světlo pročeje načelo budetъ sъ světloju pověstiju." (LP,I,60) = "Because our story is addressed to the brilliant [Paraskeva], the beginning will shine bright with a brilliant narrative. "

m) "Nъ ni tako prězrě bogъ svoju rabu na mnozě bezъpametnu ležati, niže tljeju rastlěti se neporočnomu onomu tělesi, nъ i o semъ čjudo pokaza divno." (LP,V,67) = "But God did not forsake his slave that she should lie there long without memory, nor that her immaculate body should decompose with decay, but instead [He] worked a wondrous miracle."

n) "Vъ nošti že toj i někaa ot blagogovějnyx ženъ--Evtimia toj prozvanie--podobno tomužde viděniju viděnie vidě" (LP,V,68-69) = "And on that night one of the reverent women--Euthymia was her name--saw [lit: visioned] a similar vision to that vision"

o) "subotstvuj istinnoje subotstvovanie" (LP,VIII,76) ="celebrate the true sabbath"

p) "xodatajstvuj nexodatajstъvně" (LP,IX,77) = "intervene directly [lit.: without intervention]"

q) "jakože ni samǫ sъnědlьj vъzmošti sladko sъněsti" (LPh,IV,82) = "so that you will not be able to enjoy eating food"

r) "I tako sebe znamenavši znameniemъ krlъsta" (LPh,VI,86) = "So she made the sign of the cross"

Like all of the rhetorical features examined thus far, tautology is employed not only in texts of a rather complex nature predating Euthymius (such as the LKlOxr, LSym(Sav) and LTheod[98]), but also, and more

---

98 An example from the LKlOxr is "ἐχάρη μὴν χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα" (III.9, 82, line 2) = "[Hadrian] rejoiced greatly" [lit.: "rejoiced with great joy"].

In the LSym(Sav) we find, for example, "i simi uvěty uveštavъ ixъ dobry gospodinъ i blagy pastyrь" (III, 4, lines 5-6) = "And with these admonitions the good lord and gentle shepherd admonished them" (III, 265); and "vъsacěm že xranjeniemъ

significantly, in pre-fourteenth century texts written in a simple style, such as the LDanStyl, LC, LM and the LW. Here are some examples:

Life of Daniel the Stylite:

a) "ἐχάρησαν χάραν μεγάλην" (5, 5,lines 14-15) = "[his parents] rejoiced with great joy" (5,9)

Life of Wenceslas:

a) "i blagoslovi i se rekъ gl(o)s(pod)ь i(su)sъ x(ri)sto(s)ъ blagoslovi otroca se blagosloveniemъ" (105) = "and blessed him saying: 'O Lord Jesus Christ, bless this boy with the blessing with which Thou blessed all Thy righteous men"

b) "i bl(o)gъ pokoi ego d(u)šju vъ věčnemъ pokoišti..." (109) = "May God rest his soul in eternal rest"

Life of Constantine:

a) "Po six že i ina mnoga vъprašania vъprašašą" (VI,11) = "After these things they asked him many questions"

b) "to poslědi sladokъ plodъ priploditь" (XI,25) = "it [the tree] will be the last to bear sweet fruit".

c) "a onъ uzritь vъ sudnyi, egda sądetь sudii vetxyi denьmi suditi vsěm jazykomъ" (XI,26) = "...but he will come on the Judgment Day, when the Judge, the Ancient of Days, will take his seat to judge all of the nations"

Life of Methodius:

a) "ašte li prъstupitь sъmьrtiju umьretь, ot svojeja volą a ne ot božija velěnija." (I,42) = "...if he transgressed [the commandment], he would die through death by his own will, and not by God's command."

b) "zapovědь zapovědavъ jemu" (I,42) = "a commandment was commanded unto him"

---

xrani svoe srьdьce" (VIII, 9, line 26) = "Preserve your heart with all diligence" [lit.: "preserve with every preservation] (VIII, 281).

In the LTheod we find, an example of tautology is "i grozьnь pozorь vъsěmь zrěštiimь" (XIV, 20, line 13) = "and gazing at everyone with a frightful gaze".

The device of tautology, as well as appearing in earlier Byzantine and Slavic texts, would have naturally entered into the medieval Slavic rhetorical repertoire from Biblical examples. One, need look only as far as the book of Genesis to find examples of tautology in the Septuagint: "Ἰδοὺ δέδοκα ὑμῖν πᾶν χόρτον σπόριμον σπεῖρον σπέρμα." (Gen1.29); "Οὐ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε" (Gen 3:4), and "Πληθύνων πληθυνῶ" (Gen 3.16).

6) alliteration and assonance:

These devices overlap with the category of tautology, presented above. Most of the examples of tautology are alliterative; and because they are tautological, they are also *ipso facto* assonantal. For this reason, alliteration and assonance are not treated here as separate categories but are comprehended in the category of tautology. There is only one example of assonance we found in the vitæ by Euthymius that does not fit into the category of tautology: "umovrědnaago těxъ mǫdrovania" (LPh,VII,88) = "and the thought of those things which are damaging to the mind". Another example of this can be found in the LSym(Sav): "žitie bo se sěnь i sьnь" (III,4,line 1-2) = "life is but a shadow and a dream" (III,265).

7) appositional series:

Throughout the vitæ, Euthymius employs series of appositions like this one from the LIR: "tvoeǫ starosti podporъ i tvoego domu naslědnika i tvoego sěmene plod...otroka" (III,10) = "your child...your support in your old age, the heir to your home, the fruit of your seed." These are markedly prevalent in those passages of the vitæ where Euthymius introduces an encomium, or panegyric, to the saint. For example, in the panegyric to Saint Paraskeva, which takes up all of chapter VII of the vita, there are twenty-seven laudatory epithets which Euthymius uses to praise her.

Apposition itself -- which often manifests itself in hagiographic texts by simply referring to the hero by one or more fixed epithets -- is a common feature of all periods of life-writing, pre- and post-Metaphrastic alike. However, the feature of describing or characterizing the hero

through a long string of encomiastic epithets, sometimes numbering ten or more, is peculiar to texts of the post-Metaphrastic tradition and is generally absent from the vitæ of simpler style, such as the LAnth, LDanStyl, LC, LM and LW. For example, the LSym(Sav) contains the following panegyric passage to St.Symeon containing a long, amplificatory appositional series:

> Čto bo i nareku, vъ istinu nedouměju. gospodina li dobrago? učitelja li pravověriju? otьča li blagago? pastira li, iže věroju upase stado emu prědanoe? crьkvamь li prosvětitelja i blagonraviju učitelja i vъ molitvě vinu prěbyvajušta? ništimь li prěizobilnago služitelja i ljubitelja? pravověriju li nastavnika i blagověriu učitelja i čistotě vьseljeněi světilo? ispilnjenago li věry i obrazь krotosti i pošteniju nastavnika? prěmudrosti li nastavnika i sьmyslodavca i nesьmyslьnymь kazatelja? sьbljuditelja li stadu svoemu i prěmudro otvětodavca kь vьsěmь okrьstь živuštixь ego?" (V,6,lines 6-14)[99]

8) **synonyms** (and nearly synonymous phrases):

In addition to the abundant use of metaphor and simile, one of the most striking characteristics of Euthymius' hagiographic style is his use of synonyms or synonymous phrases in the texts. According to this feature, rather than stating something once, one employs words or phrases that means almost the same thing in order to emphasize the content. Here is an inventory of the instances of this device in the vitæ by Euthymius:

a) "otemletь vlasy sъ <u>strastmi</u> i <u>poxotmi</u>" (LIR,II, 8) = "and he had himself tonsured with <u>passion</u> and <u>desire</u>".

b) "vъzděvaą prěpodobnyą rǫky bez <u>gněva</u> i <u>sъmǫštenia</u>" (LIR,II, 9) = "Lifting up his venerable hands without ire and agitation"

c) "nǫ <u>malo zělo</u> i <u>skǫdno</u>" (LIR, II, 9) = "<u>very little</u> of it and <u>in great scarcity</u>."

---

99 "For what shall I call him? Yea, I know not! A good lord? A teacher of Orthodoxy? A good father? A shepherd who through faith tended the flock entrusted to him? An englightener of churches, a teacher of morality, a man of unceasing prayer? The most diligent of servants and lover of the poor? A preceptor of Orthodoxy, teacher of piety and luminary of universal purity? A preceptor of abstinence? A preceptor of wisdom, and a counselor and teacher of the thoughtless? A protector of his flock and the wisest of oracles to all who lived near him?" (V,271).

d) "ideže peštero obrětь temno zělo i mračno" (LIR, III, 9)= "where he found a very dark and gloomy cave."

e) "Stoaše mlьča i ničьsože otnod věštaa" (LIR,III,11) = "He stood there in silence and said absolutely nothing [lit: "He stood there being silent and saying absolutely nothing"]

f) "i po molitvě sěděše, skrъba i tožą o lišeni otroka" (LIR,III,11) = "And after the prayer, he sat down, saddened and grieved over the loss of the child"

g) "obrětoša kamen veiej, vysokь zělo i žestokь i vesma neudobь šestъvenь" (LIR,VIII,17)="they found the big rock, very high and treacherous and very difficult to climb"

h) "Pečalenь ubo velmi bystlьl carь...otide sъ mnozěmь sětovaniemь i skrъbio" (LIR,VIII,18) = "The tsar was sad...and left with great lamentation and grief."

i) "i beše němь vъsěčьsky i nikakože věštaa" (XI,22) = "and he was completely mute, not being able to say anything"

j) "kralь, straxomь i užasomь odrъžimь bystlьl" (XI,22) = "the king...was seized with terror and awe"

k) "Malu že vrěmeni prěšedšu i svątomu preležně věrnya učąštu i nakazoštu ljudi" (LHM,V,33) = "Only a little time having passed, and the saint having taught and instructed carefully the devout people."

l) "Nь niže to samoje bylie, niže vodu do sytosti prijemljaaše, nь malo i xudě i se zělo kь večeru" (LP,III,63) = "And she took neither grass nor water to the point of satiation but rather she took of them for herself very sparingly and late in the day at that."

m) "obače, jako ne iskusni i nevěžde sušte" (LP,V,68) = "however, they, being inexperienced and ignorant"

n) "i mužьstьvně vъsa pokori že i pooblada i samy tь carьstvujuštij gradь povoeva že i pokori" (LP,VI,70) = "bravely he overmastered and took control of everything, and he even conquered and overmastered the Imperial City [Constantinople]"

o) "pečalь, skrъbь i vъzdyxanie" (LPh,IV,83) = "sadness, grief and sighing"

p) "děvьstvo xranąšte i čistotǫ" (LPh,IV,83) = "to preserve their virginity and chastity"

q) "čistotǫ i cělomǫdrie" (LPh,IV,84) = "chastity and purity"

r) "slavoslovie božie i xvalǫ" (LPh,VII,88) = "worshipping and praising Him"

s) "sъ vъsěcěmь straxomь i boaznię tǫ čistǫ i neporočnǫ xraniti i bljusti" (LPh,VIII,89) = "with all awe [lit: terror] and fear, you ought to preserve and maintain [the faith] pure and unblemished"[100]

t) "běše carь vъ radosti i veseli mnozě" (LPh,XII,96) = "the tsar was overjoyed and very delighted"

This feature, too, is found in texts that predate Euthymius and the Hesychasts. Of the texts examined for this study, this rhetorical feature appears in both "low" and "high" style texts, e.g. LC, LSym(Sav), and the LTheod. Here are some examples:

Life of Constantine:

a) "kon'stantinъ filosofъ, nastavnikъ i učitelь našь" (II,2) = "Constantine the Philosopher, our preceptor and teacher"

b) "budi mi prosvětitelь i učitelь" (III,4) = "Be my enlightener and teacher"

Life of Symeon (by Sava):

a) "i obrětoxь čьstnoe tělo ego cělo i nevrědimo" (XI,13,lines 24-25) = "and they found his pure body whole and unharmed"

---

100 This is a particularly illustrative example, because it contains three sets of near-synonymous lexical series.

b) "cělь i sьxranjenь i nevrěždenь ničimže" (XI,13,line 32) = "whole and preserved and in no way harmed"

Life of Theodosius:

a) "i gněva že i jarosti" (XXVII,34,line 9) = "with anger and wrath"

b) "tьmna i mračna" (XXII,30,line 25) = "and dark and gloomy"

c) "skrьběše nemьnjee i tužaaše" (X,16,line 10-11) = "and he was very grieved and saddened"

d) "i ot tělese cělomudrьnyx i čistotnyixь" (XXI,29,line 25) = "from the body of the pure and the chaste"

e) "věrovati vъ nepročnuju i čistuju našu věru" (XX,26,line 24) = "to believe in our pure and clean faith"

9) antithesis:

One common feature of all the hagiographic texts examined for this study is the affinity for creating contrasts, even at times where, contextually, they seem out of place. According to this rhetorical device, the writer introduces a phrase containing information that he then intends to show as being contrary to the truth, usually by employing the conjunction "but" (Slavonic "nǫ") or "and" (Slavonic "i"). What follows is an inventory of this device in the vitæ of Euthymius:

a) "ot crlьlkve nikako otstǫpaą, nǫ sъ vъnimaniemь poslušaą božlьlstvnyix slovesь svąštennaa učenia." (LIR,II, 7-8) = "...under no circumstances being absent from church, but listening with great attention to the divine words of the sacred teaching."

b) "Ni bo to samoe bylie pustynnoe do sytosti priimaaše, nǫ malǫ zělo i skǫdno" (LIR,II, 9) = "He would not take enough of that desert plant to fill him, but rather very little of it and in great scarcity."

c) "Nǫ Ivanъ nikakože na są naděą są bě, nǫ na boga..." (LIR,VI,14) = "But Ivan--in no way relying on himself, but on God..."

d) "ne našeǫ radi pravdy, nǫ radi tvoeǫ blagosti i štedrot tvoix" (LIR,VI,15) = "not thanks to our truth, but thanks to Your kindness and generosity."

e) "Nenavidąj že dobra diavolъ ne sъtrъpě na mnozě tolikǫ doblestь mǫža, nǫ, poemь sъ soboǫ legeonъ běsov, surově na svątago priidoša" (LIR,VII,16) = "Now the Devil hating good, did not tolerate for long such virtue of this man; but, having taking with him a legion of devils, they were coming to the saint ruthlessly."

"nenavidąj že dobra diavolъ ne sъtrъpě na mnozě slaviti są prěpodobnomu, nǫ nevěria strěloǫ sr|ъ|dce episkopa grada togo uězvi" (LIR,XI,22) = "Now the Devil, hating good, did not tolerate for long their glorification of the venerable saint, [but] stung the heart of the bishop of the city with the arrow of unbelief."

f) "ni edinomu času razlěnenie ili unynie podavь, nǫ kъ revnosti pače revnostь i kъ usrъdiju usrъdie prilagaą" (LIR,IX,20)= "and not for one hour did he fall to indolence or depression, but added [lit: adding] zeal unto zeal and diligence unto diligence."

g) "Věra že neispytanna veštь est|ь| i neskazanna i otnǫd ązykomь plъtěnomь skazati są ne mogǫšti" (LHM,VI,38) = "Faith is an unfathomed and ineffable thing, and on the contrary it cannot be expressed with a tongue of the flesh."

h) "Oni že čąstaa prixoždenia kъ nemu tvorěxǫ, ne radi polzy se tvorąšte, nǫ vinǫ nekǫą tomu vъzložiti xotąšte" (LHM,VII,42) = "They paid frequent visits to him. They did this, of course, not to benefit from it, but because they wanted to find some fault to reproach him with."

i) "Ne bo ot čąsti podvizal są esi, nǫ daže do krъve, i bez krъvi pokazal są esi mǫčenikь" (LHM,XVIII,58) = "For you did not perform heroic deeds in a small measure but [in great abundance] and up until your very death; and without [the shedding of] blood you showed yourself to be a martyr."

This device is common both to "high" and "low" style texts. Numerous examples can be found in the LC and the LM. In the LC alone there are seven examples, and in the LM, three. Here are some examples from the *Life of Constantine*:

a) "ne ljudskago obyčaa drъži, no božiix zapovědi zri (V,6) = "keep not the ways of man, but keep God's commandments"

b) "i na utrii denь ničtože ne ostavląja, no ništimъ razdaaše vъse, na boga pečąlь vъmětaa, iže są (i) vsěmi na vsąkъ denь pečetь" (VII,11-12) = "He kept nothing for the next day, but distributed it all to the poor, casting up his care upon God, who cares for everyone every day."

c) "i obьštago spasenią ne otrini, no vsą podvigni ne lěniti są, no jati są po istin'nyi putь" (XIV,31) = "and do not reject universal salvation. Prod all not to be idle, but to take the true path"

10) epithets:

The vitæ of Euthymius, like the other vitæ included in this study, abound in epithets that are attached to the heroes of the lives themselves, to God or Christ, to the Devil or his accomplices, or, where patriotic themes are employed, to the emperors, tsars, or cities of the country of origin of the vita. The most common epithets for the saint/hero of Euthymius' vitæ are:

a) "blaženyi" ("blessed") (e.g., LIR,III,9; LHM,III,30; LPh,V,85), which can also be found in the LM (VIII,48) and the LSym(Sav) (II.2,line 26);

b) "božii" ("divine", "godly") (LIR,XI,22; LHM,VIII,42), which can also be found, for example, in an early thirteenth-century manuscript of the late eleventh-century *Life of Theodosius, Abbot of the Kievan-Crypt Monastery* by Monk Nestor (hereafter referred to as LThKCM)[101]; and in the LTheod (XXVIII, 34, line 11).

c) "okaannii" ("miserable," "unfortunate") (LPh,IV,82; VIII,90), which is found in the Izbornik Svjatoslava of 1073;[102]

---

101 "božii že otrokъ" = "the blessed child"; *Life of Theodosius* in *Успенский сборник XII-XIII вв.* под редакцией С.И. Коткова, Москва: АН СССР, 1971, p.79, 30г2.

102 Sreznevskij cites this under the entry for this word. See Срезневский, op.cit., vol.2, p.640.

d) "prěpodobnyj" ("venerable") (LIR,III,10; VIII,19; XII,23,24), which can be found also in the LSym(Sav) (VII,8,line 6);

e) "ubogyj" ("wretched") (LIR,VIII,19; LP,IV,66; LPh,VI,86,90), which is found in Lk 21.3 (Zograph.: "ěko vъdovica si ubogaě"[103]; Assem.: "ěko vъdovica si ubogaa"[104]) and in the LThKCM by Nestor.[105] Some epithets applied to the saint in the LDanStyl are "athlete of Christ"[106], "servant of God"[107]; and in the LJohnAlm, "the great servant [attendant] of Christ"[108] and "renowned light of the Church".[109]

One epithet that appears in the LPh (X,94), "pustynnaa grъlice", or "turtle dove of the desert", also appears in the LSym(Sav): "pustynoljubnye grъlice" (VII,8,line 37), and Sreznevskij cites its appearance in a 12th-century manuscript of the Žitie Alekseja.

The most common epithet for the devil is "vselukavyi" (LIR,IV,12), or alternately, "lukavyi" ("crafty", "sly", evil") (LP,III,64). This epithet is found in the LThKCM[110] and in the LTheod (XVIII,24,line 20; and XXIII, 31); but there are biblical sources for these: Mt 6.13 [from the Lord's Prayer] (Assem.: "izbavi nъi ot lǫkavaago"[111]); Mt 18.32

---

103 See Jagić, *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*, Berlin, 1879; reprint, Graz: Akad.Druck-U.Verlagsanstalt, 1954, p.126.

104 See Kurz, *Evangeliarium Assemani (Evangeliář Assemanův)*, vol.2, Úvod, text v přepise cyrilském, poznámky textové, seznamy čtení, Prague: Nakladatelství československé akademie věd, 1955, p.135.

105 *Успенский сборник*, op.cit.,129, 63в26-28:"niže omyvaite ubogago mojego těla" = "nor cleanse my wretched body".

106 "ὁ ἀθλητὴς τοῦ Χριστοῦ" (15, 16,lines 2-3)

107 "τοῦ δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ" (18, 18,line 4)

108 "ὁ μέγας θεοῦ θεράπων" (1,19,line 3)

109 "ὁ περιβόητος τῆς ἐκκλησίας φωτὴρ" (2,19,line 17)

110 *Успенский сборник* : "i lukavago vraga" (p.84,34в2) = "of the evil Enemy"; and "sja zmii lukavyi" (92,39б25) = "this evil serpent"

111 Kurz, op.cit., 146.

(Zograph.: "rabe lǫkavy"[112]; Assem.: "rabe lǫkavyi"[113]). Other epithets for the devil appear in the vitæ such as "velerečivy vrag" (LIR,III,10) = "the bombastic Enemy" (LIR,III,24) and "zlonačalnyj vragь" (LPh,VI,86) = "The Enemy, the originator of evil" (VI,108), which do not appear in the other vitæ examined in this study. Similar examples, however, of epithets applied to the Devil in the pre-Metaphrastic tradition can be found in the LDanStyl: "ὁ ἀεὶ φθονερὸς καὶ βάσκανος διάβολος" (68, 65, line 22)[114]; "ὁ ἀεὶ φθονῶν τοῖς καλοῖς διάβολος" (49, 47, lines 1-2)[115]; and "Ὁ οὖν ἐμποδιστὴς τῶν καλῶν διάβολος" (62, 61, line 7).[116]

Because the relics of every subject of Euthymius' vitæ were translated to Trnovo, they are filled with laudatory references to the Bulgarian tsar and the royal capital of Trnovo. In every instance, the tsars are referred to as "pious": "blagočьstivomu...carju Petru" (LIR,VIII,19); "blagočьstivějšemь cari Aseni" (LIR,XII,23); "blagočьstivějšij carь Kalojan" (LHM,XVI,56). And there are seven references to the "glorious" ("slavnyi" or "prěslavnyi") city of Trnovo (LIR,XII,23-24; LHM,VI, 56; LP,VI,71; VII,74; XII,95). The LDanStyl also contains an example of this kind of patriotic epithet. We find mention of "the pious Emperor Leo the Great" (67,47)[117] and "the pious sovereigns and their unfailing protection"(92,64).[118]

The epithets that refer to the relics of the saint: "čьstnyą mošti" (LIR,XII,24) and "vьsečьstnoje...tělo" (LP,XII,74) can both be found in the LSym(Sav) (VIII,10 and IX,14, respectively).

---

112 Jagić, op.cit.,27.

113 Kurz, op.cit.,88.

114 "the ever envious and malignant Devil" (68,48)

115 "the Devil, who is ever envious of the good" (49,35).

116 "the Devil, the hinderer of good men" (62,44).

117 "τὸν εὐσεβῆ βασιλέα Λέοντα τὸν μέγαν" (67, 65,line 10)

118 "τῶν εὐσεβῶν...καὶ τὸ ἀνενδεὲς διαφυλάττειν" (92, 86, lines 28-29)

11) paranomasis:

In paranomasis, two or more words or phrases are juxtaposed side by side that express roughly the same meaning. The difference between paranomasis, as it is employed in the hagiographic texts examined for this study, and synonym, is this: while both (or all) components of a paranomastic series communicate similar meaning, one of the member of the pair (or the group of words/phrases) will express the notion more concretely, while the other (or others) will express the notion more abstractly. In all four vitæ, there is a total of six examples of this device:

a) "Ašte ubo dolnimь i tlěǫštimь poně i malo umom vьnimal bi bozlьjstvnějšij sь mǫžь i o něčьsom zemněmь tvoril bi popečenie, vь skorě togo mimotešti xotěxom pamątlьj i zabьvenia otslati glǫbinamь" (LIR,I,6-7) = "Because this most divine man paid no heed to lowly and perishable things and had no concern for things of this world, it is our desire to relate quickly the memory of this man, thereby consigning to the depths of oblivion all the aforementioned lowly things."

b) "obrětaetь ego pečaliǫ drьžima i estestьvnymi žǫly strěčema" (LIR,III,10) = "He found him gripped by sadness, pricked by nature's sting"

c) "vь skorě ązyka ego ǫzy razrěsi i blagoglagolna paky togo ustroi" (LIR,XI,22) = "and so in short time [he] undid the knot on his tongue and restored back to him his speech"

d) "Elma ubo...sьvьnesoxomь i tvoix blagoděanij obьjavixomь pučinu i sveštennyje tvojee raky neskudnyj istočnikь"(LP,VIII,75) = "Because...we proclaim the inexhaustible source of your blessed deeds and the abundant spring of your holy shrine"

e) "Mně ubo popečenia isxodataiši mnoga, sebě že bezměrnǫą pečalь i vьsegdašnee mǫčitelstvo" (LPh,IV,82) = "You will afford me many troubles and yourself immeasurable grief and continual torment."

f) "i prěbǫdemь vь čistotě, neoskvrьnena tělesa sьxranše" (LPh,IV,84) = "let us live then in chastity, preserving our bodies undefiled."

This device is commonly found in vitæ of all periods where paranomastic citations from the Scriptures are used, as in this example from Euthymius: "vъzlagaetь šlěmь spasenia, božь|stvnyj pokrovь" (LIR,II,8) = "[Ivan] taking up the shield of salvation, the divine protection." In general, examples of this device may be found in the earliest Slavic vitæ, the LC and the LM. In the LC one finds the following, for example:

> "dva mlažena běsta u cěsara někoego vъ čьsti velicě i ljubima zělo" (XI,24) = "Two newly-weds lived with a certain king in high esteem and were much loved."

Two examples of paranomasis from the LM are:

a) "načatъ že paky sъ pokorъmь povinuą są služiti filosofu i učiti sъ nimь" (V,47) = "Once again, [Methodius] began to serve the philosopher [Constantine] with humility, obeying him, and to teach with him" (V,111)

b) "vьsju že volju jego sъtvori jeliko xotě, i ne oslušavъ ni o čьsomьže" (XIII,53) = "And he fulfilled whatever Methodius desired, refusing him nothing" (XIII,123)

12) paraphrase:

Paraphrase is a rhetorical device whereby a given concrete or abstract idea is expressed in a purposely circumlocutious manner. This is a fairly common device in Euthymius' hagiographie style. Earlier instances of the device are found in the LDanStyl, the LC and the LM, where there are at least seven examples alone in each, as well as in more stylistically complex works such as the LSym(Sav) and the LTheod. These are some examples from the *Life of Constantine* :

a) "ot vasъ že iže sutь silnii vъ slovesěx" (X,16) = "of those of you who are strong in words" [i.e. good speakers/writers]

b) "došedše (že) bezvodnyx městъ pustъ" (XII,27) = "having come to an empty, waterless places" [i.e. the wilderness].

c) "da by obrělъ želanie serdca svoego" (III,4) = "that he would gain his heart-felt desire" [i.e.his wish].

And these are examples from the *Life of Methodius* :

a) "prěloži zemьnyja tьmy volju na nebesьnъja mysli" (III,45) = "he exchanged his inclination toward earthly darkness [i.e. sin] for heavenly thoughts."

b) "Nъ veliju slyšavъša rěčь na molitvu są naložista i sъ iněmi iže bąaxu togože duxa jegože i si" (V,47) = "Having listened to the great matter, they began to pray with those who were of the same spirit as they."

There is also a particularly poetic example of paraphrase from the LTheod in which honeycomb is referred to as a "šestouglьnye domy" (X,17, line 12), or "hexagonal houses."

What follows is an inventory of the paraphrastic expressions in the vitæ of Euthymius. As the footnotes indicate, many of them appear in earlier hagiographic texts:

a) "Estъ že sъ Srědecь vъ prědělěxь Evropijskyx" (LIR,II,7) = "And Serdica is in European lands" [i.e. Europe].[119] / "Srědečьskyj gradь" (LIR,XII,23) = "Serdican city" [i.e Serdica/Sofia]

b) "ničtože vъ sъnědь imy, razvě bylie trěvnoe, eže zemlě skotomь prozątbati obyče, i vodǫ, ąže neskǫdno istočnici istěkaǫtь" (LIR,II,9) = "having nothing for food except a grassy plant [i.e. grass], which the earth usually sprouts for cattle [i.e. which usually cattle/beasts eat], and water which the springs abundantly poured forth."

c) "Ni bo to bylie pustynnoe do sytosti priimaaše" (LIR,II,9) = "He would not take enough of that desert plant [i.e. grass] to fill him."

d) "tělesnǫą nemoštь malo utěšaą i ątrobnǫą skǫdostь isplъněą" (LIR,V,13) = "comforting somewhat his bodily sickness [i.e. healing him somewhat] and filling the poverty of his belly [i.e. assuaging his hunger]"

---

119 A similar example can be found in the LTheod: "po sredě predělу grečeskią i bolgarskią zemli" (V,12,line 35; foonoted variation) = "in the territory between the Greek and Bulgarian lands"

e) "aggelьskoe prěbyvanie" (LIR,VIII,18) = "angelic existence [i.e. ascetic life]" / "aggelskoe žitelstvo" (LPh,VI,87) = "angelic life [i.e. ascetic life]

f) "postničьskyimь sъnědemь" (LIR,VIII,19); "postničьskyą...sъnědi" (LIR,VIII,19) = "fasting food [i.e. fasting]"

g) "knązi že tvoą poxvaly na ązycěx da nosąt" (LIR,VIII,20) = "let your princes carry praise for you on their tongues [i.e. let them praise you/let them speak your praises"] / "jakože vъsej brati togo na ązycě obnositi" (LHM,III,30) = "all his [monastic] brothers carried him on their tongues" [i.e. his name was on the lips of all...][120]

h) "vъzradova są duxomь" (LIR,XII,24) = "became overjoyed in spirit" [i.e. very happy].

i) "kъ inočьskomu priteče žitiu" (LHM,III,29) = lit: "he ran to a monk's life" [i.e. he went off to pursue a monk's life/he became a monk][121]

j) "načąlstvuǫštomu svoǫ o gospodi prěkloni vyǫ" (LHM,III,29) = lit: "bowing his neck to his superior [i.e. abbot] in the Lord" = "deferring to/obeying his superior in the Lord"

k) "anggelskyimь pročee oděa są obrazomь" (LHM,III,29) = lit: "moreover he dressed himself in the angelic image", [i.e. he became a monk] / "ovi že inočьskyimь oděvaaxǫ są obrazomь" (LHM,III,31) = "and these people donned the monk's image" [i.e. became monks][122]

l) "čąstaa prixoždenia kъ nemu tvorěxǫ" (LHM,VIII,42) = lit: "and they were making frequent visits to him", [i.e. they came to see him often]

---

120 This paranomastic phrase is also found in the LTheod: "pisanie...na ezycě nose" (XII, 18, lines 16-17) = "he carried the Scriptures...on his tongue" [i.e. he had memorized the Scriptures].

121 A similar passage is found in the LDanStyl "καὶ μεθ' ὑμνολογίας δίδωσιν αὐτῷ τὸ ἅγιον σχῆμα" (5, 6,lines 9-10) = "he bestowed upon him the holy robe of the monk"; and in the LTheod: "vъ inočьskoe vъnide žitie" (II,10,line 21) = "he entered the monastic life"

122 Similar examples are found both in the LSym(Sav): "vъsprieti anьgelьsky...obrazъ" (II,2,lines 21-22) = "to receive the angelic...station" [i.e.become a monk] (II,261); and the LTheod: "mnišьskyi oděa obrazъ" (III,11,lines 19-20) = "donning a monk's image"; "vъ inočьskyi odějavь obrazъ" (IX,15,line 12) = "having donned a monk's image"

m) "iže nemoštiju slova bědьstvujuštimь namь" (LP,I,60) = "but we are impoverished by our weakness with words", [i.e. we lack the ability to write well]

n) "vь prěmirnaa seljenia, vь nebesnyje sěni...vь nebesnyj črьtogь" (LP,VIII,75) = "to the peaceful dwellings, to the heavenly halls...to the heavenly mansion" [i.e. heaven].[123]

o) "i neutěšim tvoréše plačь" (LPh,IV,81-82) = lit.: "and [Philothea] made unconsolable weeping", [i.e.wept unconsolably][124]

p) "ot tvoeǫ bo volą azъ nikakože izydǫ" (LPh,IV,83) = lit.: "I will never depart/stray from your will", [i.e. and I shall not go against your will]

q) "vъzlegošą počiti i tělu malo utěšenie ot sъna podati" (LPh,X,94) = "they lay down to relax and give their body some rest in sleep", [i.e. to sleep].[125]

13) lexical anaphora:

The device of lexical anaphora is characterized by a series of phrases or sentences that all begin with the same word or group of words. Lexical anaphora is a common device in the ecomiastic genre, and it is present, though rare, in pre-Metaphrastic texts. Euthymius employs it with special emphasis in the LHM, LP, and LPh:

a) "Se pokazaxь vamь ot evaggelia že i apostola,

---

123 Compare this with the following passages from LSym(Sav): "raiskoe ono i neizrečennoe žilište" (II,2,line 20)= "heavenly and ineffable dwelling" (II,261); and "ubo umь našь da budetь na nebesěxь vь viděni, na krasotaxъ raiskyxь, na obitělexь věčnyixь" (XII,14,lines 32-33) = "Thus may our spirit contemplate the heavenly, the beauties of paradise, the eternal abodes" (XII,295).

124 A similar expression can be found in the LTheod: "vь slozax i umiljenix i plačě vъsegdašnjem prěbyvajušte" (XXI,28,line 32) = "and they were in constant tears and appeals and weeping" [i.e.they wept and cried ceaslessly].

125 Compare this with the expression found in the LSym(Sav): "i několiko malo pokoa vъkusiti" (IX,12,lines 2-3) = "and to savour some rest" [i.e. to rest/sleep a while]."

jako bogъ nebu i zemli i vъsěkoj tvari estьjtvorecъ, i
jako drevnij i novyj zakonъ ot nego danъ bystьj, i
jako našǫ tlěnnǫą i mrъtvnǫą vъzątъ plъtъ i tǫ, oboživъ, na
nebesa vъznese i odesnǫą otca sъposadi, i
jako ot děvičьskyx čistyx krъvej plъt vъzątъ, i
jako Xristos krьjstomъ vъselenǫą spase, i
jako tomu poklonit są vъsěko kolěno nebesnyx i zemnyx
prěispodnix i vъsěkъ ązykъ ispověstъ,
jako gospodь Isi [sic. Isus] Xristos vъ slavǫ bogu otcu. "
(LHM,VII,41)[126]

b) "kto spěše vъ korabli, ašte ne naše estьjstvo,
kto o gradě poplaka,
kto nad Lazaromъ prosьzi,
vъ domu Simona prokaženago
kto vъzleže
kto nogy umyt učenikomъ,
kto tainstva prědastьj,
kto svązanъ vedenъ bystьj vъ dvorъ Kaiafinъ,
kto na krьjstě pověšenъ bystьj.
kto vъ grobě položen bystьj
kto po vъskrьjěseni učenikomъ reče..." (LHM,IX,44) [127]

c) "Temže blažu tvojego tělese, Petko, sveštennym sъsudъ;
blažu i čьstnyje tvoje udy;
blažu dobroglasnyj tvoj ezykъ, jako slavoslove boga ne prěsta;
blažu oči, jako ne vъzdrěmaše sъnomъ, sъvodeštimъ vъ sъmrьtъ;
blažu rucě, jako vъ dělnoje podvizajušti se, ne oblinistě se;

---

126 "Behold I have shown you from the Gospels and from the Book of the Apostles that God is the Creator of heaven and earth and all the creatures, and that the Old and New Testament were given by Him, and that He took up our corruptible and mortal flesh to heaven, and once he had sanctified [our flesh] he carried it up and placed it at the right hand of the Father, and that his flesh was taken from the pure blood of the Virgin, and that Christ saved the world through the cross, and that every knee in all of heaven and the earth below will bow to him, and that every tongue will proclaim that Jesus Christ is the Lord in the glory of God, the Father."

127 "Who slept in the boat, if he was not of our nature? Who cried for the city? Who wept over Lazarus? Who went into the home of Simon the leper? Who washed the feet of his disciples? Who handed down the sacrament to us? Who was bound and led into the court of Caiaphas? Who was put on the cross? Who was put in the grave? Who said to the disciples after the Resurrection..."

blažu i nozě, jako kъ vsenoštnomu stojaniju ne oslaběvše." (LP,VII,73)[128]

d) "Ot sǫdu kaznь na vesь priide rodъ,
ot sǫdu nedǫzi različnii i iskušenia,
ot sǫdu kъ mǫžu vъzvraštenie ženě,
ot sǫdu tъj tobojǫ obladaetь,
ot sǫdu vъ pečalex raždati žena otsǫždena bystь] i tako na ves ženskyj rod priide kaznь" (LPh,II,79)[129]

This device is also found in earlier vitæ, such as the LAnth, the LC and the LM. In the chapter 87 of the *Life of Anthony* one finds this panegyric passage:

> Τίς γὰρ λυπούμενος, ἀπήντα, καὶ οὐχ ὑπέστρεφε χαίρων; τίς ἤεχετο θρη_ῶν διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ τεθνηκότας, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀπετίθετο τὸ πένθος; τίς ὀργιζόμενος ἤρχετο, καὶ οὐκ εἰς φιλίαν μετεβάλλετο; τίς πένης ἀκηδιῶν ἀπήντα, καὶ ἀκούων αὐτοῦ καὶ βλέπων αὐτὸν, οὐ κατεφρόνει τοῦ πλουτοῦ, καὶ παρεμυθεῖτο τὴν πενίαν; τίς μοναχὸς, ὀλιγωρήσας, καὶ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν, οὐ μᾶλλον ἰσχυρότερος ἐγένετο; τίς νεώτερος ἐλθὼν εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ θεωρήσας Ἀντώνιον, οὐκ εὐθέως ἐξηρνεῖτο τὰς ἡδονὰς, καὶ ἠγάπα σωφροσύνην; τίς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ δαίμονος πειραζόμενος ἤρχετο, καὶ οὐκ ἀνεπαύετο; τίς δὲ ἐν λογισμοῖς ἐνοχλούμενος ἤρχετο καὶ οὐκ ἐγαληνία τῇ διανοίᾳ; [130]

---

128 "In this way I praise your body, Petka, a vessel of the consecrated ones; I also praise your bodily remains; I praise your sweet-speeched tongue, for it constantly glorified God; I praise your eyes, which never became drowsy with sleep that leads to death; I praise your hands, which performed heroic acts, never resting; I praise your legs, which throughout all-night vigils never weakened."

129 "Hence the punishment to the whole race, hence various diseases and temptations, hence to the man must the woman turn, hence [man] rules over you, hence was the woman condemned to bear in grief, and thus this punishment came upon the whole of womankind."

130 Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, vol.26, p.965. The English translation reads: "For, who came in sorrow who did not return rejoicing? Who came mourning for his dead and did not quickly put aside his grief? Who came in anger and was not converted to kindliness? Who came weary in his poverty and, upon hearing and seeing Anthony, did not despise wealth and find consolation in his poverty? What monk grown careless came to him but did not become stronger? What youth came to the mountain and have seen Anthony did not

In the LC and LM, lexical anaphora does appear, but only when biblical passages are being quoted, e.g. "Xvalite gospoda vsi jazyci, poxvalite ego vsi ljudie"(LC,XVI,34)[131]; and "bědy ot razboinikъ, bědy vъ mori, bědy vъ rěkaxъ, bědy vъ lъži bratii..."(LM,XIV,53)[132],

In the LKlOxr there is a good example of this rhetorical device in the epilogue, which also contains a panegyric, or encomium, to the saint:

> Διὰ σοῦ γὰρ πᾶσα τῆς Βουλγαρίας ἡ χῶρα θεὸν ἐπέγνωσεν ... μοναστὰι διὰ σοῦ βίοις πατέρων ὁδηγοῦνται πρὸς ἄσκησιν ...ἱερεῖς διὰ σοῦ τὸ κανονικῶς ζῆν παιδεύονται (XXIX.79,144, lines 27-31) = Through you, the whole Bulgarian land came to know God!...Through you, and by the Lives of the [Fathers] the monks are inspired in their holy toils!...Through you the priests are taught to live according to the canons! (XXIX.79,124)

From the examples above, it is clear that the presence of this device in the hagiographic tradition, too, predates the Euthymian vitæ and the Hesychast Revival. While it can be found in pre-Metaphrastic texts, this feature is much more common and more productive in the post-Metaphrastic period.

14) personification:

There are only three examples of personfication in the hagiographic texts of Euthymius. Most of them are of the type whereby one is "seized" or "gripped" by some strong emotion, e.g. "i gněvnyj obъemletъ ego oblakъ" (LIR,III,11)= "a cloud of anger seized him"; "pečali togo obъątъ oblakъ" (LIR,III,11) = "a cloud of grief seized him"; or "i radosti obъątъ ego oblakъ" (LIR,VIII,17) = "a cloud of joy seized him." Similar images

---

straightway renounce pleasure and love self-restraint? Who came to him tempted by the Devil and was not relieved? Who came troubled in thought and did not gain peace of mind?

131 This is a quotation of Ps 116.1 (English Psalter 117.1), translated from the Septuagint, which reads: "Αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐπαινέσατε αὐτὸν, πάντες οἱ λαοί...")

132 A reference to 2 Cor 11.26-27, which in Greek reads: "Ὁδοιπορίαις πολάκις, κινδύνοις ποταμῶν, κινδύνοις λῃστῶν, κινδύνοις ἐκ γένους, κινδύνοις ἐξ ἐθνῶν, κινδύνοις ἐν πόλει, κινδύνοις ἐν ἐρημίᾳ, κινδύνοις ἐν θαλάσσῃ, κινδύνοις ἐν ψευδαδέλφοις").

appear in the LTheod whereby a character is "seized with deceit" (XIV,19) or "seized with shame" (XV,22,line 18). The other examples of personification in the vitæ of Euthymius are:

a) "i abie krotkyma dlanma sъmrlъjtь togo vъspriąt." (LIR,III,12) = "and immediately death took the child away with her meek palms"

b) "Obače strax prěmagaaše gladě, i ne prěstaaxǫ ištǫšte." (LIR,VIII,17) = "However, their fear vanquished their hunger, and they did not stop looking [for him]."

c) "sъmrlъjtь nenadeždna tebe postignetь" (LPh,IV,83) = "unexpected death will overtake you"

Use of the device of personification is found in the earliest Byzantine and Slavic hagiography. In the LDanStyl one finds the passages "ὕπνος περιεγένετο" (15,15,line 15) = "sleep overpowered him"; and "καὶ τῶν ἐν διαφόροις ἀσθενείαις κρατουμένων" (85, 79,lines 27-28) = "those overmastered by divers illnesses" (85,59). In the LC, there is this fine example: "Skorostь bo są sъ priležaniemъ sъključi, i druga drugu prěspejušti, imže są učenia i xudožьstva sъvrъšąjutь" (LC,IV,5) = "For keenness joined with zeal, the one vying with the other, by which ability studies are perfected."

15) metonymy:

Every example of metonymy in the vitæ of Euthymius occurs in those phrases that refer to the Bulgarian or Byzantine political powers or rulers; and because of the patriotic nature of Euthymius' vitæ, there are several such references. Metonymic expressions such as "xorogvi drъžǫštu" imply, for example, the tsar's or emperor's position as ruler of the country. Other expressions such as "Blъgarskago skiptra", "tvoa bagrenica", and "vъzdviže rog", too, connote the office of the tsar or emperor or the duties implied by the office. Here is an inventory of such metonymic expressions in Euthymius' saints' lives:

a) "Blagočьstivomu bo togda carju Petru Blъgarskago carstva xorǫgvi drъžǫštu" (LIR,VIII,17) = "At that time the pious Tsar Peter of the Bulgarian kingdom was holding the [battle] flags."

This phrase contains a metonymic device within a metaphor: "holding the flags" is itself a metaphor for "ruling the country", and "flags" itself is a metonymic notion for the country: "Sъ ubo xorǫgvi carьstvia jako prěemь..." (LIR,XII,23) = "having taken the flags of the kingdom."

b) "Blagočьstivomu i samdrъžcu Blъgarskago skiptra, carju Petru" (LIR,VIII,19) = "To the pious and autocrat Tsar Peter of the Bulgarian scepter."

"blagocьstivějšij carь Kalojan Blъgarskoe togda pravlěaše skiptrǫ" (LHM,XVI,56) = "the most pious Bulgarian tsar Kalojan at that time was holding the scepter"

"Grьčьskago carstva skiptru iznemogšu" (LP,VI,69) = "The scepter of the Greek empire weakened"

"ot iže togda carskaa pravąšta skiptra" (LPh,X,93) = "by the man who held the royal scepter at the time" (occurs again in LPh,XII, two more times)

c) "Da siaetь světlostiǫ dobrodětělej tvoa bagrěnica" (LIR,VIII,20) = "Let your purple mantle [i.e. the office of your kingship] shine forth with the brightness of virtues."

d) "blagovoli bogъ obnoviti Blъgarskǫą drъžavǫ i vъzdvignǫti ...padšǫą są sěnь, obetšavšǫą Grьčьskyimь nasiliemь" (LIR,XII,23) = "God graciously deigned to renew the Bulgarian kingdom and raise up again...the fallen canopy which had become dilapidated as a result of the Greek war."

In the previous example "d" we have a metonymic phrase which serves as a metaphor for the weakened Bulgarian kingdom: "fallen canopy." In this last example "e", "horn" or "trumpet" is employed as a metonymic symbol to represent the power and glory of the monarchy.

e) "vъzdviže rogъ Blъgarskago carьstva pri blagočьstivějšemь cari Asěni" (XII,23) = "He lifted up the trumpet of the Bulgarian kingdom under the pious Tsar Asen."

The exact image employed in example "b" can be found in the LDanStyl in the following passage:

> καὶ ἐγένετο συμβούλιον ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου ἕνεκεν τοῦ νήπιον ὑπάρχειν τὸν βασιλέα καὶ μὴ δύνασθαι ὑπογραφὰς ποεῖν. καὶ ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν τούτου πατέρα Ζήνωνα λαβεῖν τὰ σκῆπτρα τῆς βασιλείας (67, 65,lines 12-15);[133]

and in the *Life of Gregory the Sinaite* : "Ὅτε βασιλεὺς ἐκεῖνος ὁ μέγας Παλαιολόγος κύρις Ἀνδρόνικος τὰ σκῆπτρα τῆς βασιλείας ἦν θιευθύνων..." (4,3,lines 29-30) = "When that great emperor, Lord Andronicus Palaeologus, was holding the scepter of the empire."

16) litotes:

Litotes is a device which can, most simply put, be defined as the opposite of hyperbole. Litotes is characterized by intentional understatement of emotion or emphasis, and its expression is often the negation of the opposite meaning intended, as in "not a little" for "a lot." There a few examples of this device in the vitæ of Euthymius:

a) "posla paky kъ nemu zlata ne malo" (LIR,VIII,18) = lit: "he sent [to Ivan] not a little gold" = "a lot of gold"

b) "ne malǫ ot tvoego zrěnia mněvь priploditi polzǫ" (LIR,VIII,18) = "for I have thought of how much [lit: not a little] benefit would flower forth from seeing you."

c) "Elma ubo...sьvьnesoxomь i tvoix blagoděanij obьjavixomь pučinu i sveštennyje tvojee raky neskudnyj istočnikь"(LP,VIII,75) = "Because...we proclaim the inexhaustible source of your blessed deeds and the abundant spring of your holy shrine"

---

133 "Then the Senate convoked a meeting because the Emperor was an infant and unreliable to sign documents; and they determined that his father Zeno should hold the sceptre[s] of the Empire." (67,47)

d) "i rydanie i mlъva ne mala bě" (LPh,IX,92) = "and great [lit: not small] were their sobbing and wailing"

Examples of this device can be found in an earlier hagiographic text from both the pre-Metaphrastic Byzantine period: LDanStyl: "Χρόνον δὲ οὐκ ὀλίγον προσκαρτερήσασα" (39, 36, line 1) = "she stayed there not a little time" [i.e. a lot of time] (39,30); and from the post-Metaphrastic Byzantine tradition: LKlOxr: "οὐκ ὀλίγοι γὰρ τῆς διδασκαλικῆς ταύτης πηγῆς ἔπινον" [II.7,80,line 25).= "not a few [i.e. many] drank from this source of learning" (II.7,95).

17) hyperbole:

Most of the examples of hyperbole in the vitæ of Euthymius are in the form of expressions of grief or lament in which someone "pours tears all over himself", "slъzami sebe obliavъ" (LIR,III,11; and VI,15); or "slъznya istekaǫ istočniky." This last expressions also appears in the LTheod: "oblivaaxu sebe slъzami" (XXVIII,34,line 13).

The other striking example of hyperbole is found in chapter VIII of the LIR: "bystrěe neže slovo Rylǫ dostiǯaaxǫ" (VIII,17) = "faster than a word/speech [they] reached Rila." A very similar example can be found in the LTheod, in which it is written that the reputation and glory of the saint "spread faster than a bird in flight." An example of hyperbole can also be found in the LKlOxr in which Theophylact introduces the deeds of the Cyrill and Methodius by speaking of their "unconsolable grief" ("ἀπαρα-κλήτου λύπης"; II.5,80,line 5) over the fact that the Slavs were not able to read the Scriptures.

This chapter has given an inventory of all of the rhetorical devices found in the four vitæ by Euthymius, and in our discussion we have given evidence to demonstrate how each feature of Euthymius' style appears in earlier texts that predate his literary career as well as the Hesychastic Revival in Byzantium and on the Balkans. As we have noted above, although apposition does appear in texts of all stylistic levels, the feature of long appositional series appears only in texts of the high-style, post-Metaphrastic tradition. Lexical anaphora -- while it can be found in early,

low-style texts, such as the LAnth -- is quite rare in pre-Metaphrastic texts. In the case of the categories of metaphor and simile, the two poetic devices most often used by Euthymius, we have managed to trace almost every one back to an earlier source. Thus we have demonstrated in this chapter that all of the poetic and rhetorical components of Euthymius' works -- and even the specific poetic images that he uses -- all came to him from a received Byzantino-Slavic tradition of life-writing, which, by virtue of the genre's liturgical function, drew heavily from ancient poetic images found in the Scriptures.

The most important conclusion that we have reached from this inquiry on the style of the vitæ is this: not only does every single rhetorical feature found in the vitæ of Euthymius appear in texts that predate his literary career, but they also appear in texts that predate the period of Hesychastic cultural influence in Bulgaria. As we have pointed out, beginning approximately in the tenth century in Byzantium and the late twelfth to early thirteenth century in Slavic lands, hagiographers begin to follow the example set by Symeon Metaphrastes. In this post-Metaphrastic tradition of life-writing, rhetorical devices such as those examined above are used with much greater frequency, resulting in a much more ornate and dense poetic language what one finds in the period before it. This leads us to an important distinction: the ornate literary style that scholars have tried to attribute to the "Hesychastic schools" of Patriarchs Kallistos and Euthymius was inherited by them from this earlier tenth-century shift in the hagiographic genre.

While the texts of Euthymius represent an apex in the Slavic hagiographic tradition of high style life-writing -- employing to an unprecedented extent in the Slavic tradition these various rhetorical devices -- the Byzantine texts that predate the Hesychast Revival of the fourteenth century, such as the LKlOxr, employ these rhetorical devices to as large an extent as those that were written within the period of the assumed Hesychastic influence. The tendency to use the rhetorical devices discussed above to a greater and greater extent within the Slavic tradition beginning around the early thirteenth century and flourishing in the fourteenth century is not a function of Hesychastic influence or any attitude toward language that reflected Hesychastic ideals or tenets, but it is rather a function of the fact that Slavic hagiographers, such as Euthymius, began to

take more of an interest in mastering and implementing the complexities of the already centuries-old Byzantine tradition of high-style rhetoric. The high point of Slavonic imitations of this borrowed Byzantine style is represented in hagiographic literature by the works of Patriarch Euthymius on the Balkans and Epiphanius the Wise in East Slavic lands.

Chapter 3:
The Structure of the Euthymian Vitæ

As we have pointed out in the conclusion to chapter one of this section, this study of the Euthymian hagiographic texts should concern itself with three primary levels of consideration: the style, the structure, and the content of the vitæ. In chapter 2 of this section we succeeded in tracing all of the rhetorical devices of Euthymius' style back to the period preceding the assumed Hesychastic influence in Byzantine and Slavic territories and, in most cases, to the period preceding the career of Symeon Metaphrastes. In this chapter we will determine whether the structural elements of Euthymius' hagiographic works are taken from an earlier tradition (as the rhetorical features of his works do) or whether they contain elements that are original to him.

According to our analysis, there are five basic structural characteristics of the Euthymian vitæ: they are marked by 1) the presence of weaving of subthemes (this is defined in chapter one of this section); 2) the use of formulaic phrases of emotion (e.g. formulaic phrases of weeping and crying, grief and lament, anger and hatred, joy and happiness) as a narrative device that lends structure to the vita by creating recurring images in much the same way as the repetition of subthemes does; 3) the use of rhetorical questions as a structural device to advance the narrative; 4) the abundant use of the comparison topos as a structural device to amplify those sections in the text that are devoted to the deeds of the hero; and 5) by the insertion of long encomiastic or panegyric digressions to praise the saint and underline his or her greatness.

First let us consider the question of the weaving of subthemes and thematic phrases. In order to determine whether this device (which we have posited to be the main feature of "word-weaving" style) is either original to Euthymius or to hagiographic practices in general of the period of the Hesychast Revival of the fourteenth century, we have traced and outlined the narrative structure of several vitæ which represent various periods.

