

Yavor Miltenov (Sofia)

A NOTE ON THE ADOPTION OF THE BYZANTINE MODELS IN MEDIEVAL BULGARIA (9TH–10TH CENTURIES) THE CASE OF THE *CHRYSORRHOAS* COLLECTION

In the first quarter of the 10th century the first Slavic collection of homilies of John Chrysostom was compiled. It was called *Zlatostruy*, which means *Chrysorrhoeas* or *Golden Stream*. In previous studies *Zlatostruy* was noted mostly for its *Preface* (Прилогъ самияго христолюбиваеяго цѣсаря Свѣмѣона), whereby the Bulgarian king Symeon (893–927) is named initiator of the gathering the initial *corpus Chrysostomicum* and author of its name:

The pious tsar Symeon, it states, after examining all the books of the Old and New Testament, and others of the Christian and non-Christian authors, as well as the morals, customs and wisdom of the Church Fathers, was amazed by the verbal wisdom and grace of the Holy Spirit (embodied in the works) of the blessed John Chrysostom; getting into the habit of reading all of his books and after choosing all the homilies from all of his books, he gathered them in this collection giving it the name *Zlatostruy*.

The evidence in the *Preface* puts the collection in a unique position among the other early Slavic translations for it suggests reliable timeframe and moreover offers a valuable insight into a comprehensive cultural policy in this period. The *Preface* introduces the basic concepts underlying the popular idea about this specific historical period featuring the enlightened monarch, the royal library, the state support for literature, the personal involvement of the ruler with these works to be collected, selected, translated and distributed. According to this evidence it was the judgment of the king himself that the content of these texts was useful for nourishing the Christian morality and spirituality of the Bulgarian people in a time when a new Christian identity was being formed according the Byzantine models.

The importance of the *Zlatostruy* collection is supported not only by the *Preface*, which may be considered of more or less ideological value. It was substantiated by means of a comprehensive text-critical and comparative analysis that endeavors to reconstruct the history of the collection and reveal further detail

about the textual history of the homilies from the Byzantine originals to the later Slavic copies¹. In this paper I shift the focus to those features that are related to the flourishing of the 10th century Bulgarian literary tradition and the successful adoption of the Byzantine literary models.

Among the most notable elements of the early history of the *Zlatostruy* are the scope, compilation strategy and its impact on the medieval Bulgarian literature. The original corpus contained an impressive number of homilies ascribed to John Chrysostom (more than 120) that were gathered from typologically different Byzantine codices. Its core was built by works found in Greek miscellanies of stable content containing the Chrysostom's homiletic series on the Acts and Epistles², Gospels³, and Genesis⁴; additionally, Greek homiletic miscellanies of mixed content can be considered sources for a number of other (Chrysostomian and pseudo-Chrysostomian) texts⁵. Comparative analysis shows clearly, that this Greek manuscript collection was – as claimed in the *Preface* – used with a critical eye. As concerns the homiletic series, only certain homilies or parts of homilies or even individual passages were selected. Usually it was the *ethica* (the morally instructive

¹ Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй: старобългарски хомилетичен свод, създаден по инициатива на българския цар Симеон. Текстологическо и извороведско изследване*, София 2013. Cf. F.J. THOMSON, *Chrysostomica palaeoslavica. A Preliminary Study of the Sources of the Chrysorrhoeas (Zlatostruy) Collection*, Сур 6, 1982, p. 1–65; А. ДИМИТРОВА, *Златоструят в преводаческата дейност на старобългарските книжовници*, София 2016.