The *Life of Anthony* by Athanasius (fourth century Egyptian text in Greek) dates from the period of the early Desert Fathers. The *Life of Daniel the Stylite* (early sixth-century Greek text) is a good example of the

stylistic norms of pre-Metaphrastic Byzantine hagiography. The *Life of St. John the Almsgiver*, an early seventh-century work by Bishop Leontius of Neopolis (Cyprus) and Sophronius, the sophist, represents the transitional period in Byzantine writing that marked the beginnings of the Macedonian Renaissance in Byzantium that was to later inspire Symeon Metaphrastes. The *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* by Theophylact (late eleventh-century Greek text) represents that post-Metaphrastic Byzantine hagiographic style. The *Life of Constantine* dates from the ninth century, the early Slavic Christian period. Though the text chronologically is post-Metaphrastic, it (as well as the *Life of Methodius*) can be characterized stylistically as a pre-Metaphrastic work.[1] The *Life of Symeon* by his son Sava (early thirteenth-century Serbian) is an example of Slavic hagiography influenced by post-Metaphrastic Byzantine works; and like the LKlOxr, it dates from the period preceding the Athonite Hesychast Revival in Byzantium. The late medieval Byzantine and Slavic period that coincides with the Hesychast Revival are also represented respectively by the 14th-century *Life of Theodosius* by the Byzantine Patriarch Kallistos (only the Slavonic text survives) and the four vitæ by Patriarch Euthymius.

1. The Life of Anthony. The narrative structure of the LAnth is rather straightforward. The introduction to the life realizes the benefit topos ("Κἀμοὶ γὰρ μέγα κέδρος ὠφελείας ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ μόνον Ἀντωνίου μνημονεύειν" [intro.,837A][2]) and a modified modesty topos ("ὀλίγα τῶν ἐκείνου μνημονεύσας"[intro, 837B][3]). In chapter 1, the theme of origins is developed but the theme of birth is missing. The main body of the life (chapter 2-88) contains an alternation back and forth

---

[1] See К.Иванова, "Патриарх Евтимий и агиографската традиция в средновековната литература," *Литературна мисъл* 10 (1977): 90-99, p.95. Ivanova writes: "Двете пространни жития на славянските първоучители, създадени пет века преди [Евтимий], са изградени в духа на дометафрастовия житиен канон." ("Two long vitæ of the first teachers of the Slavs [she means here, of course the *Life of Constantine* and the *Life of Methodius*] were written five centuries before [Euthymius] and are created in the spirit of the pre-Metaphrastic literary canon").

[2] "Indeed, merely to call Anthony to mind is of great profit to me..." (intro.,133)

[3] "All that I shall write will be but a few of the things I have remembered about him" (intro,133)

between the themes of training and deeds, as do all the texts included in this study, and this feature alone does not constitute what we have defined to be the interweaving of themes. For example, the author of the life will at times alternate between exposing some deed or miracle of Anthony's and reminding the reader or interlocutor of his outstanding moral or spiritual qualities (which he acquired through his spiritual training). Also, the author of the LAnth employs the subtheme of harmony restored a total of fourteen times in the text. Clearly the focus of Anthony's sanctity is on his resolve to overcome all forms of evil and sin through his faith and purity.[4]

Even the repetition of the subtheme of harmony restored does not, however, represent a weaving of subthemes. In the LAnth, each time the subtheme of harmony restored is developed, it is done so through a simple, straightforward narrative with a beginning (appearance of a devil), a middle (the devils torments or tempts the saint), and an end (the saint overcomes the torments and harmony is restored). In a sense, each time the subtheme appears, it is realized as a self-contained story within the narrative. The weaving of subthemes takes the place of a linear narrative development; so that instead of developing an idea or notion surrounding the saint (such as his ability to lead people or fight evil) through a linearly exposed *sujet,* the author can merely suggest it by inserting one, two or a whole string of phrases that became intimately associated with that idea or notion. In sum, the narrative of the LAnth does not contain a weaving of subthemes, but is rather an example of simple, linear narrative.

2. The Life of Daniel the Stylite. The LDanStyl, like the LAnth, has a narrative structure that is characterized by the stringing together of a number of stories or anecdotes about the saint. Both vitæ are examples of "linear" narrative structure, for both are comprised of string of stories or anecdotes about the saint. Just as the LAnth repeats again and again tales of Anthony's struggles against the Devil, the LDanStyl contains no fewer than nineteen incidents of healings and exorcisms performed by Daniel. The

---

[4] In the *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, Daniel reflects on Anthony's many torments against the Devil and his endurance in order to lend himself more courage to undertake his dangerous journey to Bzyantium See *Three Byzantine Saints*, edited by E. Dawes and H. Baynes, Crestwood,NY: St. Valdimir's Seminary Press, 1977, chapter 24, pp.14-15.

main subtheme that the narrative is built around is the subtheme of the saint's miracles, unlike the post-Metaphrastic examples which merely suggest the vast number of miracles performed by the saint through the repetition of stock thematic phrases and poetic images that say that the saint worked innumerable, glorious, wonderful miracles (as in the LHM, LP, LPh, see below). The point that the saint indeed did perform many miracles is underscored instead by repeating over a dozen times specific incidents of healings and casting out devils. Although there are a few phrases in the text that indicate the miracles performed by the saint (three), the reputation and glory of the saint spreading (two), the innumerability of the saint's miracles (one), and the saint as a good pastor of his flock (two), the basic narrative structure is that of the pre-Metaphrastic vita.

3. The Life of John the Almsgiver. The LJohnAlm in some respects is a good representation of the transitional period between the earlier and later hagiographic traditions. In this text, the syntactic structures are more complex than in the LAnth and the LDanStyl: antithesis is now preferred whereby a negative statement is followed by its opposite; more epithets are employed in the introductory sections on the saint's origins and training. These are indications of the stylistic changes that later become *de rigueur* after the reforms of Symeon Metaphrastes. But these devices in the LJohnAlm soon dissipate and the narrative gives way to the familiar "linear" structure. Each chapter is basically an anecdote from the saint's life, and there are only a couple of the types of phrases that later become formulaic in the post-Metaphrastic period. There is, for example, only one phrase of the type that states that the reputation and glory of the saint spread and one phrase that states that the heretics renounce their former faith.

4. The Life of Kliment of Oxrid, and 5. The Life of Constantine (Cyrill); A Comparison: The LKlOxr is extremely complex, both stylistically and structurally. Structually, it really contains three lives in one: chapters 2-3 summarize the life and deeds of Constantine; chapters 4-6 summarize the work continued by Methodius; and chapters 7-29 contain the life and deeds of Kliment of Oxrid. Because of the subject of the life, the first known teachers and educators of the Slavs in Christianity, it is not at

all surprising that the subthemes of academic and spiritual training are underlined throughout the text and become its main focus. These subthemes are repeated no fewer than twenty times throughout the text; and in order to lend even more support for the case of Kliment's canonization, in addition to his activities in educating and instructing the Slavs in Christianity, Theophylact also attributes to Kliment the power to work miralces (see chapters XII, XIII, and XV).

By way of demonstrating why this life represents a good example of weaving of subthemes, it is useful to compare it with the LC, which also relies primarily on the subthemes of academic and spiritual training. Like the episodes in the LAnth where harmony is restored, the passages in the text of the LC where the subtheme of academic training does appear develop the subtheme not through suggestion by way of phrases (as does the LKlOxr) but through the development of an actual narrative episode.

In chapter 3 of LC, Constantine is sent away to receive a formal education. His promise as a brilliant scholar is suggested through the use of a poetic metaphor ("Siaetь bo premudrostь pače solnca" [III,3] = "For Widsom shines even more than the sun"), and it is stated that he surpassed all of his fellow students in his ability to learn (spějaše pače vsěx učenikъ vъ knigax pamątiju i xytrostiju dobroju velьmi" [III,3]). Then he commits to memory the writings of Gregory the Theologian ("učą są knigamъ izъustь svątago Grigoria Feologa" [III,3]). Finally, in chapter 3 he meets a man "who knew grammar" ("Stranenъ že bě někyi tu uměa gramotikiju" [III,4]), and Constantine begs him to teach him. In chapter 4, Constantine begins a formal education in Constantinople, where he studies all formal subjects. His success is expressed by means of a personifying metaphor ("Skorostь bo są sъ priležaniemъ sъključi, i druga drugu prěspějušti, imže są učenia i xudožьstva sъvrъšąjutь" [IV,5] = "for keeness joined with zeal, the one vying with the other, by which ability studies and skill are perfected"). In chapter 8, he masters Hebrew and Syriac (Russian?)[5]; and in chapter 13 he displays his erudition

[5] For various positions in the scholarly community on the interpretation of this passage to mean either "Syriac" or Russian", cf. A.Vaillant, "Les 'Lettres Russes' de la Vie de Constantin," *Revue des Études Slaves*, 15 (1935): 75-77; G.Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943, pp.347-350; R. Jakobson, "Saint Constantin et la langue syriaque," *Annuaire de l'institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 7 (1939-1944): 181-186; H.Lunt, "Again the rusьskymi pismeni," *Cercetări de ling-*

by deciphering an inscription on a chalice, written "in Hebrew and Samaritan letters" ("na nemьže sut pismena židovьska i Samareiska" [XIII,29]).

All of these instances of demonstrating Constantine's academic training are anecdotal, whereas in the LKlOxr, the subthemes of academic training, teaching, and miracle-working (a subtheme of deeds) are all suggested again and again through phrases associated with the subtheme. In chapter I Theophylact compares the scions of the Moravian mission to the first teachers of the Slavs, Constantine and Methodius. Here the subthemes of good teacher and miracle-worker are both developed:"Ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ τὴν τῶν Βουλγάρον χώραν ἐφώτισαν ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις τούτοις χαιροῖς πατέρες μακάριοι καὶ διδάσκαλοι, λάμψαντες διδάγμασί τε καὶ θαύμασι," (I.3,78,line 10-12) = "In the same manner, blessed fathers and teachers enlightened in these later years the Bulgarian land, shining with their teaching and their miracles (I.3,94)

In chapter II he writes, "καὶ Κύριλλος, ὁ πολὺς μὲν τὴν ἔξω φιλοσοφίαν, πλείων δὲ τὴν ἔσω" (II.4,78,line 23-24) ="Kiril who was great in his knowledge of the heathen philosophy, and even greater in his knowledge of the Christian lore" (II.4,94). Theophylact also adds that after Constantine and Methodius invented the Slavic alphabet, they imparted this knowledge to their most talented disciples; but rather than relating this anecdotally, Theophylact employs a familiar biblical metaphor to communicate this meaning: "οὐκ ὀλίγοι γὰρ τῆς διδασκαλικῆς ταύτης πηγῆς ἔπινον" (II.7,80,line 25) = "many drank from this source of learning" (II.7,95).

In chapter III, as in the preceding example, the success of Constantine and Methodius's translations is suggested through a metaphor:

> Ὡς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐμφανισθείη τῷ πάπᾳ, καὶ τὴν τῶν γραφῶν ἐν γλώττῃ μετάθεσιν κατασκέψαιτο, ἀποστολικῆς ὄντως ψυχῆς χάριτος πνευματικῆς οὖσαν γέννημα (III.9,82,line 14-16) = [The Pope] saw that the translation of the Scriptures into the [Bulgarian] language was the fruit of spiritual grace poured on truly apostolic souls (III.9,96)

---

vistica 3 (1958): 324-326; Franz Grivec, *Konstantin und Method: Lehrer der Slaven*, Wiesbaden, 1960; Francis Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions Among the Slavs*, Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, 1970.

In chapter IV, Theophylact writes of Methodius that he "outshone all with his teaching" (IV.14,98) (= "καὶ πάντων προλάμπων τὸ διδασκαλικόν" [IV.14,86,line 23-24]). Also, Theophylact makes reference for the fifth time to the fact that Constantine and Methodius translated the Scriptures, yet again with a biblical metaphor:

> καὶ τροφῆς δὲ πάντως πνευματικῆς δέονται, γράμματά τε ἐξεύροντο, καθ' ἃ προειρήκαμεν, καὶ τὴν τῶν γραφῶν ἐπὶ τὸ Βουλγαρικὸν μετάθεσιν ἐποιήσαντο, ἵνα τὰ γεννηθέντα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θείας τροφῆς ἱκανῶς ἔχοιεν, καὶ εἰς αὔξην πνευματικήν (IV.16,88,line 20-24) = they were wholly deprived of spiritual food, they invented the alphabet, as we said, and translated the Scriptures into Bulgarian so that the newlyborn children of God could have enough divine nourishment and attain spiritual growth... (IV.16,99)

Chapters XVIII through XXVIII contain many references to Kliment's academic skill and his teaching of Christianity to his fellow Slavs:

a) "ἀλλ' ὥσπερ μήπω μηδενὶ θεραπεύσας Χριστὸν ἀρχὴν τοῦ περὶ τὸν λόγον ἀγῶνος καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸ κήρυγμα σπουδῆς ταύτας δὴ τὰς τιμὰς κατεβάλλετο..." (XVIII.56,124,line 26-28) ="He proceeded about his business as if he had not yet served the Lord. He [Kliment] looked at the honours as the beginning of his toils in teaching and his diligence in preaching" (XVIII.56,115).

b) "καὶ πάντοτε συνῆμεν αὐτῷ πᾶσι παρακολουθοῦντες οἷς ἔπραττεν, οἷς ἔλεγεν, οἷς δὶ ἀμφοτέρων ἐδίδασκεν" (XVIII.58, 126, line 14-16) = "We were constantly with him, present at everything he did, at all his preaching, and at all his teaching both by act or sermon" (XVIII.58,115).

c) "εὑρὼν γὰρ τὸν τῆς ἐνορίας ταύτης λαὸν παντάπασι θείου λόγου καὶ γραφῶν ἀνομίλητον, καὶ μηδὲν πεπαιδευμένον τῶν ἐκκλησίαν κοσμούντων καὶ λαὸν ταττόντων τῷ τῆς εὐταξίας καὶ κοσμιότητος πνεύματι, οὐκ ἔδιδου ὕπνον τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς οὐδὲ νυσταγμὸν τοῖς βλεφάροις, ἀλλὰ τροφὴν καὶ τρυφὴν τὴν περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ ἐποιεῖτο μέριμναν. Καὶ ἀεὶ ἐδίδασκε καὶ ἀεὶ διέττατε, τὴν ἄγνοιαν διορθούμενος, τὴν ἀκοσμίαν κοσμῶν..." (XXI.63,130,line 3-10) =

"Finding the people in that district entirely unfamiliar with the word of God and with the Scriptures and untutored in any of the things that adorn the Church, he sought to guide the people with the spirit of the good order and prosperity, and he gave not sleep to his eyes, nor slumber to his eyelids but turned the cares for his people into his food and his pleasure. He constantly preached and constantly taught, correcting the ignorant and turning disorder into order..." (XXI.63,117).

d) "λόγῳ μὲν οὕτως ἔτρεφε" (XXI.64,13θ,line 19) = "He nourished them in this way with the Word" (XXI.64,117)

e) "Συνιδὼν δὲ τὸ τοῦ λαοῦ παχὺ καὶ περὶ τὸ νοῆσαι γραφὰς ἀτεχνῶς δερμάτινον, καὶ ἱερεῖς δὲ πολλοὺς Βουλγάρους δυσξυνέτως ἔχοντας τῶν γραικῶν, ὧν περὶ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν μόνην ἐνετρίβησαν γράμμασι, καντεῦθεν κτηνώδεις ὄντας, ὡς μὴ ὄντος Βουλγάρων γλώσσῃ πανηγυρικοῦ λόγου, ταῦτα τοίνυν συνεγνωκὼς μηχανᾶται καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο καὶ καθαιρεῖ τὸ τῆς ἀγνοίας τεῖχος τῷ μηχανήματι" (XXII.66,132,line 1-6)
= "Knowing of the coarseness of the people, their utter dullness for comprehending the Scriptures, and seeing that many Bulgarian priests were slow to understand writing in Greek with letters of which they were only trained for reading, and for this reason were as simple as cattle, because in the Bulgarian tongue there were not even panegyrics, he invented some means against it and made the wall of ignorance crumble before his deed." (XXII.65 [sic,66],118).

f) "διὰ τούτων τὰς τῶν ἁπλουστέρων Βουλγάρων ψυχὰς ἐθρέψατο γάλακτι ποτίσας τοὺς μὴ δυναμένους στερεωτέραν τροφὴν προσήκασθαι..." (XXII.66,132,line 9-12) = "With [his sermons] he nourished the souls of the simpler of the Bulgarians, and fed with milk those who could not take more solid food..." (XXII.65 [sic,66],118)

g) "ἔσπευδε γὰρ διὰ πάντων τὴν τῶν Βουλγάρων περὶ τὰ θεῖα ῥαθυμιαν ἐκκρούεσθαι" (XXIII.67,134,line 5-6) = "In every possible way he sought to overcome the indifference of the Bulgarians to the things divine" (XXIII.67,119)

The theme is also repeated in the conclusion to the vita:

h) "Διὰ σοῦ γὰρ πᾶσα τῆς Βουλγαρίας ἡ χῶρα θεὸν ἐπέγνωσεν, τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτὸς τοῖς ὕμνοις καὶ ταῖς ψαλμῳδίαις ἐπύκνωσας, τὰς ἑορτὰς τοῖς ἀναγνώσμασι κατεφαίδρυνας,

μονασταὶ διὰ σοῦ βίοις πατέρων ὁδηγοῦνται πρὸς ἄσκησιν" (XXIX.79,144,line 27-30) =

"Through you, the whole Bulgarian land came to know God! You, by yourself supplied the churches with songs and psalm-singing. You explained the holy days with homilies. Through you, and by the Lives of the [Fathers], the monks are inspired in their holy toils!" (XXIX.79,124).

Clearly the nature of the development of the same subthemes (those of academic training and ability to instruct) within the LC and LKlOxr are handled in very different ways. The LKlOxr employs an interspersing, or weaving, of phrases -- most of which contain the poetic devices of simile and metaphor -- to suggest the same subthemes. In addition to this, formulaic images and thematic phrases are employed ("teaching and preaching", "nourished the people"). By contrast, in the LC, the same subthemes are realized through a narrative structure that develops these same subthemes through various episodes or anecdotes taken from the biography of Constantine, as explained above. The subthemes in this kind of narrative structure are not suggested and are not repeated throughout the text as a recurring theme; they are, rather, overtly stated and reappear only as specific incidents built into the framework of the vita's plot structure.

6. The Life of Symeon by Sava. The *Life of St. Symeon*, written by his son Sava sometime in the first decade of the 13th century, is a veritable *tour de force* of the rhetorical phenomenon of weaving of subthemes. Stefan Nemanja's (St.Symeon's) historical significance was great: he was the consolidator of power in Serbia and the founder of the Nemanja dynasty; but, the most significant of his achievements for the purposes of this vita was his founding of several monasteries in Serbia, among them the Chilandar Monastery on Mt. Athos, and his abdication of the throne to pursue the life of a monk. As a result, the most prevalent subtheme of the work is the subtheme of the saint as a good teacher and pastor of his people; and this subtheme is suggested in nearly every chapter of the text.

First of all, it should be commented that the disposition of themes in the text is completely unconventional. The text begins with the theme of deeds (chapters I-V), with a brief panegyric to the saint inserted in chapter V, a continuation of deeds through chapter VII. Chapter VIII contains a

poučenie to his son Sava, and this begins the theme of death, which covers chapters IX through XI. The theme of training and origins is not developed; but chapter XII, the last chapter, contains in brief the theme of birth, the benefit topos ("Uvědĕti že vamь estь o semь blaženemь otьci našemь i xtitorě gospodině Simeone" (XII, 14, lines 8-9) = "And you ought to learn about him, our blessed father and founder Symeon").

Let us see how the subtheme of Symeon as a good teacher and pastor of his people is developed and interwoven in the text of the life. In chapter I, the subtheme is introduced through the following lyrical passage:

> Čto bo sego narečemь? vladyku li pače i učitelja? utvrьdi bo i vьrazumi vьsěxь srьdьca, i nastavi ny kako podobaetь pravověrnymь xristianomь drьžati pravuju věru kь bogu (I,1,line 27) = Yea, what shall we call this man, Shall it be lord, or even more teacher? For he fortified and edified the hearts of all, and taught us how Orthodox Christians should keep the true faith before God. (I,259)

In this next passage, the subtheme is stated and then elaborated upon by a long amplifying passage:

> soboju prьvěe blagověrie pokaza, potomь že i iněxь nastavi. crьkvi osveti, monastire sьzda, svetitelje vь slastь poslušae, ieree čьte, kь mnixom že veliko směrenie i ljubovь imae, nenadějuštim se nadežda, ubogymь zastupnikь, ništimь krьmitelь, nagye vь domь svoi vьvode i oděvaše, sirye vьspita, vьvodice opravda, slěpymь i xromymь i nemoštnymь i gluxymь i němymь vь istinu mati bystь, i prosto rešti vьse svoe imênie vь zaimь izda (I,I,line 30-36) = First he revealed piety in himself, and then he taught others. He consecrated churches, built monasteries, listened to holy men with delight, respected priests and treated monks with great love and humility. He brought hope to the hopeless, defended the needy, and sustained the poor. He took the naked to his home and clothed them, he fed orphans, protected widows, and was truly like a mother to the blind and the lame, the infirm, the deaf and the dumb. Put simply, he lent out all his possessions... (I,259).

From here on out, the subtheme is repeated in the narrative of subsequent chapters, as in chapter II:

> edinь bo bogь věstь, i člověkomь neutaeno, koliks podvigь ego bystь o nasь i o ljudьskyxь nevěždьstvixь, sego blaženьnago muža, gospodina ny i učitelja, imuštago solomonovu prěmudrostь, davidovu krotkostь, iosifovo blagonьravie. (II,3,line 1-4) = For God alone knows, though it was not concealed from men, how great was [Symeon's] struggle on our behalf and against man's ignorance, the struggle of this blessed man, our lord and teacher who

possessed the wisdom of Solomon, the gentleness of David, and the righteousness of Joseph (II,263).

in chapter III:

> někotorimь priloženiemь vь umь ego proložívšu xristu i nastavlьšomu...i sьvьkupivь jee kь sebě načetь imь uče glagolati... (III, 3, lines 15-16,18) = And by some inclination Christ inclined his mind and instructed him...And having gathered them to himself, he began to instruct them, saying... (III,263)

Then what follows in chapter III is the poučenie to his followers:

> i naučixь vy, kako drьžati se pravověrnye věry...nezabyvaite učenia svoego i pravověrnago zakona mnoju ustavljenago (III,3,line 26; 29-30)...i simi uvěty uveštavь ixь dobry gospodinь i blagy pastyrь (III,4,line 5-6) = 'And I have taught you [all my sons] how to keep the Orthodox faith...Therefore...forget not your instruction and the Orthodox law, which I have established'...And with these admonitions the good lord and gentle shepherd admonished them (III,265).

Chapter III then concludes with this prayer from Symeon's disciples. This passage also repeats the subtheme of Symeon as a good teacher and pastor:

> neostavi nasь sirь, gospodi, toboju bo osveštenni byxomь, i toboju naučeni byxomь, i toboju prosvětixom se, pastyrju dobry, polagaei dušu svoju za ovce. i nikoliže bo vь tvoe dьni vьsxyšteno bystь ovče vlьkomь otь bogaprědannago ti stada pastve (III,4,line 5-10) = 'Leave us not orphans, O lord, for you have illumined us, and you have instructed us, and you have englightened us, O gentle shepherd, who lays down his soul for his sheep! for never during your days has the wolf carried off a lamb from the flock which God entrusted to you, O shepherd' (III, 267).

Chapter IV contains this repetition of the subtheme, built into the narrative framework of Symeon's instruction to his son, Stefan Nemanjić:

> i načetь i učiti pospěšьstvovati emu o vьsakomь dělě blazě vь vladyčьstvi ego, i blagosrьdu emu byti na mirь xristianьsky, egože emu prědastь bogoupasenuju imь pastvu (IV,4,line 20-23) = [Symeon] began to instruct [Stefan] to concern himself with every good deed in his dominion, and to be kindhearted to the Christian community, the God-sheltered flock which he entrusted to him (IV,267).

Before leaving the royal court to pursue his wanderings and life as a monk, Symeon says these parting words to his subjects:

> mirь vy budi vьsěmь, stado xristovo slovesno, eže bogomь prědanoe

> bystь mně, i upasь vy nevrědime sьxranixь, jako pastyrь dobryi dušu svoju polagae za vy (IV,5,line 29-31) = Peace be unto all of you, O flock of the Word of Christ, which was entrusted to me by God, you whom I preserved from harm, having tended you like a good shepherd who lays down his life before you" (IV, 271).

In chapter 5, the subtheme appears yet again, this time, interwoven into a panegyrical passage that consists of a series of twelve epithets, all restating the subtheme of the good teacher and pastor:

> čto bo i nareku, vьistinu nedouměju. gospodina li dobrago? učitelja li pravověriju? otьca li blagago? pastira li, iže věroju upase stado emu prědanoe? crьkvamь li prosvětitija i blagonraviju učitelja? ...pravověriju li nastavnika i blagověriu učitelja i čistotě vьseljeněi světilo? ...pošteniju nastavnika? prěmudrosti li nastavnika i sьmys-lodavca i nesьmysiьnymь kazatelja? sьbijuditelja li stadu svoemu i prěmudro otvětodavca kь vьsěmь okrьstь živuštixь ego? vь istinu bo sia vsa byše o nemь. (V,6,line 6-15) = For what shall I call him? Yea, I know not! A good lord [master]? A teacher of Orthodoxy? A good father? A shepherd who through faith tended the flock entrusted to him? An enlightener of churches, a teacher of morality...? A preceptor of Orthodoxy, teacher of piety, and luminary of universal purity?...preceptor of abstinence? A preceptor of wisdom, and a counselor and teacher of the thoughtless? A protector of his flock and the wisest of oracles to all who lived near him? Yea, he was all of these things... (V,271)

In the course of the next few chapters, the subtheme is repeated four more times through the following phrases:

a) "syi že prědivnyi blaženy otьcь našь i xtirorь, gospodinь Simeonь, prěbyvaše vь nasь vь vsakomь blagověry i čistotě, prěspěvae i uče vьsěxь podvigomь duxovnymь" (V,6,line 31-34) = "And Lord Symeon, our truly wonderful and blessed father and founder, abided among us in piety and purity, <u>helping and teaching</u> all by his spiritual struggle" (V,273).

b) "sego bo radi blaženyi otьcь gospodinь Simeonь vьždelě iti vьsvetuju goru, jako pastyrь dobryi poiskati ovčete zabegšago, i vьzьmьšu na ramo i prinesetь kь otcu si, i kь svoemu xotěniju" (VI,7,line 23-25) = "Thence was the blessed father Lord Symeon moved by a desire to go to the Holy Mountain <u>to search for his stray lamb like a good shepherd</u> and, upon laying it on his shoulder, to bring it home to its father and its hope" (VI,275).

c) "divešte se toliku směreniju i obrazu krotosti i poštěniju nastavnika i poslědatelja svetyxь evanьgelii učenia" (VII,8,line 21-23)= "They marveled at his great humility, and at the model forbearance

and abstinence of the preceptor and follower of the teachings of the Holy Gospels..." (VII,277).

d) "srědě že togo jako sladkoglasnuju pticu i pustynoljubnye grьlice želaemago vьluči někoego mnixa, miluju utěxu xristoljubivomu starcu, i inogda byvšee vьspitěnoe emu ovče, větvь otь ploda ego i cvětь otь korěne ego" (VII,8-9,lines 36-38,1-2) = "And amidst all this be found, like a sweet singing bird and a solitude-loving dove, that particular sought-after monk, the tender consolation of this Christ-loving patriarch, the lamb that was once nurtured by him, the branch of his fruit and the blossom of his root" (VII,279).

Throughout the *Life of Symeon,* as is clear from the passage given above, the subtheme of good teacher and pastor is interspersed numerous times throughout the text through metaphor, simile, and the repetition of key formulaic words and thematic phrases such as "teacher/preceptor of Orthodoxy", "good pastor", "good shepherd", "nurturing his flock", "the flock entrusted to him", etc.

7. The Life of Theodosius. The *Life of Theodosius* by Kallistos employs the technique of weaving subthemes as well. In the case of this particular work, the leitmotif is purely Hesychastic in content: Kallistos intersperses throughout the text various acts of ascesis that reflect the tenets of the mystical movement in much the same way Euthymius does (a full discussion the Hesychastic content of Euthymius' vitæ is presented in Section IV, Chapter 2 of this study). There are several references to the central concepts in the teachings of Gregory the Sinaite: πράξις (deeds), νήψις (sobriety), θεωρία (contemplation), ἡσυχία (quietude, i.e. "Hesychasm"). Here are some examples:

a) "radi umnago dělania i radi opasnago trězvenia" (I,10,line 19) = "for the sake of mental deeds and careful sobriety"

b) "Sъ ubo velikyi i nbsnyi člkь i zemlьnyi aggls...mnogyxь nauči dobrě že i neprělъstně děaniu i viděniu. ibo jako vъ istinu onь běše obogativyise dobrodětělnym bezmlьviemь" (V,13,lines 5-8)= "Thus this great and heavenly man, this earthly angel [Gregory the Sinaite]... instructed many well and without deceit in [the principles of] deeds and

contemplation, for in truth he had enriched himself through virtuous quietude."

c) "Jako ubo zrěše čjudnago Teodosia bžstvnyi onь mužь velikyi otcь i bezmlьvia dělatelь..." (VIII,14,lines 24-25) = "When [Gregory], that great and godly father and practitioner of Hesychasm, saw Theodsius"

d) "i vьzvraštse vъ svoju kjeliju obyčnago drьžaašese bezmlьvia" (XIII,19,line 17) = "and upon returning to his cell, he would habitually practice quietude"

e) "opasnago i agglskago drьžaaše bezmlьvia" (XXI,27,lines 21-22) = "maintaining careful and angelic quietude"

As is clear from the evidence presented above, the device of weaving subthemes -- i.e. suggesting one or several subthemes throughout a text by a repetition of phrases that reiterate that subtheme -- is a feature of hagiographic works that predates Euthymius and the period of the Hesychast Revival. But unlike our findings with regard to the rhetorical devices in chapter 2 (all of which appear in pre-and post-Metaphrastic texts), the structural device of weaving subthemes occurs only in texts that date from the period after the Metaphrastic reforms. In the Byzantine tradition the device seems to appear somewhat earlier than in the Slavic tradition. The earliest Slavic hagiographic texts (LC, ninth century) do not employ the device at all, while the LKlOxr, a Byzantine text of the late eleventh century, does employ the device. By the thirteenth-century, however, the weaving of sub-themes is already, we would posit, the main organizing structural principle of such hagiographic works as the LSym(Sav). There is a continuation, then, of this device in both the Byzantine and Slavic hagiographic traditions of the fourteenth century, as attested to by the LTheod by Kallistos and the vitæ of Euthymius.

8. The Life of Ivan of Rila. Let us now examine how Euthymius weaves subthemes into the narrative of his saints' lives and how, if at all, his technique differs from his predecessors. We will begin with the *Life of Ivan of Rila*. This vita realizes all of the stock hagiographic themes except that of birth; and as with earlier Byzantine and Slavic texts, there is a

regular alternation between the larger themes of deeds and training. What is immediately striking about this text when one looks at an outline of the subthemes it contains is this: not only does Euthymius weave or intersperse subthemes, creating a kind of leitmotif, but he also constantly intersperses several subthemes, not just one or two, to create many leitmotifs in the work. As we will see, the same is true for his other vitæ as well.

In the LIR, Euthymius develops the following leitmotifs, or recurring subthemes: 1) the first is the saint's ascesis. Euthymius includes five different references to the saint's maintenance of fasting and vigils:

a) "postomь i molitvami blagougoždaaše gospodevi" (II,8) ="and it was his habit to please the Lord with fasting and vigils"

b) "pošteniemь i bděniemь udrǫčavaą tělo" (II,9) ="burdening his body with fasting and vigils"

c) "Slъznyj že paky togo istočnikь kto po dostoaniju izvěstitь, vъsenoštnaa že takožde stoania i kolěnopřěklonenia?" (II,9) = "Who is worthy to recount his 'fountain of tears', and also his all-night vigils and prayer?"

d) "i vъsenoštьnymi bděnii i vъzdyxanii vъ sto trudy plodą" (VII,16) = "and through all-night vigils and sighs he produced the fruit of a hundred labors"

e) "Přěkloni są ubo blažennyj Ioannъ kъ moleniu, vъ kupě že i postničьskyimь sъnědemь" (VIII,19) = "The blessed Ivan inclined himself to prayer, together with fasting"

There are fomulaic phrases interspersed in chapters III, IV, V, VII and IX that suggest the saint's pursuit of ascesis with increasing intensity. This commonplace is usually in the form "adding labor unto labor," etc. ("prilagaą trudy kъ trudomь...."):

a) "prilagaą trudy kъ trudomь i kъ želaniju želanie" (III,9) = "adding labor unto labor and desire unto desire"

b) "trudy kъ trudomь i bolězni kъ boléznemь prilagaą" (IV,12) = "he added labor unto labor and toil unto toil"

c) "prěxodą ot sily vъ silǫ i vъzxoždenia vъ sr|ъ|dci polagaą" (V,13) = "going from strength to strength and placing the ascents in his heart"

e) "ni edinomu času razlěnenie ili unynie podavъ, nǫ kъ revnosti pače revnostь i kъ usrъdiju usrъdie prilagaą" (IX,20) = "and not for one hour did he fall to indolence or lose heart, but [he] added zeal unto zeal and diligence unto diligence"

It is interesting to note that this kind of fomulaic phrase is present in the mid fifteenth-century manuscript of the LC by Vladislav the Grammarian (dated 1469)[6], but is missing from the earlier manuscripts used by Vaillant and Šafařík. In the manuscript of Vladislav the Grammarian the following passage is added to the end of chapter VII: "And thus, exalting in his heart, he conducted his life honorably, adding labor unto labor and excelling greatly in godly virtues" (VII,42). But this kind of thematic phrase that expresses the saint's ascesis in increasing intensity still appears only once throughout Vladislav's manuscript. This suggests that even though his reworking of the text did employ some of the formulaic conventions known to Vladislav from later Slavic hagiography (he also worked with Euthymius' vitæ), the reworkings were only minor. He did not introduce into the text an elaborate interplay or interweaving of subthemes that was already, by his time, a well-established tradition in the genre.

The LTheod by Kallistos employs this formulaic phrase three times in the text:

a) "trudy že kъ trudomь i poštenie kъ pošteniju prilagaaxu, vъsxoždenia vъ srdci polagajušte (X,17,line 5-6) = "adding labor unto labor and fasting unto fasting, they placed the ascents in their hearts"

b) "trudy kъ trudomь prilagaaše i kъ bolěznemь bolězni" (XV,22,line 25) = "adding labor unto labor and toil unto toil"

c) "těmže i trudy prilagaaše kъ trudom, i kъ bolěznemь bolězni" (XXX,35,lines 29-30) = "moreover he added labor unto labor and toil unto toil"

---

6 See M.Kantor, *Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes*, Michigan Slavic Translations, no. 5. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1983, p.17.

Given the appearance of this commonplace only in the late medieval texts or recensions of texts, it is tempting to attribute its use to conventions of Slavic hagiographic composition that belong to the period of the Hesychast Revival, but evidence based on such a small body of texts is insufficient to prove this. All that can be said with confidence is that its use in the texts is an example of the weaving of subthemes that has been discussed above, and its function is to intensify in the LIR the already stated subthemes of the saint's maintenance of an ascetic life.

2) A second subtheme that Euthymius develops into a leitmotif in the LIR is that of the importance of quoting or singing from the Psalms. There are three references to this:

a) "poą sъ Davidomъ" (II,9) = "And he would sing from the Psalms of David..." [lit: "with David"]

b) "poą" (IV,12) = "and he would sing [from the psalms]"

c) "i sladostně vъspěvaą" (VII,15) = "and sweetly he sang [from the psalms]."

3) A third subtheme is that of the saint's glory and reputation spreading. There are six references to this in the text. The formulaic phrases are typically "his glory spread" and "word of him began to travel."

a) "Oni že...vъ svoa otxodątъ, xvaląšte i slavąšte boga o vъsěx, jaže viděšą i slyšašą, skazaǫšte po vъsej straně onoj i vъ okrъstnyix vesex." (V,14) = "...they returned home, praising and glorifying God for all they had seen and heard, telling [about it] throughout that country and in all the surrounding villages"

b) "Slavě že ot tolě po vъsej straně toj prošedši o nemъ, xvaléaxǫ boga vъsi i mnogǫ ljubovъ i revnostъ kъ nemu stążavaxǫ" (VI,15) = "From that time on, as the glory of [Ivan] spread throughout that land, everyone was praising God, and they attained much love and zeal toward him"

c) "Vъ six ubo i sicevyx tomu sǫštu, slux o nemъ, jakože prědreče są, proxoždaaše" (VIII,16-17) = "Once all these things happened, word of him, as he had predicted, began to travel"

d) "Slavě že ne maiě po vъsej zemli toj prošedši, mnozi dobrodětělnomu ego vъzrevnovašą žitiju i žiti sъ nimь izvolišą i" (IX,20) = "His great glory spread throughout this land, and many, envying his virtuous life, wanted to live with him"

e) "Sluxu že po vъsej straně onoj prošedšu i vъsěmь tamo sъtěkaǫštim są" (XI,22) = "Word then spread throughout that country, and everyone gathered there together"

f) "Slavě bo mnozě o nemь vъsą siǫ stranǫ isplъnši, i divnaa i prěslavnaa tvorąštu iscělenia, ne tъčiǫ ubo zde, nǫ i vъsą Vǫgrъskǫą drъžavǫ oglasišą" (XII,23) = "Much glory of him has filled this whole country, and the wondrous and glorious healings performed [by the relics] are heard about not only here, but in all of the Hungarian kingdom."

4) The fourth subtheme is that of the posthumous miracles performed by his relics. Euthymius develops it through the interspersing of such formulaic phrases as "wondrous and glorious miracles", "wondrous and awesome miracles", "glorious and innumerable miracles." It appears six times in the text:

a) "i vъ nej položeny byšą čьstnyą ego mošti, divnaa i prěslavnaa tvorąšte čjudesa" (X,21) = "and his pure relics were then placed in it, working wondrous and glorious miracles"

b) "vъ gradě glagoleměmь Ostrigomь. i tu prěslavnaa i divnaa sъtvarěaxǫ čjudesa, vъsěkъ nedǫgь i vъsěkǫ bolěznь otgonąšte" (XI,22) = "...and there too [in Ostrogan] they worked glorious and wondrous miracles, chasing away all disease and sickness"

c) "Mnoga že i ina divnaa i užasnaa čjudesa vъ zemli Vǫgrъstěj sъtvori" (XI,22) = "And he performed many other wondrous and awesome miracles in the Hungarian land"

d) "prěslavnaa i bezčislъnaa prěpodobnago čjudesa slyšavь" (XII,23) = "...and [Tsar Asen] having heard about the glorious and innumerable miracles of the venerable one"

e) "priidox...čl̥stnyą mošti prěpodobnago otca Ioanna...čjudesmi i iscěleni isplъnena" (XII,23) = "'I arrived...finding the saintly relics of the venerable father Ivan...who has performed miracles and healings'"

f) "čьstně položišą prěpodobnaago vъ nej mošti...ideže i do dlьjnešněgo ležąt dlьjne, različnaa iscělenia tvorąšte" (XII,25) ="they...piously placed the relics in [the church]...where they lie up to this very day, working various healings for everyone who approaches them with faith."

5) There is a fifth subtheme developed in the LIR through the interweaving of formulaic phrases: that of the relics of the saint or things associated with the saint being likened to "very valuable treasure." This appears three times in the text:

a) "prěpodobnyą svątago blagočьstně oblobyzavь mošti, mněše są někoe mnogocěnnoe skrovište obrěsti" (XII,23) = "And having kissed piously the venerable relics of the saint, he [the tsar] believed he had found some very valuable treasure"

b) "i jakože někoe mnogocěnno skrovište vъsxytiti xotąšte" (XII,24) = "And like some very valuable treasure, they wanted to steal the [relics]"

The third example, c, is formed by analogy with the relics, which are a part of the saint. Ivan's letter to Tsar Peter is also likened to a valuable treasure because it was penned by Ivan, therefore part of him:

c) "Carь že, jako sia pročьtъ, mněše są velie něčto priąti, i ljubezně to lobzavь. iměše to vъ nědrox svoixь jakože někoe mnogocěnnoe skrovište" (VIII,20) = "The tsar, when he had read the letter, thinking he had received something great, kissed it tenderly; and he kept it near his bosom as if it were some very valuable treasure."

This last image is juxtaposed nicely after an episode where Ivan, in his letter to the tsar, advises the tsar that he is rejecting his gift of gold and precious stones, i.e. earthly treasures.

9. The Life of Hilarion of Moglena. The *Life of Hilarion of Moglena* realizes all of the main hagiographic themes: origins, birth, training, deeds, and death. Like the LIR, the LHM contains an interweaving in the text of at least six subthemes. They are the subthemes of 1) the saint leading people to God, 2) the saint instructing people in Orthodoxy, 3) the followers being

added to the orthodox fold, 4) heretics rejecting their former faith, 5) the saint's reputation and glory spreading, and 6) the saint's posthumous miracles.

Based on this inventory of developed subthemes, it is clear that the sanctity of Hilarion is focused on and demonstrated by his abilities as a good teacher and pastor (like the LC and LKlOxr), his far-reaching reputation, and the miracles performed by his incorruptible relics. Let us now look at the passages from the text:

1) The subtheme of the saint as a good teacher and pastor is developed in the text through much the same kinds of phrases employed in the LSym(Sav) ("shepherding flock", "teaching and instructing", "good shepherd/pastor", "innocent lamb",etc.). The first example, a, is in the form of a simile of biblical comparison:

a) "Sice ubo vtoryj Iosifь žitodavecъ svoimь učenikomь jako pokaza są, množajšee usrъdie i věrǫ kъ nemu stążašą" (III,30-31) = "Thus this second Joseph turned out to be a giver of grain to his pupils, for increased diligence and faith were added unto him"

b) "Sice ubo tomu lěta dovolnaa sъtvoršu, inočьskyą dobrě pravąštu liky" (IV,31) = "Several years passed, and Hilarion continued to be a good leader for the monks"

c) "Malu že vrěmeni prěšedšu i svątomu preležně věrnyą očąštu i nakazaǫštu ljudi" (V,33) = "Only a little time had passed, and the saint had taught and instructed carefully the devout people"

d) "Nǫ dobryj slovesnyix ovec Xristověxъ pastyrь, Ilarionь," (V,33) = "But the good pastor of God's sheep, Hilarion..."

e) "Božij že arxierej, nevъzbranno učą i nakazuą..." (VIII,42) = "The blessed bishop [Hilarion], invincibly teaching and instructing..."

f) "I bystlьj pročee edino stado i edinь pastyrь" (X,52) = "And from then on there was one flock and one shepherd"

g) "vъsi bo iže ot vlъkov byvšei ovcą, prěměiše sebe dobryimь izměneniemь, poslědovaaxǫ svoemu pastyrju, jakože agnъci nezlobivi" (XIII,54) = "Those who from wolves became sheep, transforming themselves with a good change, followed our pastor, like innocent lambs"

h) "dobrě napravlěemo i vodimo dobryim pastyremь" (XIII,54) = "well directed and led by the good pastor."

2) The next subtheme, that of the saint instructing the people to maintain the orthodox faith, is realized three times in the text through the following phrases:

a) "Pouči že těx priležně pravyǫ drъžati są věry, preležati že zapovědem gospodьnimь i pravoslavnyimь poslědovati povelěniomь, nečьstivyx že eresej i těx tъšteglasia udalěti są po rečenomu..." (IV,32) = "He taught them to maintain carefully the correct faith, to keep God's commandments, to observe the rules of orthodoxy, to forsake blasphemous heresies and their idle verbiage according to the Scriptures"

b) "i čąstaa poučenia kъ svoimь tvoréše ljudemь, učą i utvrъždaą těx pravoslavnyǫ drъžati są věry" (V,33) = "and he gave frequent instruction to his people, teaching and convincing them to keep the orthodox faith"

c) "učą i nakazuą vъsą iže pod nimь ljudi blagočьstivyix drъžati są velěnij, zloslavnyix že udalěti są eresej i těx otběgati" (XII,53) = "He taught and instructed everyone under him to uphold the sacred commandments [of God] and to shun and avoid infamous heresies."

3) The third subtheme, that of Hilarion's followers being increased and added to the Orthodox fold, appears nine times in the text:

a) "i množaaše są čislo učenik" (III,31) = "and the number of his pupils grew"

b) "eretici že zavistiǫ i gněvomь raždiʒaaxǫ są; sam že blaženyj vъrǫčennyj emu umnožiti tъštaše są talantъ" (IV,33) = "The heretics were fired up with hatred and wrath, for the blessed one himself was endeavouring to increase the talent that had been given to him"

c) "pristǫpišą kъ sъbornějь crlъjkvi i izbrannomu sъčetašą są stadu" (VII,42) = "...and they [the Manichaeans] went to the catholic church and added themselves to the number of the chosen flock"

d) "i prilagaaše są prisno kъ čislu pravoslavnyx množьstvo mnogo ljudij" (VIII,42) = "and he was constantly adding to the number of the orthodox believers a numerous number of people"

e) "Prědrečenii že Arměne...izbrannomu sъčetašą są stadu" (X,52) = "The above-mentioned Armenians...adding themselves to the chosen flock"

f) "I bě viděti množǫštee są pravoslavnyx množьstvo" (XI,53) = "And it was seen how the number of orthodox believers was increased"

g) "Ilarionъ...i crlъkovь vъzdviže zělo člьstnǫ...eǫže krasota mnogyx udivlěetь i vъ slavoslovie privoditь božie" (XI,53) = " "Hilarion...erected a very honorable church...the beauty of which surprised many and led many to the glorification of God"

h) "Nečьstivyą že i skvrъnnyą Bogomilskyą eresi poklonniky, eliky blagočьstia priemšǫ sěmą božij arxierej vidě, vъsą sъčeta kъ pravoslavnyix stadu" (XIII,54) = "[Hilarion] saw so many of the blasphemous and evil adherents of the Bogomil heresy accept the seed of piety, adding all of them to the orthodox fold"

i) "Prědrečennoe že inočьskoe ono sъstoanie, dobrě napravlěemo i vodimo dobryim pastyremь, rastěše, prěspěvaą vъ slavǫ boziǫ" (XIII,54) = "The aforementioned group of monks, well directed and led by the good pastor, increased in size, flourishing in the glory of God."

4) The fourth subtheme, that of the heretics rejecting completely their former, unclean faiths, appears four times in the text:

a) "prosąšte ot nego darъ svątago krlъštenia i mnogo svoǫ ukorivše i oplъvavše věrǫ" (VII,42) = "asking of him the holy gift of baptism; and [the Manichaeans] cast aspersions upon and spat upon their [former] faith..."

b) "vъ poznanie priidošą svoeǫ ix prělьsti i, zělo svoǫ ukorivše i oplъvavše eresь" (X,52) = "[the Armenians]...came to an understanding of their deceit, and they completely spat upon their heresy"

c) "Oni že, jako sia slyšavše, pristǫpišą są priąti krlъštenie, svoǫ oplъvavše do konca eresь" (XI,53) = "When [the Bogomils] heard

this, they went to the church and they accepted baptism, completely spitting upon their own heresy"

d) "vъ vsemь tomu pokarěǫšte są, ukarěǫšte že i opljuvaǫšte iže prъvěe těx odrъžavšǫą prělьstь i toǫ načąlniki krěpcě xuląšte že i proklinaǫšte" (XIII, 54) = "[They obeyed] him in everything, insulting and spitting upon those who maintained those deceits and abusing and damning strongly the leaders of such heresies."

5) The fifth subtheme of the LHM, that of the saint's reputation and glory spreading, appears three times in the text:

a) "vъsej brati togo na ązycě obnositi i togo krasiti są dobrodětělmi" (III,30) = "...and his name was on the lips of all his [monastic] brothers, and they adorned him with precious adornments"

b) "Sluxu že o nemь prosluvšu są po vъsǫdu, ne bě nigdeže město, ideže imą ego ne obnošaaše są" (III,31) = "The word about him spread all around, and there was no place where his name was not being uttered"

c) "Semu že užasnomu čjudesi po vъsǫdu proizšedšu" (XV,55) = "News of this awesome miracle spread everywhere."

6) The sixth, and last, subtheme, that of the saint's posthumous miracles, is realized in the text in three different passages:

a) "Različnaa že mnoga znamenia i čjudesa bogъ sъ svoimь ugodnikomь tvorą" (XV,56) = "God, with the help of His saint, gave many signs and worked many miracles"

b) "ot vъsǫdu kъ grobu ego mnozi prixoždaaxǫ i različnaa iscělenia vъzimaaxǫ. Sice ubo grobu ego bezměrnaa dějstvuǫštu" (XV,56) = "Many came from all over to his grave, and they received various healings. Thus his grave worked innumerable miracles."

c) "vъ č|ь|stněj položi cr|ъ|kvi...i do n|y|ně ležǫšte, podavaǫtь iscělenia nevъzbranno vъsěmь, iže sъ věroǫ i ljubovią kъ nimь prixodąštiimь" (XVI,56-57) ="they placed [his relics] in the holy

church...where [his relics] remain today, giving healing unconditionally to everyone who comes with faith and love."

10. The Life of Paraskeva. The *Life of Paraskeva* realizes all of the major themes of the hagiographic genre except that of birth. Throughout this vita, Euthymius develops three basic subthemes: 1) the subtheme of the saint's ascesis (her constant maintenance of fasting and vigils), 2) the subtheme of the posthumous miracles performed through the relics of the saint, and 3) a subtheme which was popular amongst the Hesychasts (but by no means specific to it), that of the "Bride of Christ", which also figures in the *Life of Philothea* (see below).

1) The first subtheme is interwoven into the text in three separate passages:

a)"postomь i bděniemь iznurajušti tělo, zlostradanii i na zemli lěganii" (III,63) = "exhausting her body with fasting and vigils, sufferings, and prostrations"

b) "tamo neveštьstvnoe i aggelьskoe prěbyvaaše žitie...postomь i bděniemь sebe udručajušti, pustynnoe že bylie pričeštajušti se, i se skaredě že i xudě, studeniju že i znojemь istavajema...Nь niže to samoje bylie, niže vodu do sytosti prijemljaaše, nь malo i xudě i se zělo kь večeru" (III,63) = "she led there an angelic and chaste life...maintaining fasting and vigils, eating desert grass--and very little and meagerly at that--withstanding intense cold and heat.And she took neither grass nor water to the point of satiation, but rather she took of them for herself very sparingly and late in the day at that"

c) "trudy kь trudom i bolězni kь boléznemь prilagajušti, postomь i bděniemь sebe ukrašajušti i edina edinomu vynu besědujušti" (IV,66) = "adding labor unto labor and toil unto toil, adorning herself with fasting and vigils and always speaking to Him alone."

2) The second subtheme, that of the saint's posthumous miracles, appears in the text five times:

a) "Nь ni tako prězrě bogь svoju rabu na mnozě bezьpametnu ležati, niže tljeju rastlěti se neporočnomu onomu tělesi, nь i o semь čjudo pokaza divno" (V,67) = "But God did not forsake his slave that she

should lie there without proper burial, nor that her immaculate body should decompose with decay, but instead [He] worked a wondrous miracle"

b) "Vьzьmše že to...vь crlьkvi...položiše...vь nejže ležešti, mnogaa i čjudna znamenia tvoraaše" (V,69) = "Having taken [the body]...[and] placed it in the church...where she lay and made many miraculous signs"

c) "vьsi bo iže okrstь nedužnii i běsnujuštei se, sь věroju prixodeštei, iscěljenia polučaaxu" (V,69) = "All in the area who were afflicted with disease and possessed by devils,who came to her with faith, received healing"

d) "Vьsudu bo prosia čjudesi, vьsudu luče rasprostrětь blagodlěltnyje, vьse ozari zemlьnye konce" (VI,70) = "Everywhere miracles were being requested, and everywhere rays of divine acts were being dispersed, and they lit up every end of the earth"

e) "položiše vь crlьkvi carьscěj, ideže i do dlьnьšnjago ležitь dlьne, različnaa iscěljenia podavajušti iže sь věroju i ljuboviju kь toje slavněj pritěkajuštiimь racě" (VI,72) = "And...they placed her in the royal church, where she lies up to his very day, giving various healings to those who come to her glorious shrine with faith and love."

3) The third, and last, subtheme in the LP is that which presents her as the Bride of Christ. The significance of this subtheme for the Hesychasts will be dealt with in detail in Section IV, Chapter 2. For the present, we will simply cite here all of the occurrences of this theme in the text. Euthymius often realizes this particular theme in the text by referring simply to the Bridgeroom, i.e. Christ. The theme appears a total of ten times in the text:

a) "Elma ubo vьsa prěobidě mira krasnaa i nebesnomu sebe unevěsti ženixu" (I,61-62) = "For as all she wanted in this whole wide world was to be betrothed to her Heavenly Bridegroom"

b) "Ne bě toj tamo popečenie o...nь o srětenii ženixově" (III,63-64) = "She had no care for [material concerns]...but for the meeting with her Bridegroom"

c) "Tebe ženiše moj, ištu" (III,64) = "I am looking for you, my Bridegroom"

d) "kako sladkago ženixova uslyšitь glasa" (III,64) = "...and she would listen to the voice of her sweet Betrothed"

e) "Ty istinnago ženixa čьstnaa nevěsta" (VII,73) = "You are the honorable bride of the True Bridegroom"

f) "tebe rody člověčьscii blažetь, jako svojemu poslědovala esi ženixu" (VII,73) = "...human races glorify you because you followed your Bridegroom"

g) "dannoju ti ot tvoego ženixa Xrista" (VII,74) = "...which was given to you by your Bridegroom Christ"

h) "Carica bo i ty, ašte i ne zemlьnaa, nebesnago že cara izbrannaa nevěsta" (VII,74) = "For you are a tsarina, though not an earthly one, but the chosen bride of the Heavenly Tsar"

i) "Nasladi se slavy...svoego ženixa" (VIII,75) = "Take joy in the glory...of your Bridegroom"

j) "Sego radi i ženixь sь sladostiju ti prověšta: 'Gredi ot Livana, nevěsto...'" (VIII,76) = "Because of this the Bridegroom with sweetness announces to you: 'Come with me from Lebanon, my spouse...'"

11. The Life of Philothea. The *Life of Philothea* is a particularly rich example of the rhetorical category of weaving of subthemes. I have identified in this vita six basic subthemes which are elaborated in the text by means of interspersing formulaic phrases. The two most prevalent subthemes are: 1) the Bride of Christ subtheme -- seen above in the LP -- which is tied intimately with the work's most important subtheme: 2) that of chastity. The other subthemes are: 3) the saint's ascesis through fasting and vigils; 4) Philothea's instruction to the people to maintain Orthodoxy; 5) the saint's reputation and glory spreading; and 6) the posthumous miracles worked through her relics.

The vita realizes all of the major hagiographic themes: origin, birth, training, deeds, and death. Within the body of the life is the tale of Amoun

(chapters IV-V), which Philothea relates to her earthly bridegroom, Constantine, in an effort to persuade him of the benefits -- and necessity -- of maintaining a chaste life within marriage. Within this tale are included some fomulaic phrases that recall the themes of ascesis and chastity.

1) The subtheme of the Bride of Christ is realized eight times in the text:

a) "Sego radi poxvalě spodobliěǫt są mǫdryą ony děvy, ąže, vъsě prězrěvše, světilniky duševnyą ugotovašą kъ ženixovu srěteniu, těmže i sъlikъstvuątь ženixu i neizglagolannyǫ naslaždaǫt są slavy." (I,78) = "Because of this, those wise young maidens who, having abandoned everything, prepare their spiritual lamps for their meeting with their Bridegroom, [Christ], are worthy of praise; moreover they rejoice together over their Bridegroom and delight in ineffable glory."

b) "Sego radi i mǫdryą ony děvy, ižže evaggelskaa pominaetь kniga, ugotovašą vъsedušno sebe kъ srěteniu nebesnaago ženixa i, vъsě mira sego krasnaa ni vъ čtože vъměnivše" (II,79-80) = "Because of this these wise young women, whom the books of the Gospels commemorate, prepared themselves whole-heartedly for the meeting with their Heavenly Bridegroom, and they despised the beauties of this world."

c) "vъnegda uslyšǫtь glas: 'se ženix'! gotově kъ togo srěteniu potekǫtь" (II,80) = "when they would hear the voice: 'Behold, the Bridegroom', they would run ready to meet him"

d) "blažennaa Filotea, potъšta są svoemu ugoditi ženixu" (II,80) = "the blessed Philothea strove to please her Bridegroom"

e) "'Prisna...Xristova rabo, neskvrъnnaa nevěsto'" (X,94) = "'Eternal servant of God...undefiled bride'"

f) "mǫdryixь děvь sъžitelnice, Isusova nevěsto" (XIV,97) = "you who live with the wise virgins, bride of Christ..."

g) "nǫ licemь kъ licu svoego zriši ženixa, Isusa sladkago" (XIV, 98) = "but face to face you see your Bridegroom, sweet Jesus"

h) "siceva čjudesa neporočnyǫ Xristovy nevěsty" (XV,98) = "These are the miracles of the chaste bride of Christ."

2) The next subtheme, that of chastity, is realized eleven times in the text. The formulaic phrases associated with this subtheme are "live in purity", "virginity and chastity", "preserving ones body undefiled", etc.

a) "koeǫ xytrostiǫ sebe neoskvrъnenǫ sъxranitь" (IV,81) = "...by means of what craft could she preserve herself undefiled?"

b) "daruj mi silǫ sъbljusti są čistotě moej neoskvrъneně" (IV,81) = "'...give me the gift of strength to maintain my purity, undefiled'"

c) "Poslušaj ubo mene, blagaa ti sъvětuǫštago, i prěbǫdem vъ čistotě'" (IV,83) = [Amun]: "Thus, listen to me who am telling you good things, and let us continue to live in purity..."

d) "prěbyvaaxǫ pročee děvьstvo xranąšte i čistotǫ." (IV,83) = "they continued to preserve their virginity and chastity"

e) "diavol, ne mogy trъpěti na mnozě čistotǫ i dobrodětělь božiix ugodnikь" (IV,84) = "The Devil...did not tolerate for long their chastity and the virtue of these divine saints"

f) "tako prěbysta vъ vъsěx и i-tix [18] lětěx, čistotǫ i cělomǫdrie do konca sъxranše" (IV,84) = "And so it was for all of eighteen years, [they lived] preserving their purity and chastity."

g) "prěbǫdemь vъ čistotě, neoskvrъnena tělesa sъxranše" (IV,84) = "'Let us then live in chastity, preserving our bodies undefiled'"

h) "neoskvrъneno sъbljudǫ tělo moe" (IV,85) = "'I will maintain my body undefiled'"

i) "prěbyvaaxǫ pročee vъ čistotě i cělomǫdrii" (IV,85) = "they abode thenceforth in purity and chastity"

j) "eže čistě i neporočně sebe že i těx sъbljusti" (VIII,91) = "in order to that you and they may preserve yourselves pure and chaste."

k) "i pročee cělomǫdrъno i čisto poživemь" (X,94) = "'we will live in chastity and purity all our lives.'"

3) The next subtheme of ascesis through fasting and vigils is realized a total of four times in the text:

a) "prěbyšą na mnoga lěta, čąstaa kolenopoklonenia tvorąšte i postomь i bděniemь tělo udrǫčavǫšte" (IV,84) = "[Amun and his wife lived] there many years,controlling the body with frequent genuflections, fasting and vigils. "

b) "i tu vъšedši i kelijcǫ malǫ sъtvorši, prěbyvaaše pročee, mątežь vъsěcьsky ot sebe ottrąsši, pošteniemь i bděniemь i na zemli lěganiemь tělo" (VI,85) = "and there she went and made a small cell, and lived there, ridding herself of all turmoil, maintaining fasting and vigils and prostrations"

c) "Prěpodobnaa že Filotea, sebe vъ kelii zatvorši, prěbyst|ь| d|ь|ni četyri, nikakože pištǫ vъkusivь, nǫ vъ bděnii i slъzaxь i čąstyx kolěnopřěklonenix vъsą ony istъšti d|ь|ni" (IX,92) = "The venerable Philothea, locking herself up in her cell, lived four days, eating no food, but spending these days [keeping] vigils, [shedding] tears, and [praying] with frequent genuflections. "

d) "Sicevo žitie prěpodobnyǫ našǫ matere...jaže, vъ malo vrěmą podvizavši są vъ postě i bděnix i molitvax i slъzax i vъ inyx pročix zlostradaniix" (XV,98) = "Thus, this is the life of our venerable mother...who immediately roused herself zealously to fasting and vigils and prayers and tears and other sufferings."

4) Unlike Euthymius' other heroine, Paraskeva, Philothea is established as a defender of Orthodoxy against current heresies. Unlike her male counterparts, she does not have a debate with the heretics in order to overcome them. But she does contribute in the battle against the heresy in her contact with the man who comes to her for healing the disease of his feet. She says that he is diseased because he has used his tongue to support the Hellenic deceit. Also she teaches against it as she is dying in a final instruction. The subtheme is realized only three times in the text, thus showing itself to be clearly secondary to her virtues of chastity and ascesis:

a) "Sia ubo byvaema na kъždo, jakože bi rešti, d|ь|nь Filotea slyžǫšti, pečalia ljutoǫ sebe ujazvěaše i vъsěx, iže kъ nej prixodąštix, ot božl|ь|stvnyx poučaaše pisanij i Ellinskǫą do konca uničižaaše

prělьstь." (VII,87) = "Philothea heard it said that these things were happening every day, and she was wounded by bitter grief and she was instructing everyone who came to see her from the Holy Scriptures and advising them to rout out completely this Hellenic deception."

On her deathbed, Philothea gives this final instruction to her disciples:

b) "Dostoitь ubo vamь sъ vъsěcěmь straxomь i boaznię tę čistę i neporočnę xraniti i bljusti i nepokolěblema crlьkovnaa drъžati prědania" (VIII,89-90) = "Thus, with all awe and fear, you ought to preserve and maintain and obseve the Church's tradition pure and unblemished."

c) "Podobaetь ubo vamь pravyą drъžati są věry i nikakože Ellinskyim vъnimati blądemь" (VIII,90) = "For it behooves you to adhere to the correct faith and not to pay attention to any Hellenic deceptions. "

5) Philothea's miracles both before and after her death are underscored by the subtheme of her reputation and glory spreading, which appear in the text a total of six times:

a) "vъsěmь diviti są o nej i toę po vъsędu proxoditi slavě" (III,81) = "everyone greatly marvelled at her, and her glory spread everywhere.

b) "nę vъsě okrъstnaa onogo města toę oglašaaše žitie, i slava mnoga isxoždaaše o nej" (VII,87)= "and [people] in the surrounding areas were proclaiming her life, and her glory spread throughout the land

c) "Vrěmeni že ne malu mimošedšu i čjudesi semu po vъsędu prošedšu" (VII,88) = "When some time had passed and word of this miracle had spread everywhere"

d) "I semu ubo čjudesi po vъsędu prošedšu, slavěaxę vъsi boga, blagodarestъvnaa vъzsilaęšte xvalenia." (VII,88-89) = "And when news of this miracle had spread everywhere, everyone glorified God, and offered up praises. "

e) "Simь ubo vъsędu protěkaemomь i vъsěmь sluxy oglašaęštimь" (XI,95) = "Thus [word] about these things spread everywhere, and everyone heard the stories.

f) "I semu že čjudesi po vъsǫdu prošedsu, vъsi slavlěaxǫ boga i prěpodobnǫą Filoteǫ" (XIII,97) = "And when [news of] this miracle spread everywhere, everyone praised God and the venerable Philothea."

6) The subtheme of Philothea's posthumous miracles is realized four times in the text through these phrases and the subtheme of the innumerability of her miracles is realized three times in the text:

a) "tvorąšti divnaa i prěslavnaa čjudesa, imže něstlь] čisla, jaže ašte po drobnu skazovati načьnemь, postignet mą pověstvuǫšta lěto" (IX,93) = "she worked wonderful and glorious miracles, which are so numerous that were we to begin to tell [of them] in detail, it would take me a year to relate them."

b) "Vrěmeni že mnogu prěšedšu i čjudesemь mnogomь byvaǫštimь" (XII,95) = "Much time having passed and many miracles having been worked"

c) "Iscělenia že mnoga togda bogъ pokaza vъ toǫ prěnesenii i različna, ižže ne vъzmožno estlь] po drobnu skazovati věruǫštiimь, věroǫ že tъčiǫ priimati i dobrodětěli revnovati" (XIII,97) = "And then God showed many and various healings in the translation of her relics, of which healings it is impossible to tell in detail to believers who accept them in faith alone and strive for virtue."

d) "i divnaa i prěslavnaa tvoritь čjudesa, imže něstlь] čisla, vъsěm iže sъ věroǫ i ljubovioǫ kъ nej pririštǫštiimь" (XIV,98) = "and her body works wondrous and glorious miracles, which are innumerable, and everyone comes to her with faith and love."

As shown with textual evidence above, the device of weaving subthemes is employed by hagiographers beginning in at least the late eleventh century (e.g., LKlOxr). While some of the imagery in the subthemes interspersed in the Euthymian texts is specific to Hesychast mysticism (as is discussed in Section IV, chapter 2), the device itself is not new to the period of the Hesychast Revival.

Within the category of weaving subthemes, another feature of the Euthymian texts must also be considered: that of the constant repetition throughout his texts of formulaic phrases of emotion: 1) expressions of

weeping and crying, 2) expressions of grief and lament, and 3) expressions of joy and happiness. Also present in the texts are formulaic circumlocutions for death and dying.

As for the circumlocutions for death and dying in the vitæ of Euthymius, these can also be found in earlier texts spanning the period from the ninth to the fourteenth centuries. Expressions such as "went to the Lord" and "time to depart to the Lord" abound in the Euthymian texts:

a) "I jako ubo svoe eže kъ gospodu otxoždenie razumě" (LIR,IX,20-21) = "And when he understood that his own time to depart to the Lord was nigh"

b) "Lětomь že dovolnom prešedšemь.otlьlcъ svoe eže kъ gospodu otxoždenie razuměvь" (LHM,III,30) = "When a few years had passed, the father understood that the time for him to depart to the Lord was nigh"

c) "gospodevi svoj prědastlьl duxъ" (LHM,III,30) = "and then he gave his soul over to the Lord"

d) "sъžitelě bo svoego prědotpustila běše kъ gospodu" (LHM,XII,53) = "She had given her husband over to the Lord"

e) "svoe eže kъ gospodu otxoždenie razumě" (LHM,XIV,54) = "understood that it was time for him to depart to the Lord"

f) "konecъ žitia priątъ...Blažennaa že, jako mǫža kъ gospodu ošedša vidě" (LPh,V,85) = "[Constantine] came to the end of his life [lit: "having taken the end of his life..."]...The blessed Philothea, when she saw her husband go to the Lord..."

g) "Vrěmą ubo...moego ošestvia nastoitь" (LPh,VIII,89) = "The time...of my departure is come"

h) "Simže poǫštimь, ta svoj gospodevi prědastlьl duxъ" (LPh,IX,92) = "While they were singing, she gave her soul over to the Lord."

But similar expressions can be found in the LC: "na sud že emu xotąštu iti" (II,2) ="and when he could depart to Judgment Day"; in the

LKlOxr: "πρὸς κύριον ἐξεδήμησε" (XXVII.75,142,line 3-4) = "he went to the Lord" (XXVII.75,123); in the LSym(Sav): "juže prispě vrěme razlučenia naju" (VIII,10,line 11) = "Behold, the time of our parting is already at hand" (VIII,283); and in the LTheod:

a) "vъkupě že i oca kъ glospodju otslavъ" (IV,12,line 6) = "having sent [their spiritual] father to the Lord"

b) "i vrěme uže priide eže kъ boga ošьstvia onomu" (IX,15, line 29-30) = "the time had already come for his departure to the Lord"

Expressions like this one from the LIR: "vъ rǫce božii prědastь dux." (IX,21) = "he gave his soul over to the hands of God" can be found in the LKlOxr: "τὸ πνεῦμα τοῖς δορυφορήσασιν αὐτὸν ἀγγέλοις" (VI.23, 96, line 26-27) = "he gave his spirit to the angels who had accompanied...him" (VI.23,102); and the LTheod: "vъ rucě božii prědastь dlujxь" (XXVIII,34,line 25).

Other expressions which employ elaborate metaphors for heaven -- such as this one found in the LPh: "vъ netlěnnyą prěidi obitěli" (III,81) = "[Philothea's mother] went to her incorruptible home", and the LP: "vь nebesnye prěidoše obitěli" (II,62) = "they went to their heavenly dwelling places" -- can also be found in the LC: "i jakože približe se časь, da paky priimetь i prěstavitь se vь věčnaa žilišta" (XVIII,24,line 9-10) = "And when the hour to repose and remove to the eternal dwellings approached."

Concerning <u>expressions of emotion</u>, many of the formulaic phrases for <u>joy and happiness</u> that are found in the Euthymian texts can also be found in earlier hagiographic sources. In the LSym(Sav) one finds this passage: "radostiju radujušte se i veseliemь veselešte se" (XI,13,line 36) = "They rejoiced in joy and made merry in merriment" (XI, 293), which is similar to another passage found in the LPh: "běše carь vь radosti i veseli mnozě tako i sъ vъsěmь voinstvomь" (XII,96) = "the tsar was overjoyed and very delighted, and so too with his entire host [of soldiers]".

In the LTheod one finds this example: "něs rešti koliky radosti dxovnye i sladosti neizrečennye isplъnise" (VI,13, line 22-23) = "it is impossible to express with how much spiritual and ineffable joy and delight

he was filled." This image of ineffable joy is taken from 1 Pet 1.8 ("ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ" = AV: "ye rejoice with joy unspeakable") This example corresponds to the following passages from Euthymius' vitæ:

a)"neizglagolannoǫ radovaaxǫ są radostiǫ" (LHM,VII,42) = "they rejoiced in inexpressible joy"

"neizglagolannyą ispl̥ъnĕaše są radosti" (LHM,X,52) = "and he was filled with ineffable joy"

b)"Božij že arxierej jako sia vъ prĕdnjaa prošьdšaa vidĕ, radosti vesь ispl̥ъnĕaše są i veselia duxovnaago" (LHM,XI,52) = "The divine bishop [Hilarion], when he saw what had happened, was completely filled with joy and spiritual happiness."

c) "I jako sia vidĕ množьstvo ono togo učenikь, neizglagolannyǫ ispl̥ъnišą są radosti" (LHM,XV,56) = "And when the number of his disciples saw this, they were filled with inexpressible joy"

d) "tĕmže i neiskazannoǫ radostiǫ ispl̥ъnĕaxǫ svoa srl̥ьdca" (LPh,III,80) = "their hearts were filled with ineffable joy"

e) "i radosti neskazannyǫ ispl̥ъnl̥ь są" (LPh,XII,96) = "and he was filled with ineffable joy"

f) "vъse radosti ispl̥ъni są" (LHM,II,29) = "she was filled with joy"

g) "radosti kupno i nedoumĕnia ispl̥ъnĕaše są" (LHM,II,29) = "she was filled with both joy and disbelief"

h) "duxovnyj otl̥ьcъ na vъsĕk veselia ispl̥ъnĕaše są dl̥ьnь" (LHM,III,30) = "His spiritual father...was filled with joy [lit: happiness] every day."

i) "Radosti ubo mnogyą ispl̥ъnь są i veselia duxovnaago" (LIR, XII,23) = "He was filled with much joy and happiness of the soul"

Also, this example from the LHM, "neizglagolannoǫ radovaaxǫ są radostiǫ" (VII,42) = "they rejoiced in inexpressible joy", is similar to this

passage from the LTheod: "neskazannaa objemljaše radostь" (XXI,27, line 21) = "they were seized with ineffable joy".

The LKlOxr has these expressions of joy and happiness in the text:

a) "Ἀνδριανός...ἐχάρη μὲν χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα" (III.9,82,line 1) = "Hadrian...rejoiced greatly [with joy] on learning of their arrival" (III,9,95).

b) "καὶ τῷ τῶν λαμπάδων φωτὶ τὴν τῆς χαρᾶς ἐπισημαίνων φαιδρότητα" (III.9,82, line 10-11) = "and by the light of the candle-sticks he expressed his shining joy" (III.9,96).

c) "χρήσαιτο τῇ χαρᾷ"(III.9,82, line 17) = "[The Pope] was joyous with joy]" (III.9,96).

Like the example from the LC given above, examples a and c from the LKlOxr both employ the device of tautology to express joy. A similar expressions is also found in the Bible in Mt 2.10 ("ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα" = AV: "they rejoiced with exceeding great joy").

It is clear that the formulaic phrases to express joy or happiness are not themselves original to Euthymius. Identical phrases or phrases of similar rhetorical complexity are found in pre-Euthymian texts from the early, middle, and late medieval period. The Euthymian texts do not reveal a more frequent use of these phrases of joy and happiness. The most rhetorically elaborate texts included in this study, e.g. the LKlOxr, the LSym(Sav) and the LTheod, use such expressions on an average of three per text. In the LIR there are at least four such examples, and in the LHM there are eight; but in the LDanStyl alone there are six such phrases employed.[7]

---

[7] a) "ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην" (5, 5,lines 14-15) = "[his parents] rejoiced with great joy" (5,9)

b) "Ἰδὼν γὰρ αὐτὸν ὁ μακάριος Συμεὼν πάνυ ἐχάρη" (9, 10,lines 4-5) = "Symeon rejoiced exceedingly when he saw him" (9,11)

c) "ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ χαίρων καὶ δοξάζων τὸν θεὸν" (34, 33,lines 1-2) = "Then the father...returned to his home rejoicing and glorifying God" (34,27)

d) "ἡ τῆς εὐσεβοῦς μνήμης Εὐδοξία...χαραποιηθεῖσα σφόδρα" (35, 33, line 5,8) = "[Eudoxia] of pious memory...rejoiced greatly" (35,27)

Concerning expressions of grief and lament, Euthymius employs an average of three such expressions per text. Here is an inventory of the formulaic phrases he employs:

a) "pečali togo obьątь oblakъ" (LIR,III,11) = "a cloud of grief seized him"

b) "i častyimi vъzdyxanmi srъdьčnoe sъkrušenie pokazovaaše" (LIR,XI,22) = "And with frequent sighs he showed his heart-felt grief"

c) "Ʒělo bo pečaliǫ sъnědaema esmъ" (LHM,II,29) = "I am very much consumed by grief"

d) "i bratiamь naležąštij pečali otgna oblakъ" (LHM,III,30) = "and the cloud of grief that was hovering over the brothers was chased away"

e) "i skrъbeše ubo o razlǫčeni bratii" (LHM,IV,32) = "And though he [Hilarion] was filled with grief at [having to be] separated from his brothers

f) "ljutoǫ sъnědaaše są pečaliǫ" (LHM,V,33) = "he [Hilarion] was consumed with bitter grief"

g) "i pustynnoe pominajušti prěbyvanie, ljutoju snědajema běše pečaliju." (LP,IV,65) = "and remembering her desert life, she was consumed with bitter grief"

h) "Sia vьsa blagočьstivyix zrešte sьborь, sětovania i pečali těx prikryvaaše oblakь...Vъ six ubo i sicevyix blagočьstivyx sětovania odrъžaaše oblakь" (LP,VI,69) = "The assembly of the pious, seeing these things, were covered by a cloud of grief and woe...In these ways the cloud of grief seized the pious men"

i) "Sice ubo toj na vъsěkь moląšte są čas i neizrečennoǫ odrъžima sǫšti pečaliǫ" (LPh,IV,81) = "Thus she prayed this every hour and was gripped by indescribable sadness"

---

e) "Οἱ καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὴν μετ' εὐφροσύνης ἀπῆλθον" (40,37,lines 14-15) = "and they took her and went away rejoicing" (40,31)

f) "καὶ ἦν ἰδεῖν τὸ πλῆθος μετ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ χαρμονῆς πάλιν ἀπερχόμενον πρὸς τὸν ὅσιον" (20, 21,lines 10-11) = "The people could be seen flocking to the holy man again with joy and delight" (20,18)

j) "Sia ubo byvaema na kъždo, jakože bi rešti, d|ь|nь Filotea slyšǫšti, pečalia ljutoǫ sebe ujazvěaše" (LPh,VII,87) = "Philothea heard it said that these things were happening every day, and she was wounded by bitter grief"

k) "Bogoljubeznaa že, jako tǫ vidě sice straždǫštǫ, sr|ъ|dcemь zělo ujazvi są i milosrъdova o nej" (LPh,VII,87-88) = "But when the one who loves God, Philothea, when she saw [this woman] suffering so, her heart was very wounded, and she took pity on her"

l) "I pečaliǫ bezměrnoǫ sъrdrъžimi" (LPh,X,93) = "and they were seized with immeasurable grief."

The *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* above contains four such expressions, the same number as the LHM:

a) "ἀπαρακλήτου λύπης ἐπιοῦντο ὑπόθεσιν. ἤλυον, ἐδυσφόρουν, ἀπελέγοντο τὴν ζωήν" (II.5,80, line 5-6) = "They found reason for their unconsolable grief...They grieved, suffered, and denied this earthly life" (II.5,95)

b) "καὶ ἡ σύζυγος αὐτῶν εὐφροσύνη τὴν προτέραν λύπην αὐτῶν ἀπήλασε" (II.7,80,line 20-21) = "and the joy that comes from these things dispelled their grief" (II.7,95)

c) "λύπῃ μὲν τὴν καρδίαν ἐβάλλετο" (IV.13,86,line 10-11) = "[Methodius] gave his heart to sorrow" (IV.13,97)

d) "τί δὲ οὐκ εἶπειν τοσοῦτον πένθος ἐπὶ τῷ παιδὶ τοῖς ξένοις ἐλεεινῶς δυστυχήσαντα" (XV.44,116,line 29-30) = "What he did not say to the foreigners, overwhelmed with grief and lament for his child?" (XV.44,111).

The result of this comparison is that the LKlOxr, a pre-Euthymian, high-style hagiographic text, contains as many, and in some cases more, expressions for grief and lament as the Euthymian texts.

Furthermore, in considering the formulaic phrases for weeping and crying, one is struck by the frequency with which they are used in the Euthymian texts: four occurrences in the LP and LHM, five in the LIR and ten in the LPh. The LKlOxr reveals none, the LSym(Sav) only one, and the

LTheod five. At this juncture, it would be tempting, based on the evidence from the use of expressions of joy/happiness and weeping/crying, to ascribe to Euthymius a greater overall use of these formulaic phrases of emotion in the hagiographic tradition. The examples, however, are hardly sufficient to prove this. Furthermore, there is more evidence that argues against such a claim. In the "Narrative and Passion" version of the life of Boris and Gleb, one can find at least seventeen occurrences of formulaic phrases of weeping/crying and grief/lament.[8] And in the sixth-century LDanStyl there are at least thirteen such phrases in the text.[9]

---

[8] All quotes in Slavonic are taken from the *Успенский Сборник XII-XIII вв.*, под ред. С.И.Коткова, 52-58, Москва: АН СССР, 1971. The English translations of the passages are taken from Kantor's edition, op.cit, 165-236.
a) "i slьzami razlivaaše sia vьsь" (45,10a; lines 19-20) = "[He] was completely choked with tears." (173)
b) "i kъžьdo vъ dši svoje i stonaaše gorestiju srdьčьnoju i vsi sъmuštaaxu sja o pečali" (45,10a;lines 26-29) = "And each in his soul groaned with heart-felt grief, and all were troubled in their sorrow." (173)
c) "tače zabyvъ skъrbь sъmьrtьnuju" (46,10б; lines 15-16) = "Then, forgetting his deathly sorrow" (173)
d) "i bjaaše vъ dnь subotьnyi vъ tuzé i pečali udručьnъmь srdcьmь" (46,10г;l ines 24-27) = "On the Sabbath day he was in distress and grief, and his heart was oppressed" (175)
e) "plakaše są sъ krušenъmь srdcьmь. a dšeju radostьnoju" (46,10г; lines 28-30) = "[He] wept with a broken heart but a joyful soul" (175)
f) "načatъ mitvu tvoriti večernjuju sъ slьzami gorьkymi i častyimь vъzdyxanijemь" (47,11a; lines 24-27) = "[He] began to say the evening prayer with bitter tears, frequent sighs, and much groaning" (177)
g) "vъ pečali krépъcé i tjažьcé i strašьné." (47, 11a,б; lines 30-32, 1) = "His was troubled by...a great, heavy, and terrible grief" (177)
h) "i načatъ slьzy ispuštati otъ očiju svojeju" (47,11в; lines 9-11) = "and he began to shed tears from his eyes" (179)
i) "i uzьrésta popinъ jego i otrokъ iže služaaše jemu i vidévъša gospodi na svojego drjaxla i pečaliju oblijana sušta zélo rasplakasta sja zélo" (48,11в,г; lines 29-32; 1-2) = "And when the priest and the retainer who served him looked and saw their lord downcast and overwhelmed by grief and they began to mourn greatly" (179)
j) "i vъzьrévъ na nbo sъ slьzami i goré vъzdъxnuvъ" (48,12a; lines 12-14) = "And upon glancing tearfully up at the heavens and sighing bitterly" (181)
k) "I vъzьrévъ kъ nimъ umilenama očima i spadъšemь licьmь i vьsь slьzami oblijavъ sja" (49,12б; lines23-26) = "looking at them with tender eyes and a downcast face, and bathed in tears" (181)
l) "da jeliko slyšaxu slovesa jego otъ slьzъ ne možaaxu ni slovese rešti otъ straxa že i pečali gorьky i mъnogyxъ slьzъ nъ sъ vъzdyxanijemь gorьkymь žalostьno glagolaaxu i plakaaxu sja i kъžьdo vъ dši svojei stonaaše" (49,12б,в; lines 30-32; 1-7) = "And all those hearing his words were unable to utter a single word because of tears and fear, and bitter grief, and much weeping, but with bitter sighs they wept, and each groaned in his soul and said mournfully" (181-83)

m) "blaženyi vъzъpi plačьmь gorьkyimь i pečaliju srdьčьnoju" (50-51,13б,в; lines 21-22; 1-2) = "the blessed one cried out with bitter weeping and heartfelt grief" (185)
n) "otъ dvoju plačju plačju sia i stenju dъvoju sětovaniju sětuju i tužju" (51,13б; lines 25-28) = "With twofold weeping I weep and moan, with twofold greif I greive and groan" (185)
o) "i sice jemu stenjuštju i plačjuštju sia i slъzami zemlju omačajuštju sъ vъzdyxanii častyimi boga prizyvajuštju" (51,13в, lines 25-30) = "And so, he was groaning and weeping, and wetting the earth with his tears, and calling upon God with frequent signs" (187)
p) "vъzъrévъ kъ nimъ umilenama očima i slъzami lice se umyvaja sъkrušenъmь srdcьmь sъmérenъmь razumъmь i častyimь vъzdyxanijemь vьsь slъzami razlivaja sja " (51, 13г; lines 24-31) = "He gazed at them with tender eyes, his face bathed in tears, broken in heart, humbled in mind, frequently sighing, choked with tears" (187)
q) "vižь tečenije slъzъ moixъ jako réku" (52, 14в; lines 10-12) = "See my tears flowing like a river!" (191)

9 a) "καὶ κλαύσασα πικρῶς καὶ στεναγμοῖς πολλοῖς συντρίψασα ἑαυτῆς τὴν καρδίαν" (2, 3,lines 3-4) = "after weeping bitterly and afflicting her soul with many lamentations" (2,8)

b) "ὅστις εἰσελθὼν ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔδαφος ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ κίονος κλαίων καὶ ὀλοφυρόμενος καὶ βοῶν " (29, 29,lines 12-14) = "This man came and threw himself to the ground in front of the column, weeping and lamenting and crying out" (29,24)

c) "συσχεθεὶς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδάκρυσεν" (29, 29,lines 19-20) = "he, too, was affected and burst into tears" (29,24)

d) "παρακάλει τὸν θεὸν...μετὰ δακρύων" (40, 37,line 8) = "he besought God with tears" (40,31)

e) "περιεπλάκη τῷ κίονι κλαίουσα καὶ εὐλογοῦσα τὸν θεὸν" (40, 37, lines 12-13) = "she embraced the pillar weeping and praising God" (40,34)

f) "Ὁ δὲ ὅσιος δακρύων ἐπὶ τούτους ἔφη" (45, 43,lines 2-3) = "the holy man wept with them and said..." (45,33)

g) "καὶ βοὰς λοιπὸν μετὰ δακρύων ἀνέπεμπον" (47, 45,lines 10-11) = "Their shouts were mingled with their tears" (47,34)

h) "Τῇ χάριτι δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ οὕτω κατηνύγη ὁ πιστότατος λαὸς, ὥστε τὸ ἔδαφος ῥαντισθῆναι τοῖς δάκρυσιν αὐτῶν" (58, 57,lines 15-17) = "And by the grace of God the hearts of the faithful people were so touched to the quick that they watered the ground with their tears" (58,41)

i) "Πολλῆς δὲ ἐκβοήσεως γενομένης καὶ πάντων δάκρυσιν νικωμένων" (70, 67,lines 18-19) = "A great shout arose and all were overcome [vanquished] by tears" (70,49)

j) "Καὶ ἄλλας τινὰς φωνὰς ἀνέπεμπον μετὰ δακρύων" (71, 68,lines 26-27) = "And other such exclamations they poured forth with tears" (71,50)

To summarize, it is clear from the evidence presented that the structural device of weaving subthemes and formalaic phrases into the texts, while a salient feature of "pletenie sloves" and Euthymius' style in general, was not an innovation of Euthymius or of the Hesychasts. Furthermore, the weaving of subthemes is a feature of the post-Metaphrastic texts only; whereas the use of formulaic phrases of emotion are employed in the earliest Slavic vitæ, which are examples of the pre-Metaphrastic hagiography.

We would posit that the practice of developing and interweaving subthemes into a hagiographic text as Euthymius does (thus creating many leitmotifs, as it were) is one of his contributions within the Slavic tradition of life-writing toward its total assimilation into the Metaphrastic norm.

We have now completed our inquiry into the first two structural components of the Euthymian vitæ, i.e. the weaving of subthemes and the use of formulaic phrases of emotion. The third component to be considered is the device of rhetorical questions. As stated in chapter one of this section, they are used by the author of a vita as a device to advance the narrative and signal to the reader or interlocutor a shift in focus; usually they signal and introduce sections in the narrative that deal with the deeds of the hero; or, alternately, they are used to introduce a panegyrical passage to the hero.

The oldest hagiographic texts examined here, the LAnth and the LC do not employ this device at all; the LSym(Sav) employs a rhetorical question only to introduce the panegyric to Symeon in chapter V; but the LKlOxr employs a total of ten rhetorical questions, significantly more than any of the Euthymian texts:

---

k) "καὶ προσευξαμένου αὐτοῦ μετὰ δακρύων πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθησαν" (77, 75,lines 2-4) = "and after he prayed with tears to God, they were immediately cleansed" (77,55)

l) "ὁ δε ὅσιος ἀνὴρ...συγχυθεὶς τοῖς δακρύσιν" (79, 76, lines 2-5) = "the holy man was dissolved in tears" (79,56)

m) "ὀδυρμῶν καὶ δακρύων ἀφέντες πλῆθος, ἦχον πολὺν ἀπετέλεσαν ὥσει βροντῆς" (95, 89,lines 28-30) = "they burst into such weeping and wailing that the noise of ther lamentation sounded like unto a clap of thunder" (95,67)

a) "Τίνες οὖν οἱ πατέρες οὗτοι, τάχα ζητεῖτε μαθεῖν;" (II.4,78,line 20) = "Perhaps you would like to know who these church fathers are?" (II.4,94)

b) "Τί γοῦν ποιοῦσι;" (II.6,80,line 7) = "And so, what were they to do?" (II.6,95)

c) "τίς ὁ κλῆρος, τάχα ποθεῖτε μαθεῖν" (IV [sic VI].22,94,line 18) = "Perhaps you are curious to know what this inheritance was?" (VI.22,101)

d) "Τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις τίς ἂν ἐκδιηγήσεται λόγος, ὅσα κακία λαβομένη δυναστείας εἰργάσατο" (XI.34,110,line 6) = "What speech can describe the evils that followed, once corruption was given power?" (XI.34,108)

e) "Τί παθεῖν οἴεσθε τὸν πατέρα, τί δὲ οὐκ εἰπεῖν τοσοῦτον πένθος ἐπὶ τῷ παιδὶ τοῖς ξένοις ἐλεεινῶς δυστυχήσαντα;" (XV.44,116,line 29-30) = "What, do you think, did the father feel? What did he not say to the foreigners, overwhelmed with grief and lament for his child?" (XV.44,111)

f) "Τί τοίνυν ὁ πατήρ;" (XV.46,120,line 1) = "And what did the father do?" (XV.46,112)

g) "Τὰ δὲ τοῦ Κλήμεντος οἷα; ἆρα ταῖς τιμαῖς χαυνωθεὶς καὶ ὑπὲρ ὃ ἦν ἑαυτὸν λογισάμενος εἶτα καὶ τρυφερώτερον ἔζησε, πάντα ἤδη κατωρθωκέναι οἰόμενος; ἄπαγε" (XVIII.56,124,line 24-26) = "And what were the deeds of Kliment himself? Was he not filled with pride after the honor given him, did he not esteem himself something more than he was? And after this did he not start a life of luxury, reckoning that he had achieved everything? By no means!" (XVIII.56,115)

h) "Τί δέ;" (XXI.64,130,line 19) = "And what else?" (XXI.64,117).

i) "Τί ἔτι;" (XXVI.74,140,line 17) = "What else?" (XXVI.74,122)

j) "Καὶ τί δεῖ με τάδε καὶ τάδε καταριθμεῖσθαι;"(XXVIII.78, 144, line 7) = "Must I list these things?" (XXVIII.78,124)

The LIR contains six rhetorical questions, the LHM none, the LP five, and the LPh three:

a) "Kto ubo sъkazati vъzmožetь togo ąže togda tvorěše trudy?" (LIR,II,9) = "Who can tell of the works he then did?"

b) "Slъznyj že paky togo istočnikь kto po dostoaniju izvěstitь, vъsenoštnaa že takožde stoania i kolěnopřěklonenia?" (LIR,III, 10) = "Who is worthy to recount his "fountain of tears" and also his all-night vigils and prayer?"

c) "Nǫ čto?" (LIR,III,10) = "Well, what then?"

d) "Nǫ čto ubo krotkago vladyky krotkyj učenikь?" (LIR,III,11) = "And what about the humble disciple of the Humble Ruler?"

e) "Nǫ čto ubo tvorit bogъ, iže děti ostaviti kъ nemu prixoditi povelěvyj?" (LIR,III,11) = "And what did God do, He who has commanded that we leave our children and come to Him?"

f) "Nǫ čto ubo tvoritь, iže vъsě na polzǫ tvorąj?" (LIR,V,13) = "And so what did [God] do, He who does everything to some profit?"

g) "Nь kto ubo toje po česti izrečetь děania že i čjudesa, kto blagoděania i zastupljenia i prědstatelstva...?" (LP,I,60) = "Who can relate in an honorable way her acts and miracles, who can tell of her blessed acts and defense [against evil]?"

h) "Kako uboi poréšitь prosimaa?" (LP,I,62) = "And how could she be deprived of her request?"

i) "I čto mi pročeje vь dlьgotu prostirati slovo i slova slyšateljemь usrьdie zagraždati...?" (LP,I,62) = "But why should I draw out my words, making this story longer and, thereby, thwart the zeal of its listeners...?"

j) "Kto bo toje iže togda sьnověstь slьznyj istočnikь stenania že čestaa i nepřěstannaa kto izrečetь, nizolěgania že i tomljenia vъsegdašnaa kto skažetь?" (LP,III,63) = "Who then will relate this [life], a source of tears? Who will tell of her frequent and constant weeping? Who will tell of her constant prostration and exhaustion?"

k) "Čto bo i duxu tvojemu posljemь, kotoryje pěsni, kotoraa xvaljenia, kotoryje poxvaly?" (LP,VIII,75) = "What will we send to your spirit, what songs, what laudations, what praises?"

l) "Čto bo ino bǫdetь blažajšee ili povlanjějše dušą ony, iže sebe vъsedušno bogovi vъzložívšǫą i togo zapovědemь poslěduǫštǫą?" (LPh,I,78) = "What else could be more blessed or praiseworthy than the soul which has given itself completely over to God and which follows His law?"

m) "Čto ubo iže čjudesemь bogъ?" (LPh,II,79) = "What [were] the other miracles of God?"

n) "Slъznyj že toǫ kako skažǫ istočnikь, nepréstanaa vъzdyxania, mlъčanie krasnoe, nepréstannyą molby. čąstaa kolěnopoklonenia, bestrastie konečnoe, ljuby ąže o bozě, aggelskoe žitelstvo i ina takova, taže o božlьstъvnějpokaza ljubvi?" (LPh,VI,87)= "How can I tell of her spring of tears, her constant sighing, her beautiful quietude, her constant prayer, frequent kneeling, her endless stoicism, her love for God, her angelic life, and such things which she showed in divine love?"

The device of using rhetorical questions in the narrative of the saint's life clearly predates the Euthymian tradition. Based on the texts used for this study, the device of weaving of subthemes appears only in those texts of the post-Metaphrastic period.

The fourth component of the structural devices of the Euthymian vitæ that we must consider is the comparison topos, whereby the hero of a life is compared favorably to a biblical or holy predecessor, or to some natural phenomenon, such as a celestial object. If one compares all the instances of the use of the comparison topos in all of the texts included in this study, the figures suggest a rise in the use of this topos in texts of the post-Metaphrastic period. The LPh contains only two examples of the comparison topos, but the LHM contains seven, the LP eight and the LIR fifteen. The LSym(Sav) contains nine, the LKlOxr six, and the LTheod eight; whereas the LAnth and the LC contain only four.

The fifth, and last, structural component of the Euthymian vita that must be taken into consideration is that of genre-mixing, specifically the insertion of panegyrics into the narrative of a hagiographic text. Not only do some pre-Euthymian hagiographic texts of non-Slavic origin contain panegyrics -- such as the LAnth (see chapter 87), the LKlOxr (see chapter

29) -- but so do some pre-Euthymian hagiographic texts of Slavic origin -- such as the LSym(Sav)[10] and the Narrative of Boris and Gleb.[11]

To conclude our inquiry into the style and structure of the Euthymian vitæ, we can summarize our findings in the following statements:

1) None of the rhetorical devices employed in the hagiographic texts of Euthymius are new to the genre. The rhetorical devices appear in texts belonging to all periods in the development of the genre. What is new in the post-Metaphrastic tradition (beginning in Byzantine hagiography in the tenth century and in Slavic hagiograpy of the late twelfth/early thirteenth century) is the extent to which these devices are used, as in the LKlOxr, LSym(Sav), the LTheod, and the vitæ of Euthymius. In particular should be noted the fact that in the post-Metaphrastic tradition, the device of lexical anaphora becomes much more common, and long appositional series enter the genre in the post-Metaphrastic period from other forms of encomiastic literature. In terms of structural components, rhetorical questions and the comparison topos become much more prevalent in the post-Metaphrastic hagiographic texts.

2) The weaving of subthemes appears as a structural element in the hagiographic genre only in those texts of the post-Metaphrastic period. Euthymius uses this device every bit as much as his Byzantine predecessors, such as Theophylact and Kallistos, and significantly more than any of his predecessors in the Slavic hagiographic tradition.

3) Within the category of the weaving subthemes, the weaving of formulaic phrases of emotion appears, on the whole, to no greater extent in the vitæ of Euthymius than in earlier texts. Unlike the feature of weaving of subthemes, this device appears to some degree in the earliest of Slavic vitæ, e.g. the LC and the Narrative of Boris and Gleb, and in the sixth-century Byzantine vita LDanStyl, all of which were written according to the stylistic and structural norms of pre-Metaphrastic texts.

4) The device of rhetorical questions is not used to any greater extent by Euthymius than by his post-Metaphrastic predecessors. The device, however, begins to appear in the hagiographic texts examined for this study

---

10 See Section III, Chapter 2, fn.99.

11 See Kantor, op.cit.,199.

only in the post-Metaphrastic period. The LAnth and the LDanStyl and the earliest Slavic hagiographic texts do not employ this feature at all.

5) The comparison topos prevails in the hagiographic texts of all periods, from the LAnth to Euthymius. There is, however, a significant rise in the frequency of the use of this topos in post-Metaphrastic texts.

6) To return to a question raised in the first chapter of this section, the phenomenon of genre-mixing in hagiographic texts to include panegyrics (and even sermons, as in the LAnth, see chapters 16-60) is as old as the genre itself. Panegyrics can be found in hagiographic texts dating back to the time of the Early Desert Fathers, through the Metaphrastic period and the post-Metaphrastic period, down to Euthymius. Furthermore, this kind of generic intermixing is common to medieval literature in general, not just to the fourteenth century or to one particular school within that period.[12]

In terms of style and structure, then, there is not a single component of Euthymius' texts that can be deemed original. Every rhetorical feature and structural component can be traced to earlier sources -- both pre- and

---

12 See Д.С.Лихачов (=Лихачев), "Старославянските литератури като система," *Литературна мисъл* 1 (1969): 3-38. On p. 23 he writes: "Понятието 'произведение' е по-сложно в средновековната литература, отколкото в новата. Произведението--това е и летопис, и включващите се в летописа отделни повести, жития, послания. То е и житие като цяло, и отделни описания на чудеса, 'похвали,' песнопения, които се включват в това житие. Поради това отделните части на произведението могат да принадлежат на различни жанрове, а тъй като през средните векове художественият метод е тясно свързан с жанра на произведението, то в различните свои части произведението е могло да бъде написано по различни художествени методи." ("The notion of a 'work' is more complex in medieval literature than in contemporary literature. If the work be a chronicle, then the chronicle is comprised of separate tales, lives, epistles. And the vita as a whole contains separate descriptions of miracles, 'panegyrics,' psalmody, which are all included in the vita. Because of this, the separate parts of a work can belong to different genres; and because the medieval artistic method is closely bound up with the genre of the work, then in its different parts the work can be written according to different artistic methods.")

For studies on the question of genre idenfication specifically within medieval Slavic literature, cf. Dmitrij Čiževskij, "On the Question of Genres in Old Russian Literature," *Harvard Slavic Studies* 2 (1954): 105-115; Norman W. Ingham, "Genre-Theory and Old Russian Literature," *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 31 (1987): 234-245; Gail Lenhoff, "Categories of Early Russian Writing," *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 31 (1987): 259-279; G. Lenhoff, "Toward a Theory of Protogenres in Medieval Russian Letters," *The Russian Review* 43 (1984): 31-54; and Klaus-Dieter Seeman, "Genres and the Alterity of Old Russian Literature," *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 31 (1987): 246-258.

post-Metaphrastic -- all of which predate the period of the fourteenth-century Hesychastic Revival. Euthymius certainly employed abundantly the devices of weaving subthemes and the comparison topos -- already found in such pre-Hesychast Byzantine predecessors as Theophylact and to a more limited extent in the Serbian *Life of Symeon* by Sava -- but he did not introduce these techniques into the genre.

The next section of this work will examine the history of the Hesychastic movement and its importance for the Slavs; the content of the vitæ of Euthymius (specifically, the ways in which the texts reflect and allude to the tenets of Hesychast mysticism); and the last chapter will attempt to characterize the Metaphrastic and Euthymian aesthetic within the framework of literary theory.

Section IV

Byzantine Hesychasm, the Religious Content of the Vitæ, and Metaliterary Considerations

Chapter 1: On the Origins of Hesychasm and its Role in Orthodox Slavic Culture

> Each day, as it comes, brings its own shadow for the soul, and the nights, taking over the troubles of the day, beguile the mind with the same phantasies. There is but one escape from these distractions, a complete separation from the world.[1]
>
> --*Saint Basil the Great*

Hesychasm and Early Christianity:

In order to better understand the content of Hesychasm in the vitæ by Patriarch Euthymius and the significance of the movement for fourteenth-century Slavic and Byzantine religious life, it is appropriate that we should first examine in some detail the origins and history of the movement and its manifestation in Slavic Orthodox culture.

Many scholars who have dealt with the subject of Hesychasm, its dissemination among the Slavs in Bulgaria, Serbia[2] and East Slavdom, and its assumed consequences for literary creation in these lands, tend to approach the issue from primarily one perspective; namely, Hesychasm's fourteenth-century Byzantine revival and not its entire history as a mystical movement.[3] The term "Hesychasm", in fact, designates different things

---

[1] Epistle II [Benedictine order] of St. Basil to Gregory Nazianzus, in *St. Basil, Letters 1-185*, The Fathers of the Church, vol.13, New York: The Fathers of the Church, 1951, p.6.

[2] For general studies on Hesychasm in Serbia, cf. В.Розов, "Синаитцы в Сербии в XIV веке,"*Byzantinoslavica* 1 (1929): 16-20; M.Vasić, "L'hésychasme dans l'Église et l'art des Serbes au Moyen Âge," in *L'art byzantin chez les Slaves, Receuil dédié à la mémoire de Theodore Uspenskij*, 1, 110-123, Paris, 1930; and A.E. Tachioas, "Le monachisme serbe de saint Sava et la tradition hésychaste athonite," in *Хиландарски зборник*, vol.I, 83-90, edited by G.Ostrogorsky, Belgrade: Српска Академија наука и уметности, 1966.

[3] The most comprehensive scholarship to date done on the history of the movement is that of Professor John Meyendorff, who is cited extensively in this chapter. For some other good general overviews, consult J.Bois, "Les hésychastes avant le XIVe siècle," *Échos d'Orient* 1 (1901): 1-11; J.Bois, "Les débuts de la controverse hésychaste," *Échos d'Orient* 5 (1902): 353-362; Игнатий Брянчанинов, *О молитве Исусовой*, Санкт-Петербург, 1867; I.Hauscherr "La méthode d'oraison hésychaste,"*Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 9.2 (1927): 101-210; I.Hauscherr, "Les grands courants de la spiritualité orientale," *Orientalia christiana periodica* 1 (1935): 114-138; I.Hauscherr,

depending on where it is examined on the time line of its long evolution. The history of this branch of mysticism spans over a thousand years, from the times of the early Desert mystics of the fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian era to the period of the theological polemics between Gregory Palamas (1296-1359) and Barlaam the Calabrian (ca.1290-ca.1348) in fourteenth-century Byzantium; and the Hesychast tradition continues to survive even into the twentieth century.

This chapter will trace the origins of Hesychastic mysticism from the early Desert Fathers to the fourteenth-century Byzantine Athonite revival, which culminated with the formulation of the defense of the movement by Palamas and the spread of the movement to Slavic lands through the teaching of Gregory the Sinaite. Before venturing into an investigation of the origins and influences of Hesychasm on Slavic culture, one must first understand the roots of that influence.

We can use as a point of departure for our own investigation the four definitions of Hesychasm proposed by John Meyendorff, all of which are interrelated to some extent but have to be understood within a separate historical framework.[4] He writes that Hesychasm, first, "designates the phenomenon of Christian monastic life, based on contemplation and 'pure prayer', of which the writings of the great Evagrius Ponticus (fourth century) are the first articulate expression."[5] Secondly, he writes that Hesychasm also refers to a mystical tradition of meditative prayer and

---

"Hésychasme et prière," *Orientalia christiana analecta* 176 (1966): 1-308; Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia, "The Holy Name of Jesus in East and West: the Hesychasts and Richard Rolle," *Sobornost: E.C.R* 4.2 (1982): 163-184; George A. Maloney, *Russian Hesychasm: The Spirituality of Nil Sorskij*, The Hague: Mouton, 1973, pp. 269-279; Г.А. Острогорский, "Афонские исихасты и их противники, (К истории поздневизантийской культуры)," *Записки Русского научного института в Белграде*, 5, Белград, 1931; M Mulić, "Pletenije sloves i hesihazam," *Radovi zavoda za slovensku filologiju* 7 (Zagreb,1965): 141-156, esp.pp.150-155; Н.Кочев, "Идейно-теоретические корни исихазма," *Études balkaniques* 1 (1973): 41-61.

[4] See J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Hesychasm: Historical, Theological and Social Problems*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1974. See also pp.447-452 of his more recent article,"Is 'Hesychasm' the Right Word? Remarks on Religious Ideology in the Fourteenth Century," Okeanos, Festschrift on the Sixtieth Birthday of Ihor Ševčenko, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1983): 447-456.

[5] See introduction to Meyendorff, *Byzantine Hesychasm*. Pages of the introduction are unnumbered.

specific psychosomatic disciplines which, as Hesychasm gained ground amongst these early desert monks, became increasingly and eventually inseparably associated with the monks (Hesychasts) who embraced it, thereby obtaining the designation "Hesychasm." Thirdly, Meyendorff writes that Hesychasm also refers to the theological system proposed by Gregory Palamas in his Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχαζόντων, written as a defense of the methods of prayer practiced by Gregory's fellow Hesychasts against the charges of heresy levelled by Barlaam.[6] Fourthly, and lastly, Meyendorff asserts the existence of a "political Hesychasm", that is, the social, cultural and political ideology which Byzantium exported, as it were, to the Balkan Slavs and later to East Slavic lands.

One of the objectives of this chapter is to examine which elements of the Hesychast tradition were passed on to medieval Slavic culture; therefore, we will have to determine to what extent this fourth distinction of Hesychasm made by Meyendorff is a composite of the first three elements or whether it excludes any of them.

The term "Hesychasm" comes from the Greek word "ἡσυχία", meaning "silence" or "quietude". The term "Hesychast", or "ἡσυχαστής", (meaning therefore "one who practices quietude or silence") had been used to designate a monk since the beginnings of Christian monastic history.[7] During this period of the early Desert Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, to be a monk meant by virtue of its root ("μόνος" = alone, single) to live the life of a hermit. Although many early monks lived in isolation in the desert, it seem that from the earliest times anchoritic

---

[6] The work consists of nine treatises that are divided into three parts. For this reason it is sometimes referred to as the Triads.

[7] Cf. J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Chruch*, Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982, p.168. This work will be referred to hereafter by the abbreviation *BL*.

Cf. also Mulić, "Pletenije sloves i hesihazam," p.151; he writes: "This much is clear: in the early Byzantine period, Hesychasm was seen as synonymous with the life of a hermit" ("Stvar je jasna: u ranobizantijsko doba hesihazam se poistovećuje s pustinjaštvom."). N. Kočev (Н.Кочев), in his article "Идейно-теоретические корни исихазма," *Études balkaniques* 1 (Sofia, 1973): 48-61, p.48, echoes Mulić's opinion, noting that in the early Byzantine period Hesychasm was "identified with a hermit's life" ("в ранневизантийскую эпоху исихазм был отождествляем с отшельничеством").

communities existed alongside cenobitic ones. Achieving the quietude of spiritual stillness ("ἡσυχία") was the main purpose for leading such a life of seclusion and asceticism. The term "ἡσυχαστής" appears in the writings of Evagrius Ponticus (345/6-399) and his friend St. Gregory of Nyssa (335-395), who together with his brother, St. Basil the Great, and St. Gregory Nazianzus, made up the group known as the Cappadocian Fathers.

In the writings of these men, "Hesychasm" is used to designate the life of a monk in general, not a religious movement or group apart from the common monastic practice contemporary to them. "Hesychasm" as a term to identify a distinct religious and mystical movement was not used until the fourteenth-century Byzantine revival of the Hesychastic methods of prayer, largely resuscitated by Gregory the Sinaite and a supporter of his teachings, Gregory Palamas. As a result of this revival, the practitioners of this meditative prayer became identified formally as a group. Before the revival, the Hesychast ascetics had been identified in the East simply as practitioners of an ongoing tradition of meditative prayer.