² From *In Acta Apostolorum* series (CPG 4426) seventeen homilies were translated partly or in full (*homiliae* I, II, III, IV, XII, XVIII, XXIII, XXIV, XXVI, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXIV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XLIV, XLV, XLVIII). In *Epistulam ad Ephesios* (CPG 4431) is represented by three translated texts (*homiliae* II, III, IV); In *Epistulam ad Hebraeos* (CPG 4440) is represented by six (I, III, X, XXVIII, XXXI, XXXII); In *Epistulam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432) by two (III, XIII); In *Epistulam ad Romanos* (CPG 4427) by ten (V, VII, VIII, XII, XIII, XIV, XVIII, XXIII, XXV, XXXI); In *Epistulam ad Titum* (CPG 4438) by one (*homilia* III); In *Epistulam primam ad Corinthios* (CPG 4428) by sixteen (I, VIII, IX, X, XI, XVII, XXIII, XXIV, XXVII, XXXII, XXXVI, XL, XLI, XLII, XLIII, XLIV); In *Epistulam secundam ad Corinthios* (CPG 4429) by four (IV, IX, X, XXII); In *Epistulam primam ad Timotheum* (CPG 4436) by three (VI, XIV, XV); In *Epistulam secundam ad Timotheum* (CPG 4437) by four (I, II, VII, VIII).

³ The initial corpus contained at least five translations from *In Matthaеum* series (CPG 4424), viz. *homiliae* XXIII, XXXVII, LIV, LVI, LXXVI (and probably *homiliae* LXI and LXVIII too). It had also at least two texts taken from *In Iohannem* (CPG 4425), viz. *homiliae* IV and LXXXVII.

⁴ From the *Homiliae in Genesim* series (CPG 4409) three were used (XIII, XXXI, XXXV). Three translations are attested from the *Sermones in Genesim* (CPG 4410) series too (III, VI, VII).

⁵ It is obvious that for example *Quomodo animam acceperit Adamus* (CPG 4195), *Homilia in dimissionem Chananaeae* (CPG 4529), *Admonitiones spirituales* (CPG 4670) and *De s. hieromartyre Phoca* (CPG 4364, BHG 1537) could not have been taken from one and the same book. The same applies to tens of other homilies, which are not part of series. It worths mentioning also that the initial Slavic corpus included translations of some texts, which are unedited or poorly attested in the Greek manuscripts, such as *In patriarcham Abraham* (CPG 4992, BHG 2354m), *In s. Paulum apostolum* (CPG 5067, BHG 1462s), *Quod filii debeant parentes honorare* (CPG 5092), *In secundum adventum Domini nostri Iesu Christi et de eleemosyna* (CC.SG 4, № 5, 5), among others.

concluding parts of the homilies) that were translated while dogmatic and argumentative parts were omitted. In other cases, however, whole texts were translated or parts of them were used for compilations. Individual homilies, which are not included in series, are, as a rule, represented in full.

Recent studies of the manuscript sources show that probably the corpus of Slavic translations did not reach us in a one and only codex. Most probably such a codex never existed. It seems plausible that initially the texts were stored unbound⁶ and were further supplemented with other (pseudo-)Chrysostomian works to serve as a master copy for compilation of other miscellanies. Thus, the compiler of the so-called 'longer' *Zlatostruy* took 45 homilies from the original corpus⁷. This selection was copied for some time and at a certain point of its transmission another 10th century compiler expanded it to 138 homilies with one of the sources being again the archetypal corpus⁸. A compiler of another collection, the so-called 'shorter' *Zlatostruy*⁹, selected 81 homilies, 14 of which are not found in the 'longer' version, which means that he used the initial corpus independently. The major characteristic of the 'shorter' *Zlatostruy* is that its compiler has edited and abridged the available Slavic translations without consulting the Greek originals. In the next stages of transmission this collection was supplemented twice with additional groups of texts at the end taken from other homiletic collections.

Both 'longer' and 'shorter' *Zlatostruy* were transmitted as miscellanies of stable content in which transpositions and alterations occur very rarely. They were very popular and widely distributed (especially in medieval Rus') and contain all the texts that could be considered part of the original corpus. However, there are a number of other witnesses that are also important for shedding light onto the

⁶ As suggested by some chance confluences of texts and excerpts in the earliest stage of transmission.

⁷ On this collection see most recently А. Димитрова, *Златоструят...*, *passim*.