From the time of Evagrius, Hesychasm became associated with a particular philosophy behind the act of prayer. Evagrius interpreted New Testament references to constant prayer[8] as the ultimate method of spiritual purification.[9] Evagrius did not prescribe the repetition of one particular prayer (though he did extol the healing power of the Psalms). It would not be until the mystical writings of Pseudo-Macarius[10], St. Diadochus of Photice, and especially St. John Climacus that Hesychast mysticism became centered on and firmly rooted in the practice of one specific prayer, the Jesus Prayer, or "prayer of the heart" (i.e., "Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me, a sinner," or "Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ ὑιὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐλεείσον με τὸν ἁμαρτωλόν"), which was extremely common in

[8] e.g. Mt 6.6, 1 Thess 5.17.

[9] Cf. J. Meyendorff, *Saint Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974, pp.20-23. This work will be referred to hereafter by the abbreviation *SGP&OS*.

[10] Macarius is more correctly referred to as Pseudo-Macarius as modern scholarship has discovered that the works historically attributed to St. Macarius had been done so erroneously. St. Macarius was Evagrius' spiritual master in the Egyptian desert of Scete. In the few of his apophthegmata (short, instructive sayings) which are still extant, he shows himself to be one of the first practitioners of Evagrian "pure prayer."

the earliest Byzantine liturgies. The Jesus Prayer later becomes shortened to simply a repetition of the name of Jesus.

The Jesus Prayer is so essentially tied to Hesychastic spirituality that a study of the origins of Hesychasm or its Byzantine revival would be incomplete without an investigation into the origins and practices of the prayer itself. Moreover, the Jesus Prayer tradition must be understood in order to understand the Palamite controversies, which were caused by the Hesychasts' traditional methods of prayer and their goal to attain a vision of the "Divine" or "Taboric Light".

The tradition of this contemplative prayer among the Hesychasts has a long history of practice, the origins of which are not entirely clear, and a long evolution as a doctrine, which is codified in the extant writings of many important figures in Orthodox patristic theology.

The Jesus Prayer is an ancient prayer. It is known that constant repetition of the Jesus Prayer in the Eastern Church goes back to the Desert Fathers,[11] and that mysticism associated with the name of God goes back at least as far as the ancient Hebrews. Gillet writes that Yahweh "was a kind of entity detachable from the divine person, a greatness existing in itself, alongside this person."[12] In pre-Christian pagan culture, too, the invocation of the name of the deity played an important role. Gillet notes that it is found among the Mandaeans and the cults of Isis and Astarte.[13]

Because the ancient Hebrews associated mystical powers with the utterance of the name Yahweh, Gillet notes that a concept of spirituality naturally developed in which the utterance could either constitute a "sanctification of the name" (kiddush hashem) or a "profanation of the name", (hillul hashem).[14] It is presumably this tradition that the Christian world inherited as a direct model for its veneration of the name of Christ.

---

[11] Cf. Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, p.24, and L.Gillet, *The Jesus Prayer*, edited by Kallistos Ware, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987, p.30.

[12] Gillet, op.cit., 23.

[13] Gillet, op.cit., 23.

[14] Gillet, op.cit., 23-25.

One of the first Christian writers to allude to the power contained in the name of Jesus was Hermas in the Shepherd (2nd century,AD) who says "to bear the name of the Son of God...[is] to lay aside mortality and to assume life."[15] Origen (3rd century AD), in his *Contra Celsum*, writes, "Even today the name of Jesus frees people from mental distraction, puts devils to flight, cures the sick."[16]

Throughout these early centuries of Christianity the name of Jesus Christ was invoked in prayer, but no formal theology of a Jesus Prayer tradition was elaborated until the sixth-century Sinaite monasticism[17], largely by St. John Climacus, who will be discussed in more detail below.

Even the Cappadocian Fathers, contemporaries of Evagrius and Ps-Macarius do not develop the theme of the name of Jesus as a formal meditative device.[18] Nor does one find any special mention in the writings of the contemporaries of the Cappadocians, Athanasius or John Chrysostom. Indeed, the only Cappadocian Father from which Palamas draws heavily in his defense of the Hesychast tradition of the Jesus Prayer is Gregory of Nyssa, the only mystic amongst the Fathers. [19]

Meanwhile in the West, St. Ambrose (fourth century AD) became interested in the connection between deep spiritual meditation and the name of Jesus. Gillet writes, "Acording to [St. Ambrose, Jesus'] name was contained in Israel like perfume in a vessel."[20] St. Paulinas of Nola (354-431) and Pope St. Damascus (366-84) were also contributors to the theology of the name of Jesus.

The absence of an elaborated tradition of repeating the name of Jesus in prayer amongst the early Desert Fathers does not lead conclusively to any assumption that they did not practice such a prayer. On the contrary,

---

[15] As quoted by Gillet, op.cit., 25.

[16] As quoted by Gillet, op.cit., 28. Origen is alluding to Acts 19.

[17] Gillet, op.cit., 35.

[18] Gillet, op.cit., 31.

[19] Gillet, op.cit., 30.

[20] Gillet, op.cit., 29.

the appearance of a later tradition among the Islamic mystics, the "dikhr" (also a prayer of the Divine Name), could suggests a direct influence from an earlier but unattested Christian tradition of the Jesus Prayer on Islam.[21] Gillet notes that two early (fourth century) apophthegmata of Syrian origin, collected by Bousset, are devoted to the mysticism of the name of Jesus.[22]

The fourth-century Desert Fathers used the Κύριε ἐλεείσον formula in which God, not the Son, Jesus, is invoked.[23] Gillet's conclusion is that this tradition of short prayer became fused among the Hesychasts with the name of the Son, and the result was the Jesus Prayer.[24]

Evagrius Ponticus was one of the first intellectuals to adopt the life of the early desert ascetics and is the first important figure in the history of a doctrine of the Jesus Prayer.[25] Meyendorff writes that Evagrius was not "content with the ascetic practices [of his fellow monks] and manner of prayer, so he tried to integrate them into a metaphysical and anthropological system inspired by Neoplatonism."[26] Since according to platonic philosophy man was possessed of a divine mind, which existed naturally and without matter, he was anthropologically defined as a divine mind trapped within a corporeal prison. Evagrius seemed to have found in this philosophy a justification, as suggested by Meyendorff[27], for the desert life

---

21 See L.Gardet, "Un problème de mystique comparée: la mention du Nom divin -- dikhr-- dans la mystique musulmane," *Revue Thomiste* 3 (1952): 642-679; reprint 4 (1953): 197-216. See also Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 62.

22 Gillet, op.cit., 31.

23 See the *Life of Daniel the Stylite*. The Greek text is found in *Les saints stylites*, edited by H. Delehaye, 1-94, Subsidia Hagiographica, no.14. Brussels: Société des bollandistes, 1923. An English translation may be found in *Three Byzantine Saints*, edited by E. Dawes and H. Baynes, 1-72, Crestwood,NY: St. Valdimir's Seminary Press, 1977. In chapter 33 ones finds this passage: "μετὰ καρύων ἔκραζον τὸ Κύριε ἐλεήσον" (32, 33, line15).The English passage reads: "and with tears [he] kept shouting 'kyrie eleeison' (Lord have mercy!)" (Dawes, 26).

24 Gillet, op.cit.,31.

25Meyendorff, *BL*, 168.

26Meyendorff, *SPG&OS*, 20.

27 Meyendorff, *BL*, 168.

that he had embraced: one went to the desert, according to this justification, to forget the material, abjure the physical and the corporeal in order to develop and fortify the mind as an instrument of God.

In the century before Evagrius lived, neoplatonic philosophy had been employed by Origen, as a Christian theologian, whose aim was to elaborate a complete Christian philosophy based on the Scriptures and the works of Plato. Plato's writings were cleary influential in the formulation of Hesychastic doctrine; the categories of the primordial state of man in which his reason and understanding are unclouded and pure, a spiritual ascent, the ultimate contemplation (θεωρία) resulting in a vision of the bright sun during which one beholds a godlike face are all concepts common to Plato and the Hesychasts, particularly as elaborated in the fourteenth century under Gregory the Sinaite.[28] Plato's ideas reached later Hesychast intellectuals through the medium of such Christian, neoplatonic writers as Origen and Evagrius.

Louth, however, cautions us from making the assumption that there is more correspondence than actually existed between Origenistic and Platonic philosophy. He underscores the point that although Origen may have found in Platonic concepts a way of expressing the Christian's spiritual ascent, Origen's concepts, nevertheless, mean something very different from what Plato or Plotinus intended. "Origen is talking about the life of a baptized Christian within the Church; Plato and Plotinus about the search for ultimate truth by an intellectual élite."[29]

Evagrius drew directly from Origen in his neoplatonic sympathies.[30] Long after his death, Evagrius was condemned by the ecumenical Council of 553 for his Origenistic theology[31]; however, despite the supposed

---

[28] See A. Louth's discussion of Plato in *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition From Plato to Denys*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981, pp.1-17.

[29] ibid., 53.

[30] See К. Станчев, *Поетика на старобългарска литература*, София: Наука и изкуство, 1982, p.13. He writes that the ideas of Origen were most widely developed in the writings of the Cappadocian Fathers, especially in those of Gregory of Nyssa. According to Gregory, the most important goal of man is the knowledge of God's beauty [божествената красота].

[31] Meyendorff, *BL*, 169.

heretical nature of Evagrius' writings, they continued to be circulated and read, often under the pseudonym of St. Nilus. Meyendorff writes that Evagrius, better than any other early teacher of monastic spirituality "formulated...that fundamental doctrine on prayer which will inspire the hesychasts in all later centuries."[32]

The early spiritual fathers taught that the way to discover "ἡσυχία", through which one obtained the highest possible communion with God, was through a life of solitude and silence. Evagrius Ponticus was living the life of an ascetic when he formulated his doctrine on prayer. The doctrine was adopted by his fellow monks and became associated with them. This was the notion of "pure prayer", or "mental prayer" (νοερὰ προσευχή), as he called it. Evagrius taught that the practice of this kind of prayer should be the goal of everyone.

Evagrius' doctrine itself was simple in essence, but it called for extreme intellectual and spiritual discipline: the most important activity toward spiritual improvement was prayer, specifically "mental prayer"[33], and this was the only activity that one should be concerned with: "prayer without ceasing" as it is stated in 1 Thess 5.17. In the *Life of St. Anthony* (written between 356 and 357), Athanasius writes that "he prayed continually, because he learned that one must pray in secret without ceasing."[34]

It seems that by choosing "mental prayer" as a term, Evagrius was not only revealing his own neoplatonic convictions, but he was advocating a mode of prayer in which one employs primarily the forces of concentration. In addition to exalting statements on the practice of prayer in and of itself (e.g. "Prayer is the ascent of the intellect to God", and "Prayer is the energy which accords with the dignity of the intellect; it is

---

32 ibid.,168.

33 See Д. Ангелов, "Към историята на религиозно-философската мисъл в средновековна България--исихазъм и варлаамитство," *Българското историческо дружество* 25 (София, 1967): 73-92, p.79.

34 For the English text, see *Early Christian Biographies*, The Fathers of the Church, no.15, edited by R.J. Deferrari, New York: Fathers of the Church, 1952, chapter 3, p.137. The original texts reads: "Προσηύχετο δὲ συνεχῶς, μαθὼν, ὅτι δεῖ κατ' ἰδίαν προσεύχεσθαι ἀδιαλείπτως." (See J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiæ Græcæ*, vol.26, p.845).

the intellect's true and highest activity"[35]), one finds specific quotations in Evagrius' "Chapters on Prayer" that point to a definition of "mental prayer". For Evagrius, "mental prayer" first of all implies mental concentration:

> [35]. Undistracted prayer is the highest intellection of the intellect.
> [42]. Whether you pray with brethren or alone, try to pray not simply as a routine, but with conscious awareness of your prayer.
> [43]. Conscious awareness of prayer is concentration accompanied by reverence, compunction and distress of the soul as it confesses its sins with inward sorrow.[36]

Secondly, "pure prayer" implies control over the intellect, whose seat, along with the soul, is in the mind:

> [52]. We practise the virtues in order to achieve contemplation of the Logos whogives them their being: and He manifests Himself when we are in the state of prayer.
> [54]. He who wishes to pray truly must not only control his...power and his desire, but must also free himself from every impassioned thought.[37]

In addition to these precepts, Evagrius, true to his neoplatonic roots, includes as a prerequisite for "pure prayer" the separation of mind from body; and the suspension of all bodily and evil sensations:

> [62]. When your intellect in its great longing for God gradually withdraws from the flesh and turns away from all thoughts that have their source in your sense-perception, memory or soul-body temperament, and when it becomes full of reverence and joy, then you may conclude that you are close to the frontiers of prayer.
> [64]. He fills [the intellect] with whatever knowledge He wishes; and through the intellect He calms the uncontrolled impulses in the body.
> [105]. Detach yourself from concern for the body when you pray; do not let the sting of a flea or a fly, the bite of a louse or a mosquito, deprive you of the fruit of your prayer.[38]

---

[35]Quoted from the *Philokalia*, ed.by Kallistos Ward, et al., vol.1, London: Faber and Faber, 1979, from Evagrius' work "On Prayer", or "Chapters on Prayer", nos. 36 and 48, pp.60, 65 respectively.

[36] ibid., 60.

[37] ibid., 61-62.

[38] ibid., 62-3, 67.

As Meyendorff observes, it is with the writings of Evagrius that "the desert anchorites began to speak the language of the Christian *didascaleion* of Alexandria."[39] Because of Evagrius' writings, New Testament precepts on prayer for these monks became the way of meditation. Evagrius himself taught that only through this kind of prayer could human beings restore their natural relationship with God; and as the only part of the human organism that was naturally divine was the mind, it was then through the mind, by way of "mental prayer", that this relationship could be restored.[40] His followers took his doctrine so much to heart that they rejected everything but prayer and deliberately withdrew from cenobitic communities.[41]

This shift of Hesychast spirituality away from an Origenistic orientation was largely accomplished by the *Spiritual Homilies* of Ps-Macarius. With Ps-Macarius, the mystical writings of Evagrius on "pure prayer" receive a christocentric interpretation.[42] As Christianity had no need to make a separation of mind and body (after all, Christ was human and divine, body and mind together) one could employ both to sanctify the whole being. The Neoplatonic opposition of the body and mind could be discarded in favor of a concept of the mind and body working together in unison towards purification, a concept based on the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation.[43] The incarnation of God in Christ into an entire human person was a demonstration of the fact that both the body and the soul could be sanctified.[44]

---

[39] Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 20.

[40] Meyendorff, *BL*, 168.

[41] Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 21.

[42] Meyendorff, *BL*, 169.

[43] Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 24. He suggests that the concept of man as a single whole in the Macarian vocabulary is inspired by the Stoics as well as by the Bible.

[44] See Д.Ангелов, "Към историята," 77. He writes that the Hesychasts were against the Bogomils and other Dualists who thought that only man's soul is inspired by God, and his body is a creation of an evil power. They maintained that both soul and body stem from God, and the flesh is his temple. They wanted to renew the spiritual tie between man and God that had been broken by sin, i.e. for man to restore himself to the state of Adam, as

In this christocentric reinterpretation, the soul is seated not in the mind but in that organ of the body through which the incarnate God is accessible: the heart. According to the writings of Ps-Macarius, one should employ the heart, since that is where the Name of the Incarnate Word dwells in all humans.[45] With Ps-Macarius, the Evagrian "mental prayer" becomes reinterpreted as "the prayer of the heart."

This historical development in the history of Hesychastic spirituality takes a broad leap between the writings of Evagrius and Ps-Macarius. With Evagrius, the Hesychasts are for the first time associated not only with the ascetic practices they embraced as early Christian monks, but also with a particular philosophical approach to the act of praying itself. With Ps-Macarius' writings, the Jesus Prayer -- as a formal discipline discussed later by Diadochus (fifth century) and John Climacus (sixth century) -- is clearly on its way to being incorporated into the canon of Hesychastic spirituality. Ps-Macarius' contribution is the mysticism of the heart, around which the Jesus Prayer philosophy of the Hesychasts is elaborated. With SS Diadochus and John Climacus, the Hesychasts -- in addition to being associated with the revised Macarian philosophical approach to prayer, "prayer of the heart" -- come to be identified by their practice of one specific prayer, the Jesus Prayer:

> For [Diadochus and John Climacus], prayer was basically a simple though difficult displine of "keeping one's mind in the heart," of "placing" there the name of Jesus--since the name of God is identified with the presence of the divine person Himself--or of "attaching the name of Jesus to one's breath" (St. John Climacus).[46]

Another important figure in the formation of Hesychastic doctrine is Ps-Dionysius. According to his mystical system, the path of mystical ecstasy -- which is attainable only for a select few and which is directly tied to an anchoritic life [47]-- leads to a knowledge of godliness, to a closeness

---

Gregory the Sinaite preached, to renew the "premordial perfection" (първобитно съвършенство) that was man's before his fall from grace.

[45] Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 38.

[46] Meyendorff, *BL*, 171.

[47] See K. Stančev's (К. Станчев) discussion of the Areopagite's teachings in *Поетика на старобългарската литература*, p.15. He writes: "In the system of Pseudo-

with God. According to Ps-Dionysius, one could be bapised anew in the pursuit of monasticism.[48]

The founding of the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai in 527 by Emperor Justinian I was to have enormous impact on the spread of Christian culture in general, and specifically on the development of an elaborate Jesus Prayer tradition among the Hesychasts and its diffusion. The spirituality of the "Taboric Light" had come to represent the Hesychasts' goal of prayer[49] -- to have the Divine Light of God revealed to them as it had been revealed to Jesus' disciples on Mt. Tabor. Origen in the third century and St. Gregory of Nyssa in the fourth century had linked this light mysticism to the Biblical image of Moses on Mt. Sinai. In fact, the Hesychasts' elaboration of a mysticism of the Taboric Light can already be seen in Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Moses*.[50] As Meyendorff points out, it was appropriate that the Hesychast spirituality should flourish on the "very spot where God had given the Law of people [to Moses]."[51] It is here that the Jesus Prayer tradition as a formal mystical theology of the Heschasts was elaborated.

A century before the founding of the monastery on Mt.Sinai, St. Diadochus of Photice (400-486?), whom Meyendorff credits as being "a great popularizer of desert spirituality of the Byzantine world"[52], wrote

---

Dionysius there are two ways to acquire a knowledge of the divine, to [attain] a closeness with God. One is the path of mystical ecstacy, which is for a select few and which is directly tied to the practice of an anchoritic life [отшелничеството]. This line is continued even by later Byzantine thinkers...and leads eventually to the theory and practice of Hesychasm in the 14th century."

48 See Николай Кочев, page 49 of his article "Идейно-теоретические корни исихазма," *Études balkaniques* 1 (1973): 48-61.

49 See Д.Ангелов, op.cit.,79-80; see also, Bois, "Les hésychastes avant le XIVe siècle," 10, writes that according to the Hesychasts, the Divine Light is the way God manifests himself in the soul of the Hesychast, a result of the physical and spiritual disciplines. The Light penetrates the soul, purifying and sanctifying.

50 See A. Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition From Plato to Denys*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981, p.84.

51 Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 32.

52 ibid., 30.

his work *On Spiritual Knowledge and Discrimination* in which he employed both Evagrian vocabulary and Macarian concepts to insist on the oneness of the mind and body and on the invocation of the name Jesus:[53]

> [31]. When our intellect begins to perceive the grace of the Holy Spirit, then, Satan, too, importunes the soul with a sense of deceptive sweetness in the quiet times of the night, when we fall into a light kind of sleep. If the intellect at that time cleaves fervently to the remembrance of the glorious name of the Lord Jesus and uses it as a weapon against Satan's deception, he gives up this trick and for the future will attack the soul directly and personally. As a result the intellect clearly discerns the deception of the evil one and advances even further into the art of discrimination.[54]

The founding of the Jesus Prayer tradition as a formal practice is credited however to the great Sinaite doctor St. John Climacus (580-650).[55] In his mystical work *The Ladder* (or Κλῖμαξ in Greek, whence his name), St. John continued the Macarian theme of the heart mysticism and adds to the tradition one of its most important components: a particular role of the body in prayer. Bois writes that Climacus devotes a long chapter in his treatise on ἡσυχία; but he goes a step further by distinguishing between the notions of "Hesychasm of the body" (ἡσυχία σώματος) and "Hesychasm of the mind" (ἡσυχία ψυχῆς).[56] Both are necessary for θεωρία (contemplation) and a vision of the Divine Light. This is what forms the basis of Gregory the Sinaite's teachings of πράξις and θεωρία, or, in Slavonic, dějanie and sъzerzanie. Climacus also writes of the ἁρπαγὴ πρὸς Κύριον, the "rapt en Dieu" (or the "seizure in God"), and the "gift of tears." Meyendorff suggests that the tradition of Hesychast psychosomatic prayer may have begun with the writings of St. John Climacus, rather than in the High Middle Ages, as is usually suggested. Meyendorff writes:

---

53 *Philokalia*, 251.

54 ibid., 261.

55 See Gillet, op.cit.,39; see also p.37 for mention of SS John and Barsanuphius, two other 6th century representatives of Sinaite spirituality. The two lived in a monastery near Gaza, wrote letters, over 840 of which are still extant, on spiritual matters. These letters apparently were not a personal correspondence, but were intended as edifying reading for others. In them is stressed the importance of the name of Jesus.

56 Bois, "Les hésychastes avant le XIV siècle," 4.

> Certain passages might even lead us to believe that the Sinaitic abbot already knew the practice of uniting the Jesus Prayer to breathing, later adopted by the 14th-century hesychasts. Hence, it is not surprising to find many references to *The Ladder* in later authors, such as Nicephorus the Hesychast, Gregory of Sinai, and Gregory Palamas. The exceptional authority of Climacus even led the Byzantine Church to celebrate his memory on the fifth [sic., fourth] Sunday of Lent, thus ranking him first among the spiritual and ascetic doctors.[57]

The first appearance of the appellation "Jesus Prayer" (εὐχή τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) is so far attributed to a work which was written after St. John Climacus, though it has been falsely attributed to St. Hesychius, a priest at Jerusalem (c.450).[58] The work quotes Climacus and was probably composed by a monk or group of monks associated with the Batos (burning bush) monastery on Sinai.

So far we have examined briefly the origins of the particular Hesychastic philosophy on prayer, which finds its first expression in the vocabulary of the Evagrian "pure prayer", and the origins of the Hesychasts' adoption of one specific prayer. With the adoption of the Jesus Prayer as a means of putting Evagrian and Macarian philosophical approaches to prayer in practice, two important components of the Hesychastic mystical tradition have been examined. The third component of the Hesychast method of prayer is the psychosomatic element of the tradition, the actual physiological discipline of controlled breathing and bodily position, with the eyes' gaze fixed on the stomach. The discipline of controlled breathing practiced by the Hesychasts was done in order to locate the area of the heart, "en cherchant à découvrir la région du coeur"[59]; and, as Bois points out, the heart was considered by the Hesychasts to be the center of the soul, the seat of God and the Divine Light.

The combination of this psychosomatic element of controlled breathing with the element of repeating again and again the name of Jesus has led some to draw comparisons between the Hesychastic tradition and

---

57 Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 35.

58 Gillet, op.cit., 40.

59 Bois, "Les hésychastes avant le XIVe siècle," p.9.

the Tantric yoga tradition (with the repetition of "Jesus" serving as the analog to the Indian mantra).[60] Thus far, research has not produced conclusive findings as to the extent or nature of such an influence between the two traditions.[61]

Descriptions of the breathing techniques attached to the practice of the Jesus Prayer begin to appear most noticeably in the thirteenth-century writings of the Hesychasts, and not, however, with the Sinaitic monks of the period of St. John Climacus.[62]

Gillet comments that the eighth and ninth centuries produced no outstanding texts concerning Hesychastic mystical tradition.[63] The tenth century, however, produced St. Symeon the New Theologian (949-1022), who effectively bridged the gap between the early Desert Fathers and the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Hesychasts of the Byzantine Athonite revival period. In his Περὶ τῶν τριῶν τρόπων τῆς προσευχῆς, or *Three Methods of Attention and Prayer*,[64] Symeon describes the importance of the heart and breath rhythms.[65] It is he who develops the theme of our incorporation in Christ and introduces the psychosomatic elements of prayer in his writings; he speaks of the concentration of the eyes on the stomach during prayer. By doing this, one attains θεωρια, a "firmly established and undeviating" concentration.[66] One possible reason

---

60 Cf. Thomas Matus, *Yoga and the Jesus Prayer Tradition, An Experiment in Faith*, Ramsey, NJ: Paulist Press, 1984, p.45; and Antoine Bloom, "L'Hésychasme...yoga Chrétien?" *Cahiers du Sud* No.sp. (1953): 177-195.

61 Bois, op.cit., 1, writes: "The adherents [of Hesychasm] pretended, in fact, to arrive at a tangible vision of the Divinity through an analogous--if not identical--procedure used by the fakirs of India in order to obtain the "delicious repose" of Nirwana. [Eventually one would see] a mysterious light, the sight of which...is a source of unspeakable pleasure. This light was none other than that emanated by God, which was manifested to the prophets of the Old Testament and revealed to the apostles on Mt. Tabor."

62 Meyendorff, *BL*, 172.

63 Gillet, op.cit., 41.

64 The authorship of the text is still a point of controversy. See Bois, op.cit.,9.

65 Matus, op.cit., 8.

66 Gillet, op.cit., 41.

for the focus on the stomach as a center of convergence of the soul, mind and body during prayer is discussed by Gendle in the notes to his translation of Gregory Palamas' *Triads* :

> According to mediaeval notions, the power of concupiscence is concentrated in the belly (hence the reference to "law of sin" that rules there and the use of the strong word *ther* (wild beast) for "intelligible animal". By fixing attention of this "lower half", the contemplation as it were descends to do battle in the area where evil is centered. Alternatively, "beast" may refer to the Devil, whose seductive powers are concentrated in the belly.[67]

Another theoretician of the movement, Symeon the Younger, in his work *Divinorum amorum* describes the vision of the Divine Light as the descent of God to the soul, where He lights it up like a brilliant and warm sun.[68]

All the elements of Hesychastic mysticism, especially the methods of prayer, which are justified by the theology of the "Taboric Light", will become issues during the polemics between Palamas and Barlaam.[69] Barlaam labelled the practitioners of the Hesychastic methods of prayer as the ὀμφαλόψυχοι ("people with their souls in their navels").[70]

Thus far the first two of Meyendorff's definitions of the term "Hesychasm" outlined in the beginning of this chapter have been examined: "Hesychasm" as a designation for the ascetical practices carried out by

---

67 See N. Gendle, trans., *Gregory Palamas: The Triads*, Classics in Western Spirituality, Crestwood, NY: Paulist Press, 1983, p.127, fn60. In this chapter we make reference to the treatises of Gregory Palamas by employing the notations (e.g. I,ii; II,ii, etc.) that are used by Gendle in his edition.

68 Bois, op.cit.,10.

69 For other discussions on Palamas and Palamism, cf. Д. Ангелов, op.cit., esp. pp. 78-80; J.Bois, op.cit., pp.1-11, esp.p.2; H.G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, Munich, 1959, pp.712-761; H.G.Beck, "Humanismus und Palamismus," in *Actes du XII Congrès International des Études Byzantines, Ochrid 1961*, vol.1, 63-82, Belgrade, 1963; E.V. Ivanka, "Palamismus und Vatertradition, 1054-1954," *L'Église et les Églises* 2 (1955): 29-46; B. Krivocheine, *The Ascetic and Theological Teaching of Gregory Palamas*, London, 1954; К. Радченко, *Религиозное и литературное движение в Болгарии в эпоху перед турецким завоеванием*, Киев, 1898, pp.98-168; and R. Sinkewicz, "A New Interpretation of the First Episode in the Controversy between Barlaam the Calabrian and Gregory Palamas," *Journal of Theological Studies* 31 (1980):489-500.

70 See Meyendorff, introduction to *Byzantine Hesychasm;* pages unnumbered.

early Christian monks in the deserts of Egypt and Palestine, and "Hesychasm" as a term for the system of mystical tradition of theological beliefs and methods of prayer embraced by such monks, sometimes referred to as "Sinaite Hesychasm" because of the major role that the doctors of Mt. Sinai played in the elaboration of the doctrine. Now we will turn to the third designation of Hesychasm, the one that is, traditionally in scholarship, most closely linked with the diffusion of Hesychast theology to the Slavic world: the system of concepts elaborated by Gregory Palamas to defend his fellow-Hesychasts against accusations of heresy by Barlaam, and, more importantly, the teachings of Gregory the Sinaite on Mt.Athos and among the Bulgarians. This form of Hesychasm, sometimes called "Palamism", did not begin with the writings of Palamas, but was rather the culmination of what had been a very strong and far-reaching revival of Hesychast spirituality. This revival of Hesychast spirituality began largely as a result of the teachings and writings of Gregory the Sinaite and spread to the monastic community of Mt.Athos.[71] For this reason one also encounters the term "Athonite Hesychasm" to characterize the revival of Hesychast mysticism in fourteenth-century Byzantium.

The role of Gregory the Sinaite in the spread of Hesychasm amongst the Slavs is primary and will be discussed in more detail shortly. First some attention must be given to the other spiritual leaders of Athonite Hesychasm who had a profound impact on Gregory Palamas personally and on the formulation of his theology as expressed in his defense of the

---

[71] For a general discussion of the important role played by Gregory the Sinaite in the dissemination of Hesychasm to Athos and the Southern Slavs, see J. Bois "Grégoire le Sinaite et l'hésychasme a l'Athos au XIVe siècle," *Échos d'Orient* 2 (1901): 65-73. Bois points out in both of the articles cited in this chapter that Hesychasm was practiced on Athos before the 14th-century revival. There is evidence of its practice in the 13th century at the Serbian Chilandar Monastery. Furthermore, Bois points out in "Les hésychastes avant le XIVe siècle", p.4, that Athanasius, the founder of the Lavra Monastery at Athos, mentions in his typikon that five monks separated themselves from the community in order to give themselves over to a purely contemplative life: "πέντε μοναχοῦς κελλιώτας τῆς λαύρας ἔξωθεν ἡσυχάζειν βουλόμεθα". But in Bois' article "Grégoire le Sinaite," p.66, Bois stresses that although Hesychasm was known to the Athonite community before the arrival of Gregory the Sinaite, he nevertheless introduced some elements not previously known to them such as the concept of mental prayer (νοερὰ προσευχή), the "preservation of the soul" (φύλακη νοός, or φύλαξις τοῦ νοός), and abstinence (νήψις)--all concepts that he had himself learned from Arsenius when he was on Cyprus. Bois concludes with these words: "On peut à juste titre, le considérer comme l'initiateur du movement hésychaste que nous étudions." Cf. also p.69 of the same article.

Hesychasts. The names Nicephorus and Theoleptus figure here beside the name of Gregory the Sinaite.

Gregory Palamas, himself a devout follower of the writings and teaching of all the early desert Fathers and Sinaite doctors, found sources of inspiration from some of his contemporaries. The Athonite monk Nicephorus the Hesychast wrote of the beneficial results of the practice of the Jesus Prayer. He also emphasized the technique of controlled breathing, holding back within the heart the air that is breathed in, "so as to facilitate", as he puts it, "the entrance of the intellect (νοῦς) into the heart."[72] Theoleptus, archbishop of Philadelphia (died between 1310-1320) was interested not in the psychosomatic technique of the Jesus Prayer but in the psychological implications of the prayer and in his writings, which have remained mostly unpublished, assigned to each function of the brain a role in the practice of the Jesus Prayer.[73] Both of these men were spiritual masters of Gregory Palamas.

The Role of Gregory the Sinaite:

Gregory the Sinaite, who brought the practice of the "prayer of the heart" to Mt. Athos, had a profound impact on his Orthodox contemporaries at home and abroad in the territories of Orthodox Slavdom.[74] Gregory the Sinaite also inspired Palamas in his own elaboration of Hesychast theology. Gregory the Sinaite not only defended Hesychasm in the face of other ascetic doctrines gaining popularity at the time, but he also "enriched it with a new philosophical foundation."[75]

Gregory the Sinaite's treatises consist of one hundred and thirty-seven Κεφάλαια δι᾽ ἀκροστιχίδος[76], dogmatic commentaries on various

---

72 Gillet, op.cit.,49.

73 ibid.,56.

74 Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 56.

75 E.Turdeanu, *La littérature bulgare du XIVe siècle et sa diffusion dans les pays roumains*, Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'Études Slaves, 22, Paris: L'Imprimerie Nationale, 1947, p.8

76 For the Greek text, see J-P.Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 150, Paris: Garnier, 1887, pp.1239-1346.

points of ascetic life plus three or four small treatises on Hesychasm and the methods of prayer. In Church Slavonic translations, these texts appear only in fragments as separate chapters of various compilations.[77] Although much of what he preached was taken from an earlier tradition of Hesychast mysticism, Gregory's main contribution to the knowledge of Hesychasm in Athonite society consisted in the distinction between the νοῦς πρακτικός and the νοῦς θεωρητικός, or to put it in simpler terms, the distinction between the component of deeds and the component of contemplation, both of which were necessary in order to obtain the sought-after vision of the "Divine Light."

Throughout the course of Gregory the Sinaite's life he acquired many disciples, a few of whom were later to become prelates of the Orthodox Church in Byzantium and Bulgaria. Among them were the monk Theodosius of Trnovo, Patriarch Euthymius of Bulgaria, and Patriarch Kallistos of Constantinople (twice patriarch, from 1350-1354, and 1355-1363). Hesychastic ideology was also popularized in Serbia by Patriarch Kallistos' biographer, Jacob, who became the archbishop of Serbia.[78]

Gregory the Sinaite was born in Asia Minor and spent most of his life traveling, seeking to perfect his religious ideals, often meditating and fasting. It was on Mount Sinai that he became a monk, hence his name. He devoted several years to the recopying of the Holy Scriptures and studying the writings of early ascetics. Eventually Gregory travelled to the island of Crete. There he met a hermit named Arsenius, who taught him the fundamentals of Hesychast spirituality: the practice of silent, contemplative "mental" prayer."[79] Filled with inspiration, Gregory then went to Mount Athos, and from there he made several visits to outlying monasteries,

---

[77] Turdeanu, op.cit., 12. For a Russian translation of his treatises, see *Добротолюбие*, том 5, 195-256, Москва, 1890.

[78] Turdeanu, op.cit., 6.

[79] Turdeanu (op.cit., 5) writes that Gregory learned from Arsenius "la pratique de la prière en silence et la contemplation divine par une méditation profonde et ininterrompue." In his article "Grégoire le Sinaite," p.67, Bois writes the following concerning the formation of Gregory under Arsenius' influence, who obviously knew well the tradition stemming from Evagrius, Macarius, and John Climacus: "Arsène parla de la prière mentale, νοερὰ προσευχή: il expliqua ce qu'est l'ἡσυχία et la φύλαξις τοῦ νοός, il déclara comment l'âme peut arriver par la pratique des préceptes a la possession de la lumière."

making inquiries about the practices of the monks. Soon thereafter the increasing pillages of Turkish invaders made the monasteries and most of the coastline unsuitable for a peaceful, much less meditative, existence. Gregory then set out on a journey to seek a place to teach. He went to Constantinople and then back to Bulgaria, to Parorius, where in 1325 he founded a monastery under the patronage of Tsar Ivan Alexander. It was here that the Hesychast doctrine found a formal center.[80] Proxorov points out that the number of practicing Hesychasts in the first decade of the fourteenth century, in the period before the dissemination of Gregory the Sinaite's ideas, was very small:

> It is possible to term the first decades of the 14th century the "esoteric" period of Hesychasm, inasmuch as Hesychasm--in the life of society--was not yet playing a major role...On all of Athos, even at that time, Gregory the Sinaite--who was making it a point to seek out Hesychasts--was able to find only three monks who were practicing contemplation even on a small scale [θεωρία].[81]

By the time of Gregory's death, however, Hesychasm -- which must have been perceived by the Orthodox Christian community as the apotheosis of the anchoritic ideal and not as a separate sect apart from the mainstream -- had spread to such an extent amongst the Greek and Slavic monastic communities as to be practiced by the leaders of the Church. In both the

---

80 Turdeanu, op.cit., 5-7. See also Г.М. Прохоров, "Исихазм и общественная мысль в Восточной Европе в XIV в.," *ТОДРЛ* 23 (1968): 86-108. On page 88 he writes: "In the meanwhile, in the silence of the Athonite wilderness and cells, the number of pupils and followers who came to Athos after Gregory the Sinaite's travels around the Mediterranean increased. He taught them all about the ancient but almost forgotten technique of 'mental prayer'--the technique of Hesychasm, or quietude" ("Между тем в тиши афонских пустынь и келий множилось число учеников и последователей прибывшего на Афон после скитаний по восточному Средиземноморью Григория Синаита, который обучал их древней, но почти забытой технике 'умного делания', технике исихии, 'безмолвия'").

81 See Г.М. Прохоров, op.cit. The original passages read: "Первые десятилетия XIV в. можно назвать "келейным" периодом исихазма, поскольку в общественной жизни серьезной роли он еще не играет" (p.87). "Даже на всем Афоне в это время Григорий Синаит, специально разыскивавший исихастов, смог обнаружить лишь трех монахов, которые упражнялись немного и в созерцании" (p.87, fn.11).

Byzantine Empire and the Bulgarian Kingdom, Hesychasts occupied the patriarchal throne.

Palamas and Barlaam:

Because many of the writings of practitioners of Hesychastic mysticism up to the time of Gregory Palamas had been regarded as purely Orthodox in content, the practices of the Hesychasts were in no way regarded as heretical or unorthodox in the eyes of the ecumenical authorities. It is for the first time with Gregory Palamas and Barlaam that Hesychasm requires justification before the eyes of the Byzantine Church.[82]

Palamas and Barlaam actually came into contact with one another from the time when both were recruited by Constantinople to discuss with Rome the controversy of the Filioque and the possibilities for a reconciliation between Rome and Byzantium.[83] In the writings of Ps-Dionysius the Areopagite, Barlaam had found what he felt to be sufficient proof for arguing that the whole controversy of the Filioque itself should not be subjected to mortal exegesis: since the apophatic theology of Ps-Dionysius teaches us that we cannot know the qualities that define God, that they transcend all knowing, it is fruitless and even inappropriate for humans to endeavour to determine whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone or from both the Father and the Son. His proposal, then, for a reconciliation between the two rites was to dispense with the polemic of the Filioque. Both Barlaam and Palamas defended the Greek view; it is in this matter of theological debate that one finds the seeds of the issue over which they argued vehemently and pointedly, with high stakes to fuel the fire of their respective positions.

---

82 Turdeanu (op.cit., 8) observes the following: "L'hésychasme n'était pas une doctrine contraire à l'orthodoxie; son contenu idéologique, simple et puissant, tendait au contraire à régénérer la vie chrétienne...[et elle] apporta, dans la spiritualité relâchée du temps, un réconfort considérable et, dans l'activité littéraire, un renouveau appréciable des écrits ascétiques." ("Hesychasm was not a doctrine which opposed Orthodoxy; its ideological content, simple and powerful, tended on the contrary, toward the regeneration of Christian life...and carried, in a period of relaxed spirituality, a considerable comfort in and an appreciable renewal of interests in the writings of the ascetics.")

83 See Gendle, *Triads*, 6.

Their differences of ideological conviction were determined by their irreconcilable views on the "knowability" of God. Barlaam maintained an unwaivering apophatic view, while Palamas insisted on the simultaneous unknowability and knowability of God. According to Palamas' theology, God remains in his essence unknowable, but reveals himself to human eyes by means of his uncreated energies.[84] The sources Palamas had for this theology were drawn from the tradition of Greek patristic thought, which ultimately is why he was able to argue his stance so well and have his doctrine accepted fully by the Church. In 1341, after his Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχαζόντων had been reviewed by the Council of St. Sophia, Palamas' theology was incorporated into the body of canonical writings and Barlaam was condemned.[85]

The notion that God reveals himself in some form to the mortal is at the very basis of why Hesychasts prayed the way they did, and the mysticism of the "Taboric Light" had been elaborated to prove the point that through the heart, one can experience an image of Divine Light, the Taboric Light, through which Jesus revealed himself to the disciples and indeed through which he can reveal himself to mortals. This controversy, one of the three main ones addressed in Palamas' Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχαζόντων, is often referred to as the controvery on the "doctrine of grace" or the controversy of the "Taboric Light."

Barlaam denied the claims of the Hesychasts to be able to experience the divine essence at all and felt that one could rely only on spiritual or patristic writings for proof of the nature of God. Palamas did not, however, take the nominalist approach. Instead he took the realist view: that one could gain apodictic knowledge of God through experience. For Barlaam, a knowledge of the "unknowability" of God had nothing to do

---

84 For further reading on Palamas' distinction of the essences and energies and the polemic with Barlaam, see Ware's introduction to Gendle's translation of the *Triads* ; Meyendorff, "Les debuts de la controverse hésychaste," *Byzantion* 23 (1953): 87-120, reprinted in *Byzantine Hesychasm* as article I; Д.Ангелов, op.cit., esp.p.80; Г.М. Прохоров, "Исихазм и общественная мысль в Восточной Европе в XIV в," esp.pp.88-100; H-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, pp.322-332, and 712-732.

85 For a detailed discussion of the controversy between Palamas and Barlaam, see Gendle, *Triads*, intro, pp.1-22, and *SGP&OS*, 86-107.

with human experience and could only be approached through a knowledge of "creatures," another side to the controversy which will be examined below.

Barlaam decided to acquaint himself with the Hesychast methods of prayer and was horrified by their claim that the human body -- and not just the mind -- could be transformed through psychosomatic prayer. It was claimed that this transfiguration took place by the Divine Light. According to their theology, psychosomatic prayer would lead to visions of the Divine Light such as the disciples saw on Mt.Tabor, and this in turn would lead to purification or sanctification/deification (θεόσις) of the body as a whole, not just the mind.

Meanwhile Palamas' student Akindynos, a Bulgarian by birth, entered into polemics with Palamas. Akindynos could accept the basis of Hesychastic spirituality, but he could not accept Palamas' theology of a separate "essence" and "energy". To Akindynos, God was equal to his essence only.

Palamas began writing his Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχαζόντων before Barlaam had written his own criticisms of the Hesychasts (entitled "On the Acquisition of Wisdom, On Prayer and On the Light of Knowledge" and "Against the Messalians"). Palamas' reason for beginning his treatise was to defend the theology and methods of prayer of the Hesychasts and to demonstrate that their methods of prayer could lead to a knowledge of the "uncreated energies" of God, which is available to every Christian by means of baptism. He also wanted to demonstrate that the entire Greek patristic tradition can be seen as an affirmation of the goal of θεόσις.

Barlaam affirmed the truths of apophatic theology, namely the principle of God's unknowability; and that the only possibility of knowing the unknowability of God was "through the intermediary of creatures" or a knowledge of beings (γνώσις τῶν ὄντων). Palamas masterfully maintained an important distinction: that a part of God, the "uncreated energies" were knowable to man, but Palamas was careful to describe this side of God which is revealed to humans in apophatic terms. It is "an illumination immaterial and divine, a grace invisibly seen and ignorantly known. What it is they [who practice Hesychast methods of prayer] do not

pretend to know."[86] Herein lies the very core of the controversy over the "Taboric Light." To support the notion of God's real manifestation to us, he draws on St. Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus, who had referred to the New Testament accounts and references to the Transfiguration of Christ on the Mount.

For Barlaam, the inability of humans to know God was a condition, proven by apophatic theology. For Palamas, apophatic theology was but one step; "a change of heart and mind" is what enabled man to achieve a θεοσις, a purification in Christ through the Hesychastic methods of prayer. In other words, true knowledge of God implied a transfiguration of man by the Spirit of God, and the negations of apophatic theology signify only the inability of reaching God without such a transfiguration of the spirit.

Treatise number III of Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχαζόντων is directed against Barlaam's subsequent claims that the Hesychasts were Messalians (which Barlaam had claimed on the ground that they professed the ablity to see the divine essence of God with human, material eyes).[87]

The second and most famous point of the controversy involved Barlaam's attack on the Hesychast method of prayer, in which the body was utilized in the invocation of the Name of Jesus in the Jesus Prayer. To the refutation of Barlaam's claims that the Hesychasts were practicing heretical methods, Palamas wrote treatises I,ii and II,ii of Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχαζόντων. In these treatises, Palamas drew from the writings of Nicephorus the Hesychast, his spiritual mentor[88], and the New Testament to uphold the assertion that man's body may be sanctified through prayer:

---

86 See Gendle, *Triads*, p.57, II, iii,8.

87 Meyendorff, *BL*, 171.

88 See К.Иванова, "Някои моменти на българо-византийските литературни връзки през XIV в.," *Старобългарска литература* I (1971): 209-42. On page 223 she writes that Nicephorus the Hesychast (not to be confused with Nicephorus Gregorus, an enemy of the Hesychast Patriarch Philotheus and his circle) collected into one anthological tome excerpts from the lives of famous ascetics and mystics (from Anthony the Great, founder of monasticism, to Symeon the New Theologian), and he accompanied them with praise of "mental prayer" (νοερὰ προσευχή) and "contemplation" (θεωρία).

"Our bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in us...We are the House of God."[89]

In these sections of his work, Palamas returns the same accusation made originally by Barlaam of the Hesychasts, that is, he accuses Barlaam of adopting the Bogomil philosophy that the body was the creation of evil.[90] After all, even the most platonic of the Church Fathers would admit that the body was something good, and this idea had been accepted as a basic assertion of Christian Orthodoxy.

Palamas states that "some" (here he refers to St. Gregory of Nyssa) have held that the principle organ of the mind is the brain, whereas "others" (meaning Ps-Macarius) maintained that the seat of the mind is in the "heart".[91] Here Palamas, quoting from Ps-Macarius, launches into his defense of the heart as the seat of the soul and mind in order to justify the tradition of the "prayer of the heart", or Jesus Prayer:

> And the great Macarius also says, "The heart directs the entire organism, and when grace gains possession of the heart, it reigns over all the thoughts and all the members; for it is there, in the heart, that the mind and all thoughts of the soul have their seat.[92]

---

[89] 1 Cor 6.19, Heb 3.6; Gendle, *Triads*, 41, treatise I, ii, sec.1. The original Greek text, found in J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, vol.150, Paris, 1865, p.1104, A, reads: "Ἀδελφὲ, οὐκ ἀκούεις τοῦ Ἀποστόλου λέγοντες, ὅτι Τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν ἁγίου Πνευματικός ἐστι.'" References to Palamas' *Triads* below in the original Greek will be designated by *PG* 150 (*Patrologia Græca*, vol.150) followed by the page number and section number.

[90] Gendle, *Triads*, 124, fn4. See also Радченко, op.cit., 206-207. Radčenko posits a connection between the Bogomils and the Hesychasts of this period, stating that Athos and Thessalonika were centers where both groups thrived. Furthermore, he posits that on Athos Hesychasm incorporated certain philosophical tenets of Bogomilism. We have found nothing that indicates that Athos was a center of Bogomil activity; nor does there seem to be any significant similarity between the Hesychasts and the Bogomils.

[91] ibid., p.42,treatise I, ii, sec.3. The original text reads: "Οἱ μὲν γὰρ, ὡς ἐπ' ἀκροπόλει τινὶ, τῷ ἐγκεφάλῳ ταύτην ἐνιδρύουσιν. οἱ δὲ τῆς καρδίας τὸ μεσιτάτον, καὶ τὸ κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦ, ψυχικοῦ πνεύματος ἀπειλικρινημένον, ὄχημα διδόασιν αὐτῇ" (*PG* 150, 1105,C) (= "Some place the mind in the brain, as in a kind of acropolis; others hold that its vehicle is the very centre of the heart, and that element therein which is purified of the breath of animal soul"; *Triads*, 42).

[92] ibid.,43. The original Greek passage reads: "Ταῦτ' ἄρα καὶ ὁ μέγας Μακάριος. Ἡ καρδία, φησὶν, ἡγεμονεύει ὅλον τοῦ ὀργάνου. καὶ ἐπὰν κατάσχῃ τὰς νομὰς τῆς καρδίας ἡ χάρις, βασιλεύει ὅλων τῶν λογισμῶν, καὶ τῶν μελῶν. ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ νοῦς, καὶ πάντες οἱ λογισμοὶ τῆς ψυχῆς" (*PG* 150, 1105,D).

Palamas in the Macarian tradition calls the heart "the place of the rational faculty,"[93] as a consequence of his assertion that the heart is the principle organ of the mind.

In defense of the Jesus Prayer, Palamas upholds that its purpose is to recollect, i.e. concentrate and reintegrate the distracted mind, which is so easily led away from inner attention on God. The whole purpose of the Jesus Prayer "is to achieve this interior recollection [by]...bringing the mind into the heart."[94] To lend canonical authority to the role of the heart in prayer, Palamas draws from John Climacus' *The Ladder*: "The hesychast is one who seeks to circumscribe the incorporeal of his body."[95]

In regard to the practice of controlled breathing, Palamas refers to the "Three Methods" of Symeon the New Theologian. The idea, he implies, is to control the mind and bring it back into the heart by controlled breathing. As for the practice of focusing the eyes on the navel, he again draws from the writings of Symeon and says, "How should such a one not gain great profit if, instead of letting his eye roam hither and thither, he should fix it on his navel, as a point of concentration?"[96]

---

93 ibid.,43. The original Greek passage reads: "Οὐκοῦν ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν ἔστι τὸ τοῦ λογισμοῦ ταμεῖον." (*PG* 150, 1105,D).

94 ibid.,125, fn25. The passage in question from Palamas' treatise reads: "Τὸ τοίνυν λογιστικὸν ἡμῶν ἐν ἀκριβεῖ νήψει σπεύδοντες ἀπισκέπτεσθαι καὶ διορθοῦν, τίνι ἄλλῳ ἐπισκεψαίμεθα, εἰ μὴ τὸν ἐκκεχυμένον διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων νοῦν ἡμῶν ἔξωθεν συναγόντες, πρὸς τὰ ὄντος ἐπαναγάγοιμεν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν ταύτην τὴν καρδίαν, τὸ τῶν λογισμῶν ταμεῖον" (*PG* 150, 1105,D - 1107,A) (="Consequently when we seek to keep watch over and correct our reason by a rigorous sobriety, with what are we to keep watch, if we do not gather together the mind, which has been dissipated by the senses, and lead it back again into the interior, to the selfsame heart which is the seat of the thoughts?" (*Triads*, p.43, I, ii, 3).

95 ibid., p.45, 1, ii, sec.6. The original passage reads: "ἡσυχαστής ἔστιν, ὁ τὸ ἀσώματον ἐν σώματι περιορίζειν σπεύδων" (*PG* 150, 1109,B). Here Palamas is quoting from a passage of John Climacus' *Ladder of Divine Ascent* (Κλῖμαξ). See *PG* 88, 1097, B; from Step 27.

96 ibid., p.46, I, ii, sec.8. The original passage reads: "πῶς οὐκ ἂν συντελέσειε τι μέγα τῷ σπεύδοντι συστρέφειν τὸν νοῦν εἰς ἑαυτόν, ὡς μὴ τὴν κατ' εὐθεῖαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν κυκλικὴν καὶ ἀπλανῆ κινεῖσθαι κίνησιν, τῷ μὴ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ὧδε κακεῖσε περιάγειν, ἀλλ' οἷον ἐρείσματι τινὶ τοῦτον προσερείδειν, τῷ οἰκείῳ στήθει, ἢ τῷ ὀμφαλῷ" (*PG* 150, 1112, BC).

In the *Life of Anthony*, Athanasius writes: "he [Anthony] then placed his confidence in the weapons 'in the navel of his belly'" (*Early Christian Biographies*, The Fathers of the Church, no.15, edited by R.J. Deferrari, 133-224, New York: Fathers of the Church,

The third point of the controversy over which Palamas and Barlaam debated was the meaning of "purification" (κάθαρσις), which in neoplatonic terminology is a condition for knowledge. According to Barlaam, who was quoting Plotinus, the purification of intelligence, or the knowledge of God, was obtained through the acquisition of secular knowledge. The monks on the other hand maintained a christocentric approach asserting that such purification was only attainable by keeping the commandments. What ensued was a discussion of the role of secular knowledge towards an understanding of God. Treatise I,iii of the Triads refutes this intellectualism of Barlaam and his disciples.[97]

Palamas and his followers were strongly anti-Hellenic and maintained that the Platonists and neo-Platonists expressed dangerous ideas; such ideas, they believed, thwarted the process of purification. Barlaam had grown up in Italy and had come to Constantinople to pursue his interest in ancient philosophy, to which he had been introduced in his native country. Nicephorus Gregoras, an eminent humanist and contemporary of Barlaam, (also the political enemy of the Hesychast Patriarch Philotheus of Constantinople[98]) said in effect that Barlaam had come to Constantinople because he wanted to study Aristotle in the original.[99] Moreover, Barlaam was coming from Italy, where, because of the ground gained by Scholasticism, the classical tradition had been reconciled with the Christian heritage, and the two were no longer seen as incompatible. Ironically, in Byzantium on the soil where these philosophical traditions had been born, the

---

1952, chap.5, p.138). The original passage reads: "τότε δὴ τοῖς ἐπ'ὀμφαλοῦ γαστρὸς ὅπλοις ἑαυτοῦ θαῤῥῶν, καὶ καυχώμενος ἐπὶ τοῦτοις" (*PG* 26, 848,A).

97 Cf. Meyendorff, "Humanisme nominaliste et mystique chrétienne à Byzance au XIVe siècle," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 70, No.9 (1979), reprinted in *Byzantine Hesychasm* as article VI, p.908.

98 See К.Иванова, "Някои моменти," 222. Nicephorus Gregoras (1295-ca.1360) was one of the most educated opponents of Palamas. He was the author of the Roman History, one of the works translated into Slavonic in the 14th-century that summarized for the Slavs the arguments of the Barlaam-Palamas controversy. He was also the author of encomia and vitæ of famous figures from Byzantine history, e.g. Michael Syncellus, Patriarch Anthony II Kavleas, Empress Theophana and others. He also wrote a vita about his uncle John, bishop of Heraclea.

99 Meyendorff, "Les debuts de la controverse hésychaste," p.93.

separation between the two remained quite sharp, and ancient philosophy penetrated into a few disciplines in pedagogical application, such as mathematics and music[100]; and the notion of its existence within theological discussion and debate remained a point of controversy.

The idea surrounding the renewal of classical antiquities over which Barlaam and Palamas polemicized was by no means a new one. There had begun in Byzantium, around the 9th century, the second active revival of classical literature and philosophy. The first revival had occured during the eighth century, when classical rhetoric was reintroduced -- a period known as the Macedonian renaissance.[101] These periods were characterized by the desire of the Byzantine world to establish to some extent a continuity between its present culture with that of its non-Christian, pagan past, the so-called "outside knowledge" (ἡ ἔξω φιλοσοφία). This tendency in Byzantine society to reawaken its consciousness of its classical past was, however, met with differing and contrasting viewpoints. Robert Browning writes:

> There was another strand in Byzantine culture, that of those who opposed the Christian classical synthesis and based their view of life solely on Christian tradition. For them, the adoption of Christianity meant the rejection of the pagan, classical part.[102]

This debate, however, came to a climax during the fourteenth century, particularly in light of the popularity of Scholasticism in the West.

Palamas' treatise I,i in the Triads is devoted to this issue. In an effort to demonstrate the fallacy of the notion that secular knowledge was a prerequisite for any knowledge of God, Palamas avails himself of quotations from Evagrius and Maximus the Confessor, for whom "unknowing" (ἀγνωσία or ἄγνοια) denotes self-emptying, a voiding of

---

100 Cf. Ann Moffatt, "Early Byzantine School Curricula," in *Byzance et les slaves, Mélanges Ivan Dujčev*, Paris, 1976.

101 The consequences these classical revivals had on Byzantine rhetorical style and Slavic writing have already been discussed at some length in Section III, see especially Chapter 1.

102 R.Browning, *Byzantium and Bulgaria: A Comparative Study Across the Early Medieval Frontier*, Berkeley: University of California Press: 1975, p.172.

the mind, so as to be filled with the grace of supernatural understanding.[103]

The final outcome of the Palamite controversy was that the Orthodox Church accepted the treatises of Palamas as Orthodox, Barlaam's condemnation and exile to Italy and Palamas' eventual promotion in 1351 to the archbishopric of Thessalonika. The first strong defense for Palamas came with the issuance of the Hagiorite Tome, which was composed by Palamas himself and signed by the abbots of Mt. Athos in 1341 as a statement that they recognized Palamas' doctrine as orthodox and rejected Barlaam's "nominalistic humanism."[104] In June and August of 1341, two councils were held in St. Sophia at Constantinople condemning Barlaam. Barlaam was not able to realize his dream of finding in Byzantium a place where the study of ancient letters existed and thrived alongside with Christian theology. He returned to Italy, where such a combination of scholarship was already being pursued in the fourteenth-century, and where the Western European Renaissance was to flourish later in the *quattrocento* :

> It was [in Italy] that the clear, proud and worldly spirit of Roman Antiquity could be rediscovered, that its contrast with Christian faith did not bar its way, that its attitude to physical beauty in the fine arts and beauty of proportion in architecture found an echo, that its grandeur and its humanity were understood. The fragments of the Roman past in art and literature had been there all the time, and had never been entirely forgotten. But only the 14th century reached a point that made a cult of the Antique possible.[105]

Barlaam received the post of bishop of Gerace and spent his old age tutoring Petrarch in Greek.[106] "In condemning Barlaam," Meyendorff writes, "the Byzantine Church had condemned the spirit of the Renaissance."[107]

---

[103] Gendle, *Triads*, p.117,fn.3.

[104] Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 95.

[105] N. Pevsner, *An Outline of European Architecture*, reprint of 6th edition, 1960; Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1961, pp.289-290.

[106] See *Enciclopedia Italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, (in 35 tomes), Rome:1949, vol.VI, p.192: "il Petrarca ricominciò con lui [Barlaam] lo studio del greco."

[107] Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 96.

For the ensuing five years Palamas' career, however, remained unstable as a five-year civil war for the throne broke out during the Regency of Ann of Savoy. The details of this political conflict between the throne and Cantacuzenus can be found in a number of histories of Byzantium and Orthodox theology and need not be dealt with here.[108] The eventual outcome, however, in 1347 proved to secure Palamas' place in the history of the Orthodox Church. That year Ann of Savoy assembled a council which deposed the Patriarch John Calecas, who had in the meantime excommunicated Palamas, and Cantacuzenus wielded his power at the councils to raise Palamas to the position of archbishop of Thessalonika. And in July 1351 another council published the Synodal Tome, which thenceforth constituted "the official manifesto in which the Orthodox Church sanctioned the doctrine of Palamas."[109] The rulings of the Council of 1351 were also "incorporated into other local councils"[110]; for example, they were confirmed by the patriarchate of Trnovo[111] and by other Bulgarians who were not only disciples of Gregory the Sinaite but also closely connected with Palamite zealots of the patriarchate of Constantinople: Isidore, Kallistos, and Philotheos. These historical events lead Meyendorff to the conclusion that "the theological structure elaborated by Palamas and confirmed by the Church was adopted by the whole Hesychast tradition."[112]

---

108 See for example Meyendorff, "Society and Culture in the Fourteenth Century Religious Problems" in *Byzantine Hesychasm*, article VIII,52-55; and *SGP&OS*, 99-103.

109 Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 103.

110 ibid.

111 See К.Иванова, "Някои моменти," 211. She writes that Barlaam was condemned in Bulgaria by the Council of 1360. H. Goldblatt (*Orthography and Orthodoxy*, 347) writes: "After their 'victory' at the synods of 1341, 1347, and 1351, the Hesychasts not only dominated the spiritual life of the Second Bulgarian Empire during the last decades of its existence but also created a network of religious propaganda which extended from Serbian lands and Romanian principalities to the East Slavic territory.

112 Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 132.

Hesychasm Amongst the Slavs:

While it is a fact of history that Palamite theology was confirmed and incorporated by the Bulgarian Patriarchate of Trnovo, one has to approach the question of Palamas' concrete influences on the development of the mystical side of Hesychasm in Slavic territories carefully. It is at this juncture that we can now turn our attention to the original question posed in this inquiry, namely which forms of Hesychasm were adopted by medieval Slavic Orthodox culture of the fourteenth century.

All evidence concerning which works from the vast Byzantine heritage were translated for the Slavs from the ninth century through the end of the fourteenth century points to an overwhelming preference for the compositions (liturgies, martyriæ, vitæ, etc.) of the Early Church Fathers. In addition to portions of the Scriptures (including the Psalms) and liturgical books (such as the Euchologion, Praxapostolos, Horologion, Triodion, Pentekostarion, Oktoechos, Menologies -- all translated in Bulgaria probably before the end of the tenth century), the Christian Slavs translated the liturgies of St. John Chrysostom, St. Basil, and St. Gregory the Great. Mathiesen writes that the mystical works translated by the Slavs "were mostly those important for the hesychast movement: pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite's works and the scholia thereto by Maximus the Confessor, the Sermons of Isaac the Syrian, and especially the works of Symeon of Thessalonika."[113] Also *The Ladder* of John Climacus enjoyed wide translation and popularity. Diadochus of Photice, Dorotheus, John Damascene and Theodore of Studios were also translated to a lesser extent.[114]

While it is probable that some well educated Slavic contemporaries of Palamas would have conceivably been familiar with the Greek original of his Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχαζόντων and studied its content for doctrinal purposes, the evidence points to a relatively small knowledge of Palamas' writings based on extant copies of Slavonic translations.

---

[113] R. Mathiesen, "Byzantine Influence" in *Handbook of Russian Literature*, ed.Victor Terras, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, p.71.

[114] Browning, op.cit.,171.

Klimentina Ivanova discusses in detail the treatises of Gregory Palamas that were translated into Slavonic.[115] Most of the extant manuscripts of the translated treatises of Palamas date from the late fourteenth/early fifteenth centuries. There are other treatises that are extant only in sixteenth-century copies, penned by Vissarion Debarski.[116] While Ivanova notes that most of these translations were probably done on Mt. Athos, she notes that the technique of the translation and some of the linguistic features of the Vissarion manuscript give basis to the notion that they can be ascribed to the translation activities of the Euthymian School.[117]

Though the body of Palamas' treatises actually translated into Slavonic is small, there were several other polemical works that were translated which summarized for the Slavs the basic positions of the arguments of the Barlaam-Palamas controversy. Of these only the pro-Hesychastic literature was translated in Bulgaria, while the pro-Barlaamite literature was not. Ivanova notes that the correspondence of Gregory Palamas and his group was translated as well as various contemporary histories (e.g. the Roman History by Nicephorus Gregoras and the History by Ioann Cantacuzin), all of which treated the topics of the debate.[118] But, as Ivanova notes, the controversy was largely known to the Bulgarians solely from one side of the argument, the pro-Palamas side. She writes: "In our translated literature, the ideological battles were reflected one-sidedly: translations were made of the works which defended Hesychasm."[119]

---

115 See К.Иванова, "Някои моменти," 213-216. She also refers to a study done by М.Т. Попруженко, "Из истории религиозного движения в Болгарии в XIV в.,"*Slavia* 7 (1928): 536-548. He suggests that the works of Palamas translated for the Vasarion Sbornik was done in Bulgaria at the time of Euthymius (see pp.536-548).

116 See К.Иванова, "Някои моменти," 217-219 for details.

117 К.Иванова, "Някои моменти," 220. Concerning Serbian translations made of some of Palamas' treatises, see also I. Dujčev,"Les rapports littéraires byzantino-slaves," *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol.2, 3-27. Storia e letteratura, raccolta di studi e testi, 113. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1968, pp.16-17.

118 Иванова, ibid., 212.

119 Иванова, ibid., 212. The original reads: "В преводната ни литература идейните борби са отразени единостранно--превеждат се произведеия в защита на исихазма." In another article by her ("Отражение борьбы между

Ivanova also adds that this was completely natural because Barlaam (with his support of ἡ ἔξω φιλοσοφία) was perceived by the Bulgarians to be an exponent of Latin ideas.[120]

Despite the fact, however, that pro-Barlaamite works were not translated by the Bulgarians, his position against Palamas was known at least superficially to them, for it figures in the *Life of Theodosius* by Kallistos in passages where Theodosius' stance against Theodorite, a Barlaamite, is revealed explicitly. In chapter XIII of the LTheod, we learn that a monk named Theodorite comes from Constantinople to Trnovo, spreading various heresies, including the Barlaamism as well as "magic and witchcraft":

> Some monk named Theodorite came to Trnovo from Constantinople, proclaiming hateful heresies; and in undertaking these deeds, he began to grow the weeds of heresy, for weeds indeed they are! -- these abuses were [the ideas] of Akindynos and Barlaam. Not only this, but he was also deceiving many with magic and witchcraft.[121]

исихастами и их противниками в переводной полемической литературе болгарских славян," *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines* [Semptember 6-12, 1971], vol.2, 167-176, Bucharest: Editarai Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975), Ivanova writes (pp.167-8): "Во всяком случае славянские переводчики отбирали произведения информативного характера, излагающие сжато идеи варлаамитов и их опровержение. Переводы эти были адресованы более широкому кругу читателей, скорее всего с той целью, чтобы предохранить их от заблуждений, чем для того, чтобы дать им возможность рассуждать о них." On page 167, fn.2, Ivanova underscores that there is a dearth of translations of Barlaam's texts into Slavonic. She writes that in South Slavic literature there have not been preserved any of the works in defense of the Barlaamites. Moreover, the only work of Barlaam which penetrated into the Slavonic written tradition is his anti-Latin treatise "On Papal Authority."

120 ibid.

121 "Mnixъ nékyi imenemъ Teodorit ot konstantinova grada vъ trьnovъ priide, vračevskye izvětom xytrosti. i jako pojetse děla, načet plěvely séati nečьstia, plěvele že vъ isitinu oni, akindina nečьstivago i varlaama běxu xuljenia. ne tъčiju že, nь i čaroděanmi i vlьxovanmi mnogy prělъštaaše..." (13,19,lines 3-7). Taken from Zlatarski's edition of the *Life of Theodosius*. See В.Н. Златарски, *Житие и жизнь преподобнаго отца нашего Теодосия*, Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжина (СбНУНК), №20.София, 1904.

He also advocated the ancient Indo-European custom of worshipping the oak.[122] Theodosius, however, defends and saves his flock in the face of such danger.[123]

Grigorij Camblak's "poxvalno slovo" in honor of Euthymius contains a reference to the dissemination of Barlaamite ideas in Bulgaria

---

122 The passage from the LTheod reads: "poklanjati bo se nakazovaaše duby, i ot njego iscěljenia primati." (13,19,line 10) = "he was teaching [them] to bow down before the oak tree and to accept healing from it."

Dąbek-Wirgowa (*Historia literatury bułgarskiej*, Wrocław, 1980, p.42) discusses some of the heresies that were spreading in Bulgaria of Euthymius' day; and she makes note specifically of this incident involving Theodorite: "Podczas gdy w pustelniach hesychaści podzukiwali zjednoczenia z Bogiem, wśród ludności krzewiły się zabobony i herezje; pojavili się adamici, na dawnych uroczyskach pogańskich odbywały się nocne orgie, przybyły z Konstantynopola mnich Teodoryt składał ofiary pod świętym dębem" ("During the period when the Hesychasts were seeking a unity with God in the wilderness, superstitions and heresies were spreading amongst the people: the Adamites appeared; nocturnal orgies were taking place on ancient, pagan sacred spots; and having arrived from Constantinople, the monk Theodorite was putting offerings under the sacred oak"). See also К.Радченко, *Религиозное и литературное движение в Болгарии*, Киев, 1898, pp.191-192.

J.G.Frazer in his seminal study on Indo-European mythology, religion and magic entitled *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* (1922; reprint, New York: Macmillan, 1985, pp.184-187) observes that the religious custom of worshipping the sacred oak obtained in all Aryan cultures, including the Slavs. He writes the following: "The worship of the oak tree or of the oak god appears to have been shared by all the branches of Aryan stock in Europe. Both Greeks and Italians associated the tree with their highest god, Zeus or Jupiter, the divinity of the sky, the rain, and the thunder. Perhaps the oldest and certainly one of the most famous sanctuaries in Greece was that of Dodona, where Zeus was revered in the oracular oak...When we pass from Southern to Central Europe we still meet with the great god of the oak and the thunder among the barbarous Aryans who dwelt in the vast primaeval forests. The among the Celts of Gaul, the Druids esteemed nothing more sacred than the mistletoe and the oak on which it grew; they chose groves of oaks for the scene of their solemn service, and they performed none of their rites without oak leaves...In the religion of the ancient Germans the veneration for sacred groves seems to have held the foremost place, and according to Grimm the chief of their holy trees was the oak...Amongst the Slavs also the oak appears to have been the sacred tree of the thunder God Perun, the counterpart of Zeus and Jupiter. It is said that in Novgorod there used to stand an image of Perun in the likeness of a man with a thunder-stone in his hand. A fire of oak wood burned all day and night in his honour; and if ever it went out the attendants paid for their negligence with their lives...From the foregoing survey it appears that a god of the oak, the thunder, and the rain was worshipped of old by all the main branches of the Aryan stock in Europe, and was indeed the chief deity of their pantheon."

123 "těmže i sъ tъštaniemъ šъdъ, zloe ubo ot srědy sъtvori. crkovnoe že utvrъdi prědanie, i edinomu bogu vъ triexъ sъstavěxъ poklanjatise nauči." (13,19,lines 12-15) = "Moreover, [Theodosius] came with great haste to banish evil from the land, and he upheld the traditions of the Church and taught [all about] the one God who exists in the three hypostases [of the Cross]."

during Euthymius' incumbency as patriarch. In chapter XII, Camblak tells the story of Piron, a supporter of the Nestorian heresy and Iconoclasm and Barlaamite views.[124] Piron comes from Constantinople to Trnovo, where he meets up with a "pseudo-monk" (лжеинок) Theodosius -- whose name is really Fudul -- with whom he shares the same beliefs. They bring troubles to Euthymius' flock, tempting them away from the true faith, but Euthymius saves his people through his prayers. We also know that Akindynos, one of Barlaam's allies against Palamas and Palamas' former pupil, was a Bulgarian[125]; and Barlaam was condemned by the Bulgarians at a separate council from that convened by the Byzantines.[126]

The small number of translations of Palamas' treatises, suggests Ivanova, is due to the fact that their content was too complex and sophisticated for the fourteenth-century Bulgarians. While the Slavs of this period were interested in the fundamentals of the argument going on in Byzantium -- inasmuch as they were concerned about the future of Hesychasm as would be determined by the councils in Constantinople -- they could, apparently, do without the details of Palamas' written defense of the Hesychasts. Ivanova writes:

> Our bookmen selected works of an informative character, [works] which presented concisely the ideas of the Barlaamites and their brief refutation [of their ideas]...The subtleties of Palamas' theological definitions, his

---

124 See Kałużniacki, *Aus der panegyrischen Litteratur der Südslaven*, Vienna, 1901; reprint, London: Variorum, 1971, p.46, lines 1-26 for the entire story. Lines 3-5 read as follows: "Někto Pironъ, Nestorievy eresi topiъ xranitelь i Akindinovy i Varlamovy, k sim i ikonoborьskyą slovy vuda poborникъ, ot konstantinova grada isšed." Radčenko points out that Piron was a Monophysite, not a Nestorian, as Camblak writes. See К.Радченко, *Религиозное и литературное движение в Болгарии*, Киев, 1898, p.201.

125 Akindynos was not anti-Hesychast but was anti-Palamas, see Beck, op.cit.,716.

126 See E. Bakalova, "La société et l'art en Bulgarie au XIVe siècle (L'influence de l'hésychasme sur l'art)," *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines* (September 6-12, 1971), vol.2, 33-38. Bucharest: Editarai Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975, p.35. She writes that Ivan Alexander convened two councils against the heretics, one in 1360--i.e. exactly during the period when the frescoes of Ivanovo were painted (which are said to be of Hesychastic significance)--which condemned the heresy of Barlaam and Akyndinos.

complex constructs concerning the divine essence and divine energy are less well represented in our translated literature.[127]

It could be said, then, that Hesychasm as a culmination of monastic anchoritic values -- i.e. Hesychasm according to its first two definitions by Meyendorff -- was known to the Slavs on Mt. Athos and at home; but Hesychasm as Palamism (Meyendorff's third definition) was evidently far less well known to the Slavs. While the former became absorbed into monastic practices and culture of fourteenth-century Bulgaria, as is evidenced alone by the content of such works as the *Life of Theodosius* and the vitæ by Euthymius, the latter notion, i.e. Hesychasm as Palamism, probably remained esoteric to a large measure in late medieval Bulgarian Orthodox culture. What Gregory the Sinaite in his teachings brought to the Slavs was a revival of the physical and spiritual disciplines that offered the promise of a meeting and unity with God. What Palamas presented was a highly technical theology that did not touch the daily life and experience of the medieval monk, whereas Gregory the Sinaite's teachings did.

Support for this notion is found elsewhere in the scholarly community. Meyendorff contends that the influence of Gregory the Sinaite was "far greater than that of Palamas in the sphere of spiritual life" among the Slavs[128]; and he credits Gregory the Sinaite's works as being the main corpus of writings which systematized the whole Hesychast tradition in Orthodox Slavdom. Fine also discusses the important role played by Gregory the Sinaite in the spread of Hesychasm amongst the Slavs and points out that the dissemination of Hesychasm in Bulgaria was accomplished by the disciples of Gregory the Sinaite, notably Theodosius and Euthymius.[129] Obolensky's findings also point to the same conclusion:

---

127 Иванова, "Някои моменти," 213. The original passage reads: "Нашите книжовници подбират произведения с информативен характер, излагащи сбито идеите на варлаамитството и тяхното кратко опровержение... Тънкостите в богословските определения на Палама, неговите сложни построения върху божествената същност и божествената енергия, са нмерили по-слабо отражение в преводната ни литература."

128 Meyendorff, *SGP&OS*, 131.

129 J.Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans, A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Empire*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987, p.139.

> It may seem surprising, in view of the manifest readiness of the Slavs to adopt the tenets of Hesychasm, that the theology of Gregory Palamas appears to have had little impact on Slavonic countries in the late Middle Ages...It is true nonetheless that the Russians in the late Middle Ages showed no great interest in Palamas' theology; and even Nil Sorsky reveals no familiarity with his writings. Palamas' dogmatic and philosophical works were probably beyond the range of understanding of most Russian theologians of the time. It was from Gregory of Sinai, not from Gregory Palamas, that most medieval Slav readers derived their knowledge of Byantine Hesychasm.[130]

It is not surprising at all that in the spread of Hesychast mysticism among the Slavic monastic communities in medieval Bulgaria, Serbia and Russia, the writings of Palamas were given far less attention than those of Gregory the Sinaite, especially when one bears in mind the sociological and cultural differences at the time between Byzantium and Slavdom.

Defining what is meant by the term "Hesychasm" as it applies both to Byzantine and Slavic culture proves to be somewhat elusive. Primarily this is because it meant different things to the cultures that embraced it. While, as Dujčev suggests, the spread of Hesychast mysticism within the monastic communities between Byzantium and Orthodox Slavdom was the result of close contact and theological exchange[131], it is nevertheless true that in Byzantium, the Hesychast revival of the fourteenth century was marked by a different theological impetus than that which propelled the movement in Slavic territories. In Byzantium, the Hesychast revival was primarily an intellectual and political one: the prelates of the Church in Constantinople at the time were greatly concerned that the learned members of Byzantine society subscribe to the "correct" theory of knowledge.[132] Perhaps the growing interest of the West in Scholasticism and the "rehabilitation" of

---

130 See D.Obolensky, "Late Byzantine Culture and the Slavs: A Study in Acculturation," *Actes du XVe Congres International d'Etudes Byzantines*, 3-26, Athens, 1976; reprinted in *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe* as article 17, p.11.

131 See I.Dujčev, "Collaborazione fra artisti bizantini e bulgari nel secolo XIV," in *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol.1, 455-466, Rome, 1965. He states on p.456: "I monasteri degli esicasti e la migrazione degli eremiti da un paese in un altro creavano le migliori possibilità di una simbiosi fra persone d'origine greca e d'origine slava."

132 See C. Mango, *Byzantium, the Empire of New Rome*, New York, Scribner: 1980, p.88.

Aristotle (both of which preview the Renaissance) increased the misgivings of such thinkers as Palamas as to the compatability of the classical heritage with the Christian one. There was a tendency to view the activities of the West -- and especially of Italy -- as, at best, intellectual promiscuities, and, at worst, heresies.

The notion of Hesychasm as an intellectual and political movement holds true for medieval Slavdom as well; however, the climate in which it developed was quite different from that in Byzantium. The primary difference is this: in Byzantium, Palamite theology grew out of conflicts within the Orthodox Church regarding the heretical or orthodox nature of the Hesychasts' methods of prayer. In Bulgaria, the flourishing of Hesychast mysticism -- and most notably in the center of Kalifarevo and Trnovo -- served as a timely religious campaign against heretical sects that were challenging the position of the Orthodox Church as the single source of spiritual refuge in a time of tumultuous domestic politics. In primarily one respect did the role of Hesychasm in Bulgaria share something in common with the role it played for the Byzantines: the role of a combative measure against ascetic laxity. In this sphere the Hesychasts were viewed as a kind of elite within the monastic community.[133] But this is the only main point of commonality between Hesychasm in Bulgaria and Byzantium. With the growing threat of the Bogomils[134], the neo-Manichaeans, and the invading Turks, Bulgaria's immediate need was the consolidation and strengthening of Orthodoxy as a cultural and political force. Although Byzantium's politics were anything but stable during the period under consideration, Orthodoxy had already permeated her institutions and

---

133 See J. Bois, "Les hésychastes avant le XIVe siècle," p.7. He writes: "Les hésychastes jouissaient, au mont Athos, d'une consideration toute spéciale...Ils formaient une élite parmi les moines: on les considérait commes des maîtres dans les voies de la spiritualité et de la mystique."

134 See J. Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans, A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983, pp.171-79. He considers Bogomilism "a small movement" (179). See also his earlier article "The Size and Significance of the Bulgarian Bogomil Movement," *East European Quarterly*, 11, no. 4, (Winter 1977): 385-412. A contrasting viewpoint is found in J.Bois, "Les hésychastes avant le XIVe siècle", p.8, in which he writes that "Nicéphore Grégoras affirme positivement que l'Athos se trouva à l'époque où il écrivait, infesté par l'erreur des messaliens et des bogomils."

cultural activities. After all, Christianity had by this time been their official religion for nearly a thousand years. The Bulgarians, by contrast, Christians officially only since 864, lacked the same kind of ecclesiastic vision that afforded the Byzantine's the luxury of debating the fine points of Hesychast practices and the adverse effects of a classical revival.[135]

Precisely because the need for consolidation was pressing in Bulgaria, Tsar Ivan Alexander supported a large-scale Orthodox cultural revival. Of course, this importation of culture had been going on since the christianization of the Bulgarians under Tsar Boris and his younger son, Tsar Symeon, in the period known as the "Golden Age" of Bulgarian literature. During the 14th century, Bulgaria was undergoing its second period of conscious, intensive "byzantinization", especially in artistic spheres: iconography, literature, manuscript illumniation[136] and architecture.

The Baroque developed at the time when the Roman Catholic Church launched its own campaign to attract the populace away from the "heresy" of the Reformation; similarly, the activities in the arts in fourteenth-century Bulgaria that coincided with the spread of Hesychasm were an outgrowth of Bulgaria's own campaign against heresies. Yet we maintain that Hesychasm was not the source of inspiration for these arts (as we have made clear in Section III of this work). Hesychasm was rather a concurrent development in monastic culture that primarily changed the way Bulgarian monks of Euthymius' day practiced ascesis. While Hesychasm provided material for the religious art of the day, it did not determine the form of literary art; that is, it did not change either the style or the structure.

Because the monastic circles of medieval Slavdom were interested in Hesychasm primarily as a means of combatting heresy and ascetic laxity,

---

135 See I.Dujčev, "Slawische Heilige in der byzantinischen Hagiographie," *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol.2, 207-224. He states on p.208: "Die verschiedenen häretischen Bewegungen unter den Süd- und Ostslawen stellten eine starke Opposition gegenüber den byzantinischen Einflüssen in Religion und Kirchenleben dar. In diesem Sinn könnten sie als eine Äusserung des Strebens nach nationaler Autonomie im geistlichen Leben gewertet werden." See also Dujčev, "I Bogomili nei paesi slavi e la loro storia," pp.251-282; and Browning, op.cit.,162-165.

136 See А. Джурова, *Болгарская рукописная книга X-XVIII вв.*, Москва: АН СССР, 1978; "Le manuscrit pendant le deuxième Royaume Bulgare (1185-1396)," *Cyrillomethodianum* 4 (1977): 36-99; *Хиляда години българска ръкописна книга, Орнаменти и миниатюра*, София: БАН, 1981.

they naturally would have been more interested first in disseminating the content of Hesychast mysticism among Slavic monastic communities before launching into the complexities of Palamite theology. Gregory the Sinaite's writings in essence contained the most important elements of Hesychast mysticism, whereas the writings of Palamas presupposed an extremely wide knowledge of Hesychast writers before him and enter into detailed arguments which, for these Slavic monks learning the basics of Hesychasm for the first time, would have unessential if not incomprehensible.

Returning to our original definitions of Hesychasm, as previously formulated by Meyendorff, we would herefore conclude that what the Slavs of the fourteenth century inherited from Byzantium, the so-called "political hesychasm" that was passed on to the Slavs from Byzantium, is a composite of the first two definitions of Hesychasm given by Meyendorff, and in the main lacks any significant element of Palamism, Meyendorff's third definition. Obolensky cites Serbia as something of an exception to this conclusion in that the Serbs had translated Palamas into Slavonic in the fourteenth century[137] and even began to venerate him as a saint before his official canonization in 1368[138], but there is no evidence pointing to a significant contribution by him in the development of Hesychast mysticism in Serbia, Bulgaria, or in any other area of Orthodox Slavdom.

In other words, we may now identify the form of Hesychasm embraced by the Slavs as 1) a continuation of the early Christian and Sinaite Hesychastic tradition and 2) the Athonite Hesychastic tradition, the revival of which occurred with the teachings of Gregory the Sinaite. This is not to suggest that Palamas could not have had a place in highly sophisticated exegeses among the educated elite of Slavic lands, but to suggest an influence of Palamas on the common level of monastic practice equal to or even approaching that of Gregory the Sinaite is so far groundless.

---

137 Hesychasm itself seems to have penetrated the Chilandar Monastery on Mt.Athos in the 13th century. Apparently Sava, St. Symeon's son, established an ἡσυχαστηρίον at Chilandar. See J. Bois, "Les hésychastes," pp.6-7; and also in his article "Grégoire le Sinaite," p.69, he writes: "Nous savons que le typicon rédigé par saint Sabbas de Serbie pour les habitants de l'ἡσυχαστηρίον établi par lui...leur imposait la récitation quotidienne du psautier."

138 Obolensky, "Late Byzantine Culture and the Slavs," 11.

As we shall see in the next chapter, Euthymius' hagiographic texts contain numerous references to Hesychastic mysticism as taught by Gregory the Sinaite (and as described in the *Life of Gregory the Sinaite* and the *Life of Theodosius* by Patriarch Kallistos and in the *Life of Romil of Vidin*). Euthymius employs key images taken from Hesychast mysticism and refers to Hesychasm iteself by name in several passages; but the Euthymian texts contain no references to the theology of essences and energies developed by Palamas.

Chapter 2:
The Hesychastic Content in the Vitæ by Euthymius

> Nothing cleanses the soul and
> leads to the prototypical state
> like the desert and quietude.[1]
> -- *Patriarch Euthymius*

As we have already seen, many claims have been made in the field of Byzantino-Slavic scholarship that seek to establish a connection between a particular style of writing and the mystical movement of Hesychasm, claims that find no proof in an examination of the very hagiographic texts in which this connection is said to be manifested. As we have posited above, the only sphere of the Euthymian hagiographic texts in which one can detect a Hesychastic influence is the content, while style and structure are demonstrably directly borrowed from an earlier, inherited Metaphrastic tradition. This chapter examines those passages of the Euthymian texts that show clearly the author's intent to develop each protagonist specifically as the embodiment of Hesychast mysticism.[2] Euthymius himself was a

---

1 From chapter IV of the *Life of Paraskeva*. The term used in the original is "ѣezъmlъvie", the Slavonic translation for the Greek term "ἡσυχία", or "quietude, silence".

2 See J.Børtnes, "Hesychast Doctrine in Epiphanius' 'Life of Saint Stephen, Bishop of Perm '," *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 31-32 (1985): 83-87. In this study Børtnes comes to the surprising and important conclusion that the elements of Hesychast mysticism (which we do find in the Euthymian texts) are missing in the *Life of Stefan of Perm'* by Epiphanius, another writer who has been singled out for employing a style and thematic structure that is reflective of Hesychasm. On page 84 Børtnes writes: "A reader expecting to find in the Life of Saint Stephen a reflection of Hesychast mysticism will be sadly disappointed. The recurring elements of Hesychast theology, such as the liberation from the passions through mental prayer, the idea of the deifying gift of the Spirit as a mystical light, transforming into light those who receive its richness, deification as imitation of Christ and participation in him--none of these elements are to be found in Epiphanius' account. When 'light' is used in a metaphorical sense by Epiphanius, it refers to the missionary work of Saint Stephen among the people of Perm', whom he 'enlightens' by the Word of God, whereas it never occurs in the sense of mystical illumination by the 'light of deification' or 'divine energy,' as we know it from Hesychast theology. The doctrine of deification in contemplation of the 'hypostatic light' has no place in Epiphanius' representation of the life of Saint Stephen...Omissions such as these are hardly accidental. Clearly, Epiphanius never intended to represent his saintly hero as an embodiment of Hesychast mysticism."

Hesychast and developed as a writer within a Hesychastic cultural circle in Bulgaria and Byzantium. As a Hesychast, Mulić observes, Euthymius "demonstrates Hesychastic concepts in his works, especially in the vitæ, which ascribe to his heroes the characteristics and ideas of the Hesychast of [Euthymius'] day."[3] Ian White also points to the significance of the "purely Hesychast content" of the Euthymian literary texts, and he cites some examples drawn specifically from the saints' lives.[4]

Every hero of Euthymius' vitæ is depicted as a Hesychast.[5] To what degree the incremental steps toward the ascension of the soul of the saint are explicitly developed varies across texts but every Euthymian subject has this in common: each attains the ultimate goal of the Hesychasts, a vision of the Divinity in the form of the Taboric Light. Moreover, the way in which this moment of ecstasy is described also differs from vita to vita; nevertheless Euthymius' intent is clear--that Ivan, Hilarion, Paraskeva, and Philothea should all stand out as shining examples of Christian and, more specifically, Hesychastic perfection. All retreat from the world, all endure physical hardships (e.g. abstinence from sleep, food, manual labor,

3 See Mulić, "'Pletenije sloves' i hesihazam," *Radovi zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 7 (1965): 141-56, pp.141-2; the original passage in full reads: "I sam Jevtimije kao učenik Teodosija Trnovskoga, učenika Grigorija Sinajita, bio je hesihast pa je hesihastička shvaćanja ispoljio i u svojim djelima, osobito u žitijima, pripisujući svojim junacima osobine i shvaćanja hesihasta svoga vremena."

4 See I.White, "Hesychasm and the Revival of Bulgarian Literature in the Fourteenth Century", in *Bulgaria, Past and Present,* Columbus: AAASS, 1976: 249-254, p.252. White states that while "it is not possible to show that Hesychast beliefs prompted Evtimij to develop the language employed in his surviving works... [nevertheless] the proposition that this language was devised for purposes framed in the spirit of Hesychasm may be supported by reference to the purely Hesychast content of some of these works."

5 On the subject of Hesychastic themes and content in the tradition of Slavic hagiography, Richardon's dissertation, ("Hesychasm in the Hagiographic Works of Patriarch Kallistos", Ph.D.Dissertation, Harvard University, 1969) makes a claim that we cannot agree with. He maintains that only the *Life of Gregory the Sinaite* and the *Life of Theodosius* represent, in the Slavic tradition, vitæ of Hesychastic content. He writes on page ii of the preface: "...I make a claim that there existed in medieval Slavic hagiography a special category of lives, which might properly be called hesychastic lives. But the claim is [a] much more modest one than I had anticipated when I began my research, because hesychastic hagiography in Slavic literatures is represented only by two lives: these of Gregory and Theodosius by Patriarch Kallistos." Richardson's work offers many valid and interesting points, but his decision to exclude Euthymius' vitæ from this category of Hesychastic Slavic lives is puzzling, especially when one considers the obvious references in his works to the vision of the Divine Light as taught by Gregory the Sinaite.

exposure to the elements), all give themselves over to solitude and prayer. While all of these subthemes of deeds are common to most hagiographic texts, not just Hesychastic ones, there is a moment in each text that is undeniably specific to Hesychast mysticism: the culmination of ascesis, the vision of God in the form of the Taboric Light. Whatever mode of expressing it--"clearly delighting in the light of the consubstantial Trinity,"[6] "seeing clearly the Holy Trinity,"[7] "conversing face to face with the Bridegroom Christ,"[8] "speaking with Christ as one would with one's own kin"[9]--the result is the same: all of Euthymius' heroes complete their journey of the ascent of the soul to the apotheosis of earthly sanctity; and in each case, this is accomplished through the prescriptive steps of πράξις (dějanie, or deeds) and θεωρία (sъzercanie, or contemplation), both of which were carefully prescribed by Gregory the Sinaite in his teachings.

Similar to what we already observed in chapter 1 of Section III (in which we argue that the post-Metaphrastic texts are characterized by a suspension of the "linear narrative" whereby interspersed formulaic phrases are favored over an anecdotal exposition) the references to a vision of the Divine Light do not appear as an integral part of the narrative. There is not an anecdote or episode in which the saint attains the goal of the Hesychastic mysticism. Rather, the attainment of this goal of the vision of the Taboric Light is stated -- usually with only one phrase -- either in the introduction, in the panegyrical section at the end of the life, and/or with short phrases interwoven throughout the text, much like the formulaic sub-

---

6 "i jasno nasiaždaą są světa edinosǫštnyą trojcą" (LIR, XIII, 25-26).

7 "čistě zriši svątǫą trojcǫ" (LHM,XVIII, 57)

8 "nь licemь ky licu čistě sъbesěduješi emu iženiхu Хristuj " (LP, IX,76)

9 The full passage reads: "not with mirrors and divination, but face to face you see your Bridegroom, sweet Jesus, Jesus your Lover, for whom you have prepared yourself, and were not ashamed; you do not speak to Him plaintively but as if to your own kin." The original reads: "ne zrъcalomь i gadaniem, nǫ licemь kъ licu svoego zriši ženiхa, Isusa sladkago, Isusa ljubeznago, Isusa svoego račitelě, emuže ugotovi są i ne smąte są, i ne хodatajstъvně kъ nemu besěduješi, no svojstъvně i ąže o nas čistě kъ nemu prinoosiši molby" (LPh, XIV, 98). Another reference to mirrors appears in this passage from the LTheod: "vъsěх bo togda budutь tělesa jakože zrъcala prěd zreštimi iх" (LTh, XXI, p.29, line 23).

themes examined in Section III, chapter 3. In fact, all of the references to Hesychasm are subtle references in the sense that Euthymius alludes to various processes toward the attainment of the vision of the Taboric Light without an overt statement that the saint actually experienced the vision. It would seem to provide sufficient material to lead to a conclusion about the status of Hesychasm in Euthymius' society: that Euthymius -- and the select audience whom he was trying to reach -- were familiar with the processes of πράξις and θεωρία (expounded by Gregory the Sinaite) that it was not necessary for Euthymius to present in his literary works an explicit explanation of the goals of the Hesychasts. Euthymius' texts lead one to the conclusion that these points were already known, so that a detailed summary or explanation of the processes would have been superfluous. Mere references to the processes of Hesychastic practice sufficed.

In the LP, for example, one goal of the Hesychasts -- the restoration of man's original, unfallen state -- is encapsulated in just one line: "Nothing cleanses the soul and leads to the primordial state like the desert and quietude [ἡσυχία]."[10] Here Euthymius is establishing a dialogue with one of Gregory the Sinaite's points made in Chapter 61 of Gregory's Κεφάλαια in which he speaks of the primordial simplicity of man.[11] Obviously, Euthymius assumes some basic knowledge of Hesychastic tenets on the part of his audience: 1) that the goal of πράξις and θεωρία is a vision of God which occurs only when one has reclaimed the primitive sinless state of Adam[12], and 2) that a life of isolation in the desert as well

---

10 "ničtože bo ino tako dušu očištajetь i vъ prъvoobraznoe privoditь, jakože pustynja i bezъmlьvie" (LP,IV,65).

11 Gregory the Sinaite, Κεφάλαια δι' ἀκροστιχίδος, in *Patrologia Græca*. vol. 150, 1239-1346, edited by J.-P. Migne, Paris, 1887 (hereafter referred to as Migne, *PG* 150). See 1256, C, Chap.61.

12 This is not to be confused with the doctrine of the Adamites, who advocated the shedding of one's clothes in imitation of the first man. See J.Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans, A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Empire*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987, p.441. There is mention of an Adamite in the *Life of Theodosius* by Kallistos; and Theodosius, a Hesychast, refutes their teachings.

Earlier reflections of this particular philosophical approach that regarded the spiritual purification of man as a recapturing of his primitive or premordial state can be found in the *Life of Anthony* : "We need only to will perfection, since it is within our power and is developed by us, for, when the soul keeps the understanding in its natural state, perfection is confirmed. The soul is in its natural state when it remains as it was created, and it was

as the practice of quietude and silence (ἡσυχία, безмълвие) are the two basic components of πράξις that must be fulfilled before the work of θεωρία (contemplation) can be undertaken.

The disciplines of πράξις and θεωρία, as discussed in the first chapter of this section, were introduced to the Slavic community largely through the teachings of Gregory the Sinaite. The scholar A.E. Tachiaos writes:

> Quant à la prière du coeur...on peut conclure qu'elle se trouvait sous l'influence du manuel byzantin bien connu, qui traite de l'oraison hésychaste. Aussi faut-il noter que cette prière avait dans la vie hésychaste athonite le caractère--qu'il nous soit permis d'appeler "dure"--de la tradition sinaitique, telle qu'on voit d'ailleurs ranimée ensuite à l'Athos par Grégoire le Sinaite.[13]

It is worth examining the details of the processes and steps that were to be followed by the aspiring Hesychast in order to obtain the sought-after vision of the Divine, or Taboric, Light.

Certain prerequisites must be met before one can undertake πράξις. One must first isolate oneself in the desert or wilderness, or in a cell apart from the community. Angelov writes that the Hesychasts believed that they had to break with all human contact and either live in a cell alone or in a deserted place where they would not be disturbed, so-called "love of the wilderness" ("пустиннолюбието").[14] Then the body must be

---

created beautifully and exceedingly upright" (chap.20); and "If we care to know the future, even once, let us be pure in mind, for I believe that, when a soul is perfectly pure and has been preserved in its natural state, it becomes clear sighted and is able to see more and futher than the evil spirits" (chap.34).

13 A.E.Tachiaos, "Le monachisme serbe de saint Sava et la tradition hésychaste athonite" in *Хиландарски зборник,* edited by G. Ostrogorski, 83-89, Београд: Српска Академија Наука и Уметности, 1966, pp.85-86.

14 Д. Ангелов, "Към историята на религиозно-философската мисъл в средновековна България--исихазъм и варлаамитство," *Българското историческо дружество* 25 (1967): 73-92, p. 79. See also J.Bois, "Les hésychastes avant le XIVe siècle," *Échos d'Orient* 1 (1901): 1-11; he adds (pp.5-6) an interesting historical note, pointing out that the monks on Mt. Athos who chose to go off by themselves remained officially attached to the monastery, and the monastery provided them with their essential needs. The monk who wished to pursue such a life had to make an appeal through his superiors, and he was or was not then deemed worthy or sufficiently serious. Others completely detached themselves, becoming independent and wayfaring.

strengthened through abstention from spiritually debilitating comforts. One must abstain from food, sleep and exhaust the body with manual labor.[15]

In each of Euthymius' saints' lives, the hero fulfills these requirements by retreating far from the city to a place where, in a cell, the work of ascesis can be pursued. In the *Life of Ivan of Rila*, Ivan is led by God from his home to the wilderness, and this is expressed in the form of a biblical comparison: just as God commanded Abraham to leave his city and go to the place that God showed him, so He "showed [Ivan] also the place where it pleased Him."[16] Ivan is shown a mountain where he goes and builds himself "a small hut out of bushes."[17] In the next chapter, Ivan moves to "a dark and gloomy cave,"[18] where he is pursued by his nephew Luke who has run away from home in search of his uncle, Ivan, and a pure life in the desert.

In this particular scene, Euthymius lends authority to the chosen life of the Hesychastic desert hermit in three ways. First, Euthymius borrows an incident out of the *Life of Anthony*. As a boy, Anthony comes across an old man living a life of solitude, and Anthony begs him to let him stay and live with him. Even if this literary allusion is missed, the biblical comparison cannot be: "And Luke was with him in the desert like an innocent lamb, shepherded by a true shepherd just as Abel or Isaac had been, and he was imitating in every way his forerunners, who had been raised from childhood in the desert."[19] Lastly, when Luke is found by his father (who is shown the place by the Devil) and taken against his will back home, Euthymius as narrator inserts a poetic contrast between the sinful existence of inhabitants of the world filled with sin and the sacred, chosen

---

15 Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIVe siècle," p.7, writes that in addition to vocal prayer and recitation of the Psalter, the days of the Heschast monks of Athos were occupied with mediation and manual labor. This is reflected in certain formulaic phrases Euthymius employs, such as "adding labor unto labor".

16 "pokazavь emu i místo, ideže tomu blagougoditi vьzmožet" (LIR, II, 8).

17 "sъtvorь malǫ ot xrastia kolibǫ" (LIR, II, 9).

18 "pešterǫ obrétь temnǫ zělo i mračnǫ" (LIR, III, 9).

19 "I bé sъ nimь vъ pustyni jakože agną nezlobivo, istinnyimь pastyremь pasomo, jakože drugyj Avelь ili Isaakъ, prétečą vъ vъsemь podražaą, iže ot mladensta vъ pustyni vъspitannago." (LIR, III, 10).

existense of those who follow the call of God to retreat into solitude and silence (ἡσυχία): "[Luke's father] seized the child, and went back to the world, to the world more evil than a fornicator, back to the mother of all uncleanliness and evil; he took him away from the divine mountain, the fertile mountain where God deigned him to live."[20]

In the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena*, as explained in Section IV, chapter 3, the focus of Ilarion's sanctity rests not so much on his ascesis (as is the case with Ivan) as on his ability to fight against heresy and lead the Bulgarians to Orthodoxy; but there is a single reference to his pursuit of an anchoritic life as well: "...and he rejoiced and returned to his cell, to a far and secluded place from the city where they had beaten him."[21]

In the *Life of Paraskeva*, Euhthymius writes: "...she fled; and having reached the desert, she led there an angelic and chaste life, void of material concerns, imitating completely and with no less zeal the life of Elias, the visionary of God, or better to say [John] the Baptist."[22] This biblical comparison is especially significant. The passage alludes to one of the central images in the mysticism of the Hesychasts, the Transfiguration of Christ in which Christ appears -- talking with Moses and Elias -- before the disciples Peter, James and John.[23] In addition to this reference to the vision of the Taboric Light (which, by association with John the Baptist we are to assume Paraskeva attained), this passage is a justification for the anchoritic life, for John the Baptist also withdrew into the desert, eating only wild honey and locusts.[24]

---

20 "Vъzxytivъ ubo...otroka, i kъ miru grądéše, kъ miru skvrъnnéj blądnici, kъ nečistoty i skvrъny vъsékoą materi, ottrъže togo ot gory bozią, gory tučnyą, gory, vъ nejže blagovoli bogъ žiti vъ nej." (LIR, III, 11).

21 "raduą są vъ svoą otide kelią, daleče sąštu ot grada méstu i uedinenu, na nemže pobišą i" (LIR, VIII, 43)

22 "bégu se jetъ i, pustynju dostigši, tamo neveštъstvnoe i aggelъskoe prébyvaaše žitie, ničimže mъnjeje bogovidca Ilie podražavaje žitelъstvo, ili istinnéjšeje rešti, krlъjstitelja" (LP, III, 63).

23 For biblical references, see Mt 17.1-3. Compare also parallel passages in the ninth chapter of Luke.

24 Cf. Mt 3.1-4; Mk 1.1-6.

In the beginning of the fourth chapter of the *Life of Paraskeva*, Paraskeva has a vision in which she is told to leave the desert, and she is saddened to relinquish her life of quietude. While it may be argued, and correctly so, that mere references to a life of isolation do not constitute anything peculiarly Hesychast about these lives, this next passage is proof that Euthymius is developing specifically Hesychastic subjects in his hagiographic works: "but she was saddened to leave the desert, for nothing cleanses the soul and leads to the pristine state like the desert and quietude [Hesychasm]."[25] The whole point for the Hesychast in fulfilling various steps of πράξις was to first restore back to the sinful man his earlier, sinless, primordial state before his fall, which is symbolized by Adam.[26]

Following the steps of πραξις, or "practical virtues" (πρακτικαὶ ἀρεταί) will inevitably lead to the restoration of "natural virtues" (φυσικαὶ ἀρεταί).[27] In other words, the practice of these deeds then leaves the soul of man in its natural state. Once this occurs, the soul of the Hesychast is then ready to begin its ascent to a superior world. In the ultimate step of Hesychastic mysticism, the Hesychast attains the vision of the Divine Light of God and "creation itself takes on a condition of a completely intellectual nature, such as Adam had until his fall."[28] The means to acquire the goal, as is clearly stated in this passage, is a life of quietude (bezmъlvie, ἡσυχία, Hesychasm) in the desert.

Furthermore, in the LPh, the association between isolation in a cell and ἡσυχία is also made -- not overtly, but rather through the expression of its opposite, θόρυβος (mątežь, turmoil): "There is a lake near the city of Molivot, and there happens to be an island in the middle of it, and there

---

25 "pečalovaaše že o ostavljenii pustynje, ničtože bo ino tako dušu očištajetь i vъ prъvoobraznoe privoditь, jakože pustynja i bezъmiьvie" (LP, IV, 65).

26 Angelov (Д. Ангелов, op.cit., 77) comments on this: "The [Hesychasts] wanted to renew the tie between man and God that had been broken by sin, i.e. for man to restore himself as Adam." This is what Gregory the Sinaite referred to as the primordial or primitive perfection [първобитно съвършенство]. See also R. Richardson, "Hesychasm in the Hagiographie Works of Patriarch Kallistos," p.16.

27 See J.Bois, "Grégroie le Sinaite," 70.

28 Richardson, op.cit.,16.

she went and made a cell, and lived there, ridding herself of all turmoil"[29], that is, practicing Hesychasm.

And lastly, there is a passage in the LP in which a minor character, a stylite, is introduced. The passage which mentions him for the first time states that he, like Paraskeva, is a Hesychast: "Somewhere nearby there was a stylite on a column, practicing quietude [i.e. bezmъlvie, ἡσυχία]."[30]

In addition to the prerequisite of pursuing a life of isolation, the successful πράξις also requires several other steps. Angelov[31] notes that in the *Life of Romil of Vidin* [32], three observances in particular are stressed: 1) abstention from sleep, 2) abstention from food, and 3) abstention from bodily comfort. Richardson offers a summary of the cycle of πραξις[33] as taught by Gregory the Sinaite in his Κεφάλαια[34] (teachings which also provide the framework for the acts of the heroes in *The Life of Theodosius* and in *The Life of Gregory the Sinaite* written by Patriarch Kallistos[35]).

29 "Bliz že grada Molivota ezero někoe estьj, ostrov že někij sъluči są vъ nemь byti, i tu vъ šedši i kelijcǫ malǫ sъtvorši, prěbyvaaše pročee, mątežь vъséčьsky ot sebe ottrąsši" (LPh, VI, 85).

30 "Stьpniku ubo togda blizь něgde tu na stьpě bezьmlъvstvujuštu" (LPh, V, 67).

31 Ангелов, op.cit., 78.

32 The texts has been published by P.Syrku. See П.А.Сырку, "Монаха Григория житие преподобного Ромила," *Памятники древней письменности и искусства* 134 (1900):1-54. For secondary literature on this vita, see I.Dujčev, "Un manuscrit de la vie de St.Romil," *Studia Serdicensia* 2 (1940):88-92 (Reprinted in *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol.2, 231-236); and F.Halkin, "Un ermite des Balkans au XIVe siècle," *Byzantion* 31 (1961): 111-147.

33 Richardson, op.cit., 16-17.

34 See Migne, *PG* 150, pp.1272 D, 1273 A-D, Chapters 100-104.

35 E.Turdeanu summarizes the teachings of Gregory the Sinaite and his contribution to Slavic lands in his book *La littérature bulgare du XIVe siècle et sa diffusion dans les pays roumains*, Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves, no.22. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1947, p.7: "Grégoire prêchait l'isolement et le jeûne, le détachement de l'âme des tentations de la vie par le travail spirituel et le silence, d'où le nom donné à sa doctrine: hésychasme (ἡσυχία= silence, calme). Partant de i'idée qu'à la création l'homme avait joui de la perfection divine, qu'il perdit au moment du premier péché, Grégoire cherche les voies par lesquelles l'âme peut attaindre sa pureté primordiale. Elle peut y parvenir par un long effort, au cours duquel elle se détache toujours davantage de ses liens avec la vie du corps. Dans cet exercise de l'ascèse, Grégoire envisage plusieurs degrés, --et c'est là

According to Gregory the Sinaite, fasting leads to abstinence. This is the concept of νήψις that Bois suggests was one of Gregory the Sinaite's contributions to the already existing tradition of Hesychasm on Athos. Abstinence, then, leads to vigilance, vigilance to patience, patience to fortitude, and fortitude to inner calm (ἡσυχία, bezmъlvie). Inner calm then leads to prayer, as we recall from the previous chapter. This particular step, ἡσυχία, involves several physical disciplines: controlled breathing, a fixed bodily position, and vocal prayer, and the repetition of the Κύριε ἐλεείσον, the εὐχή τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, and psalmody.[36]

In a discussion of Hesychasm as it was practiced amongst the monks at Chilandar, Bois writes that the daily office specified that the Psalter must be distributed between various parts of the office in such a way that it be recited in full every day. He also notes that much of the time of the average Hesychast went to the reading of the Psalter and to "vocal prayer".[37] In the Euthymian texts there are many references to recitation of the Psalms, i.e. 1) "And he would sing from the Psalms of David..."[38]; 2) "The holy saint like an innocent lamb in the midst of the filth of wolves walked around

---

surtout son originalité. Le premier degré est la maîtrise de soi-même et la soumission à toutes les privations et à toutes les éprouves ascétiques; mais la lutte ainsi engagée contre les sens, si variés que soient ses moyens, n'est qu'une préparation pour la libération de l'esprit; elle est une discipline physique, non pas une régénération morale; elle n'est qu'une pratique (πράξις). C'est le degré que Grégoire constate chez tous les ascète de son époque et auquel lui-même se trouvait avant sa recontre avec l'ermite Arsène. Mais cette pratique, indispensable pour mortifier les tentations du corps, doit être rehaussée par une vie spirituelle intense, par une participation continue de la conscience à tout acte de dévotion, par une méditation prolongé de la divinité; d'où la nécessité pour l'ascète de vivre isolé, loin de tout bruit qui puisse le soustraire à sa vie intérieure, et d'occuper constamment son esprit par la méditation (θεωρία), par l'étude et surtout par des prières qu'il dira en lui-même; pour se détendre, il chantera des psaumes. L'essentiel de cette vie spirituelle est la prière mentale. C'est elle qui élève la pensée vers Dieu et permet à l'ascète de contempler dans les replis de son propre coeur la lumière divine (δόξα θεοῦ), c'est elle qui, enfin, rend à l'âme sa pureté primordiale et la possibilité de se confondre avec l'Entité suprême, par l'extase (ἔκστασις). La prière mentale, idée de base de l'hésychasme, est ainsi pour l'âme un moyen de purification et de résurrection: ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς κάθαρσις ἢ ἀνάστασις.