⁸ There were, however, other sources too. The compiler included twenty-nine of the *Eclogae ex diversis homiliis* (CPG 4684), ascribed to Theodore Daphnopates, in a translation, which disseminates in longer collection of *Chrysorrhoeas* only (for a complete and better translation, which still remains unstudied, see for example MS 213 from the Monastery of the Miracle of the Archangel Michael at Chonae – or Chudov monastery – collection, kept in the State Historical Museum in Moscow). He included also some homilies with no traced Greek original, ascribing them to Chrysostom. Most probably they have Slavic origin and attribution to Clement of Ochrida or his followers has been proposed for some of them (*vide*: Я. Милтенов, *Непроучено Слово за прелюбодейците и двуженците, вероятно принадлежащо на Климент Охридски*, БРе 22.2, 2016, p. 25–34; ИДЕМ, *Бележки върху текстологическата история на Слово за Света Троица, и за сътворението, и за съда, приписвано на Климент Охридски*, ИИБЕ 29, 2016, p. 47–89; ИДЕМ, *Слово за засушата и за Божиите наказания – текстологическо и извороведско изследване*, ИИБЕ 30, 2017, p. 214–261).

⁹ Cf. В. Малинин, *Исследование Златоструя по рукописи XII в. имп. Публичной библиотеки*, Киев 1878. The editions: В. Малинин, *Десять слов Златоструя XII в.*, Санкт-Петербург 1910; Т. Георгиева, *Златоструй от XII в.*, Силистра 2003; *Великие Минеи Четии, собранные Всероссийским митрополитом Макарием. Ноябрь, дни 13–15*, Санкт-Петербург 1899, col. 1180–1579.

functional mode of the original Slavic Chrysostomian corpus. These collections – known from single copies – do not contain unknown versions of the homilies, but they give different selections and different ordering of texts. Most important is that they bear evidence of textual versions that are closer to the Byzantine originals. Only two Serbian codices compiled in the Hilandar Monastery were subject of detailed critical examination so far: № 386 from the collection of the Hilandar Monastery and Voskr. 115-bum. kept at the State Historical Museum in Moscow¹⁰. At least three Russian miscellanies, which still remain unstudied, contain large selections deriving from the initial corpus or at least from the earliest stages of its transmission, viz. codex № 45 from the Zonal Scientific Library of the Saratov State University, codex № 8190 from the Museum collection (f. 178) and codex № 1280 from the V.M. Undol'skiy coll. (f. 310) both from the Russian State Library in Moscow.

As mentioned above, the initial Slavic Chrysostomian corpus was used as a base for the compilation of other collections which did not include works of Chrysostom only. Excerpts from *Zlatostruy* are found in early Slavic *florilegia* such as the so-called *Knyazheskii Izbornik* and the *Izbornik of John the Sinner*. So far 11 such excerpts have been identified¹¹. Interesting and important is the relationship of the *Zlatostruy* to the Lenten homiliaries. The earliest and most authoritative manuscripts contain a number of texts that are common to the ones found in the *Zlatostruy*¹². In the majority of cases, the translations are the same but the texts in the homiliaries stay closer to the respective archetypes. This proves that the *Zlatostruy* collections that descend from the initial corpus actually contain not only second but sometimes even third generation text versions with respect to the corresponding Slavic archetypes. It is therefore not surprising that the main characteristic of these secondary collections is the careful adaptation of the translations. The deviation from the Byzantine tradition took place in the very beginning, when

¹⁰ Кл. Иванова-Константинова, *Неизвестна редакция на Златоструя в сръбски извод от XIII в.*, ЗИК 10, 1976, p. 89–107; Y. MILTENOV, *A New Source for Studying the Symeonic Zlatostruy Collection*, SeS 8/9, 2010, p. 387–404; Я. Милтенов, *Златоструй...*, *passim*.