36 H-G.Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur in Byzantinischen Reiche*, Munich: C.H. Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959, p.352, specifically underlines the point that psalmody enjoyed the same prestige in Hesychastic circles as the "Jesus Prayer" and the Κύριε ἐλεείσον.("Sie steht gleichberechtigt neben der ψαλμῳδία, aber nicht höher.").

37 Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIVe siècle," 6-7.

38 "poą sъ Davidomъ" (LIR, II, 9).

with this song from the Psalms on his lips[39]; and 3) "She kept that verse from the Psalms on her lips."[40] Under Gregory the Sinaite, who was in turn under the influence of Arsenius, the monk on Cyprus, the emphasis on vocal prayer is shifted to the Evagrian concept of "mental prayer" (νοερὰ προσευχή) as "the highest achievement of contemplation."[41]

To continue with the steps of πράξις, prayer will lead to silence, silence to inner suffering, inner suffering to humility -- which is mentioned in the LIM: "But Hilarion in no way enjoyed this, but assumed even more the humility of Christ" (LHM,III,48) -- and humility leads to inner suffering again. This completes the cycle of πράξις, which prepares the soul for its ascent (vъsxoženie), which in turn is achieved only through contemplation (θεωρία).

According to Bois, the distinction between πράξις and θεωρία was not made in Athonite Hesychasm until the dissemination of Gregory's teachings: "Le principe fondamental de sa méthode, c'est la distinction entre le νοῦς πρακτικός and the νοῦς θεωρητικός."[42]

Before we examine the stages of θεωρία, let us first examine the occurences in the Euthymian texts of the various acts of ascesis enumerated above under πράξις. By far not all of the steps in πράξις are mentioned by Euthymius, but there is a striking consistency in the development of some of them in the narrative. Particularly pervasive are the themes of abstinence from food, sleep and physical comfort. First of all, as is formulaic for the hagiographic genre in general -- not just vitæ penned by

---

39 "Božij že ugodnikъ jako ovčą nezlobivo po srědě vlъkъ nečьstia xodaaše i psalomskoe ono vъ ustěx obnošaaše pěnie" (LHM, VIII, 42).

40 "Ona že psalomskyj onъ vъ ustěx obnošaaše glagolъ" (LPh, VI, 86). See A.E. Tachiaos, "Mount Athos and Slavic Literatures," *Cyrillomethodianum* 4 (1978): 1-35. On page 10, fn26, he writes: "These Sinaitic influences affect chiefly the life of the hermit monks and those living in *skites*. The information given to us by the Russian monk Dosifej of the Kievan Lavra is highly valuable for the history of the spiritual life on Athos at the end of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th. It appears from this that in the isolated cells inhabited by the more ascetic monks, a typikon of reading the Psalter was observed (the well-known typikon of the twelve psalms that originated in Jerusalem), but more emphasis was placed on the 'Jesus Prayer,' which is of Sinaitic origin."

41 Bois, "Grégoire le Sinaite," 66.

42 ibid., 70.

Hesychasts -- the hero renounces his or her wordly fortune. Ivan of Rila disperses "his property into the hands of the poor,"[43] and Euthymius repeats the topos with this passage: "Leaving the things of this world to the worldly and the dust to ashes, he left the world and the Ruler of the world and took nothing except one leather tunic."[44] In the LP, Euthymius completes the same theme (rejection of riches) and does so with details from the culture of his time that provide the present-day reader with a poignant look back to the persistence of materialism as a component of human nature and weakness: "She had no care for the yokes of oxen, nor for golden-bridled horses, nor for clothing, nor for beds, nor for homes, nor for maiden servants, but for spiritual purification..."[45]

Sometimes the themes of abstinence from food, sleep and physical comfort are developed individually in the narrative, but most often they are developed through an economical composite of all three into one phrase which is usually repeated several times throughout the narrative. This we have examined in detail in chapter 3 of Section III, whereby formulaic phrases of this sort constitute a leitmotif of the text and are interwoven into the narrative. We need not repeat all of them here; rather, a few examples will suffice.

Ivan takes only enough desert grass to keep himself alive "and he also took only a little water, just enough to refresh his innards."[46] The rejection of physical comforts is stated explicitly: "He lived in this cave twelve years, and having no physical comforts, he added labor unto labor and toil unto toil."[47] The author of the *Life of Anthony*, in describing

---

43 "[Ioannъ] rastoči sǫštaa togo vъ rǫky ubogyx" (LIR, II, 8).

44 "ostavlěetъ zemnaa zemnymъ i pepelnyim prъstъ, isxoditъ mira i mirodrъžca, ničьsože ino vъzemъ razvě edinǫ odeždǫ kožanǫ" (LIR, II, 8-9).

45 "Ne bě toj tamo popečenie o sъprugoxъ volovъ, niže o zlatouzdnyxъ konjexъ, ne o odeždeaxъ i posteljax, ne o domox i rabynjax, nь o duševnomь očištenii" (LP, III, 63-4).

46 "i se po zaxoždeni slъnьčněmь, i vodǫ že takožde, eliko tъčiǫ vъnątrъněa proxladiti" (LIR, II, 9).

47 "Prěbystiь] že tu vъ toj peště [12] lět, ni edinogo pokoa tělesnago iměą, trudy kъ trudomь i bolězni kъ boléznemь prilagaą" (LIR, IV, 12).

Anthony's own ascesis uses the same construction, and it is in no way surprising or coincidental that it should appear in the specifically Hesychastic texts of Euthymius. As we have seen above in the LIR and the LP, Euthymius borrows from the LAnth (one of the earliest translated and best-known vitæ to the Slavs). He does so in order to establish his own place as a direct continuant of a well established hagiographic tradition, the norms of which get established with the LAnth, and to lend prestige to the subjects of his saints' lives. In the first borrowed scene, Luke repeats the actions of Anthony as a youth, in seeking the direction of the older, experienced desert-dweller (see chapter 11 of LAnth). Also, the incident of the correspondence between Tsar Asen and Ivan is completely lifted from chapter 81 of the LAnth in which Anthony receives a similar letter from the emperor; and his response, like Ivan's, is in the form of an admonition to the sovereign. Another borrowing from the LAnth is Hilarion's status of "bloodless martyr", stated twice by Euthymius: 1) "and voluntarily Hilarion showed himself to be a bloodless martyr"[48]; and 2) "...and without [the shedding of] blood you showed yourself to be a martyr."[49] This is reminiscent of chapters 46 and 47 of the LAnth in which Anthony longs to become a martyr.[50] Also, the comparison in the third chapter of the LP which likens Paraskeva to Elias, the visionary of God is also a reference to the *Life of Anthony*. In chapter 7 of the LAnth, one finds this reference to Elias: "And [Anthony] used to say to himself that in the life of the great Elias the ascetic ought always to see his own image, as in a mirror."[51] To the educated reader of his day, it was clear that Euthymius was establishing beyond the shadow of any doubt the canonical nature of his texts not only

48 "I mǫčnikъ bez krъve Ilarionъ pokazovaaše są proizvoleniemъ" (LHM, VIII, 42).

49 "i bez krъvi pokazal są esi mǫčnikъ" (LHM, XVIII, 58).

50 Cf. fn.115 to our translation of the *Life of Hilarion of Moglena*.

51 English passage quoted from *Early Christian Biographies*, The Fathers of the Church, no.15, edited by R.J. Deferrari, 133-224. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1952, p.142. The original passage reads: "Ἔλεγε δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ, δεῖν τὸν ἀσκητην ἐκ τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ μεγάλου Ἠλίου καταμανθάνειν, ὡς ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον ἀεὶ" (Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, vol.26, p.853).

by the implementation of structural and stylistic formulaic models and by contextual references to the Scriptures, but also -- and of no lesser importance -- through correspondences with what can be termed the proto-vita of the encomiastic kind, the *Life of Anthony*. This kind of dialogue that is established across texts where scenes from well-known works are lifted into another work is what Lixačev refers to as the employment of "этикетные моменты."[52]

Other examples of phrases that indicated abstention from food and sleep in the vitæ will be familiar to the reader from chapter 3 of Section III; phrases such as 1) "and he lived there, burdening his body with fasting and vigils"[53]; 2) "..having nothing for food except a grassy plant, which the earth usually sprouts forth for cattle" [54]; 3) "Who is worthy to recount his 'fountain of tears' and his all-night vigils and prayers?"[55]; 4) "restraining himself with fasting and vigils and all-night prayer"[56]; 5) "I praise your eyes, which never became drowsy with sleep that leads to death...I praise your legs, which throughout all-night vigils never weakened" (LP, VII, 94)[57]; 6) "exhausting her body with fasting and vigils"[58];

---

52 See Д.С. Лихачев, *Поэтика древнерусской литературы*, Ленинград: Худож. лит., 1971, p. 106-107. Concerning thematic and anecdotal borrowings, he writes: "Писатель считает, что этикетом целиком определялось поведение идеального героя, и он воссоздает это поведение по аналогии ...Средневековный писатель ищет прецедентов в прошлом, озабочен образцами, формулами, аналогиями, подбирает цитаты...Писатель жаждет ввести свое творчество в рамки литературных канонов, стремится писать обо всем 'как подобает', стремится подчинить литературным канонам все то, о чем он пишет..."

53 "i bě tu prěbyvaą, pošteniemь i bděniemь udrǫčavaą tělo" (LIR, II, 9)

54 "ničtože vъ sъnědь imy, razvě bylie trěvnoe, eže zemlě skotomь prozębati obyče, i vodǫ, ąže neskǫdno istočnii istěkaǫtь" (LIR, II, 9).

55 "Slъznyj že paky togo istočnikь kto po dostoaniju izvěstitь, vъsenoštnaa že takožde stoania i kolěnopřěklonenia?" (LIR, II, 9).

56 "postomь i bděniemь i bъsenoštьnymi stoanii sebe udrǫčaą" (LHM, III, 30).

57 "blažu oči, jako ne vъzdrěmaše sьnomь, sьvodeštimь vь sьmrьtь...blažu i nozě, jako kь vsenoštnomu stojaniju ne oslaběvše" (LP, VII, 73).

58 "postomь i bděniemь iznurajušti tělo" (LP, II, 63)

7) "...and [she] lived there [on the island] maintaining fasting and vigils and prostration. And she roused herself to such passion [through the abstinence of food] that her skin was sticking to her bones"[59]; 8) "The venerable Philothea, locking herself up in her cell, lived four days, eating no food, but spending those days [keeping] vigils, [shedding] tears, and [praying] with frequent genuflections."[60]

One of the passages on abstention in the LPh corresponds precisely with an historical note made by Bois. In describing the life of Hesychastic monks associated with the Serbian Chilandar Monastery of the thirteenth century, Bois writes that they were allowed only one meal a day, except on Saturday and Sunday when, presumably, they had none.[61] This excerpt from the LPh coincides with the monastic rule described by Bois: "How she blossomed under abstention, and every week she spent both Saturday and Sunday without food, during which time she would partake of communion, eating only a little bread and some lentils and also some kvass, and so she maintained the first [monastic] rule, listening to God's law night and day and sating her soul with the Holy Scripture."[62]

The "first rule" refers to the monastic rule of St. Athanasius (i.e. Athanasius of Trebizond, 920-c.1000). Athanasius in 963 organized the Great Laura (monastery) on Athos, and he organized a rule (typicon) for cenobitic societies of monks, which were in turn based on a similar rule established by Basil of Caesarea and the ninth-century reformer, Theodore the Studite. Bois notes that in later Athonite society, in which the Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbians and Russians all had their own monasteries, the rule

---

59 "prěbyvaaše pročee...pošteniemь i bděniemь...Toliko ubo na strasti sebe podviže, eliko priibpnǫti kostemь eǫ kъ plьtem" (LPh, VI, 85).

60 "Prěpodobnaa že Filotea, sebe vъ kelii zatvorši, prěbystiьi dььni četyri, nikakože pištǫ vъkusivь, nǫ vъ bděnii i slъzaxь i čąstyx kolěnopřěklonenix vъsą ony istъšti dььni" (LPh, IX, 92)

61 See J. Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIV siècle," 6.

62 "Toliko bo vъdrъžaniemь procъvte, jakože vъsą sedmicǫ bezъ sъnědi provaždati, vъ sǫbotǫ že i vъ nedělą, po vъnegda božiьstvnyimь pričąstiti są tajnamь, malo vъkušaaše xlěba i sočiva takožde kvašena i tako prъvaago paky drъžaaše są pravila, noštiǫ že i dььniǫ božiьstъvnomu vъnimaaše zakonu i svąštennymi pisanii svoǫ nasyštaaše dušǫ" (LPh, III, 81).

of Athanasius was still imposed.[63] In addition to the LPh, the LIR and the LPh both contain references to Athansius' rule: 1) "And he never fell to depression but held himself firmly to the first rule"[64]; and 2) "...and so she maintained the first [monastic] rule."[65] Each of these passages follows an exposition of the heroes' ascesis and lends even more authority to Euthymius' heroes not only as model Hesychasts but also obedient monks.

According to Gregory the Sinaite, just when the body and soul are engaged in the steps of πράξις and just when the individual is attaining the joy and passion that comes from observance of ascesis, evil powers appear in the form of different vices: indolence, disobedience, or sensual thoughts.[66] This notion is reflected in all of Euthymius' texts. Perseverance and success in πράξις are always met immediately by interference from the Devil and expressed in the narrative with formulaic phrases like these: 1) "Now the Devil, hating good, did not tolerate for long the bravery of this man"[67]; 2) "The Devil seeing this, did not cease to cause him grief in every way: sometimes with depression, sometimes with indolence"[68]; 3) "...the Evil One in no way stopped tempting her with dreams and visions, many times taking on the image of various beasts; which he did in order to create an obstacle for her from her course"[69]; and 4) "Now the Devil hating good, did not tolerate for long to leave her untempted."[70]

---

63 J.Bois, op.cit., 5.

64 "nikakože unyvaą, nǫ prъvago pravila svoego krépcé drъžą są" (LIR, IV, 13).

65 "i tako prъvaago paky drъžaaše są pravila" (LPh, III, 81).

66 Cf. Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIV siècle", 8; and Angelov, op.cit., 78.

67"Nenavidąj že dobra diavolъ ne sъtrъpé na mnozé tolikǫ doblestь mǫža" (LIR, VII, 16).

68"Sia že diavolъ zrą, ne préstaaše vъséčьsky togo oskrъbiéą, ovogda ubo unyniemь, ovogda že lénostiǫ" (LIR,IV,12).

69 "nikakože présta lukavyj tu iskušaje mečtanmi že i prividénmi, množiceju že vь razlučnyje zvére sebe prétvaraje, eže kako bi toj sponu ot tečenią sъtvorilь." (LP, III, 64).

70 "Nenavidąj že dobraa diavolъ ne sъtrъpé ne mnozé ostaviti tǫ neiskušenǫ" (LPh, VI, 85-86).

According to Gregory, the mere mention of the name of Jesus dispells these futile attempts of the Devil and harmony is restored, though Euthymius' heroes use psalmody rather than the Jesus Prayer. As Alissandratos has pointed out[71], "harmony restored" is simply a thematic commonplace for the encomiastic genre in general and is certainly not to be attributed solely to hagiographic texts devoted to Hesychastic subjects.

Once harmony has been restored and the saint has recollected his or her strength and fortitude, the soul is ready for the next phase--contemplation, or θεωρία. Through θεωρία, the soul will begin its ascent to a supernatural world. The concept of the "ascent" (vъsxoždenie) is specific to the doctrine of the Hesychasts, and it is mentioned specifically in two passages of the Euthymian vitæ. In the LIR and in the LPh, Euthymius, in accordance with the teachings of Gregory, expresses the ascent as a direct result of a culminating process of abstention which strengthens the heart: 1) "...comforting somewhat the sickness of his body and filling the poverty of his belly, going from strength to strength and placing the ascents in his heart"[72]; and 2) "She added accomplishment to accomplishment and placed the ascents in her heart."[73]

According to Gregory the Sinaite's teaching, once one has fulfilled πράξις, then the heart, the center of the soul and the seat of God and the Divine Light, reveals its secrets.[74] Richardson discusses in detail the steps of contemplation.[75] First he explains that according to Gregory the Sinaite, contemplation leads to a supreme virtue (dobrodětelь), a theme that is repeated many times over in the LTheod. Then Richardson enumerates the three stages of contemplation, or θεωρία. He writes:

> The first moment [of contemplation] is, so to speak, preparatory. The Hesy-

---

71 J. Alissandratos, *Medieval Slavic and Patristic Eulogies*, Studia Historica et Philologica 14, Sectio Slavica 6, Florence: Le Lettere, 1982, p.8.

72 "tělesnǫą nemoštь maio utěšaą i ątrobnǫą skǫdostь ispl'ьněą, prěxodą ot sily vь silǫ i vьsxoždenia vь sr|ьdci polagaą" (LIR,V,13).

73 "podvigy kь podvigomь prisno i vьsxoždenia vь sr|ьdci polagaaše." (LPh,VI,86-87).

74 Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIV siècle," 9.

75 Richardson, op.cit., 19.

> chast, wishing to attain contemplation, gathers together all of his feelings, concentrates his mind on the idea of the Cross of Christ and its meaning... [then he] is filled with tears of tender emotion and contrition for his sins.[76]

Bois also mentions that John Climacus in his treatise Κλῖμαξ writes about the "rapt en Dieu", or the ἁρπαγὴ πρὸς Κύριον, and the "gift of tears".[77] In reference to Euthymius' use of formulaic phrases for crying, Ian White writes that "warm tears were associated with the repeated Jesus Prayer used by some Hesychasts."[78]

As we have seen in Section III, chapter 3, Euthymius' vitæ employ many phrases of weeping and crying. Twice in the LIR, Euthymius speaks of Ivan's "fountain of tears",[79] and at the time of Ivan's death he "poured forth warm tears."[80] In the LHM, Hilarion, fired up with zeal in his heart from the day's ascesis, was "pouring forth every night tearful streams."[81] In the LPh, Euthymius as narrator asks rhetorically, "How can I tell of her spring of tears, her constant sighing, her beautiful quietude (i.e. bezmъlvie, ἡσυχία),"[82] and in the LP, "Who then will relate this [life], a source of tears? Who will tell of her honest and constant weeping?"[83] In these passages one can see once again the influence of Gregory the Sinaite on Euthymius' ascetic formulæ. In chapter 45 of the Κεφάλαια, Gregory associates the act of purifying the soul through tears with the act of viewing the Divinity and becoming an incorporeal, earthly angel:

> He who cleanses his soul with tears will resurrect his soul here on earth

---

76 ibid.

77 Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIVe siècle," 4.

78 White, op.cit., 253.

79 "slъnyj istočnikъ y" (LIR,II, 9) and "slъznyą istočnik" (LIR, V, 13)

80 "i topiyą slъzy ot očiju izlivaaše" (LIR, IX, 21).

81 "i slъznyą na vъsěkǫ noštь prolivaą istočniky" (LHM, III, 30)

82 "Slъznyj že toǫ kako skažǫ istočnikъ nepréstannaa vъzdyxania, mlъčanie krasnoe" (VI, 87)

83 "Kto bo toje iže togda sъpovecstь slъznyj istočnikъ, stenania že čestnaa i nepréstannaa kto izrečetь...?" (LPh, III, 63)

through the Spirit; and through the medium of understanding he will make the flesh bright, as a depiction of divine beauty. He will almost become a cohabitant with the angels and incorporeal.[84]

After completion of this first step, the process of contemplation is in its "active manifestation."[85] In the second step, the world of the Hesychast undergoes a transformation: passions disappear, and divine love rushes in to fill the soul. The Hesychast is overwhelmed with ineffable consolation[86], and he is bathed in a vision of the Divine Light, which fills his cell. This is the beloved moment, the precious, sweet reward of the carefully prescribed steps of ἡσυχία. This is the goal which was taught and glorified by the Sinaitic doctors and commemorated in their art, such as in the marvelous mosaic of the Transfiguration at St. Catherine's.[87] Bois writes that according to the Hesychasts, the Divine Light is the way God manifests himself in their soul -- that is, God descends into the soul as a penetrating

84 The original passage reads: "Ἀγγέλοις ὁμοδίαιτος γίνεται βραχύ τι, καὶ ἀσώματος, ὡς ἄφθαρτος ὁ τὸν μὲν νοῦν διὰ δακρύων καθάρας, τὴν δε ψυχὴν, ἀναστήσας ἐντεῦθεν τῷ πνεύματι, τὴν δὲ σάρκα τῷ λόγῳ φωτοειδές τε καὶ πύρινον ἄγαλμα θείας ὥραιότητος ποιησάμενος, τὸν φύσει πήλινον ἀνδριάντα ἑαυτοῦ. εἴπερ ἀφθαρσία ἐστὶ σωμάτων, χυμῶν ἔκλειψις καὶ παχυτήτων. " (*PG* 150, p.1253,A).

85 Richardson, op.cit.,19.

86 Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIVe siècle," 8.

87 See J.Beckwith, *Early Christian and Byzantine Art*, reprint of 2nd edition, Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1986, p.105 for an illustration of the mosaic. See also Paul Evdokimov, "The Meaning of Icons," *One in Christ* 2 (1967): 165-182, p.177. He writes about the importance of the theme of the Taboric Light for the schools of iconography: "There is never any source of light on an icon, for light is its very subject--one cannot shed light on the sun. It is the kingdom of the 'day which never fades', it 'has no need of sun or moon to shine upon it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb' (Rev.21:23). By contemplating the Transfiguration every icon painter learns that he paints with the light of Tabor and not simply with colours. The technical terms themselves demonstrate this; the golden background of the icon is called the 'light' and the method of painting is known as 'progressive illumination'. It is worth noting that the picture of the Transfiguration is usually the first icon that a monk-iconographer paints, so that Christ 'may make his light shine in his heart.' A manuscript of Mount Athos sets down the epiclesis or invocation of the Holy Spirit on the 'divine art': 'Let him pray with tears so that God may enter his soul. Let him go to the priest so that he may pray over him and say the hymn of the Transfiguration'. The canons of the councils suggest that the iconographer 'work with the fear of God, for his is a *divine art*.'"

light, purifying and sanctifying.[88] As already stated in the opening paragraph of their chapter, all four of Euthymius' heroes attain this goal.

At one point, Ivan is compared to Moses when Ivan climbs up the rock again in order to take refuge: "And he found a very high rock, and immediately ascended it just that one [Moses] who had a vision of God at one time [ascended] Mount Sinai; and [Moses] entered into an impenetrable darkness of a vision of God and received the tablets written by the hand of God."[89] The Old Testament scene of the original vision of God by Moses -- which is later witnessed by the disciples as the Taboric Light in the New Testament -- is referred to here; and by the power of comparison, Ivan, it can be assumed, achieved his vision of God. Later in the vita, this is stated more explicitly: "Oh esteemed leader [Ivan]... standing before the throne of the King of all and clearly delighting in the light of the consubstantial Trinity."[90] Almost the same image is echoed in the LIM: "...for now, having destroyed the mirror and divination you see clearly the Holy Trinity."[91] This image used by Euthymius is lifted almost directly from the writings of Gregory the Sinaite. In his Κεφάλαια, he places considerable emphasis on the Trinity. A passage found in Chapter 98 corresponds closely to these excerpts from the Euthymian vitæ:

> And when they, having made themselves in one image, are united through the Spirit into one, then directly and essentially they will come to know both divine and mortal things such as they are in reality, they will contemplate clearly their characteristics, and, as much as is possible, they will clearly see the one and only reason for everything -- the Trinity.[92]

---

88 Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIVe siècle," 10.

89 "I obrěts ubo kamenь zělo vysokь, abie vъsxodit jakože bogovidecь inogda na Sinaijskǫą, vъxoditь vъ nevъxodimyj mrakь bogoviděnia, priemletь i sъ bogopisannyą skrižali" (LIR, VII, 16)

90 "Ioanne...prědstoą u prěstola vъsěxь carě i jasno naslaždaą są světa, edinosǫštnyą trojcą" (LIR, XIII, 25-26).

91 "ibo nyně, razdrěšьšem są zrъcalomь i gadaniomь, čistě zriši svątǫą trojcǫ" (LHM, XVIII, 57).

92 The original passage reads as follows: "Ἡνίκα δὲ εἰς ἓν συναφθῶσι διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἑνοειδεῖς γενόμεναι, τηνικαῦτα τὰ θεῖα καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἀμέσως καὶ οὐσιωδῶς, ὡς ἔχουσι φύσεως γινώσκουσι, καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν τρανῶς θεωροῦσι, καὶ τὴν μίαν αἰτίαν τῶν ὅλων Τριάδα" (Migne, *PG* 150, 1272B).

In the introduction of the LP, Euthymius states that Paraskeva attained a vision, but raises her prestige by comparing it to that of other saints before her: "But if someone were to tell of her deeds, which were better [than other saints], then because of these deeds [i.e., dějanie, πράξις] she would shine out; and were someone to tell of her vision [viděnie], which was loftier than theirs, then you would see how she would be adorned like the sun, which shines forth its rays everywhere."[93] Sun imagery occupies a primary importance in the symbology of the Taboric Light. In the mosaic at St. Catherine's, mentioned above, Christ appears as the source of a brilliant sunburst which emanates to his disciples who surround him. The image of the sun in Hesychastic mysticism is dealt with specifically by Symeon the New Theologian (949-1022) in his treatise *Divinorum amorum* (*Hymns of Divine Love*): during the vision of the Divine light, God descends into the soul like a brilliant sun.[94] Sun imagery is used also in the introduction to the LP in which Euthymius writes: "Like the sun in the summer hours when it spreads its rays over the whole earth, all living things grow and blossom, flourishing more."[95] Then, there is a repetition of sun imagery with a passage in chapter VI which equates divine rays with miracles: "Everywhere miracles are being requested, and everywhere rays of divine acts were being dispersed, and they lit up every end of the earth."[96] This passage provides a correspondence back to the original reference of Paraskeva as the sun: we are to understand that as a sun, Paraskeva is both the recipient of a vision of the Divine Light and a source of miracles. This idea is reinforced by the passage in chapter VII which employs lightning rather than sun imagery: "Because of this your glory, the action of your miracles, will spread over all the earth just as

93 "Ašte bo vъ děanixъ rečetъ kto těx izeštny, i sia děanij radi prosia; ašte viděniemъ vysočajše těxъ, i siju simъ vidiši ukrašenu, vъsudu jakože sijьjnce luče ispuštaejtъ." (LP, I, 59).

94 Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIVe siècle," 10.

95 "Jakože bo sijьjku, vъ proletnjeje časy luče po vsej prostrěvšu zemli, vsa životnaa rastutъ i botějutъ, na bolšeje prěspěvajušte" (LP, I, 59-60).

96 "Vъsudu bo prosia čjudesi, vъsudu luče rasprostrětъ blagodějtnyje, vъse ozari zemlьnye konce." (LP, VI, 70).

lightning lights up the whole world."[97] The idea of Paraskeva's vision is developed through the image of the sun and through the statement made in the concluding passage that she now converses face to face with God[98], Furthermore, Euthymius states clearly that Paraskeva "through her deeds [dějanie, πράξις] found ascent in the vision of God."[99] In this one sentence, both of the components of Gregory the Sinaite's teachings -- πράξις and θεωρία -- are referred to explicitly.

The third and last moment of contemplation brings the Hesychast to a supernatural knowledge of the world[100], or as Richardson paraphrases Gregory the Sinaite's teaching, "The soul of the Hesychast reaches the highest degree of enlightenment, and he realizes the real essence of things."[101] In other words, all of creation reveals itself to the Hesychast, devoid of mystery, and the mind of the individual can penetrate directly to the essential, elementary yet otherwise elusive, understanding of nature, such as man once enjoyed before the fall, such as Adam once had.

As we have seen, the concept of the retrieval or reclaiming of man's proto-state as Adam is mentioned specifically in the Euthymian vitæ, as is the next step of the sanctification of the Hesychast. Gregory teaches that at this point, the Hesychast, now in his primordial state of Adam, is filled with love for the Bridegroom, Christ; he "converses privately and unqualifiedly with God, and a personal and physical contact is made with God himself."[102] Averincev writes that in an apocryphal apothegm (изречение) attributed to Jesus Christ[103] one finds the suggestion to "lift

---

97 "Sego radi slava tvoa po vsej zemli prostrět se i dějstva čjudesъ tvoixъ jakože mlъnie vъsu osvětiše zemlju" (LP,VII,73-74).

98 "nъ licemъ kъ licu čistě sъbesěduješi emu" (LP,IX,76).

99 "I tako ubo děaniemъ vъ viděnii obrěte vъsxod" (LP,III,65).

100 Bois, "Grégroie le Sinaite," 71.

101 Richardson, op.cit., 20.

102 ibid.

103 See С. Аверинцев, *Поэтика ранневизантийской литературы*, Москва: АН СССР, 1977, p.54. He refers to the book *ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ. Sayings of Our Lord from an Early Greek Papyrus*, disc.and ed. by B.P. Grenfell and A.D. Hunt, London: 1897, p.17

the stone" and "chop up the tree" in order to meet face to face with the "embodied absolute"[104], the vision of God; but the reference to the mirror (ἔσοπτρον) and looking face to face with God is found in the canonical Bible: 1 Cor 13.12 ("For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then I shall know even as also I am known"). It is from the biblical source that Gregory the Sinaite incorporated this idea into his doctrine.

There are some overt statements of this third and last moment of Hesychastic ascent in θεωρία included in both the LP and the LPh. Chapter 3 of Section III contains many citations from the subtheme of the "Bridegroom Christ" and the "Bride of Christ"; but the most explicit passages of the attainment of this Hesychastic movement are these: 1) "not by means of mirrors and divination, but face to face you converse purely with Him"[105]; and 2) "...not with mirrors and divination, but face to face you see your Bridegroom, sweet Jesus for whom you prepared yourself and were not ashamed; you do not speak with him plaintively but as if to your own kin..."[106] At this moment of the vision, the Hesychast is as close as possible to God, the "union intime avec Dieu"[107] has been achieved.

Proxorov writes that Gregory the Sinaite "immersed himself in the 'mental paradise' of contemplation, from which he exited enlightened, joyous, and with the conviction that he had already tasted the sweetness of the resurrection of the soul, the acquittal at the Last Judgment and solemn immortality."[108] Euthymius employs this idea from Gregory's teachings

---

104 The "воплощенный абсолют"; see Аверинцев, ibid.

105 "nlyinja bo ne jako zrъcalomь i gadaniemь zriši, jakože vъzždeléia jesi, Xrista, nь licemь kъ licu čistě sъbesěduješi emu." (LP,VII,72).

106 "ne zrъcalomь i gadaniem, nǫ licemь kъ licu svoego zriši ženixa, Isusa sladkago, Isusa ljubeznago...i ne smąte są, i ne xodatajstъvně kъ nemu besědueši, nǫ svojstъvně" (LPh,XIV,98).

107 Bois, "L'hésychasme avant le XIVe siècle," 10.

108 See Г.М. Прохоров, "Исихазм и общественная мысль в Восточной Европе в XIV в.," *ТОДРЛ* 23 (1968): 86-108, p.88. The original passage reads: "[Григорий Синаит погружался] в 'мысленный рай' созерцаний, откуда он выходил просветленным, радостным, с уверенностью, что уже вкусил сладость воскресения души, оправдания на Страшном суде и торжествующего бессмертия."

and includes it in the LP and the LPh: both women undergo visions of the Last Judgment, and though it is not stated that both experience their acquittal, the vision is associated, in the case of LP, with spiritual purification and the meeting with the Bridegroom Christ, and in the case of Philothea, with the familiar scene of the shedding of tender tears of emotion that accompanies the ascent of the Hesychast through θεωρία:

> She had there no care for the yokes of oxen, nor for golden-bridled horses, nor for clothing, nor for beds, nor for homes, nor for maiden servants, but for spiritual purification and for the answer of the Judgment to come, and for the meeting with her Bridegroom (LP, III)[109]

> And she soaked her bed with her incessant tears; and there passed before her face [a vision] of the Last Judgment, of the incorruptible Judge and the merciless angels. (LPh, VII)[110]

Many of the steps of πράξις and θεωρία that are expounded by Gregory the Sinaite in his "Chapters" and portrayed by Euthymius in his lives are not at all specific to the Hesychasts. These concepts are known to the generations of mid- and late-fourteenth-century Hesychasts through the writings of Palamas and Gregory the Sinaite, but their origins are found in the writings of Plato and Origen. The themes of ascesis (fasting, seclusion, constant prayer, psalmody, virtue, tears, vigils) as well as the poetic images describing a union with God (the Bride of Christ, the act of conversing with God, the image of gazing into the mirror) are all taken directly from an early biblical and patristic tradition that appears in the earliest Christian writings.

This significance of the image of the Bride of Christ and the Bridegroom (Christ) as a metaphoric depiction of Christ's relationship to the Church, for example, had long ago been dealt with by Christian intellectuals. Hippolytus discusses it in his commentary on the Song of

---

109 "Ne bě toj tamo popečenie o sъprugoxъ volovъ, niže o zlatouzdnyxъ konjexъ, ne o odeždaxъ i posteljax, ne o domox i rabynjax, nъ o duševnomъ očištenii, o otvětě vuduštago suda, o srětenii ženixově" (LP,III,63-64).

110 "i nepréstanno postelą slьzami omakaaše i strašnoe ono i groznoe préd licemъ provoždaaše sǫdište i sǫdiǫ neumytnaago i nemilostivyą aggely" (LPh,VII,89).

Songs and Origen after him.[111] For Origen, the Song of Songs is about "the soul's intimate converse with God."[112] Origen considers the Song of Songs to be the third and ultimate step in a spiritual ascent that begins with Proverbs (the moral step), then Ecclesiastes (the physical step) and ends with this last book of the Wisdom of Solomon (the metaphysical step).[113] Consequently, Euthymius' references to the Song of Songs, the Bride of Christ, the Bridegroom, direct conversation with God in the LP and the LPh may be seen, in a larger historical context, as not specifically Hesychastic but rather Origenistic in content. While this is true, it must nevertheless be remembered that many Platonic and early Christian ideas reached the medieval Slavs through the medium of Hesychastic intellectuals, beginning with Evagrius and culminating with Gregory the Sinaite. Only in this sense were these concepts tied to Hesychasm.

The concepts elaborated by Gregory the Sinaite and expressed by Euthymius can hardly be called purely Hesychastic; nor can they, moreover, be identified as stemming solely from either the mystical line of Christian thought or the anti-mystical line of thought. In fact, the emphasis on both contemplation (θεωρία) and on the restoration of man from a fallen state to a better, primordial state reveal a kind of patchwork of both a neoplatonic Origenistic view on the one hand and the Athanasian *creatio ex nihilo* view on the other, the latter of which renounces the concept of contemplation.[114]

Few of the features examined here allow us to characterize the Euthymian hagiographic texts as being inspired soley by the tenets of Hesychast mysticism. Indeed, most of the tenets of Gregory the Sinaite's "Chapters" are taken directly from a long-established ascetic tradition and do not break from the mainstream of monastic practice. The concept of a vision of the Divine, Taboric Light is, however, specific to the Hesychasts;

---

111 A. Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition From Plato to Denys*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981, p.55.

112 ibid., 57.

113 ibid., 58.

114 ibid., 78-79.

and this image, as we have already demonstrated, is developed in all of Euthymius' works. Furthermore, all doubt as to the connection between Euthymius' theological message and the teachings of the Hesychasts is laid to rest when one considers the fact that he himself uses several times the Slavonic word for "Hesychasm", that is, "bezmъlvie", to specify the goal of his heroes. Thus, through his literary works, Euthymius reveals himself to be a supporter of the tenets of the Hesychasts.[115]

Even if the figures depicted in Euthymius' saints' lives were not Hesychasts in actuality, the fact that he creates out of them model Hesychasts is of supreme importance in what this states about the culture of Euthymius' day. Euthymius was commissioned to write all of these vitæ, and -- as is explicitly stated in the *Life of Paraskeva* [116] -- he was working in some cases under the royal subvention of Tsar Ivan Šišman. Tsar Ivan was a patron of the cenobitic community at the Ivanovo Cave Monastery (where he had a royal chapel dug out of the side of a cliff) as well as the benefactor of many other centers of Hesychastic activity.[117] These facts indicate that Hesychasm -- in its form as a religious, monastic movement -- was the official expression of Orthodox spirituality in the Bulgarian court during Euthymius' patriarchate.

---

115 Other textual evidence for this conclusion is found in Camblak's "poxvalno slovo" on Euthymius and has been discussed above in Section III, chapter 1, fn 123. See also П.Динеков, "Личността на Евтимий Търновски," *Старобългарска литература* 7 (1980): 3-21. On page 8 he comments specifically on the portrait of Euthyius as a Hesychast that is painted by Camblak in the "poxvalno slovo": "Исихазмът е важен момент във формирането на личността и мирогледа на Евтимий. Евтимий черпи от първоизвора--преките ученици на Григорий Синаит в България и Византия. В близост до Теодосий той се запознава не само с теорията на исихазма, но и с неговата практика; наблюдава своя учител в екстазно молитвено състояние."

116 In the first chapter of the LP, Euthymius writes: "And although the government of Your [Majesty's] pious kingdom, being zealous [in its faith], calls upon our powerlessness [to pursue] this blessed work which is pleasing to God..." ("Iъ, elma država tvoego blagočьstivaago carьstva usrьdstvujet i ponuždajet našu nemoštь vъ sie blagoje i bogougodnoje dělo..." LP, I, 60).

117 The *Life of Theodosius* by Kallistos informs us that Tsar Ivan Alexander granted Theodosius the Monastery at Kelifarevo, of which he became the abbot; and during Ivan Alexander's reign other Hesychastic centers sprang up in Messembria, Madara and Červen (see J.Fine, *The Late Medieval Balkans*, 440).

As the patriarch of Bulgaria and an aristocrat (it is believed that Euthymius was bom into a boyar family) in the court of the royal capital, Euthymius would have served as an apologist for the cultural and religious norms of his day, not as a representative of any minor or off-shoot movement within the Orthodox Church. In fact, Euthymius devotes much of the narrative of his vitæ to renouncing the heresies that persisted in Bulgaria of his day: Messalianism, Manichaeanism, Bogomilism, and Hellenism. In the *Life of Hilarion* Euthymius reveals his knowledge of the central figures in heretical controversies of the past, thus removing any doubt from his audience of the possibility that he, as a Christian, might err out of ignorance of history's challenges to Orthodoxy. On the contrary, by developing the subjects of his hagiographic works as Hesychasts, he solidified his position as a defender of the official position of the Church. With Hesychast patriarchs on the throne in Constantinople and with Hesychasm sanctioned at home by the tsar himself, Patriarch Euthymius was not only at liberty to but probably actually compelled to create out of his heroes paragons of Hesychastic zeal and devotion.

Chapter 3
In Search of Celestial Language: A Semiotic Approach to Metaphrastic and Euthymian Aesthetics

> 'Twould be better for the sun to be extinguished than for Euthymius' tongue to be silenced.[1]
> --*Joseph of Vidin*

In the first chapter of Section IV of this work, we presented what amounts to a diachronic analysis of the rhetorical heritage which was passed on to Euthymius and the aesthetics of the post-Metaphrastic period. This chapter aims to present a synchronic analysis of Metaphrastic and Euthymian aesthetics. As the reader will recall, we have already demonstrated that an examination of Euthymian aesthetics entails defining Metaphrastic aesthetics, because Euthymius is a direct descendent of this tradition. Analyzing the aesthetics of medieval literature in the theoretical framework of semiotic study is a fruitful application. The structural and linguistic peculiarities of the hagiographic tradition begun by Symeon Metaphrastes and continued in the Slavic world by Patriarch Euthymius can be described in terms introduced by such theoreticians as Lotman, Jakobson, Mukařovský, and Bakhtin. If we can accept medieval literature as art, then we can view this art as a system of signs that carries information to the reader-decoder just as we can view contemporary literature in this light. Through a semiotic analysis of the texts of Euthymius, the underlying changes in the synthesis of signs that take place in the post-Metaphrastic tradition and the implications of these changes for the formation of a literary style become clearer.

1 A passage from Metropolitan Joseph of Vidin's panegyric to Philothea, published in Kałużniacki, *Aus der panegyrischen Litteratur der Südslaven*, London, 1971. The original passage reads: "Unje ubo bě silъku ugasnuti, neželi Evtimievu ezyku umlъknuti." (chap.IX, p.110, lines17-18).

The "lexicon" and "syntax" of the language of the vita genre:

In his seminal book, *Структура художественного текста*, Lotman writes that "every system that serves the goals of communication between two or many individuals can be defined as a language."[2] In the course of the first chapter, Lotman develops the argument that all forms of art, having as their aim the communication of a message, are a form of language; not a "natural language", like Russian or French, but a special kind of language than can be called a "secondary modeling system." Just as natural languages have signs, which are represented by their lexical inventory, the language of art also has signs; and just as natural languages have rules that govern the synthesis or ordering of its lexicon-signs (i.e. syntax), so too, "secondary modeling systems" have rules that govern the synthesis of its signs. The first step in our inquiry is to determine what the signs are that make up the lexicon of the "language" of the vita genre as a whole. Lotman's formula "secondary modeling system" does not contribute to an understanding of the differences between the use of language for ordinary purposes and its use for aesthetic purposes; the formula merely represents one way of describing that the differences exists. In our stated task of differentiating between pre- and post-Metaphrastic aesthetics, we place the greatest emphasis on Jakobson's familiar dyadic analysis of language according to the metonymic-metaphoric poles. What Lotman's discussion of the synthesis of signs provides us with is a framework with which to introduce the notion of a "syntax" that governs the ordering of "lexical units" or "signs" in the "language" of the hagiographic genre.

The most basic model that is contained in the hagiographic genre taken as a whole is that of a binary world view: there is a holy personage and an evil personage; and these personages represent the two basic signs of the "language" of the hagiographic genre. Every formulaic theme and subtheme, the topoi of the genre, is an elaboration of these two basic signs and serves to "encode" them with more information. Each individual vita may contain many specific signs from categories, such as animal, food or

---

2 Ю. Лотман, *Стуктура художественного текста*, Moscow, 1970; reprint, Brown University Slavic Reprint Series 9, Providence: Brown University Press, 1971, p.13. The original passage reads: "Всякая система, служащая целям коммуникации между двумя или многими индивидами, может быть определена как язык."

celestial imagery, but all imagery will refer either to the holy personage or the evil personage. The themes of origins, training, comparison and death convey information about the holy personage; while the theme of deeds (and sometimes death where it includes posthumous miracles) serves to give more information about the holy personage in relation both to good and evil. This is precisely why the theme of deeds and death are the most essential themes of the genre: without them there is no conflict, no drama of struggle between the two worlds (struggles which always end in victory of holy over evil), and there would be no basis or grounds for sanctity.

What is the basic semiotic structure (i.e. the synthesis of signs) of the hagiographic genre? In its most basic form, the only requirement for the synthesis of signs (or the "syntax" of the "language" of the vita-genre) is that the holy personage (let "H" represent him/her) must be juxtaposed to the evil personage ("E"), which juxtaposition is represented by "EH". Preferably this juxtaposition will occur many times, thus increasing the level of sanctity of "H"; and after each encounter with "E", "H" emerges transformed as now more saintly, which is represented by "H^1". This notion of multiple juxtapositions of the two basic signs can be expressed simply as "EH...". What gets formed in the synthesis of our two basic signs, then, is a chain of sign juxtaposed to sign in such a way that their sum warrants the holy personage's status as saint, and with each juxtaposition, the restoration of harmony is guaranteed: "H" will always vanquish "E".

In order to complete the structure of the language of the vita-genre, more, however, is required than simply the juxtaposition of the two signs. The synthesis is essential to a correct decoding of the information. The "syntax" of the structure looks like this: $\{H + [(EH \dashrightarrow H^1)...]\}$. This represents the most basic possible structure: sign of H is introduced (this is the function of the introduction to the vita); then E must confront H (i.e. EH), but H vanquishes (sign of H again, but now transformed through increased glory, represented by H^1, which is the function of the conclusion to the vita, usually in the form of a prayer or panegyric to the saint).[3]

---

3 This is similar to the phenomenon described by L. Ginzburg in "О структуре литературного персонажа" (in *Искусство Слова: Сборник статей к 80-летию Д.Д.Благого*, 376-388, Москва, 1973) as the "hero's exposition". According to Ginzburg, the structure of the novel necessitates the introduction of the protagonist as having a value (or characteristic) x, and this is specified later in the novel as (+ or -) x. Quoted in K. Pomorska, "Poetics of Prose" in *Roman Jakobson: Verbal Art, Verbal Sign,*

What we can take from Lotman's vocabulary is this: all vitæ, when considered as a whole, have a language; furthermore, this language has a lexicon, which is the sum of its signs; and, moreover, this language has a structure (or syntax), i.e. rules for governing the synthesis of its signs.[4] Just as English (a "natural language", according to Lotman's definition) has a lexicon and a syntax regarding the possible synthesis of its lexicon -- which, on the level of a basic analysis, is usually SVO (subject-verb-object) and will only sometimes tolerate a syntax of OSV, but not SOV, OVS, VSO or VOS[5] -- so all secondary modelling systems seek to communicate information, inasmuch as they are a kind of language. Just as English, an analytical language, cannot tolerate certain syntheses of lexical components which can be tolerated by synthetic languages (like Russian, Greek or Latin), so the language of all art too has rules that govern the synthesis of its lexicon.

Bakhtin offers a different binary analysis of human verbal expression, a schema which breaks down all utterances (whether spoken or written) into two categories: "simple" speech genres and "complex" speech genres. Lotman's analysis can be compared with Bakhtin's inasmuch as in both systems, all verbal art falls into the category that represents the more abstracted, more complex (Bakhtin), or secondary (Lotman) category.[6]

To return to our work of examining the vita-genre, we repeat that basic structure is H (statement of holy personage) + EH (juxtaposition of evil personage and holy personage, which ends in victory for holy personage, and which juxtaposition can be repeated several times) ---> H^1

Verbal Time, 169-177, Oxford: Blackwell, p.173. The protagonist is introduced, and there is atributed to him or her the quality of sanctity, which is always specified and restated later as +H, or, according to our notation, H^1.

4 Лотман, op.cit., 14-16.

5 There are, of course, other human languages that will tolerate these word orders. Cf. H.H. Hock, *Principles of Historical Linguistics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1988, pp.316-319.

6 Cf. M.M. Bakhtin, "The Problem of Speech Genres," in *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*, edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 60-102, University of Texas Slavic Series, no.8. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. (original Russian "Проблема речевых жанров," in *М. М. Бахтин: Литературно-критические статьи*, 428-472. Москва:Худож. лит.,1986.)

(restatement of holy personage after transformation). Just as the laws governing English syntax will not allow variations SVO, we cannot replace our basic linguistic structure of the vita with {[(EH ---> H^1)...] + H}, nor are other combinations of the components H, EH, and H^1 possible. In essence, the structure, or the synthesis of signs of the "language" of the vita genre is fixed: the two basic signs "EH" must be "framed" on either side by a statement of the sign "H" alone, which is accomplished by the introduction and the conclusion to the life. The restatement of "H" at the end as "H^1" represents the evolution of H to a more glorious state, which is in itself a direct result of the victory over evil ("EH"). This basic structure of the life is similar to the basic structure of some fairy tales, in which there can be an underlying structure of the good personage ("G") and an evil personage ("E"). In the introduction, the sign "G" is stated. Then in the development of the plot, "E" is juxtaposed to "G", but "G" vanquishes; and then the sign "G" is restated as "G^1", where "G^1"represents "G" after a transformation usually through the medium of some magical powers, like the kiss of a prince or the aid of a wizard. Thus the basic structure of the "language" of some fairy tales is the same as the saint's life and can be expressed with the same formula: {G + [(EG--->G^1)...]}.

Obviously, our observations regarding the similarity of the transformation of the main actant(s), which function as character-signs, does not apply to all fairy tales. In his work *Морфология сказки*, Vladimir Propp flatly rejects any analysis of the fantastic tale that attempts to classify them by themes. He writes: "...we shall say that the division of fairy tales according to theme is, in general, impossible."[7] The formula given for the vita genre fits all vitæ and shares a common disposition of signs with many, though certainly not all, fairy tales.

Our formula for the narrative of the saint's life represents the simplified message (Lotman's "сообщение"[8]), which is "good vanquishes evil", and the most simplified formula for the synthesis of signs in the language of the genre as a whole. Most often the important characteristics

7 This is taken from the English-translation version of his book, *Morphology of the Folktale*, trans. Laurence Scott, 2nd ed., Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1968, p.7.

8 Лотман, op.cit., 22.

of the actants H and E are communicated to the reader (i.e. "encoded" for the reader) through the use of other signs associated with them. This is the case for vitæ of all periods, though the density of such signs in the text varies.

Metaphrastic and Euthymian Aesthetics: Different Synthesis, Different Messages:

The vitæ of Euthymius -- written according to the norms of the post-Metaphrastic tradition -- employ the same signs but follow different rules for their synthesis than do the pre-Metaphrastic texts. Furthermore, this change in synthesis, if it is not superfluous, can only indicate that a different message is being transmitted.[9] The basic stock of signs employed in the Euthymian and other post-Metaphrastic texts is the same as for those texts mentioned above, but the signs in the post-Metaphrastic texts are repeated and interwoven into the text in a way that produces less tension between the forces of the holy personage and the evil personage (i.e., EH) and more emphasis simply on the holy personage (i.e., H and H^1). Speaking in terms of narrative structure, this is achieved through avoiding numerous repetitions of the formula [(EH--->H^1)...]. Rather, through a different synthesis of signs, the author can "encode" the information contained in H^1 to the reader-decoder without having to articulate the formula [(EH---> H^1)...]. This is achieved technically by increasing in the text the number of thematic phrases and formulaic images associated with H^1, expressing the hero's virtues and sanctity.

We can elucidate the basic difference in the synthesis in the following way: the formula for the synthesis of signs in the pre-Metaphrastic tradition, as we have seen, is {H + [(EH ---> H^1)...]}. If the author-encoder of the signs wants to communicate H^1, he must, according to these rules for synthesis, precede H^1 by a statement of EH. And these statements of EH may -- and usually do in the pre-Metaphrastic tradition -- occur often in the text. By contrast, the formula for the synthesis of signs in the post-Metaphrastic tradition may be expressed as: {H + [(EH...) ---> (H^1...)]}. What this implies is that both EH and H^1 individually may be stated many

9 See Лотман, op.cit., 17.

times, and "EH" has to be stated at least once; but a statement of H^1 (the holy personage increased in his sanctity through conflict with evil) is not dependent on an immediately preceding statement of EH. As we see, the signs have not changed: they are still H, E, and H^1, but their synthesis has changed.

A change in the synthesis of signs does result, as Lotman states, in a differing message. As stated in Section III, Chapter 1, the emphasis of the post-Metaphrastic texts consists not in what the saint does, not in specific deeds, incidents, anecdotes that pit him against the forces of evil, but in the distilled, timeless and universal qualities. To restate this in terms of our signs, the emphasis is now on "H^1" rather than on "EH".

What consequences does this shift in signs have for our study of Metaphrastic and Euthymian aesthetics and the development of a particular literary style? The information transmitted by these two syntheses of signs is clearly different. Moreover, we would argue that the latter formula presents information that is more complex than the former, for in the latter, H^1 is sometimes but not always a result of EH, whereas in the former example it is always and only a result of EH. Lotman maintains that an increase in the complexity of information automatically necessitates a greater complexity of semiotic structure:

> Looking at the nature of semiotic structure, one can make the following observation: the complexity of the structure [i.e. the synthesis of signs] is in direct proportional relationship to the complexity of the information transmitted. Increasing the complexity of the information inevitably leads to an increase in the complexity of the semiotic structure [synthesis of signs] used to transmit the information...According to this notion, there cannot exist in a correctly constructed semiotic system--i.e. in one that accomplishes its goal--superfluous, unjustified complexity.[10]

In the case of the post-Metaphrastic texts, it is precisely because the message is more complex that a more complex structure is required.

---

10 Лотман, op.cit.,17. The original text reads: "Рассматривая природу семиотических структур, можно сделать одно наблюдение: сложность стуктуры находится в прямо пропорциональной зависимости от сложности предаваемой информации. Усложнение характера информации неизбежно приводит и к усложнению используемой для ее передачи семиотической системы. При этом в правильно построенной (то есть достигающей цели, ради которой она создана) семиотической системе не может быть излишней, неоправданной сложности."

Lotman cites poetic language as an example of a semiotic structure of enormous complexity when compared to natural language; and this observation is germane to our own study.

Clearly, the language (here, meaning literary style) of the texts of the post-Metaphrastic tradition is more complex. All that we have established thus far is that the post-Metaphrastic tradition represents a more complex synthesis of signs; so to make such a statement implies that we have equated a more complex literary style with a more complex synthesis of signs. But we must ask ourselves whether this is justified. Can we attribute the appearance of a more ornate literary style in the post-Metaphrastic tradition to an increase in the complexity of the information and the synthesis of signs? If we accept Lotman's thesis, it is justified. A more complex structure (synthesis of signs) is characteristic of poetic language (i.e. the language of verbal art). This is to say that a more complex structure is an indicator or marker of poetic language.

As we have just mentioned, the texts written according to Metaphrastic aesthetics do communicate a more complex message, and this will be elaborated below. The more complex message justifies the use of the more complex structure. If the more complex structure were not justified by the message, then, according to Lotman, the structure would have to be simplified. Lotman maintains that if the synthesis of signs of simple speech (i.e. natural language) transmitted the same information as the synthesis of signs of poetic language, then poetic language would perish:

> Poetic speech presents a structure of great complexity. It is significantly complex in relation to "natural language". And if the information contained in poetic (either as poetry or prose--in the given context, it doesn't matter) language and common language were the same, then poetic language would lose its right to exist and would, undoubtedly, die out. [11]

---

11 ibid. The original reads: "Поэтическая речь представляет собой структуру большой сложности. Она значительно усложнена по отношению к естественному языку. И еслу бы объем информации, содержащейся в поэтической (стихотворной или прозаической--в данном случае не имеет значения) и обычной речи был одинаковым, художественная речь потеряла бы право на существование и, бесспорно, отмерла бы."

We believe we are justified, moreover, in terming the language of Euthymian texts and other texts written in the post-Metaphrastic tradition as more poetic than those of the pre-Metaphrastic tradition. We need not rely solely on Lotman to provide a theoretical framework for our discussion. Jakobson and Bakhtin both offer a similar construct for viewing the stylistic shift that takes place in the hagiographic genre under Metaphrastic aesthetics, a shift that is characterized by an ornamentality of style (what we term here the "poeticization" of the hagiographic text).

Bakhtin suggests that "historical changes in language styles are inseparably linked to changes in speech genres."[12] This observation corresponds precisely to what we have just observed in Lotman's terms: namely, that the change in the literary style (the way linguistic units are put together to form meaning, or the synthesis of signs) exists in order to accommodate a change (and greater complexity) of message, which is the kind of "change in speech genres" to which Bakhtin is referring. This change could be put, as well, in familiar Jakobsonian terms: in comparing aesthetics of the pre-Metaphrastic tradition with the post-Metaphrastic tradition, one finds that the addresser, addressee, context, and contact are all constants, but there is a radical shift in the "message" and, consequently in the "code".[13]

The Poeticization of the Hagiographic Text:

In the Euthymian vitæ, as in hagiographic texts in general of the post-Metaphrastic tradition, there is a greater tendency toward what we term the "poeticization" of the text. In this evolution, the "linear", anecdotal narrative is abandoned for a narrative that represents a composite of thematic and formulaic phrases that serve to remind the reader of a theme or subtheme through the repetition of one or several phrases but not through an actual tale about the saint. In Jakobsonian terms, the weaving of subthemes becomes, for the Metaphrastic and Euthymian poetic text, the "dominant" that integrates all of the parts into a whole structure; the

12 Bakhtin, op.cit.,65.

13 See R.Jakobson, "Linguistics and Poetics", in *Style in Langauge*, ed. by T.A. Seboeok, Cambridge, Mass; reprinted in *Selected Writings*, vol.3, Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry, 18-51, The Hague: Mouton, 1981, pp.21-22.

weaving of subthemes is the organizing principle of this kind of poetic text just as rhyme, syllable or meter can serve as the dominant for other, "pure" poetic texts.[14]

The proposal that Euthymian (and in general, post-Metaphrastic) aesthetics is characterized by a growing "poeticization" of the text is not at odds with the fact that (as chapter 2 of Section III has demonstrated) all or most of the figurative language is borrowed and unoriginal. Mukařovský comments on this phenomenon in poetic language, pointing out that there are whole movements or periods in which novelty is not sought. The times spanning the tenth through the fourteenth centuries may certainly be regarded as examples of such a period:

> It would be equally incorrect to propose "novelty" as the essential quality of poetic reference, since there are frequent instances of poets and whole schools of poetry fond of using traditional references.[15]

We shall now explain what we mean by the "poeticization" of the hagiographic genre. Just as any system of communication (and any art form, inasmuch as it is a system of communication) has basic and more highly developed and sophisticated modes of expression, so does human language. A primal musical expression employing percussion is not on the same level as Bach or Mozart; the cave drawing of Dordogne and Altamira are but the beginnings of the human potential that later produced Michaelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci. So in human language, quotidian linguistic expression (i.e. the use of language for ordinary purposes) does not exist on the same plane as poetic language. This much is obvious. These things need not, however, be viewed in terms of evolutionary processes. One can restate these analogies by means of synchronic rather than diachronic analogies: an attempt to trace the outlines of an original masterpiece painting with pencil and tracing paper, or the whistling or

---

14 Cf. R.Jakobson, "The Dominant" in *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*, ed. L.Matejka and K. Pomorska, 82-87, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1971.

15 J.Mukařovský, "Poetic Reference" in *Semiotics of Art*, ed. by Ladislav Matejka and Irwin R. Titunik, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1976: 155-163, p.155 (appeared originally as "Dénomination poétique et la fonction esthétique de la langue," *Actes du Congrès international de linguistes [1936]*, 98-104, Copenhagen, 1938).

humming of a symphonic opus will inevitably compromise and destroy something of the original structure and information of the original work, just as a re-telling of a poem or passage of lyrical prose into quotidien, or "primary", language also changes the structure -- the information and the polyphonic character of all of these art forms is compromised.

Just as the information "encoded" in a Bach concerto, a painting by Michaelangelo or a poem by Virgil cannot be "restated" without destroying the structure of the work and, therefore, part of the information, so too with the literary prose texts of Euthymius. These texts are already encoded in "poetic" language, that is, in a linguistic medium that is clearly crafted for aesthetic effect. While the hagiographic texts of the pre-Metaphrastic tradition, as art, are also encoded in a linguistic system that, by virtue of the texts' literariness, is not the same as ordinary language; we would, nevertheless, posit that less is lost in their "re-telling" into "natural" language. To retell one of Euthymius' vitæ, to "transfer" the content of the text from the poetic to the quotidien form of expression, from the intricate interweaving of subthemes to more simple narrative, is to destroy completely the poetic integrity of the original. We would posit that in the transposition of the pre-Metaphrastic text from the poetic to the ordinary system of language, much less of the artistic integrity of the original is lost in the translation, less of the complexity is destroyed, much less information is compromised.

Lévi-Strauss in his seminal article "The Structural Study of Myth" draws conclusions about the language of the myth in contradistinction to poetry that converge quite closely with what we have said here our contrastive study of the simpler, more "anecdotal" language of the pre-Metaphrastic texts as compared to the more "poetic", post-Metaphrastic examples. For Lévi-Strauss, the linguistic expression of the myth is the antipode of poetry in that no level of translation is too unskillful or awkward to destroy the essential meaning, whereas the same is not true of poetic texts:

> Myth is the part of language where the formula *traduttore, traditore* reaches its lowest truth-value. From that point of view it should be put in the whole gamut of linguistic expressions at the end opposite to that of poetry, in spite of all the claims which have been made to prove the contrary. Poetry is a kind of speech which canot be translated except at the cost of serious distortions; whereas the mythical value of the myth remains preserved, even

> through the worst translation. Whatever our ignorance of the language and the culture of the people where it originated, a myth is still felt as a myth by any reader throughout the world. Its substance does not lie in its style, its original music, or its syntax, but in the story which it tells. It is language, functioning on an especially high level where meaning succeeds practically at "taking off" from the linguistic ground on which it keeps on rolling. [16]

A re-telling of the Euthymian vitæ according to the formula {H + [(EH ---> H^1)...]}, which is a less complex structure than {H + [(EH...) ---> (H^1...)]}, destroys the "poetic" aspect of the Euthymian texts. To reduce the Euthymian texts simply to a cause and effect relationship of "good vanquishes evil" fails to encapsulate what makes these texts different from pre-Metaphrastic examples. The difference in artistic complexity within texts of the hagiographic genre can be explained in this way: the synthesis of signs according to the formula {H + [(EH ---> H^1)...]} presents merely a stated plot, and its maximum potential for complexity consists only in a reduplication of the plot, that is, by restating [(EH ---> H^1)...]. But the synthesis of signs according to the formula {H + [(EH...) ---> (H^1...)]} presents rather a more complex potential: that of <u>theme</u> (holiness when confronted with evil vanquishes and produces even greater holiness and sanctity (EH--->H^1)) and <u>variation</u> (once EH has been stated once, H^1 can be stated as many times as the author-encoder wishes with as many corresponding signs as he wishes without an overt statement of EH, for EH is understood to be there).

An analogy can be found in music, in which one can have a stated musical theme followed by variations. Modifications to the theme notwithstanding, the theme can be recognized as the underlying structure of the variation, and these variations can follow one after the other without any restatement of the theme in between them, just as statement of H^1 can be repeated (and are repeated in the form of thematic and formulaic phrases in the Euthymian texts) without a restatement of EH. Variations on a musical theme interspersed throughout a musical text serve as an analogue to the various thematic and formulaic phrases that are interwoven in texts like the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid*, the *Life of Symeon by Sava*, the *Life of Ivan of Rila*, the *Life of Hilarion*, the *Life of Paraskeva*, and the *Life of*

16 Cf. Claude Lévi-Strauss, "The Structural Study of Myth," *Journal of American Folklore* 68 (1955): 428-444, pp.430-431.

Philothea. Each thematic phrase may differ slightly from another, but taken as a group these thematic phrases all have in common the fact that they serve to restate the same literary theme.

The shift in the narrative structure of the hagiographie text away from an anecdotal, "linear" narrative to a structure that models roughly the pattern of theme and variation in music is one of the manifestations of the process of the "poeticization" of the text under Metaphrastic (and Euthymian) aesthetics. This change in narrative structure can be better understood in light of this passage from Pomorska's article "Poetics of Prose":

> In poetry the crucial question is not "what happened?"; there is no chain of events and therefore no suspense based on the expectation of an outcome. Poetry in its epitome...involves rather a system of equivalent pieces of information expressed in various symbolic forms...[17]

Pomorska goes much further than Lotman in actually articulating meaningful differences between ordinary and poetic language. Although this passage refers to poetry in contradistinction to prose, it, nevertheless, reiterates precisely the differences between the texts of the two traditions. In texts of the pre-Metaphrastic tradition the numerous anecdotes that comprise the narrative lay emphasis primarily on "what happened"; whereas the narrative of the post-Metaphrastic texts restate already stated ideas about the saint through a structure of theme and variation that is implemented by various thematic phrases and formulaic images.

Jakobson provides us with the theoretical framework to refine most clearly our definition of the poeticization of the hagiographic text under Metaphrastic aesthetics. The differences in the narrative structure of texts of the pre- and post-Metaphrastic tradition can be explained in terms of Jakobson's bipolar relationship between selection and combination.[18] The process of selection is linked to the cognitive act of drawing metaphoric

---

17 K. Pomorska, "Poetics of Prose" in *Roman Jakobson: Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time*, 169-177, Oxford: Blackwell, p.171.

18 See R.Jakobson, "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances," in *Selected Writings*, vol.II: Word and Language, 239-259, pp.254-256.

analogies and the process of combination, to metonymic analogies.[19] The informational intent of poetry, as described above by Pomorska, to "give equivalent pieces of information expressed in various symbolic forms," describes the pattern of Metaphrastic and Euthymian aesthetics and is situated on Jakobson's metonymic-metaphoric continuum closer to the metaphoric end.[20] Pre-Metaphrastic aesthetics conjoin narrative structures not based on poetic or metaphoric relationships (which is the role of "theme" and "variation" in Metaphrastic and Euthymian aesthetics), but on a plot-sequence contiguity based on metonymic relations and associations. To put it another way, the narrative of the pre-Metaphrastic hagiographic text links into a chain a string of verbal structures that relate to one another through contiguity -- the metonymic principle of plot ("what happens next?"); whereas, by contrast, the post-Metaphrastic text links a string of verbal utterances that relate to each other through similarity, i.e. they restate metaphorically but in differing ways the qualities of the saint.

Assuming that texts of both traditions fall into the category of art, we can justifiably conclude that texts of the post-Metaphrastic tradition are artistically more complex, and moreover, that this complexity is a function of the fact that in the evolution of the genre, the message encoded by the synthesis of signs changed and became more complex and subtle. Changes in complexity of message require more complex semiotic structures. The "word-weaving" literary style is a more complex semiotic structure from what was used before it, and provides a vehicle for expressing the new message.

---

19 Jakobson demonstrates this point through the examination of two types of aphasic disorder. He calls them Similarity and Contiguity Disorders, See Jakobson, ibid.,pp.244-254.

20 For an interesting emendation to Jakobson's dyadic analysis of tropological structuring, based on metaphor and metonymy, to a triadic analysis, cf. M. and M. Shapiro, "The Structure of Figures" in *Figuration in Verbal Art*, 23-45, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988. They add the component of ranking or hierarchization, whereby "ranking or hierarchization represents an evaluative superstructure imparting form to selection, or paradigmatization, and combination, or syntagmatization" (p.27). By introducing the concept of raking, the Shapiros elucidate basic differences in the hierarchical structuring of metonomy and metaphor (see esp. p.30).

Specificity versus Abstraction:

Starting with the assumption that all vitæ exist as art, not only can we talk of comparative degrees of complexity across texts, we can also talk about the differences in the messages that are transmitted through the two different traditions of life-writings in relation to what Jan Mukařovský calls the "aesthetic object". According to Mukařovský, each individual may perceive a work of art differently, according to his own sense perception, but there is something in the work of art -- as an autonomous sign -- which is perceived and understood as a whole by society and in the collective consciousness. That which is perceived and understood in the collective consciousness (i.e. the "signification"), Mukařovský refers to as the "aesthetic object". In other words, the aesthetic object is that which is common to all of the subjective, individual perceptions of the work of art.[21]

The language of the pre-Metaphrastic texts can be characterized as less poetic (here, we mean specifically less figurative) and more reportive, i.e. oriented to the transmission of detailed information about the hero. Furthermore, as we have pointed out above, the emphasis in the synthesis of signs is on the juxtaposition of "EH", that is, on the juxtaposition and confrontation between holiness (sanctity) and evil. With few instances of figurative signs (through metaphor and simile) in these texts, the overriding aesthetic object that resounds in the collective consciousness will no doubt be almost entirely focused on the message of the prevailing dualism of good versus evil. By contrast, in the post-Metaphrastic texts, the aesthetic object will be inextricably bound up in the many poetic signs that serve to restate "H^1" (i.e. the saint as increased in sanctity and holiness) in the text.

Another point in defining the differences between pre- and post-Metaphrastic aesthetics can be illustrated using Mukařovský's terminology. According to Mukařovský, all art exists as an autonomous sign; but in addition to this, all representational art (poetry, prose, painting, sculpture, as opposed to music, dance, architecture) exists simultaneously as

---

21 J.Mukařovský, "Art as Semiotic Fact," 3-10, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1976, pp.3-4; (appeared originally as "L'art comme fait sémiologique", *Actes du huitième Congrès international de philosophie à Prague 1934*, 1065-1072, Prague, 1936).

an informational sign. The entire structure of works of representational art is comprised of the subject (i.e. theme and content) and the formal aspects of the work. This provides a theoretical structure for describing one of the main differences between the pre- and the post-Metaphrastic traditions.

The pre-Metaphrastic tradition produced vitæ that have well developed characters, and these characters are developed largely through the subject of the work, that is through theme and content. Most of the informational power of the work of art of this kind -- to put it in Mukařovský's terms -- is put into the theme and content, whereas in the post-Metaphrastic tradition, the details of the characters are very poorly developed. In other words, the "portrait" of the individual is much less complete, there are far fewer details from his life. In this tradition, most of the informational power of the work of art is in its formal aspects, that is the literary and linguistic devices: in the thematic phrases and formulaic images.

In a sense, then, one could say that the *Life of Anthony*, for example, is much more about Anthony than the *Life of Ivan of Rila* is about Ivan. In the former case, the vita is about an individual, whereas in all of the Euthymian lives, or the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* or the *Life of Symeon* by Sava, there is actually comparatively little biographical detail given. Radčenko maintains that one of the features that marks Byzantine hagiography of the fourteenth century is its emphasis on "individualism" of the hero, that is, his/her thoughts and characteristics.[22] This is correct inasmuch as there is a greater psychological development of the heroes of this period. The author delves into their thoughts and feelings as the hero proceeds upward towards spiritual perfection. On another level of consideration, however, one can view the overall structure of the vitæ of this later period (which includes, of course, both Hesychast and non-Hesychast life-writers) to be less individualized and more abstracted. The author no longer concerns himself with detailed accounts of the saint's miracles, deeds or acts of piety. In this later tradition only the distilled virtues of the hero are important.

---

22 К.Радченко, *Религиозное и литературное движение в Болгарии в эпоху перед турецким завоеванием*, Киев, 1898, pp.259-266.

This difference can be stated in another way. The direct relationship between the signs contained in vitæ written according to post-Metaphrastic norms and the heroes of these vitæ is weakened. Let us expand upon this point. One category of these vitæ that accounts for many of the numerous similes and metaphors is biblical reference, often expressed through the "comparison topos". By infusing into the text so many signs from the Bible, a transformation of the text takes place whereby the vita becomes a vehicle for the transmission of Scriptural content rather than a vehicle for simply relating the life and deeds of the saint. The text becomes a kind of dialogue between the life-writer as biblical exegete and his audience. Of course, early vitæ, too, contain biblical references, but the number is far less than in later texts. The objects of such signs are not the hero, but rather they are biblical heroes or images which are loosely connected with the hero. Only through the oblique yet contiguous reference created by the comparison topos can such signs refer to the actual hero of the vita. Through this contiguity, the qualities of the biblical hero denoted in the biblical sign(s) are applied in the mind of the reader/interlocutor/decoder to the saint himself.[23]

The vitæ of both the pre-and post-Metaphrastic traditions are, as we have already seen, highly formulaic; and both represent idealizations of the figures they describe in their composition. There is, however, a basic difference between them. The texts written in the pre-Metaphrastic tradition, while idealizing the hero, do paint a full "portrait", as it were, of the saint through the details that are either taken from the persons' life or fabricated by the author: the point is simply that details are present, and

23 In his book *Поэтика древнерусской литературы*, Ленинград: Худож. лит., 1971, Lixačev writes that the convention of "abstraction" called for the use of biblical quotes and passages. These passages formed analogies in the text between the scriptural incidents and the life of the saint. Furthermore, notes Lixačev, this technique served to present the life of the saint not as an individual biography but rather as a life in an eternal, general context: "Abstraction is maintained through the use of constant analogies from the Holy Scriptures, and these analogies accompany the narration of events in the life of the saint. These analogies force [us] to regard the whole life of the saint in a context of timelessness, to see in everything only the most general things, and to look for the instructive meaning" ("Абстрагирование поддерживается постоянными аналогиями из священного писания, которыми сопровождается изложение событий жизни святого. Эти аналогии заставляют рассматривать всю жизнь святого под знаком вечности, видеть во всем только самое общее, искать во всем наставительный смысл.")

they serve to develop completely a characterization of an already idealized hero. Texts of the post-Metaphrastic tradition, while idealizing the hero as well, give very few details: the resulting "portrait" is idealized, yet abstracted rather than detailed.

An analogy from visual arts will elucidate the point: the informational power of vitæ of the pre-Metaphrastic tradition is similar, as an informational sign, to the detailed portraits of the Italian Renaissance by Perugino or Botticelli: though the figures are thoroughly idealized and very often the invention of the artist rather than a portrait of an actual person, nevertheless, every detail of the person, the individual, peers back at us from centuries past. The post-Metaphrastic tradition, by contrast, produced vitæ that, as informational signs, communicate abstracted and general, rather than specific, virtues. They can be compared, perhaps surprisingly, with Modigliani's portraits: the nose, the hair, the eyes of his figures are all formulaic (they are repeated from painting to painting), yet they are all highly abstracted; they could belong to anyone, just as the qualities of Euthymius' characters are separable from the very characters to whom they are applied. These qualities, actually, could be applied to any figure of Christian (and Hesychastic) sanctity. Just as the work of art of the post-Metaphrastic tradition utilizes form to transmit much of its information, so does the art of Modigliani: the contours, the lines, the colors are what communicate most of the information, not the figure of the portrait itself. The likeness of the subject to the visual portrait of Modigliani or the literary "portrait" of Euthymius (and other writers in the Metaphrastic tradition) is not important; what is important is that signs are present in both, and these signs resonate in the human subconscience with a power that is different in its nature from the power of signs in a work of art in which the subject rather than the form of the work is the focus.

Of course, the subject of Euthymius' (and other post-Metaphrastic) texts do play a role in the semiotic nature of the work of art itself. As Mukařovský points out, "The subject of a work simply plays the role of an axis of crystallization with respect to that signification which, otherwise, would remain vague."[24] The point to be made here in the comparison

24 J. Mukařovský, "Art as Semiotic Fact," 6-7.

between vitæ of the post-Metaphrastic tradition and the paintings of Modigliani is that the subject of the work (though it is a vehicle for transmitting information) is secondary to the form. This differs markedly from the aesthetics of the pre-Metaphrastic texts and the visual art of the Italian Renaissance in which the subject is the focus of the work.

The same shift from subject to form can be observed in icon painting and religious art in general from the early Christian period to the fourteenth century. Early Christian painting (basically inspired by the conventions of late Roman figurative art and preserved for us in frescoes and mosaics) is certainly formulaic. The art of that period, however, clearly reveals a system of aesthetics that aimed toward a representational depiction of the human form and countenance. By the fourteenth century, iconography reveals a system of aesthetics that called for a complete abstraction of the human form and the cultivation of a certain two-dimensionality of space. The figures in the late Byzantine icons -- with their oval faces, almond-shaped eyes, pencil-thin eyebrows, exaggeratedly long noses, rigid hands and stiff postures -- are depictions of an immaterial, spiritual ideal. During the Renaissance, the human figure in painting, both secular and religious, regained its individuality, and the religious ideal was once again expressed primarily by means of the subject of the painting.

Why Euthymius Wrote "Beautifully": His Own Statements on Language as an Insight into the Aesthetics of His Age:

In Section III, we have already examined in detail the nature of the change in the narrative structure. What concerns us here is the impetus for such a change in the approach to artistic language. The impetus behind changes in aesthetics is inevitably connected with the attitude to the function of literature and literary language of a given historical period. Because evaluation of the aesthetic quality of a work is not a constant across time or space, we must ask ourselves the question of how Euthymius and his society viewed this particular system of aesthetics that we are attempting to characterize here. Was a more ornate, poetic language considered to be more desirable and appropriate for the hagiographic genre than a less rhetorically complex, more reportive language? A late twentieth-century evaluation of the post-Metaphrastic literary style as technically and struc-

turally more complex does not necessarily warrant any assumption regarding the reception by late 14th-century Byzantines and Slavs to such a linguistic and literary reality. Felix Vodička, a Prague School theorist, underscores the point that literary evaluation is very often characterized by its placement in history.[25]

Unfortunately, we have no Slavic theoretical treatises dating from Euthymius' day that offer us any systematic aesthetics for the Slavic community. Euthymius' hagiographic texts include passages in which Euthymius himself announces as his goal to write "with beauty" (po lěpotě); and as we pointed out above in Section III, chapter 1, to "write with beauty" merely echoes the current aesthetics of Euthymius' day in Byzantium. Given Euthymius' own statements regarding the act of writing and our knowledge of Byzantine literary aesthetics, we can assume that while the period in which Euthymius lived was not one of the periods in the development of poetic language that strove for originality, it did strive, however, for ornateness, which it equated with beauty.

Lotman offers an explanation of the appearance of ornamental language in medieval literature. He points out that the "relationship of folklore and medieval 'prose' genres to conversational speech is completely

---

25 See F.Vodička, "Response to Verbal Art" in *Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions*, 197-208, Cambridge,Mass.: MIT Press, 1976, p.197. He writes: "Aesthetic perception is closely tied with evaluation. Evaluation presupposes evaluative criteria, and such criteria do not remain unchanged. Therefore, the value of a work, from the point of view of historical origins, is not a constant and invariable quantity. Precisely because the criteria for evaluation and the literary values themselves continuously change over the course of history, it is the natural task of literary historical science to record these changes."

See also Б.В. Томашевский, *Теория литературы, поэзия*, 4th ed. Москва-Ленинград: Государственное издательство, 1928. Reprint. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1971.Tomaševskij reminds us that there are parameters to viewing art as independent of the conditions of its appearance--that the division of historical epochs have to be considered as well as the perception of that work by its audience (what Mukařovský refers to as the "artifact" of the work) and to which audience, in particular, the work was comprehensible. Tomaševskij writes (p.4): "On the other hand, the [notion of the] independence of literature from the conditions of its origins should be understood within parameters: one should not forget that all literature is immutable only [when considered] within more or less broad historical periodizations and is comprehensible for strata of a population of a particular cultural and social level." ("С другой стороны независимость литературы от условий ее возникновения следует понимать ограничительно: не надо забывать, что всякая литература неизменна лишь в более или менее широких пределах исторической эпохи и понятна для слоев населения определенного культурного и социального уровня.")

different from that of nineteenth century prose due to the absence of any correlation with poetry."[26] In other words, according to the aesthetic developments in world literature, by the nineteenth century, prose, as it comes into its own as an art form, is perceived against the background of poetry; whereas in the medieval period, the "prose" of the saints' lives and other genres, developed, according to Lotman, against the background of conversational speech; therefore, ornamentality in language was, in the medieval period, the primary means of distinguishing levels of language:

> "Prose" in folklore and medieval literature observed other laws: it had just been born of the conversational element and strove to separate itself from it. At this stage in the development of literature, a story about reality was not yet perceived as art.[27]

Later, Lotman offers an explanation as to why ornamentality should arise as a prerequisite in medieval literature to distinguish clearly "art" from conversational language:

> One must note that the concept of simplicity as a synonym for artistic merit appeared in art quite late. The works of Old Russian literature which seem simple to us did not seem at all so to contemporaries. Kirill Turovsky believed that "chroniclers and bards" "pay heed to tales" of ordinary people in order to retell them later "in refined language" and to "exalt with encomia"...The idea of ornmanetality as an indispensable sign that art be perceived precisely as art (as something "made", a model) is characteristic of many early artistic methods.[28]

This philosophical approach to art underlies the whole concept of the expression πλέκειν λόγον or "pletenie sloves" ("word-weaving"). The contexture of verbal art, if it is to be art, cannot be lifted from reality but has to be distinctly marked, as in a binary system, for the presence of something fabricated and crafted, something distinctly absent from everyday language. This is the role of "ornamentality", or, as Euthymius himself expresses it, writing "with beauty" (po lěpotě).[29] As already

26 Lotman, *Analysis of the Poetic Text*, Edited and translated by D. Barton Johnson. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1976, p.23.

27 ibid.,24.

28 ibid.,25.

29 Of course, as Mukařovský points out, which is in complete accord with Lotman's thesis, ornamentality is not a constant across the time line in the development of poetic

stated, this was the system of aesthetics of Euthymius' whole literary inheritance, and one he himself echoed both in expressed sentiment and in his writings. Moreover, this aesthetic approach is reflected in the Greek and Slavonic words for art, "τέχνη" and "xytrostъ", i.e. "skill, craft".

Euthymius' own statements on writing lead us to believe that he, at least, perceived that the language used up until his time by other Bulgarians to recount the life of Ivan of Rila was now inappropriate to the level of sanctity of the subject and message:

> Thus they who were writings about [Ivan] before were doing so inartistically and crudely, where we have striven zealously to retell [this story] with beauty, as is fitting[30]

As we have argued in Section III, chapter 1, this "new" approach to language (this shift in attitude toward the method of codification of information and away from the metonymic toward the metaphoric, to put it in Jakobsonian terms) does not evolve from Euthymius' own original concepts, but are a direct inheritance from Symeon Metaphrastes. So then, in describing Euthymian aesthetics, we are actually describing simultaneously the Metaphrastic aesthetics.

Deferring to Jakobson's dyadic analysis of poetic language as being characterized by either contiguity (metonymy) or similarity (metaphor), we have stated above that the change in the aesthetics from the pre- to post-Metaphrastic traditions reveals a constancy of addresser, addressee, context, and contact, but a transformation of message and code. In light of Jakobson's analysis of selection and combination as, respectively, metaphoric and metonymic, we can restate the main difference in the

---

language. In his article "On Poetic Language" (p.1), he writes: "Above all, poetic language is not always ornamental expressions. Of course, it has this characteristic in certain developmental periods, namely [in] those which feel the bifurcation between expressed content and linguistic expression, when expression is evaluated as the garment of content. However there are also periods when both these components merge indistinguishably and when this close linkage becomes the characteristic feature of poetic expression...Nor is beauty the constant token of the poetic word. The history of literature is full of examples in which the poet has sought his linguistic material in lexical spheres indifferent to the standards of beauty or even negative with respect to them."

30 E. Kałużniacki, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius*, (LIR, I, 7): "Ąže bo iže prěžde nas o nemь nexytrě někako i grǫbě sъpisašą, sia my po lěpotě, jakože ključimo estьl."

aesthetics of the two traditions in the following way: Inasmuch as the narrative of the post-Metaphrastic aesthetics is based on patterns of figurative language that rely on similarity, we can put that tradition squarely on the metaphoric end of Jakobson's pole. Moreover, the narrative patterns of the pre-Metaphrastic tradition, with its emphasis on contiguity with the subject rather than on similarity, is situated closer to metonymy. We could then make the statement that the metaphoric end of Jakobson's continuum implies (as is evidenced from the Euthymian texts) a greater emphasis on code rather than on message, or, as we have already stated in Mukařovský's terms, on form over subject (content and theme). The inverse could be stated for the metonymic end of the pole (on which end falls the pre-Metaphrastic tradition). M. and M. Shapiro, in their re-examination of Jakobson's analysis, make a statement that, indeed, corroborates our conclusion:

> In metonymy the referential dimension predominates over the significational, whereas in metaphor this dominance relation is inverted. An external or referential focus [i.e.metonymical] is thus tantamount to the priority of message over code, while an internal or significational [i.e.metaphoric] focus is equivalent to the reverse priority of code over message.[31]

To borrow a term from Lixačev, the "литературный этикет" of Euthymius' cultural milieu required of him an expression of self debasement in verbal art, a confession of modesty that was simply formulaic for the genre; therefore, Euthymius is compelled to express his ineptitude to fulfill his stated desire to write with beauty:

> If [we do not succeed in writing this] with beauty, then we will however relate to the best of our ability the life and deeds of this man. [32]

> If we do not [write this life] with beauty, then we must introduce into it something good...but due to weakness we lack the proper words.[33]

---

31 M.andM.Shapiro, "The Structure of Figures", in *Figuration in Verbal Art,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988, p.29.

32 Kałużniacki, op.cit. (LIM, I, 28): "ašte i ne po lěpotě, obače po vъzmožnomu togo sъpověmy děanie i žitie."

33 Kałużniacki, op.cit. (LP, I, 60): "Ąšte bo e ne po lěpotě, obače dostoitь i namь čto ljubo ključimo toj prinesti...nemoštiju slova bědьstvujuštimь namь."

> This story of the blessed saint will be very long and our intelligence is insufficient to be able to tell her story with beauty.[34]

The essential difference between the two hagiographic traditions, we would posit, is a fundamental shift in the approach to language that is implemented by Metaphrastes and continued by Euthymius in the Slavic tradition. One approach, the pre-Metaphrastic, sees language as primarily reportive, i.e. language can only re-create the sanctity of the hero through a re-creation of the saint's life: what he or she did, where he or she went, how many miracles and healings he or she performed. The other approach, which we posit characterizes Metaphrastic and Euthymian aesthetics, is primarily poetic, i.e. rather than re-creating the sanctity of the hero through a semblance of the life of the individual (as reportive language does through the use of its "linear" narrative), poetic language seeks rather to create an image of the hero's sanctity through oblique references to the saint's activities and through an abstraction of qualities. This shift is seen not just in the tendency of post-Metaphrastic texts to use more poetic devices (like metaphor, simile, hyperbole, etc.), but also, and more importantly, in a complete shift in the structure of the narrative.

It could be stated that a shift from a reportive to a poetic language is not only in the mind of Euthymius the writer as he creates these vitæ, but his statement about writings lends interesting insights and, at least, evidence to the fact that he was conscious of metaliterary questions; he was conscious both of himself as a writer and of the status of literary language.

These changes in the way information is encoded by the post-Metaphrastic hagiographer (that is, how he expresses the concepts, what style he uses, what rhetorical devices he employs) points to a growing dynamism in the development of the genre. Just as late-medieval artists in Bulgaria who painted the frescoes in the Church of the Forty Martyrs in Trnovo or the Ivanovo frescoes reveal a mounting dynamism in the depiction of the human figure, so Metaphrastic and Euthymian aesthetics calls for a more dynamic portrayal of the saint. Like the saints' lives by Euthymius, these frescoes manage to be simultaneously both static and

---

34 Kałużniacki, op.cit. (LP, I, 60): "Mnoga ubo i dlьga budetь o prěpodobnějь sejь pověstь, i našь umь kь sejь po lěpotě ne dovlějetь."

dynamic. That is, both art forms are subject to stringent prescriptions of content and form, yet they are evolving and changing as well. The subject (theme and content) of the church fresco art is stable and fixed, while the hand of the artist is constantly changing the way of encoding the content by experiments in form: the rendering of the folds of the robes becomes freer and more flowing, then hands and feet are now postured for movement. In the post-Metaphrastic lives, we see an analogous change taking place: the content, that is the prescribed themes and subthemes (the formulaic topoi, or commonplaces discussed in Section III) are still required for the genre, but the life-writer is no longer obliged to relate detail, but rather elicits the distilled, abstracted qualities of the saint.

Lixačev has already written on this change in narrative from the specific to the general, which he terms "абстрагированность", or абстрагирование" -- the aesthetic principle of "abstraction", or "abstracting."[35] And, paradoxically, the more general the exposition of the saint's qualifications for sanctity the more personal they become to the reader-decoder of the message (i.e. to the readers and listeners of the life); for the qualities are no longer bound up with specific biographic deeds, but with a more abstracted example of sanctity that can be separated from the individual and considered in isolation.

The analogy between life-writing and painting is drawn by Euthymius himself. In the introduction to the *Life of Paraskeva*, he writes:

> If thus the law is loved, then it will be very, indeed extremely, fitting and very desirable for those who please God to remember the memories of cherished people and to contemplate their images and actions and words, to paint many times their likenesses, to honor purely God's saints and to

35 In his book *Поэтика древнерусской литературы*, p.124, Lixačev summarizes the author's purpose in the cultivation of "abstraction" [абстрагирование] in the medieval text: "The main thing that the authors of [literary] works of the high style were aiming for was to find the general, absolute, and eternal in the personal, concrete and temporal, to find the immaterial in the material, Christian truths in all phenomena of life." ("Основное, к чему стремятся авторы произведений высокого стиля, -- это найти общее, абсолютное и вечное в частном, конкретном и временном, 'невещественное' в вещественном, христианские истины в всех явлениях жизни."); and on p.127: "Medieval art, in its religious genres, aimed to destroy the concreteness of phenomena and is characterized by the goal to achieve an abstracted artistic exposition." ("Искусство же средневековья в своих церковных жанрах стремится разрушить конкретность явлений, характеризуется стремлением к отвлеченному изложению, к художественной абстракции.")

> relate their memory and acts to some benefit. For a story about good [people and deeds] is in no small measure beneficial for its listeners.[36]

The analogy is also made by Theophylact in the *Life of Kliment of Oxrid* in which he writes that Kliment "having the life of Methodius as the basis for his own life and deeds...assiduously strove to paint his own image after it."[37] In his second epistle (to Gregory of Nazianzus), Basil the Great also drew an analogy between painting and reading:

> And in general, just as painters in working from models constantly gaze at their exemplar and thus strive to transfer the expression of the original to their own artistry, so too he who is anxious to make himself perfect in all the kinds of virtue must gaze upon the lives of the saints as upon statues, so to speak, that move and act, and must make their excellence his own by imitation.[38]

What this passage from the LP indicates is that Euthymius considers the image that is being created in his works to be comparable to the images that are created in icons (Greek εἰκών = image, likeness; Russian образ). What, then, would be their functional similarities? The function of an icon is not simply to portray the subject in a likeness; actually, religious icon paintings are not painted likenesses at all but are, rather, abstractions in the same sense that Modigliani's painting are. The function of icons is to

---

36 Kałužniacki, op.cit. (LP, I, 59): "Ąšte ubo ljubovnyj obyče zakonь, eže ljubьznyix pameti pominati i těxь sьzrьcovati obrazy i děania že i glagoly, množiceju že i těxь podobia živopisovati, mnogo, pače množaje ključimo budetь i zělo želateino bogoljubьznymь, eže božiix ugodnikь čьstně počitati i těx pameti i děania na polzu pověstvovati. Ne malu bo vьtvarajetь slyšateljemь polzu eže o polzi slovo."

37 *The Life of Kliment of Oxrid*, English translation quoted from I. Duichev, *Kiril and Methodius*, XXII.66 [sic,65], p.118.

38 See *St.Basil, The Letters*, vol.1 (of 4 vols.), Loeb Classic Library, trans. by Roy J. Deferrari, London: William Heinemann, Ltd.,1961, pp.16-17.The Greek passage reads as follows: "καὶ πανταχοῦ, ὥσπερ οἱ ζωγράφοι, ὅταν ἀπὸ εἰκόνων εἰκόνας γράφωσι, πυκνὰ πρὸς τὸ παράδειγμα ἀποβλέποντες, τὸν ἐκεῖθεν χαρακτῆρα πρὸς τὸ ἑαυτῶν σπουδάζουσι μεταθεῖναι φιλοτέχνημα. οὕτω δεῖ καὶ τὸν ἐσπουδακότα ἑαυτὸν πᾶσι τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπεργάσασθαι τέλειον, οἱονεὶ πρὸς ἀγάλματά τινα κινούμενα καὶ ἔμπρακτα, τοὺς βίους τῶν ἁγίων ἀποβλέπειν καὶ τὸ ἐκείνων ἀγαθὸν οἰκεῖον ποιεῖσθαι διὰ μιμήσεως."

provide a direct line of communication between the viewer and God, to be a "channel of grace for sanctifying virtue."[39]

The teleological nature of both of these art forms is stated by Euthymius himself when he emphasizes in the passage above that both the painting of icons and the narration of saints' lives should lead "to some benefit." This direct communication is achieved by gazing upon the "likeness" of a particular figure portrayed in them, but the goal of painting an icon is not achieved in the execution of the image but in providing the viewer with a direct link with the Divinity through the image. This leads us to the ironic conclusion that religious icon painting as signs are not what in the terms of Charles Peirce would be labelled "iconic"; they are, rather "indexical"[40], i.e. the icon paintings are indeed abstracted portrayals of saintly human figures (and only in that sense they are "iconic" in Peircian terms), but as signs they refer to an object that is contiguous to them, to an object with which it enjoys a "dynamic interaction."[41] Just as smoke is an indexical sign for fire, so the religious figure portrayed in the icon painting is an index for God inasmuch as the saint partakes in God's nature

---

39 Paul Evdokimov "The Meaning of Icons," *One in Christ* 2 (1967): 165-182. He writes on p.171: "The architectural forms of a temple, the frescoes, icons and objects of worship are not simply brought together like items in a museum; instead, as members of a body, they live in the same 'mystery life' (vie mystérique) and are integrated into the liturgical system...The important point is this: for the East, icons form one of the sacramentals of presence, and the rite of consecration confers upon them a miraculous character so that they become 'channels of grace for sanctifying virtue' and the apt milieu for 'phania' or appearances." See also V. Lossky, L. Ouspensky, *The Meaning of Icons*, Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982.

40 Peirce defines an "index" as "a real thing or fact which is a sign of its object by virtue of being connected with it as a matter of fact and also by forcibly intruding upon the mind, quite regardless of its being interpreted as a sign. It may simply serve to identify its object and assure us of its existence and presence. But very often the nature of the factual connection of the index with its object is such as to excite in consciousness an image of some features of the object, and in that way affords evidence from which positive assurance as to truth of fact may be drawn." From vol.4, paragraph 447 of *The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, 2nd printing, 4 vols., Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1965-6.

41 Michael Shapiro, *The Sense of Grammar, Language as Semeiotic*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983, p.40. Cf. also R. Jakobson, "Quest for the Essence of Language", in *Selected Writings*, vol.2, 345-359, The Hague: Mouton, 1971, pp. 346-347.

(provided the paintings are viewed in their socio-religious context rather than simply as portraits, stripped of their religious significance). It is precisely because of this teleological nature of the religious icon as a sign (the "τέλος" being the direct communication with God) that they become venerated objects themselves. Cultural historians could perhaps point to the created void in human culture by the forced removal of a pagan pantheon of gods to explain why images of religious figures other than the Godhead should themselves have come to be venerated. Suffice it here, however, to point out that as vehicles of direct communication with God, it is natural that religious icons should have enjoyed this special place in Orthodox religious culture.

These observations can perhaps offer a deeper insight into the way Euthymius himself regarded the function of the vita. Through the comparison that he himself draws between icon painting and life-writing, he indicates that the function of the vita, like the icon, is not simply in the telling or the recreation of an image in words, but that the function is also telic: it, too, should lead a person to good and, to its logical conclusion, to God. With his stated intention to write "with beauty", thereby attaining the sought-after "celestial language" (were it possible), it could be that Euthymius wishes to raise the vita to the level of prestige of the icon painting, to establish the vita not just as a story about a venerated person, but to establish also a vita about a hero-saint as a venerated object in itself.

The Euthymian system of aesthetics is characterized, among other things, by a conscious goal to craft a hieratic language that is appropriate to the sanctity of the subject. This is what underlies his stated desire "to write with beauty." Euthymius in other passages states clearly that the hieratic or "celestial" language is the "target language". First of all, he expresses the insufficiency of natural language to express exalted and divine concepts: "Faith is an unexplored and ineffable thing, and on the contrary, it cannot be expressed with a corporeal language [tongue of flesh]."[42] In one passage Euthymius actually equates the act of "writing with beauty" with "celestial language":

---

42 Kałużniacki, op.cit. (LHM, VI, 38): "Věra že neispytanna veštь estьj i neskazana i otnǫd ązykomь plьtěnomь skazati są ne mogǫšti."

> And if we possessed a celestial language we would tell of those things which are to come with beauty and with great sweetness, which is very delightful and abounds in our daily lives. Since we have not been awarded this particular pleasure, we speak of other things which the corporeal sense is not able to recognize. Thus it is impossible for mortal consciousness to speak easily of immortal and ineffable things and of things that can be acquired by faith alone.[43]

From this passage, one may deduce that unadorned literary style, i.e. the style that was used before Euthymius is not only "crude" (as stated in the introduction to the *Life of Ivan of Rila*), but also much further away from the attainment of a celestial language and represents, by contrast, corporeal language.[44] Despite the fact that Euthymius indicates in this passage that the hieratic language cannot be attained, he will at least try to attain it by writing "with beauty."[45]

---

43 Kałużniacki, op.cit. (LHM, I, 27): "I ąšte nebesnyj iměti bixomь ązykь, vъ lěpotǫ bǫdǫštaa ona skazovali bixomь sъ vъsěkoǫ sladostiǫ, zělo uslaždaǫštěǫ i prolivaemoǫ vъ žitejskyą věsti. Eima že siǫ blagodlějti ne uspodobixom są, ona věštaemь, jaže tělesnoe čjuvstvo věstь sъzrъcovati. Ne vъzmožno bo tlěnnomu čjustvu udobь netlěnnaa i neskazanaa, věroǫ že tъčiǫ priemlema sъkazovati."

44 Epiphanius the Wise in the *Life of Stefan of Perm'* expresses a similar concern as Euthymius that he should not write crudely. Of this literary sensibility, Lixačev writes (*Поэтика*, p.126): "The fear of 'bad' and 'crude' words (LStefPerm,102), words that are 'disgraceful', 'inartistic', 'ill-formed', 'unedifying' (LStefPerm,111) was caused by a wish to elevate the events of the life of the saint above the level of the quotidien, to regard these events in the context of timelessness." ("Боязнь 'худых' и 'грубых' слов (ЖСтПерм,102), слов, 'зазорных', 'неухищренных', 'неустроенных', 'неудобренных' (ЖСтПерм,111) обусловлена стремлением поднять события жизни святого над обыденностью, рассматривать их под знаком вечности.")

45 Concerning the role and nature of a hieratic language in medieval Slavic literary life, Lixačev writes (*Поэтика*, p.124-125): "The 'high' style of medieval religious literature stands apart from ordinary speech, and this is by no means accidental. It is the primary condition of the 'high' literary style. The language of literature had to be elevated and recognizably abstract...The greater the chasm between literary speech and ordinary speech, the more literature was fulfilling the task of the abstraction of the world" ("Язык 'высокий', церковной литературы средневековья обособлен от бытовой речи, и это далеко не случайно. Это основное условие стиля 'высокой' литературы. Иной язык литературы должен был быть языком преподнятым и в известной мере абстрактным...Чем больше разрыв между литературной речью и речью бытовой, тем больше литература удовлетворяет задачам абстрагирования мира.") In the Metaphrastic and Euthymian aesthetics, this rift between literary language and ordinary speech widens considerably as compared to the pre-Metaphrastic tradition.

Euthymius is the first Slavic life-writer to articulate in his works the dichotomous relationship between "corporeal" and "celestial" language. His linguistic vehicle for literary expression is, by the fourteenth century, a consciously maintained hieratic language that has come to diverge quite far from the spoken vernaculars of the Slavic world contemporary to Euthymius. As Mathiesen has pointed out, this divergence of the Slavic hieratic language from the various Slavic vernaculars of Euthymius' day and the artificiality of Church Slavonic "ceased to be a mere fact, and became a part of the ardently desired ideal which created the Euthymian tradition"; furthermore, this artificial hieratic language "was no longer simply another language, a vehicle of communication and communion with man and God, but also an icon of given theological truth."[46]

Euthymius is the first Slavic writer who states a purpose to employ a language that would be filled "with sufficient beauty"; moreover, Euthymius is the first Slavic writer to express overtly in his writings a notion that had already come to be accepted *a priori* in Byzantium even before Symeon Metaphrastes: that the loftiest genres, such as hagiographic texts, panegyrics, and sermons necessitated the use of an ornamental language, a correspondingly lofty linguistic expression.

We have no theoretical literary treatises by medieval Slavs, but from the few, revealing statements made by Euthymius in his writings we can see his underlying intent to stabilize the hagiographic genre through a consistent "beautification" of the literary style used to encode it. It is clear that in the mind of Euthymius, metaliterary concerns loomed large. The connection he insists upon between the vita genre and ornamentality of literary style reveals an awareness of a dynamic articulated centuries later by Bakhtin, who posits "style" as one of the main elements of "generic unity".[47] As a scion of Byzantine aesthetics of Metaphrastes and the Second

---

46 R.Mathiesen, "The Inflectional Morphology of the Synodal Church Slavonic Verb," Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1972, pp. 38-39.

47 Bakhtin, op.cit.,64. He writes: "The organic, inseparable link between style and genre is clearly revealed also in the problem of language styles, or functional styles. In essence, language, or functional, styles are nothing other than generic styles for certain spheres of human activity and communication. Each sphere has and applies its own genres that correspond to its own specific conditions...Style is inseparably linked to particular thematic unities and--what is especially important--to particular compositional unities: to particular

Sophistic, Euthymius' main contribution to the medieval Slavic hagiographic tradition is the solidification of the inseparable link between genre and style, a relationship that, before him, was far from fixed in Slavic literary aesthetics.

---

types of construction of the whole, types of its completion, and types of relations between the speaker and other participants in speech communication (listeners or readers, partners, the other's speech, and so forth). Style enters as one element into the generic unity of the utterance..."

Concluding Remarks

This study grew out of our initial interest in the cultural effects of the movement of Hesychasm on the religious life and artistic life of the medieval Slavs. In investigating the topic, we were naturally led to the study of the Trnovo Literary School of Patriarch Euthymius, whose importance for the period of the Second South Slavic Influence is well known within our field. As we have discussed within the body of this study, the subject of Hesychasm and its precise relationship to the literary school of Patriarch Euthymius and his employment of an ornate style of writing has led to many scholarly inquiries.

This work represents a detailed inquiry into the literary aspects of Euthymius' activities with particular emphasis on the development of the hagiographic genre. We have examined hagiographic texts from the pre- and post-Metaphrastic traditions, and we hope that in so doing we have made a contribution not only to Euthymian studies and studies of the period of the Second South Slavic Influence, but also to Byzantino-Slavic studies. In particular, it is to be hoped that our examination of the Metaphrastic and Euthymian aesthetic will provide a useful tool for Slavists and Byzantinists alike in their understanding of the generic development of the saint's life.

Much confusion and contradiction has surrounded the scholarship to date on the phenomenon of "word weaving", or "pletenie sloves", in Slavic writing. In this study we have posited that its use by Patriarch Euthymius represents an affinity for Metaphrastic stylistics, and as such, Euthymius should be viewed as a direct descendent of the Metaphrastic tradition. Its appearance in his writings (and the writings of Patriarch Kallistos) cannot properly be linked with the spread of Hesychast mysticism in Byzantium and Bulgaria. Both Euthymius and Kallistos were supporters of the Hesychasts, but as writers they were perfecting their craft based on literary prototypes that were not specific to nor in any way connected with this élite group of quietists.

Ever since D.S.Lixačev presented his seminal article at the Fourth International Congress of Slavists in 1958, many questions have been raised concerning the role of Euthymius and his school during the Second South Slavic Influence. Though much work has been done by scholars, many aspects of these cultural developments of the Second South Slavic Influence

still await thorough investigation. Great strides have been made in identifying the features of the orthographic reforms undertaken at the Resava School in Serbia. Such studies await integration with the question of a Euthymian orthographic reform. The question of a Euthymian orthographic reform still requires further study through an exhaustive analysis and comparison of manuscripts of the period before and after the proposed reform.

Lixačev has also asserted a connection between the spread of Hesychast mysticism and certain trends in icon painting of the period. This field too remains open to scholarly research. Moreover, the work begun by Mulić, Mošin and Birnbaum on the Serbian contributions to hagiographic development await more study, as do the questions of the extent and nature of Hesychasm that reached Russia of the fifteenth century and its effect on aspects of culture there.

If we have succeeded in the task we set for ourselves, this study will have elucidated many of the issues and questions surrounding the development of the hagiographic genre in the Slavic tradition. It also should have shed light as well on the questions surrounding the use of particularly literary styles employed by the Slavs in this genre and the approximate period when Metaphrastic models began to penetrate Slavic hagiography, constituting a new norm rather than exception to stylistic practices. For those scholars especially interested in the development of the hagiographic genre, much work remains to be done on its generic heterogeneity in the Slavic tradition. Slavists who have access to Romanian sources will find the field of Bulgarian literary and Hesychastic influence in medieval Wallacho-Hungarian lands open; and very little work has been done on the state of Slavic religious writing in the Balkans in the period after its fall to the Ottoman Turks.

The period of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries encompassed many changes in the politics and culture of the Balkans. Powerful kingdoms rose in Serbia and Bulgaria, but even in their development as independent political bodies and the respective acquisition of their own patriarchates, these South Slavic nations never ceased to regard Byzantium as the standard against which to measure sophistication and refinement, and Byzantinization remained for them a most sought-after goal in every realm of social activity: politics and political structures, religion, architecture,

literature, and material culture. The period of acculturation by the South Slavs of Byzantine culture is far from exhausted in scholarship, and there is still much to learn about the processes of influence from Byzantium and confluence between the Slavs themselves. In closing, it is to be hoped that this study (as should any study of worth) has opened one door, so to speak, only to then open several more for its readership.

Bibliography

Abbreviations:

АН СССР	Академия наук СССР
БАН	Българската академия на науките
ТОДРЛ	*Труды отдела древнерусской литературы*

I. Primary Sources:

A.Greek:

Athanasius. *The Life of St. Anthony* (Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀντωνίου). Greek text in *Patrologia Græca*. vol. 26, 835-976. edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris, 1887. English translation: *Early Christian Biographies*. The Fathers of the Church, no.15, edited by R.J.Deferrari, 133-224. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1952.

Basil the Great, St. *St.Basil:The Letters*. Vol.1 (of 4 vols.). Greek and English text. Loeb Classic Library, translated by Roy J. Deferrari. London: William Heinemann, Ltd.,1961.

Life of Daniel the Stylite.(Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δανιὴλ τοῦ στυλίτου). Greek text, edited by Hippolyte Delehaye. *Analecta Bollandiana* 32 (1913): 121-229. Reprint. *Les saints stylites*, edited by H. Delehaye, 1-94. Subsidia Hagiographica, no.14. Brussels: Société des bollandistes, 1923. English translation in *Three Byzantine Saints*, edited by E. Dawes and H. Baynes, 1-72. Crestwood,NY: St. Valdimir's Seminary Press, 1977.

Gregory of Nyssa, St. *St. Gregory of Nyssa: Ascetical Works*. Greek and English text. Fathers of the Church, vol.58.Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1967.

Gregory Palamas.Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶς ἡσυχαζόντων. Greek text in *Patrologia Græca*. vol. 150, 1101-1118, edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris,

1865. English text,*Gregory Palamas: The Triads*, trans. by N.Gendle, Crestwood, NY: Paulist Press, 1983.

Gregory the Sinaite. Κεφάλαια δι᾽ ἀκροστιχίδος. In *Patrologia Græca*. vol. 150, 1239-1346, edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris, 1887.

John Climacus. Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίους πατρὸς ἡμῶν᾽Ιωάννου Κλῖμαξ. Greek text in *Patrologia Græca*. vol. 88, 631-1164, edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris, 1865. English text: *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*. Boston: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 1978.

Kallistos. *The Life of Gregory the Sinaite*. (Βίος καὶ πολιτεῖα τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Σιναίτου συγγραφεὶς παρὰ τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κονσταντινουπόλεως Καλλίστου.) Edited by И. Помяловский. (Житие иже бо святых отца нашего Григория Синаита). *Записки историко-филологического факультета Императорского Санкт-петербурского университета* 35 (1896):1-64.

Leontius and Sophronius. *Life of St. John the Almsgiver*. (Εἰς τὰ λείποντα τοῦ Βίου τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐλεήμονος). Greek text, edited by Hippolyte Delehaye. *Analecta Bollandiana* 45 (1927): 5-74. English translation in *Three Byzantine Saints*, edited by Dawes and H. Baynes, 195-270. Crestwood, NY: St.Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977.