¹¹ Cf. Я. Милтенов, *Общите пасажии между колекцията Златоструй и Княжеския Изборник*, СЛ 49/50, 2014, p. 28–45. *Vide*: А. Димитрова, *Сборникът Златоструй и Изборникът от 1076 г. De precatioe oratio II от Йоан Златоуст в две старобългарски версии*, Sla 82.4, 2013, p. 408–422; М.С. Мушинская, *Изборник 1076 г.: текстология и язык*, Санкт-Петербург 2015, p. 96–97, 160–174; Н.В. Савельева, *К вопросу об источниках Изборника 1076 г. Первая часть. Три новые параллели к чтениям Изборника. Изборник и Златоструй*, Pbg 40.2, 2016, p. 49–73.

¹² Mihanovic and Gomirje homiliaries (codex № III.c.19 from the Croat Academy of Sciences and Arts and codex R-71 from the Croat Historical Museum respectively) have eighteen texts common with *Zlatostruy*, Hludov's *Zlatoust* (codex № 55 from the A.I. Hludov collection of the State Historical Museum in Moscow) has five, Damian's *Zlatoust* (codex № 390 from the Hilandar monastery) has sixteen, Jagic *Zlatoust* (codex № Q.п.I.56 in the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg; 1f. in National Library of France, № Slav. 65) has five.

the translations were made, by selecting certain homilies, parts of homilies and individual passages, as mentioned above, or independent Slavic compilations were formed by combining certain passages. For example, the *Homily on Torments* that is found in all *Zlatostruy* collections and in the Lenten homiliaries, is formed by combining eleven excerpts from different Chrysostomian works¹³; *Sermon that the Torment is Eternal* has six, *Sermon for Those Who Aspire to Unnecessary Benefits* has four, and so on. After examining the relations between Greek originals and their Slavic versions the overall impression is that a) in some cases in the Greek codices that were used passages were marked for translation or b) in other cases full Slavic translations were abridged or fragmented.

The features of the *Zlatostruy* collection mentioned above are important not only to understand the mechanisms in which the medieval Bulgarian literature adopted the achievements of the Byzantine exegetical tradition, but also to shed light on the ground-breaking effort of the Slavs to construct their own literary tradition. The compilation of anthologies is the main and perhaps the most important step in this effort. Typologically *Zlatostruy* is close to collections that represented the essence of the theological thought through specifically selected excerpts for individual reading. It has much in common with the *Knyazheskii Izbornik*. On the one hand, the *Knyazheskii Izbornik* got some excerpts from *Zlatostruy*, as was noted above, on the other hand, parts of *Zlatostruy* and *Kniazheskii Izbornik* are sometimes found in same codices, but probably the most important thing to mention here is that both *Zlatostruy* and *Izbornik* collections (which emerged at the same time) share very similar compilation strategies. Their authors were closely linked with the capital and the ruler, they used common sources, worked with partial translations or excerpts from already available extensive translations and created new miscellanies according their own choice and aims by using Slavic corpora of translations.

Having in mind these particular features and recent scholarly achievements in the study of the adoption of Byzantine models, it seems that the main driving force behind the tsar Symeon's project for cultural prosperity was the preliminary work on collecting and selecting the authoritative works of the Byzantine tradition, followed by various mechanisms of adaptation, transformation, abridgement and fragmentation. The case with the *Zlatostruy* collection shows that in the beginning of 10th century there already existed the necessary base for these processes to start and bear fruit.

¹³ Vide: Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Пъзел с единадесет елемента. Източници, текстология и значение на старобългарската компилация Слово о мжкахъ, приписвана на Йоан Златоуст*, Psl 20.1, 2012, p. 291–303. Comprehensive data on the compilations and their sources vide: F.J. THOMSON, *Chrysostomica palaeoslavica...*, p. 1–65; Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй...*, *passim*.