Palladius. *The Lausiac History*. (Παλλαδίου Λαυσιακόν). Greek text in *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, Cuthbert Butler, ed. 2 vols. Reinheim: Georg Olms Verlangsbuchhandlung Hildesheim, 1967. English translation in *The Lausiac History*, edited by R.T.Meyer. Ancient Christian Writers, vol.34. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1964.

Philokalia.Edited by Kallistos Ward, et al. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

Theophylact. *Life of Kliment of Oxrid*. (Βίος καὶ πολιτεία καὶ ὁμολογία τε καὶ μερικὴ θαυμάτων διήγησις τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Κλήμεντος, ἐπισκόπου βουλγάρων). Greek text and Bulgarian translation: see А. Милев below. English translation in *Kiril and Methodius: Founders of Slavonic Writing*, edited by

Ivan Dujčev (Duichev), 93-126. East European Monographs, no.172. Boulder, 1985.

B. Slavonic:

Euthymius, Patriarch. *The Life of Ivan of Rila.* (Žitie i žiznь prěpodobnago otca našego Ionna Rylskago, sъpisano Evtimiemь patriarxomь Trьnovskyimь). Slavonic text: see Kałużniacki, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393).* 5-26. Vienna, 1901. Reprint. London: Variorum Reprints, 1971.

----------. *The Life of Hilarion of Moglena.* (Žitie i žiznь prěpodobnago otca našego Ilariona, episkopa Meglenskago...sъpisano Evtimiemь patriarxom Trьnovskymь). Slavonic text: see Kałużniacki, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393).* 27-58. Vienna, 1901. Reprint. London: Variorum Reprints, 1971.

----------. *The Life of Paraskeva.* (Žitie i žiznь prěpodobnyje matere naše Petky... sъpisano kurь Evtimiemь patriarxomь Trьnovskyimь). Slavonic text: see Kałużniacki, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393).* 59-77. Vienna, 1901. Reprint. London: Variorum Reprints, 1971.

----------. *The Life of Philothea.* (Žitie i žiznь prěpodobnyǫ matere našǫ Filotei, sъpisano Evtimiemь, patriarxomь Trьnovskymь). Slavonic text: see Kałużniacki, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375- 1393).* 78-99. Vienna, 1901. Reprint. London: Variorum Reprints, 1971.

Kallistos. *The Life of Theodosius.* (Žitie i žiznь prepodobnago otca našego Teodosia...sъpisano svetěišimь patriarxomь Konstantina grada kurь Kalistomь). Slavonic text: Златарски, В.Н. *Житие и жизнь преподобнаго отца нашего Теодосий.* Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина (СбНУНК), №20. София, 1904.

Kiril of Turov. Service to St. (Princess) Olga. (Kirilla mnixa kanonъ i stixiry na pamjatь prepodobnoj knjagini Olьgi, baby Vladimira). Slavonic text in Николай Никольский, *Материалы для истории древнерусской духовной письменности.* 88 и.т.д. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. Имп. Академии наук, 1907.

The Life of Constantine (Cyrill). (Žitie iže vъ svątyx otca našego Kon'stantina filosofa, prъvago nastavnika Slověnьsku jazyku) Slavonic text: see. A.Vaillant, vol.1, 1-40. French translation, ibid., vol.2, 1-33. English translation, see M.Kantor, 23-96.

The Life of Methodius. (Pamątь i žlitie| blaženago otca našego i učitelą Mefodija arxiepiskupa Moravьska). Slavonic text: see A.Vaillant below, vol.1, 41-55. French translation, ibid., vol.2, 34-46. English translation, see M.Kantor, 97-138.

The Life of Wenceslas. (Ubьenie slvą|tla|go Vąčeslava knązą česьska/Na svetogo Veštеslava ispověďьnika/ Žitie blaženago knązą Vąčeslava byvšago). Slavonic texts (3 variants): see Mareš 104-123. English translation: see M.Kantor, 139-162.

The Narrative and Passion of Boris and Gleb. (Znanie i strastь i poxvala slvą|tjuju mlǫ|čnli|ku Borisa i Glěba). Slavonic text in *Успенский сборник XII-XIII вв.* под редакцией С.И. Коткова, 42-58. Москва: АН СССР, 1971. English translation: see M. Kantor, 166-253.

Nestor. *Life of Theodosius of the Kievan Crypt Monastery.* (Žitie prlě|plo|dlo|bnaago olt|ca našego Teodosija igumena pečerskago). Slavonic text in *Успенский сборник XII-XIII вв.* под редакцией С.И.Коткова, 71-135. Москва: АН СССР, 1971.

Sava (Prince Rastko). *The Life of St. Symeon (Stephen Nemanja).* (O nasledovani svetago monastira sego prěpodobnymь otьcemь našimь i xtitoromь, gospodinomь simeonomь, i o žitie ego, kakovo bystь prědь bogomь i člověky). Slavonic text in Šafařík. English translation: see M.Kantor, 255-304.

II. Secondary Sources

A. Sources in languages employing Latin alphabet:

Alissandratos, Julia. *Medieval Slavic and Patristic Eulogies.* Studia Historica et Philologica 14, Sectio Slavica 6. Florence: Le Lettere, 1982.

Angelov, Dimitar. "Humanism in Medieval Bulgaria."*Études balkaniques* 3 (1980):3-20.

Bakalova, Elka. "La société et l'art en Bulgarie au XIVe siècle (L'influence de l'hésychasme sur l'art)." *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines (6-12 septembre 1971, Bucarest)*, vol.2, 33-38. Bucharest: Editarai Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975.

----------. "Society and Art in Bulgaria in the 14th Century." *Byzantino-bulgarica* 8 (1986): 17-72.

----------. "La vie de Sainte Paraskeve de Tirnovo dans l'art balkanique du bas moyen âge." *Byzantinobulgarica* 5 (1978): 175-209.

Bakhtin, M.M. "The Problem of Speech Genres." In *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*, edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 60-102. University of Texas Slavic Series, no.8. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. (original Russian "Проблема речевых жанров." In *М. М. Бахтин: Литературно-критические статьи*, 428-472. Москва: Худож. лит.,1986.)

Beck, Hans-Georg. "Humanismus und Palamismus." In *Actes du XII Congrès International des Études Byzantines, Ochrid 1961*, vol.1, 63-82. Belgrade, 1963.

----------. *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich.* Munich: C.H.Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959.

Beckwith, John. *Early Christian and Byzantine Art.* 1970. Reprint. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1986.

Birnbaum,H. "The Balkan Slavic Component of Medieval Russian Culture." In *Medieval Russian Culture*, California Slavic Studies 7, edited by H.Birnbaum and M.Flier, 3-30. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1984.

----------. "Byzantine Tradition Transformed: The Old Serbian *Vita*." In *On Medieval and Renaissance Slavic Writing*, edited by C.H.van Schooneveld, 299-340. The Hague: Mouton, 1974. Appeared originally in *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change*, edited by H.Birnbaum and S.Vryonis, Jr., 243-284. Mouton: The Hague, 1972.

----------. "Old Rus' and the Orthodox Balkans, Differences in Kind,Extent, and Significance of the Early and Later Cultural Impact."*Cyrillomethodianum* 8-9, (1984,1985):1-15.

----------. "Serbian Models in the Literature and the Literary Language of Medieval Russia." *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 23 (1979): 1-13.

Bloom, Antoine. "L'Hésychasme...yoga Chrétien?" *Cahiers du Sud* No.sp. (1953): 177-195.

Bogdanović, Dimitije. *Inventar ćirilskix rukopisa u Jugoslaviji (XI-XVII veka).* Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda, 31. Belgrade: Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, 1982.

Bois, J. "Grégoire le Sinaite et l'hésychasme a l'Athos au XIVe siècle." *Échos d'Orient* 2 (1901): 65-73.

----------. "Les hésychastes avant le XIVe siècle."*Échos d'Orient* 1 (1901): 1-11.

Børtnes, Jostein. "The Function of Word-Weaving in the Structure of Epiphanius' Life of Saint Stephen, Bishop of Perm."' In *Medieval Russian Culture*, edited by H.Birnbaum and M.Flier, 311-342. California Slavic Studies 12. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1984.

----------."Hesychast Doctrine in Epiphanius' 'Life of Saint Stephen, Bishop of Perm."' *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 31-32 (1985): 83-87.

Bréhier, Louis. "La renovation artistique sous les Paleologues et le mouvement des idées." In *Mélanges Charles Diehl,* vol.2, Études sur l'histoire et sur l'art de Byzance, 1-10. Paris, 1930.

----------. *The Life and Death of Byzantium.* Amsterdam, New York: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1977.

Browning, Robert. *Byzantium and Bulgaria, A Comparative Study Across The Early Medieval Frontier.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975.

Burgess, Theodore C. "Epideictic Literature." *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902): 166-194.

Chadwick, Henry. *The Early History of the Church.* The Penguin History of the Church, vol 1. London: Hodder and Soughton, 1968.

Chatzidakis, Manolis. "Classicisme et tendances populaire au XIVe siècle. Les recherches sur l'évolution du style." In *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines (6-12 septembre 1971, Bucarest)*, vol.1, 153-188. Bucharest: Editarai Academiei Republicii Socialiste România 1974.

Čiževskij, Dimitrij. *History of Russian Literature, From the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque.* 3d ed.The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

----------. "On the Question of Genres in Old Russian Literature." *Harvard Slavic Studies* 2 (1954): 105-115.

Cvetkova, B.A. "Sur le sort de Tarnovo, capitale bulgare au Moyen Âge, après sa prise par les Osmanlis." *Byzantinobulgarica* 2 (1966): 181-198.

Dąbek-Wirgowa, Teresa. *Historia literatury bułgarskiej.* Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolinskich Wydawnictwo, 1980.

Delehaye, Hippolyte. *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires.* Brussels: Bureaux de la Société Bollandistes, 1921.

Diehl,Charles. *L'art byzantin dans l'Italie meridionale.* Paris, 1894.

----------. *Manuel de l'art byzantin.* vol.2. Paris: Pickard, 1926.

Dinekov, Petar. "Outlines of Old Bulgarian Literature." In *Kiril and Methodius: Founders of Slavonic Writing,* edited by Ivan Duichev (Ivan Dujčev), 1-36. East European Monographs, no.172. Boulder, 1985. (originally published in *Похвала на старобългарска литература.* София, 1979).

Djourova, Aksinia. "Le manuscrit pendant le deuxieme Royaume Bulgare (1185-1396)."*Cyrillomethodianum* 4 (1977): 36-99.

Dostál, Antonín. "Počátky staroslověnského písemnictví a Byzanc." *Slavia* 38, 4 (1969): 597-606.

Dujčev, Ivan. (=Duichev). "A Nationality-Building Factor: The Role of the Slavic Script for the Bulgarians." In *Kiril and Methodius: Founders of Slavonic Writing*, 37-48. East European Monographs, no.172. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1985.

----------. "I Bogomili nei paesi slavi e la loro storia." In *Medioevo bizantino-slavo.*, vol.1, 251-282. Storia e letteratura, raccolta di studi e testi, 102. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1965.

----------. "Chilandar et Zographou au Moyen Âge." In *Хиландарски зборник,* vol.1, 21-32, edited by G.Ostrogorsky. Belgrade: Српска Академија наука и уметности, 1966.

----------. "Collaborazione fra artisti bizantini e bulgari nel secolo XIV." In *Medioevo bizantino-slavo,* vol.1, 455-466. Storia e letteratura, raccolta di studi e testi, 102. Rome, 1965.

----------. "Euthyme de Tirnovo." In *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie écclesiastiques* 16, fasc.90, 75-77. Paris, 1964.

----------. "Le Mont Athos et les Slaves au Moyen Âge." In *Medioevo bizantino-slavo,* vol.1, 487-510. Storia e letteratura, raccolta di studi e testi, 102. Rome, 1965.

----------. "Les rapports littéraires byzantino-slaves." *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol.2, 3-27. Storia e letteratura, raccolta di studi e testi, 113. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1968.

----------. "Slawische Heilige in der byzantinischen Hagiographie." *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol.2, 207-224. Rome, 1968.

----------. "Un manuscrit de la vie de St.Romil." *Studia Serdicensia* 2 (1940):88-92. Reprinted in *Medioevo bizantino-slavo*, vol.2, 231-236.

----------. ed. *Kiril and Methodius: Founders of Slavonic Writing*. East European Monographs, no.172. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1985.

Dvornik, F. *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs*. New Jersey: Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1970.

----------. *The Slavs and Their Early History and Civilization*. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1956.

Encyclopedia of Early Christianity. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, vol.846. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.,1990.

Evdokimov, Paul. "The Meaning of Icons."*One in Christ* 2 (1967): 165-182.

Fine, John. *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983.

----------. *The Late Medieval Balkans, A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987.

----------. "The Size and Significance of the Bulgarian Bogomil Movement."*East European Quarterly* 11, no. 4 (Winter 1977): 385-412.

Frazer, Sir James George. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. 1922. Abridged Edition. Reprint. New York: Macmillan, 1985.

Frend, W.H.C. *The Rise of Christianity*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1984.

----------. *The Early Church*. Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1965.

Gardet, L."Un problème de mystique comparée: la mention du Nom divin-diikhr -- dans la mystique musulmane." *Revue Thomiste* 3 (1952): 642-679; 4 (1953): 197-216.

Gevirtz, S. *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 32. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,1963.

Gillet, Lev. *The Jesus Prayer*. Edited by Kallistos Ware. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987.

Goldblatt, Harvey. *Orthography and Orthodoxy: Constantine Kostenečki's Treatise of the Letters*. Studia Historica et Philologica, no.16. Florence: Le lettere, 1987.

Gonis, D.V. "A Commentary on the Encomium to Our Holy Father Euthymius, Patriarch of Turnovo." *Cyrillomethodianum* 8-9 (1984-85): 215-225.

Grabar, A. "Les fresques d'Ivanovo et l'art des Palaéologues." *Byzantion* 25-27 (1955-1957): 581-590.

Graebner, M. "The Slavs in Byzantine Europe--Absorption, Semi-Autonomy and the Limits of Byzantinization." *Byzantinobulgarica* 5 (1978):41-56.

Grivec, Franz. *Konstantin und Method: Lehrer der Slaven*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1960.

Halkin, F. "Un ermite des Balkans au XIVe siècle: La vie greque inédite de St. Romylus." *Byzantion* 31 (1961): 111-147.

Harvey, Susan Ashbrook. "Women in Early Byzantine Hagiography: Reversing the Story." In *That Gentle Strength: Historical Perspectives on Women in Christianity*, 36-59. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1990.

Hauscherr, I. "Hésychasme et prière." *Orientalia christiana analecta* 176 (1966): 1-308.

----------. "La méthode d'oraison hésychaste." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 9,2 (1927): 101-210.

----------. "Les grands courants de la spiritualité orientale." *Orientalia christiana periodica* 1 (1935): 114-138.

Heppell, Muriel. *The Ecclesiastical Career of Gregory Camblak*. London, 1979.

----------. "The Hesychast Movement in Bulgaria: The Turnovo School and its Relations with Constantinople." *Eastern Churches Review* 7 (1975): 9-20.

Hock, Hans Heinrich. *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton & de Gruyter, 1988.

Hussey, J.M. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Ingham, Norman W. "Genre-Theory and Old Russian Literature." *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 31 (1987): 234-245.

Iorga, Nicolaie. *Istoria Bisericii Românesti*. Vol.1. Bucharest, 1908.

Iovine, Micaela. "The History and Historiography of the Second South Slavic Influence." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1977.

Ivanka, E.V. "Palamismus und Vatertradition, 1054-1954." *L'Église et les Églises* 2 (1955): 29-46.

Jagić, Vatroslav. *Codex Slovenicus rerum gammaticarum*. First published as "Рассуждения южнославянской и русской старины о церковнославянском языке." *Исследования по русскому языку* I (1885-1895): 287-1070. Reprint. Slavische Propyläen, no. 25. Munich, 1968.

----------. "The Conversion of the Slavs." In *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol.4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

----------. *Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*. Berlin, 1879. Reprint. Graz: Akad.Druck-U.Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Jakobson, Roman. "The Dominant." In *Readings in Russian Poetics: Formalist and Structuralist Views*, edited by L.Matejka and K. Pomorska, 82-87. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1971.

----------. "Linguistics and Poetics." Reprint. In *Roman Jakobson: Selected Writings*. Vol.3, 18-51. The Hague: Mouton, 1981.

----------. "Quest for the Essence of Language." Reprint. In *Roman Jakobson: Selected Writings*. Vol.2, Word and Language, 345-359. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

----------. "Saint Constantin et la langue syriaque." *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 7 (1939-1944): 181-186.

----------. "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances." Reprint. In *Roman Jakobson: Selected Writings*. Vol.2, Word and Language, 239-259. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

Kallistos, Bishop of Diokleia. "The Holy Name of Jesus in East and West: the Hesychasts and Richard Rolle." *Sobornost: E.C.R* 4.2 (1982): 163-184.

Kałużniacki, Emil. *Actus Epistolaeque Apostolorum Palaeoslovenice*. Vienna: 1896.

----------. *Aus der panegyrischen Litteratur der Südslaven*. Vienna, 1901. Reprint. London: Variorum, 1971.

----------. *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375-1393)*. Vienna, 1901. Reprint. London: Variorum Reprints, 1971.

Kantor, Marvin. *Medieval Slavic Lives of Saints and Princes*. Michigan Slavic Translations, no. 5. Ann Arbor: Michican Slavic Publications, 1983.

Kennedy, George. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

----------. *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Kinross, Lord. *The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire*. New York: William Morrow, 1977.

Kitch, Faith C.M. *The Literary Style of Epifanij Premudryj: 'Pletenije sloves.'* Slavistische Beiträge, 96. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1976.

Kočev, N. "The Question of Jews and So-Called Judaizers in the Balkans from the 9th to the 14th Century." *Bulgarian Historical Review* 1 (1978): 61-79.

Kolendarov, P. "On the Initial Hearth and Centre of the Bogomil Teaching." *Byzantinobulgarica* 6 (1980): 237-242.

Kossev, D., Hristov, H., and Angelov, D. *A Short History of Bulgaria.* Sofia: Foreign Language Press, 1963.

Krestev, C. "Sur la renaissance balkanique au XIIIe et SIVe siècles." In *Actes du XIIe Congrès International des Études Byzantines*, vol.3, 205-211. Belgrade, 1964.

Krivocheine, Basil. *The Ascetic and Theological Teaching of Gregory Palamas*. London, 1954. First published in *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 3 (1938-1939): 26-33; 71-84; 138-156; 193-214. Translated from Russian "Аскетическое и богословское учение Св. Григория Паламы." *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 8 (1936): 99-154.

Krumbacher, Karl. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur: von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527-1453).* Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung, vol.9.1. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Oskar Beck, 1897.

Kurz Josef, ed. *Evangeliarium Assemani (Evangelář Assemanův).* Vol.2, Úvod, text v přepise cyrilském, poznámky textové, seznamy čtení. Prague: Nakladatelství československé akademie věd, 1955.

Kustas, George. "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric." *Viator* 1 (1970): 55-73.

----------. *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*. Analecta Vladaton 17. Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1973.

Lang, David M. *Armenia: Cradle of Civilization*. 3d ed. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1980.

----------. *The Armenians: A People in Exile*. London, 1981.

----------. *The Bulgarians: From Pagan Times to the Ottoman Conquest.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1976.

Lavrin, Janko. "The Bogomils and Bogomilism." *Slavonic Review* 8 (1929-1930): 269-283.

Lemerle, P. *Le premier humanisme byzantin, Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au Xe siècle*, Paris, 1971.

Lenhoff, Gail. "Categories of Early Russian Writing." *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 31 (1987): 259-279.

----------. "Toward a Theory of Protogenres in Medieval Russian Letters." *The Russian Review* 43 (1984): 31-54.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. "The Structural Study of Myth."*Journal of American Folklore* 68 (October-December, 1955): 428-444.

Liddell H.G., Scott, R. *Greek-English Lexicon.* 1940. Reprint. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Lixačev, D.S. "The Type and Character of Byzantine Influence on Old Russian Literature." *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 13 (1967): 16-32.

Lossky, Vladimir. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.* First published as *Essai sur la Théologie Mystique de l'Église d'Orient.* Paris, 1944. London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1957.

Lossky, V; Ouspensky, L.*The Meaning of Icons.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982.

Lotman, Jurij. *Analysis of the Poetic Text.* Edited and translated by D. Barton Johnson. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1976.

Louth, Andrew. *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition From Plato to Denys.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Lunt, Horace. "Again the rusьskymi pismeni." *Cercetari de lingvistica* 3 (1958): 324-326.

----------. "History, Nationalism, and the Written Language of Early Rus'."*Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 34 (1990): 1-29.

----------. Review of *Some Problems of the Second South Slavic Influence in Russia,* by Ilya Talev. *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 17 (1973): 488-91.

MacDermott, Mercia. *A History of Bulgaria: 1393-1885*. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1962.

Maloney, George A. *Russian Hesychasm: The Spirituality of Nil Sorskij.* The Hague: Mouton, 1973.

Mango, Cyril. *Byzantine Literature as a Distorting Mirror*. Inaugural Lecture, University of Oxford, May 1974. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975. Reprinted in *Byzantium and its Image*, London, Varorium Reprints, 1984, as article 2.

----------. *Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome*. New York: Scribner, 1980.

Manson, J. "Studies in Russian Hagiography During the Period of the Second South Slavic Influence." Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1968.

Mareš, Francis Wenceslas. *An Anthology of Church Slavonic Texts of Western (Czech) Origin*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1979.

Matanov, Hristo. "Le Mont Athos et les rapports politiques dans la deuxième moitié du XIVe siècle."*Études balkaniques* 2 (1983): 69-100.

Mathiesen, Robert. "Byzantine Influence." In *Handbook of Russian Literature*,70-72, edited by Victor Terras. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

----------. "The Inflectional Morphology of the Synodal Church Slavonic Verb." Ph.D. Dissertation. Columbia University, 1972.

----------. "Nota sul genere acatistico e sulla letteratura agiografica slava eclesiastica nel XIV e XV secolo." *Ricerche slavistiche* 13 (1965): 57-63.

Matus, Thomas. *Yoga and the Jesus Prayer Tradition, An Experiment in Faith*. Ramsey, NJ: Paulist Press, 1984.

Mendieta, Emannuel A. de. *Mount Athos: the Garden of the Panaghia.* Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten, 41. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972.

Meyendorff, John. *Byzantine Hesychasm: Historical, Theological and Social Problems.* London: Variorum Reprints, 1974.

----------. *Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982.

----------. "Les débuts de la controverse hesychaste." *Byzantion* 23 (1953): 87-120. Reprinted in *Byzantine Hesychasm* as article 1.

----------. "Humanisme nominaliste et mystique chrétienne à Byzance au XIVe siècle." *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 70, no.9 (1957): 905-914. Reprinted in *Byzantine Hesychasm* as article 6.

----------. "Is 'Hesychasm' the Right Word? Remarks on Religious Ideology in the Fourteenth Century." Okeanos, Festschrift on the Sixtieth Birthday of Ihor Ševčenko. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7 (1983): 447-456.

----------. *The Orthodox Church: Its Past and its Role in the World Today.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1968.

----------. *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Press, 1982.

----------. "Society and Culture in the Fourteenth Century: Religious Problems." *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines (6-12 septembre 1971, Bucarest),* vol.1, 51-65. Bucharest: Editarai Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1974. Reprinted in *Byzantine Hesychasm* as article 8.

Mihajlov, Stamen. "The Interpretation of ETXBEXTH and the Year of the Conversion of the Bulgarians into the Chrisian Faith," *Bulgarian Historical Review* 1 (1979): 75-90.

Miklosich, Franz von. *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum.* Vienna (1862-65). Reprint. Scientia Verlag Aalen, 1963.

Mishew, Dimitar. *The Bulgarians in the Past: Pages from the Bulgarian Cultural History*. Lausanne: Librairie Centrale des Nationalités, 1919. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1971.

Moffatt, Ann."Early Byzantine School Curricula and a Liberal Education." In *Byzance et les slaves, Mélanges Ivan Dujchev,* 275-288. Paris, Association des amis des études archéologiques des mondes byzantino-slaves et du christianisme oriental, 1976.

Moore, R.I. *The Origins of European Dissent*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.

Moser, Charles. *A History of Bulgarian Literature: 865-1944*. The Hague: Mouton, 1972.

Mošin, V. "Stil stare srpske proze." In *Stara književnost,* edited by Djordje Trifunović, 181-197. Belgrade, 1965.

Mougalias, Harry. *Byzantine Christianity: Emperor, Church and the West*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1982.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Art as Semiotic Fact." First published as "L'art comme fait sémiologique" in *Actes du huitième Congrès international de philosophie à Prague 1934*, 1065-1072, Prague, 1936; English translation in *Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions,* ed. by Ladislav Matejka and Irwin R. Titunik, 3-10. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1976.

----------. "On Poetic Language." First published as "O jazyce básnickém" in *Slovo a slovesnost,* 6 (1940). English translation in*The Word and Verbal Art, Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*, translated and edited by John Burbank and Peter Steiner. Yale Russian and Eastern European Studies, 13. Yale University Press, 1977.

----------. "Poetic Reference." First published as "Dénomination poétique et la fonction esthétique de la langue," *Actes du Congrès nternational de linguistes 1936,* 98-104, Copenhagen, 1938; English translation in *Semiotics of Art,* 155-163. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1976.

Mulić, M. "Jevtimije Trnovski i uloga njegove škole u stvaranju stila 'pletenija sloves' u srpskoj i ruskoj književnosti." *Зборник за славистику* 3 (1972): 99-113.

----------. "'Pletenije sloves' i hesihazam." *Radovi zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 7 (1965): 141-56.

----------. "Srpsko 'pletenije sloves' do 14 stoljeća." *Radovi zavoda za slavensku filologiju* 5 (1963): 117-29.

Murphy, J.J. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1974.

Nersoyan, Hagop. *A History of the Armenian Church, with Thirty-Five Stories*. New York: Council for Religious Education Diocese of the Armenian Church of North America, 1963.

Nicol, D. *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261-1453*. London: Hart-Davis, 1972.

Nikolova, Bistra. "La vie d'Ilarion de Müglen par le Patriarche Euthyme et le renseignement sur l'archevêque bulgare Eustache." *Byzantino-bulgarica* 8 (1986): 253-266.

Obolensky, Dimitri. *The Bogomils: A Study of Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1948.

----------.*The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1982.

----------. "Late Byzantine Culture and the Slavs: A Study in Acculturation." *Actes du XVe Congres International d'Etudes Byzantines*, 3-26, Athens, 1976. Reprinted in *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe* as article 17.

----------. "The Cyrillo-Methodian Mission: The Scriptorial Foundations." *St.Vladimir Theological Quarterly* 30, 2 (1986): 101-116.

----------. "Medieval Russian Culture in the Writings of D.S. Likhachev." *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 9 (Oxford,1976): 1-16. Reprinted in *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe* as article 9.

----------. *Six Byzantine Portraits*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Ormanian, Malachia. *The Church of Armenia: Her History, Doctrine, Rule, Discipline, Liturgy, Literature and Existing Condition.* London: A.R.Mowbray and Co., 1955.

Ostrogorsky, George. *History of the Byzantine State.* trans. Joan Hussey. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956. Originally published as *Istorija Vizantije* (Belgrade, 1969).

----------. "Moravska misija i Vizantija." In *Vizantija i sloveni,* vol.4, 59-78. Belgrade, 1970.

Oxford Classical Dictionary. Edited by Hammond and Scullar. 1970. Reprint. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Pasdermadjian, H. *Histoire de l'Arménie.* 2d ed. Paris: Librairie orientale H. Samuelian, 1964.

Patlagean, Evelyne. "Ancient Byzantine Hagiography and Social History." In *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History,* edited by Stephen Wilson, 101-120. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Patrinacos, N. *A Dictionary of Greek Orthodoxy.* New York: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, 1984.

Peirce. Charles Sanders. *The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce.* 2nd printing. 4 vols. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1965-6.

Pevsner, N. *An Outline of European Architecture.*1960. Reprint. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1961.

Picchio, R. "Early Humanistic Trends in the Turnovo School." In *Bulgaria, Past and Present,* 255-260. Columbus, Ohio: American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, 1976.

----------. "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavic Orthodoxa'." *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 1 (1977): 1-31.

----------. "The Imact of Ecclesiastical Culture on Old Russian Literary Techniques." In *Medieval Russian Culture,* edited by H.Birnbaum and H. Flier, 249-279. California Slavic Studies 12, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1984

----------. "L' 'intreccio delle parole' e gli stili letterari presso gli slavi ortodossi nel tardo Medio Evo." In *Studi slavistici in ricordo di Carlo Verdiani*, edited by A.M.Raffo, 245-262, Pisa, 1979.

----------. "Isometric Semantic Markers in the Prose of Patriarch Euthymius of Trnovo." *International Journal for Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 31-32 (1985): 309-318.

Picchio, R. and Goldblatt, H. "Old Russian Literature." In *Handbook of Russian Literature*, 316-322, edited by Victor Terras. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Pomorska, K. "Poetics of Prose." In *Roman Jakobson: Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time*, 169-177. Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.

Previale, L. "Teoria e prassi del panegirico bizantino." *Emerita: Boletin de linguistica y filologia clasica* 17 (Madrid, 1949):72-105. Reprint. Schmidt Periodical, 1989.

Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Translated by Laurence Scott. 2d ed. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1968.

Pundeff, Marin. "National Consciousness in Medieval Bulgaria." *Südost-Forschungen* 27 (1968):1-27.

Richardson, R. "Hesychasm in the Hagiographic Works of Patriarch Kallistos." Ph.D.Dissertation, Harvard University, 1969.

Roberts, Michael. *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Runciman, Steven. *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*, London, 1930.

----------. *The Last Byzantine Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Sadnik, L.; Aitzetmüller, R. *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten*. Slavic Printings and Reprintings, 6. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.

Safařík, Pavel Josef. *Památky dřevního písemnictví jihoslovanův.* Prague: Nákladem B. Tempského, 1873.

Seeman, Klaus-Dieter. "Genres and the Alterity of Old Russian Literature." *Slavic and Eastern European Journal* 31 (1987): 246-258.

Sevčenko, Ihor. *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos.* Brussels, 1962.

----------. *Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World.* London: Variorum Reprints, 1982.

----------. "Hagiograpy of the Iconoclast Period." In *Iconoclasm,* 1-42. Papers given at the 9th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies (University of Birmingham) 1975. Reprinted in *Ideology, Letters and Culture* as article 5.

----------. "A Shadow Outline of Virtue: The Classical Heritage of Greek Christian Literature (Second to Seventh Century)." In *Age of Spirituality: a Symposium,* 53-73. Edited by Kurt Weitzmann, New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1980. Reprinted in *Ihor Sevčenko: Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World,* London: Variorum Reprints, 1982 as article 2.

Shapiro, Marianne. "Word-Weaving in Medieval Romance Lyric." In *Figuration in Verbal Art,* 83-112, by Michael and Marianne Shapiro. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Shapiro, Michael. *The Sense of Grammar, Language as Semeiotic.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983.

Shapiro, Michael and Marianne. "The Structure of Figures." In *Figuration in Verbal Art,* 23-45. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988: 23-45.

Shuger, Debora. *Sacred Rhetoric, The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Sinkewicz, R. "A New Interpretation of the Frist Episode in the Controversy between Barlaam and Calabrian and Gregory Palamas." *Journal of Theological Studies* 31, part 2 (1980): 489-500.

Sparwenfeld, J.G. *Lexicon Slavonicum*. Acta Bibliothecae R. Universitatis Upsaliensis, no.24. Upsalla: Upsalla University Press, 1987.

Sullivan, R.E. "Khan Boris and the Conversion of Bulgaria: A Case Study of the Impact of Christianity on a Barbarian Society." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 3 (1966): 51-139.

Swoboda, V. "L'origine de l'organisation de l'église en Bulgarie et ses rapports avec le patriarcat de Constantinople (870-919)." *Byzantinobulgarica* 2 (1966):67-81.

Tachiaos, A.E. "Gregory Sinaite's Legacy to the Slavs: Preliminary Remarks." *Cyrillomethodianum* 7 (1983): 113-166.

----------. "Le monachisme serbe de saint Sava et la tradition hésychaste athonite." In *Хиландарски зборник*, 83-89, edited by G. Ostrogorsky. Belgrade: Српска Академија Наука и Уметности, 1966.

----------. "Mount Athos and Slavic Literatures." *Cyrillomethodianum* 4 (1978): 1-35.

----------. "Le mouvement hésychaste pendant les dernières décennies du XIVe siècle." *Κληρονομία* 6 (1974): 113-130.

Talev, Ilya. "The Impact of Middle Bulgarian on the Russian Literary Language (Post-Kievan Period)." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1972. Appeared also as *Some Problems of the Second South Slavic Influence in Russia*. Slavistische Beiträge 62. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1973.

Tchaplikov, V. "Le tombeau d'Euthyme de Tirnovo." *Échos d'Orient* 9 (1906): 292-8.

Thomson, Francis. "The Bulgarian Contribution to the Reception of Byzantine Culture in Kievan Rus'--the Myths and the Enigma." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988-89): 214-261.

----------. "The Implications of the Absence of Quotations of Untranslated Greek Works in Original Early Russian Literature Together with a Critique of a Distorted Picture of Early Bulgarian Culture." *Slavia Gandensia* 15 (1988): 63-91.

----------. "Quotations on Patristic and Byzantine Works by Early Russian Authors as an Introduction of the Cultural Level of Kievan Russia." *Slavia Gandensia* 15 (1988): 65-102.

Tschilingirov, Assen. *Christliche Kunst in Bulgarien, von der Spätantike bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*. East Berlin: Union Verlag, 1978.

Turdeanu, Émile. "Gregoire Camblak: Faux arguments d'une biographie." *Revue des études slaves* 22 (1946): 46-81.

----------. *La littérature bulgare du XIVe siècle et sa diffusion dans les pays roumains*. Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves, no.22. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1947.

Vaillant, André. "Les 'Lettres Russes' de la Vie de Constantin." *Revue des Études Slaves*, 15 (1935): 75-77.

----------.*Textes vieux-slaves*. 2 vols. Textes publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves, no.8/1-2. Paris: Imprimérie nationale, 1968.

Vasič, M. "L'hésychasme dans l'Église et l'art des Serbes au Moyen Âge." In *L'art byzantin chez les Slaves, Receuil dédié à la mémoire de Theodore Uspenskij*, 1, 110-123. Paris, 1930.

Vasiliev, A. *A History of the Byzantine Empire*, 2 vols., Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.

Vernadsky, George. *Ancient Russia*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.

Vodička, F. "Response to Verbal Art." In *Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions*, 197-208. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1976.

White, Ian. "Hesychasm and the Revival of Bulgarian Literature in the Fourteenth Century." In *Bulgaria, Past and Present*, 249-254. Columbus: American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, 1976.

Worth, D. "The Second South Slavic Influence in the History of the Russian Literary Language (Materials for Discussion)." *American Contributions to the 9th International Congress of Slavists, (September 1983, Kiev)*, vol.1, Linguistics, 349-372, edited by M. Flier. Columbus, 1983.

Young, Frances M. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon, A Guide to the Literature and its Background.* London: SCM Press, Ltd. 1983.

Zachariadou, Elizabeth A. "Les «janissaires» de l'empereur byzantin." In *Studia turcologica memoriæ Alexii Bombaci dicata*, 591-597. Seminario di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor XIX. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1982. Reprinted as article XI of *E.A. Zachariadou, Romania and the Turks (c.1300-c.1500)*, London: Variorum Reprints, 1985.

Zenkovsky, S., ed. and trans. *Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles and Tales.* 2d ed. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1974.

Zlatarski, V.N. "Bulgariens historia till befrielsen 1878." In *Bulgarerna*, edited by M. Ehrenprise and A.Jensen, 3-39. Stockholm: P.A. Norstedt och Söners Förlag, 1918.

B. Sources in languages employing Cyrillic alphabet:

Аверинцев, С. *Поэтика ранневизантийской литературы.* Москва: АН СССР, 1977.

Адрианова-Перетц, В. "Дренерусские литературные памятники в южнославянской письменности." *ТОДРЛ* 19 (1963): 5-27.

Ангелов, Боню. "Неизвестен препис на 'Похвално слово за Патриарх Евтимий' от Григорий Цамблак." *Език и литература* 24, №6 (1969): 57-60.

----------. "Проникване на старобългарски сочинения в стара руска литература." *Старобългарска литература* 2 (1977): 20-45.

----------. *Руско-южнославянски книжовни връзки.* София: БАН, 1980.

----------. *Старобългарски писатели.* София: Народа просвета, 1981.

Ангелов, Димитър. (= **Angelov**). *Богомилството в България*, София: Наука и изкуство, 1980.

----------. "Към историята на религиозно-философската мисъл в средновековна България--исихазъм и варлаамитство." *Българското историческо дружество* 25 (1967): 73-92.

----------. *Общество и обществена мисъл в средновековна България (IX-XIV v.).* София: Партиздат, 1979.

----------. *Руско-български връзки през вековете.* София: БАН, 1986.

Антиќ, Верна. *Локални агиографии во Македонија,* 47-73. Скопје: Просветно дело, 1977.

Байчева, Малина. "Проблемът за светския подвиг на героите в 'Похвално слово за Евтимий' от Григорий Цамблак и 'Житие на Стефан Пермски' от Епифаний Премъдри." *Търновска книжовна школа,* том 4, Културно развитие на българската държава, краят на XII-XIV век, 41-46, София: БАН, 1985.

Богданов, Богдан; Николова, Анна. *Антична литература: енциклопедичен справечник.* София: Държавно издателство "Д-р Петър Берон," 1988.

Богданов, Иван. *Кратка история на българската литература.* том I, Литература на възраждането. София: Народа просвета, 1969.

----------. *Патриарх Евтимий, Книга за него и неговото време.* Библиотеки бележити българи, №2. София: Изд. на Отечествения фронт, 1970.

Божилов, И. *Цар Симеон Велики (893-927): Златният век на среновековна България.* София: БАН, 1983.

Брюсова, Б.В. "О русско-болгарских связях в искусстве XI-XV вв." ***Byzantinobulgarica* 8 (1986): 131-149.**

Брянчанинов, Игнатий. *О молитве Исисовой.* Санкт-Петербург, 1867.

Бычков, В.В. "Образ как категория византийской эстетики."

Византийский временник 34 (1973): 151-167.

Васильев, А. А. *Падение Византии: эпоха Палеологов (1261-1453)* Петроград, 1925.

Вранска, Цветана. "Стилни похвати на Патриарх Евтимий." *Сборник на Българската академия на науките и изкуствата* 37, 2 (1942): 107-280.

Голубинский, Е. *Краткий очерк истории православных церквей болгарской, сербской и румынской или молдо-валашской.* Москва: Унив. Тип., 1871.

Грабар, Андрей. **(= Grabar).** *Боянската църква.* София: Наука и изкуство, 1978.

Гюзелев, В. *Духовната култура на среновековна България през XIII-XIV в.*, София: Народна процвета, 1985.

Данчев, Георги. "Агиографско-панегиричното наследство на Евтимий Търновски--извор на сведения за дейността на Асеневци." *Търновска книжовна школа*, том 4, Културно развитие на българската държава, краят на **XII-XIV** век, 9-18. София: БАН, 1985.

----------. "Отношение Евфимия Тырновского к еретическим учениям, распространявшимся в болгарских землях." ***Byzantinobulgarica* 6 (1980): 95-113.**

Данчев, Георги; Давидов, А. "Похвално слово за Евтимий от Григорий Цамблак." *Литературна мисъл* 17, №1 (1973): 140-141.

Джурова. А. **(=A. Djourova).** *Болгарская рукописная книга X-XVIII вв.* Москва: АН СССР, 1978.

----------. *24 миниатюри от томичовия псалтир.* София: Български художник, 1982.

----------. *Хиляда години българска ръкописна книга. Орнаменти и миниатюра.* София: Издателство Септември, 1981.

Динеков, Петър. (= **P. Dinekov**).“Евтимий Търновский.” *История на българската литература*. том 1, 285-307, Стойко Божков, Петър Динеков, и.т.д. ред. София: БАН, 1963.

----------. "Личността на Евтимий Търновский." *Старобългарска литература* 7 (1980): 3-21.

----------. "Търновската книжовна школа (история, основни черти, значение)." *Старобългарска литература* 20 (1987): 3-19.

Динеков, Петър; Куев. К; Петканова, Д. редак. *Христоматия по старобългарска литература*. второ подобрено издание. София: Наука и изкуство, 1967.

Дончева-Панайотова, Н. "По въпроса за родството между митрополит Киприан и Григорий Цамблак." *Старобългарска литература* 3 (1978): 77-85.

Драгова, Надежда. **(=Dragova).** "Жанрова трансформация на Евтимиевото житие за света Петка Търновска през **XVI-XVIII** век," *Търновска книжовна школа,* том 4, Културно развитие на българската държава, краят на **XII-XIV** век, 85-101, София: БАН, 1985.

Дуйчев, Иван. **(=Dujčev).** *Болонски Псалтир. Български книжовен паметник от XIII век*. София: БАН, 1968.

----------. *Из старата българска книжнина*. том 2, Книжовни и исторически паметници от второто българско царство. София: Хемус, 1944.

----------. "Итальянская книга по истории древнерусской литературы," *ТОДРЛ* 18 (1962): 552-568.

----------.*Летописта на Константин Манаси*. София: БАН, 1963.

----------."Търново като политически и духовен център през късното средновековие." *Археология* 8.3 (София,1966): 1-9.

Еремин, И.П. "О византийском влиянии в болгарской и древнерусской литературах **IX-XII** вв." *Славянские литературы (Доклады советской делегации в*

Международный съезд славистов), 5-13. Москва, 1963. **Reprinted in** *Литература древней Руси: этюды и характеристики,* 9-17. Москва-Ленинград: Наука, 1966.

Златарски, В.Н. **(= Zlatarski).** *Житие и жизнь преподобнаго отца нашего Теодосия.* Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина (СбНУНК), №20. София, 1904.

Иванов, Й. *Български старини из Македония.* София, 1908; София, 1931; **Reprint (of 1931).** София: БАН, 1970.

Иванова (= Иванова-Константинова) Климентина. "Византийските източници на Похвалната за Константин и Елена от Патриарх Евтимий Търновски." *Старобългарска литература* 10 (1981): 3-15.

----------. "Болгарская переводная литература **X-XIV** вв. в контексте **'Slavia Orthodoxa'." In** ***Studia slavica mediaevalia et humanistica,*** **no.2, edited by Riccardo Picchio, 361-371, Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1986.**

----------."Житието на Петка Търновска от Патриарх Евтимий: източници и текстологически бележки." *Старобългарска литература* 8 (1980): 13-36.

----------."Литературни наблюдения върху две похвални слова от Евтимий Търновски." *Старобългарска литература* 14 (1983): 10- 36.

----------. "Някои моменти на българо-византийските литературни връзки през **XIV** в." *Старобългарска литература* 1 (1971): 209-242.

----------. "Отражение борьбы между исихастами и их противниками в переводной полемической литературе болгарских славян."***Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines (6-12 septembre 1971, Bucarest),*** **vol.2, 167-176. Bucharest: Editarai Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975.**

----------. "Патриарх Евтимий и агиографската традиция в средновековната литература." *Литературна мисъл* 10 (1977): 90-99.

----------. "Похвалното слово за Иоан Поливотски от Евтимий Търновски." *Старобългарска литература* 12 (1982): 30-53.

----------. редактор. *Стара българска литература,* том 4, Житиеписни творби. София: Български писател,1986.

Ильинский, Г.А. "Значение Афона в истории славянской письменности."*Журнал министерства народного просвещения* 18 (ноябрь, 1908):1-41.

Калиганов, И. "Несколько соображений о методике изучения болгаро-сербско-русских средневековых литературных связей." *Старобългарска литература* 18 (1985): 58-73.

Качанковский, В. "К вопросу о литературной деятельности болгарского патриарха Евтимия (1375-1393)," *Христианское Чтение издаваемое при Санкт-петербургской Духовной Академии* 2 (1882): 216-265

----------. "Новые данные для изучения литературной деятельности болгарского Тырновского патриарха Евтимия." *Христианское Чтение* 3-4 (1888): 470-497.

Кенанов, Димитър. "Симеон Метафраст и търновската книжовна школа." *Търновска книжовна школа,* том 4, Културно развитие на българската държава, краят на XII-XIV век, 26-36, София: БАН, 1985.

Киселков, Васил С. *Житието на св. Теодосий Търновски като исторически паметник.* София: Печат С.М. Стайков, 1926.

----------. *Патриарх Евтимий.* София: Светият Синод на Българската църква, 1938.

----------. "Патриарх Евтимий (живот и обществена дейност)." *Българска историческа библиотека* 3 (София: Радикал, 1929):142-177.

----------. *Патриарх Евтимий. Похвално слово от Григорий Цамблак.* София, 1935.

----------. "Средновековна Парория и Синаитият монастир." *Сборник в чест на В.Н.Златарский*, 103-118. София: Държавна Печатница, 1925.

Косев, Димитър. **(= Kossev, D.)** *Кратка история на България*. София: Наука и изкуство,1969.

Коновалова, О.Ф. "«Плетение словес» и плетеный орнамент конца **XIV** в." *ТОДРЛ* 22 (1966):101-111

Кочев, Николай. **(= Kočev).** "Идейно-теоретические корни исихазма." ***Études balkaniques* 1 (1973): 41-61.**

Куев, К. "Образът на Иван Александър в сренобългарската поезия." *Българско среновековие (Българо-съветски сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф.И.Дуйчев)*, 270-286. София: Наука и изкуство, 1980.

Лавров, П.А. *Материалы по истории возникновения древнейшей славянской письменности*. **1930. Reprint. The Hague: Mouton,1960.**

Лазарев, В. *Византийское и древнерусское исусство*. Москва: АН СССР, 1978.

Леонид, Архимандрит "Последний патриарх болгарского царства блаженный Евтимий и его сочинения." *Чтения в императорском обществе истории и древностей российских при Московском Университете* 4 (1870): 13-18.

Литаврин, Г. "Древняя Русь, Болгария и Византия в **IX-X** вв.: история, культура, этнография и фольклор славянских народов." *Материалы IX Международного съезда славистов*. Москва: АН СССР, 1983.

Лихачев, Д.С. *История русской литературы X-XVII вв.* Москва: Просвещение, 1980.

----------. "Некоторые задачи изучения второго южнославянского влияния в России." *Исследования по славянскому литературоведению и фольклористике, Доклады советских ученых на IV Международном съезде славистов*. 95-151. Москва: АН СССР, 1960.

----------. *Поэтика древнерусской литературы.* Ленинград: Худож. лит.,1971.

Лихачов, Д.С. (=Лихачев). "Старославянските литератури като система." *Литературна мисъл* I (1969): 3-38.

Лосев, А.Ф. *Эстетика Возрождения.* Москва: АН СССР, 1978.

Лотман, Ю. **(= Lotman, J.).** *Стуктура художественного текста.* 1970. **Reprint. Brown University Slavic Reprint Series, no.9. Providence: Brown University Press, 1971.**

Маслев,Стоян. "Пустинножителска Мадара." *Арехеология* I.3-4 (София,1959):24-34.

Медведев, И.П. *Византийский гуманизм.* Москва: АН СССР, 1976.

Милев, Александър. *Гръцките жития на Климент Охридски.* София: БАН, 1966.

Мирчев, К.С. *Историческа грамматика на старобългарски език,* София: Наука и изкуство, 1963.

Мулич, М. **(= Mulić).** "Сербские агиографы **XIII-XIV** вв. и особенности их стиля." *ТОДРЛ* 23 (1968): 127-142.

Никольский, Николай. *Материалы для истории древнерусской духовной письменности.* Санкт-Петербург: Тип. Имп. Академии наук, 1907.

Острогорский, Г.А. **(= Ostrogorsky).** "Афонские исихасты и их противники. (К истории поздневизантийской культуры)." *Записки Русского научного института в Белграде* 5 (1931): 349-370.

Пикио, Рикардо. **(= Picchio).** "Върху изоколните структури в средновековната славянска проза." *Литературна мисъл* 3 (1980): 75-107.

Полывянный, Дмитрий. "Тырновград глазами средневекового соврменника." *Търновска книжовна школа,* том 4,

Културно развитие на българска държава, краят на XII-XIV век, 262-269. София: БАН, 1985.

Помяловский, Иван В. *Житье иже во святых отца нашего Григория Синаита*. Записки историческо-философского факультета Ст-Петербургского Университета, №35. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. Императорской Академии наук, 1896.

Попов, Х.И. *Евтимий, последен Търновски и Трапезицки патриарх (1375-1394)*. По случай 500-годишината от смъртта му (1402-1902). Пловдив: Печатница на Хр. Г. Данов, 1901.

Попруженко, М.Т. "Из истории религиозного движения в Болгарии в XIV в."*Slavia* 7 (1928): 536-548.

Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописей XI-XIV вв., хранящихся в СССР. Археологический ежегодник за 1965 год. Москва: АН СССР, 1965.

Прохоров, Г.М. "Исихазм и общественная мысль в Восточной Европе в XIV в." *ТОДРЛ* 23 (1968): 86-108.

Радченко, К. *Религиозное и литературное движение в Болгарии в эпоху перед турецким завоеванием*. Киев: Тип. Императорского Университета Св. Валдимира Н.Т. Корчак-Новицкого, 1898.

Розов, В. "Синаитцы в Сербии в XIV веке."*Byzantinoslavica* 1 (1929): 16-20.

Русев, Пеньо. "Реформата на Евтимий Търновски: характер, особености, разпространение." *Търновска книжовна школа*. том 2, Ученици и последователи на Евтимий Търновски, 49-54. София: БАН, 1980.

Северьянов, С. *Синайская Псалтырь, глаголический памятник XI в*. Петроград: Издание отделения руссого языка и словесности российской академии наук 1922. Reprint. Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Соболевский, А.И. *Западное влияния на литературу Московской Руси XV-XVII веков*. Санкт-Петербург, 1899. **Reprint. The Hague: Europe Printing, 1966.**

----------. "Южно-славянское влияние на русскую письменность в XIV-XV веках." *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV-XV веков*. Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности, 74, №1. Санкт-Петербург, 1903.

Сперанский, М.Н. *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей*, Москва: АН СССР, 1960.

----------. *История древнерусской литературы*, том 2, Московский период, **3d. ed.** Москва: Изд. М. и С. Сабашниковых, 1921.

Срезневский, И. *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам*. 3 тома. 1893. **Reprint.** (6 томов). Москва: Книга, 1989.

Станчев, К. "Евтимиевата школа в контекста на европейското духовно развитие." *Старобългарска литература* 11 (1982): 8-18.

----------. "Едно малко познато гръцко житие на Параскева Епиватска (Петка Търновска)." *Българско средновековие (Българо-съветски сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф. И. Дуйчев)*, 270-286. София: Наука и изкуство, 1980.

----------. "Нормативност на средновековната естетика и поетика." *Старобългарска литература* 6 (1980): 3-10.

----------. *Поетика на старобългарска литература*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1982.

Стоянов, С.; Янакиев, М. *Старобългарски език: текстове и речник*. София: Наука и изкуство, 1965.

Сырку, П.А. "Житие Григория Синаита составленное константинопольским патриархом Каллистом. Текст славянскаго перевода Жития по рукописи XVI века и историко-археео-

логическое введение." *Памятники древних письменности и искусства*, № 172 (СПб, 1909): 1-48.

----------. *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV веке*. том 1, Время и жизнь патриарха Евтимия. Санкт-Петербург, 1890. **Reprint. London: Variorum Reprints, 1972.**

----------. *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV веке*. том 2, Литургические труды патриарха Евтимия. Санкт-Петербург, 1890. **Reprint. London: Variorum Reprints, 1972.**

----------."Монаха Григория житие преподобного Ромила." *Памятники древних письменности и искусства* 134 (1900):1-54.

Тихомиров, М. "Исторические связи русского народа с южными славянами с древнейших времен до половины XVII в." *Славянский сборник*, 125-201. Москва, 1947

Томашевский, Б. В. *Теория литературы, поэзия*. **4th ed.** Москва-Ленинград: Государственное издательство, 1928. **Reprint. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1971.**

Флоровский, Тимофей. *Южные славяне и Византия во второй четверти XIV века*, Санкт-Петербург: Тип. В. Киршбаума,1882. **Reprint. London: Varorium Reprints, 1973.**

Фрайданк, Д. "К сущности и предпосылкам стиля 'плетения словес'." *Търновска книжовна школа*, том 2, Ученици и последователи на Евтимий Търновски, 89-93. София: БАН, 1980.

Фрейберг, Л.А.; Попова, Т.А. *Византийская литература эпохи расцвета, IX-XV вв*. Москва: АН СССР, 1978.

Христов, Боряна; Караджова, Даринка; Икономова, Анастасия. *Български ръкописи от XI до XVII век запазени в България. Своден каталог*. том 1. София: Народна Библиотека «Кирил и Методий», Българска Археографска Комисия, 1982.

Цанков, Стефан. *Патриарх Евтимий*, София, 1906.

Шкловский, Виктор. "Искусство как прием." *О теории прозы*, 7-23. Москва: Круг, 1929.

Шкория, К. "Мадаро-Могилского плато." ***Byzantinoslavica* 4 (1932):103-4.**

Щепкин, В.Н. "Болгарский орнамент эпохи Иоанна Александра." *Сборник статей по славяноведению, посвященных проф. М.С. Дринову,* 153-158. Харьков, 1904.

Яцимирский, А.И. *Григорий Цамблак. Очерк его жизни, административной и книжной деятельности.* Санкт-Петербург: Имп. Академия наук, 1904.

----------. "Из критико-литературных наблюдений над житьем Григория Синаита." *Византийский временник* 15, №2-3 (1908): 300-331.