Bibliography

Secondary Literature

- DIMITROVA A., *Sbornikăt Zlatostruj i Izbornikăt ot 1076 g. De precatione oratio II ot Joan Zlatoust v dve starobălgarski versii*, "Slavia" 82.4, 2013, p. 408–422.
- DIMITROVA A., *Zlatostrujat v prevodačeskata dejnost na starobălgarskite knižovnici*, Sofija 2016.
- GEORGIEVA T., *Zlatostruj ot XII v.*, Silistra 2003.
- IVANOVA-KONSTANTINOVA KL., *Neizvestna redakcija na Zlatostruja v srăbski izvod ot XIII v.*, "Зборник историје књижевности. Одељење језика и књижевности" / "Zbornik istorije književnosti. Odeljenje jezika i književnosti" 10, 1976, p. 89–107.
- MALININ V., *Desjat' slov Zlatostruja XII v.*, Sankt-Peterburg 1910.
- MALININ V., *Issledovanie Zlatostruja po rukopisi XII v. imp. Publichnoj biblioteki*, Kiev 1878.
- MILTENOV Y., *Beležiki vărhu tekstologičeskata istorija na Slovo za Sveta Troica, i za sätvorenieto, i za sâda, pripisvano na Kliment Ohridski*, "Известия на Института за бългaрски език" / "Izvestija na Instituta za bălgarski ezik" 29, 2016, p. 47–89.
- MILTENOV Y., *Neproučeno Slovo za preljubodejcite i dvužencite, verojatno prinadležašto na Kliment Ohridski*, "Българска реч" / "Bălgarska reč" 22.2, 2016, p. 25–34.
- MILTENOV Y., *A New Source for Studying the Symeonian Zlatostruj Collection*, "Scripta & e-Scripta" 8/9, 2010, p. 387–404.
- MILTENOV Y., *Obštite pasaži meždu kolekcijata Zlatostruj i Knjažeskija Izbornik*, "Старобългарска литература" / "Starobălgarska literatura" 49/50, 2014, p. 28–45.
- MILTENOV Y., *Păzel s edinaeset elementa. Iztočnici, tekstologija i značenie na starobălgarskata kompilacija Slovo o măkah, pripisvana na Joan Zlatoust*, "Palaeoslavica" 20.1, 2012, p. 291–303.
- MILTENOV Y., *Slovo za zasuhata i za Božiiite nakazanija – tekstologičesko i izvorovedsko izsledvane*, "Известия на Института за бългaрски език" / "Izvestija na Instituta za bălgarski ezik" 30, 2017, p. 214–261.
- MILTENOV Y., *Zlatostruj: starobălgarski homiletičen svod, sâzdaden po iniciativa na bălgarskija car Simeon. Tekstologičesko i izvorovedsko izsledvane*, Sofija 2013.
- MUŠINSKAJA M.S., *Izbornik 1076 g.: tekstologia i jazyk*, Sankt-Peterburg 2015.
- SAVEL'eva N.V., *K voprosu ob istočnikach Izbornika 1076 g. Pervaja čast'. Tri novye paraleli k čtenijam Izbornika. Izbornik i Zlatostruj*, "Palaeobulgarica" / "Старобългаристика" 40.2, 2016, p. 49–73.
- THOMSON F.J., *Chrysostomica palaeoslavica. A Preliminary Study of the Sources of the Chrysorrhoeas (Zlatostruj) Collection*, "Cyrillicmethodianum" 6, 1982, p. 1–65.
- Velikie Minei Četii, sobrannye Vserossijskim mitropolitom Makariem. Nojabr', dni 13–15*, Sankt-Peterburg 1899, col. 1180–1579.

Abstract. The paper aims at examining the first Slavic collection of homilies of John Chrysostom, called *Zlatostruj* (i.e. *Chrysorrhoeas* or *Golden Stream*). The peculiarities of its content, compilation strategy and impact on the medieval Bulgarian literature, revealed in previous studies, allow us to extract features that are related to the flourishing of the 10th century Bulgarian literary tradition and the successful adoption of Byzantine models.

Keywords: John Chrysostom, medieval Slavonic translations, *Zlatostruy*, adoption of Byzantine models in medieval Bulgaria

Yavor Miltenov

Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. L. Andreychin”
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
52 Shipchenski prohod blvd., bl. 17
Sofia 1113, Bulgaria