

Studia Ceranea 3, 2013, p. 131–144

Małgorzata Skowronek (Łódź)

## REMARKS ON THE ANATHEMAS IN THE *PALAEA HISTORICA*

The *Palaea Historica* is a Byzantine text based on the narratives contained in the first books of the *Old Testament* (Gn. – 1 Sam.): from the creation of the world to the reign of David. The *Palaea* can also be perceived as a document testifying to the times in which it arose and came to function as a presumably more popular and more available alternative to the Bible, recounting the history of the creation of the world and mankind, as well as narrating stories involving various *Old Testament* figures and events<sup>1</sup>.

It is believed that the *Palaea Historica* dates back to *no earlier than the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century*<sup>2</sup>. The collection, previously believed to have been compiled by authors such as John Chrysostom or John of Damascus<sup>3</sup>, contains material from diverse sources: apart from Psalm verses, we find quotes from the Church Fathers (e.g. John Chrysostom, Gregory the Theologian, Josephus), portions of the apocryphal *Assumption of Moses*, *legends and apocryphal stories from the Old Testament living in the popular oral tradition*<sup>4</sup>, and last but not least – fragmentary pieces of poetry penned by the hymnographers Andrew of Crete († 712) and Theodore the Studite († 826)<sup>5</sup>. It is these latter works that enable us to determine the *terminus post quem* of the composition. That the text was written at the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century at the latest has been widely accepted and left essentially uncommented upon by over a hundred years.

<sup>1</sup> М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *Югославянские тексты Исторической палеи и русские ее тексты*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей*, Москва 1960, p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> According to the editor of the Slavic text and the first scholar to study the Slavic *Palaea Historica*, A.N. Попов (cf. А.Н. ПОПОВ, *Книга бытия небеси и земли (Палея историческая) с приложением сокращенной Палеи русской редакции*, ЧИОИДР 1, 1881, p. XXIX–XXXII). Cf. also e.g. О.В. ТВОРОГОВ, *Палея историческая*, [in:] *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси (вторая половина 14–16 в.)*, pars 1 et 2, ed. Д.С. ЛИХАЧЕВ, Ленинград 1988–1989, 2, p. 160–161; А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Палея*, [in:] *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник*, coll. Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, ed. Ив. ДОБРЕВ, А. МИЛТЕНОВА, Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, Велико Търново 2003<sup>2</sup>, p. 345–346.

<sup>3</sup> Д. ДРАГОЛОВИК, В. АНТИК, *Богомилството во средновековната изворна граѓа*, Скопје 1978, p. 167.

<sup>4</sup> Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *Русская историческая палея*, ФЗ 2, 1888, p. 3–4; D. FLUSSER, *Palaea Historica – An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends*, [in:] *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature*, ed. J. HEINEMANN, D. NOX, Jerusalem 1971, p. 48–79 [= *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 22].

<sup>5</sup> Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 3; М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

A critical edition of the *Palaea Historica*, relying on a number of Greek versions of the text, was published in 1893 by A.V. Vassiliev<sup>6</sup>. The basis of the edition is the Vienna text from the 15<sup>th</sup> century (Cod. Theol. 247 Nesseli). The ‘chapter’ Περὶ τοῦ Ἀδάμ, located almost at the very beginning of the text, traces the story of the forefathers Adam and Eve up to their expulsion from the Garden of Eden. The author of the *Palaea* decided to take advantage of this opportunity to remind the reader of the correct interpretation of this event:

τοῖς δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι συνουσία τῷ Ἀδάμ ἐγένονεν σὺν τῇ Εὐᾷ ἐντὸς τοῦ παραδείσου ἀνάθεμα [καὶ οὗτοι ψεύδονται μὴ εἰδότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν]. ὁ γὰρ Ἀδάμ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν τοῦ παραδείσου τριάκοντα χρόνους ἐποίησεν πενθῶν καὶ οὕτως συνεγένετο τῇ Εὐᾷ. ὁθεν καὶ [ὁ] Γρηγόριος ὁ Θεολόγος εἰς τὸ „Χθὲς τῇ λαμπρᾷ τῶν φωτῶν ἡμέρα” οὕτως ἔφησεν. ὅτι Ἰησοῦς τριακονταετῆς βαπτίζεται διὰ τὴν τριακονταετῆ ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ Ἀδάμ. ὅς τε καὶ αὐτὸς μαρτυρεῖ. ὅτι ἀφ’ οὗ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου τριάκοντα χρόνους ἐποίησε καὶ οὕτως συνεγένετο τῇ Εὐᾷ. Τοῖς δὲ ἀπευκταίοις Φουνδαῖταις τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι ἀντικείμενος συνῆλθε τῇ Εὐᾷ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔτεκεν τὸν Κάϊν ἀνάθεμα. Ἐγὼν δὲ Ἀδάμ Εὐᾶν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκεν τὸν Κάϊν.<sup>7</sup>

In the unpublished 14<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript of the *Palaea Historica* housed at the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice (Cod. Marc. Gr. 501), Coll. 555, f. 4–72<sup>8</sup>, the same fragment recurs in almost identical form:

τοῖς δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι συνουσία τῷ Ἀδάμ ἐγένονεν σὺν τῇ Εὐᾷ ἐντὸς τοῦ παραδείσου ἀνάθεμα. ὁ γὰρ Ἀδάμ [...] τὸ ἐξελθεῖν τοῦ παραδείσου τριάκοντα χρόνους ἐποίησεν πενθῶν καὶ οὕτως συνεγένετο τῇ Εὐᾷ. ὁθεν Γρηγόριος ὁ Θεολόγος εἰς τὸ „Χθὲς τῇ λαμπρᾷ τῶν φωτῶν ἡμέρα” οὕτως ἔφησεν. ὅτι Ἰησοῦς τριακονταετῆς βαπτίζεται διὰ τὴν τριακονταετῆ ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ Ἀδάμ. ὅς τε καὶ αὐτὸς μαρτυρεῖ. ὅτι ἀφ’ οὗ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου λ̄ [=τριάκοντα, MS] χρόνους ἐποίησε καὶ οὕτως συνεγένετο τῇ Εὐᾷ. Τοῖς δὲ ἀπευκταίοις Φουνδαῖταις τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι ἀντικείμενος συνῆλθε τῇ Εὐᾷ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔτεκεν τὸν Κάϊν ἀνάθεμα εἶναι. Ἐγὼν ὡς Ἀδάμ Εὐᾶν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ συλλαβοῦσα ἔτεκεν τὸν Κάϊν.<sup>9</sup>

Whatever small differences there are between the two versions, they do not alter the overall sense of the passage. Evidently, the apostates nurtured two views pertaining to humanity’s original parents. The first one concerns Adam and Eve’s union before they were banished from the Garden of Eden; it was – as maintained by the author/compiler of the *Palaea* – rejected and compromised already by Gregory the Theologian. The second one relates to the birth of Cain as the son

<sup>6</sup> A.V. VASSILIEV, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina*, Москва 1893 [Сборник памятников византийской литературы, 11], p. 188–292.

<sup>7</sup> Cited from: A.V. VASSILIEV, *op. cit.*, p. 191. The editor’s addenda and variant readings from other manuscripts are included in square brackets.

<sup>8</sup> Miscellanea, described as “Palaea historia, sive collectio historiarum Veteris Testamenti et Scripturis sacra et apocryphis excerpta”, in *Bibliotheca Divi Marci Venetiarum codices graeci manuscripti*, rec. E. MIONI, vol. II, Roma 1985, p. 338–341. Vassiliev dates the manuscript to the 12<sup>th</sup> century. I would like to thank Prof. Georgi Minczew of the University of Łódź for information on the manuscript, and Prof. Aleksander Naumow of Ca’ Foscari University of Venice for sending me photographs of the *Palaea*.

<sup>9</sup> Ff. 4’–5.

of Eve and Satanael. Already the first researchers to study the text point towards the Gnostic-Manichaean sect of the Archontians as the source of this idea<sup>10</sup>.

The anathema is thus motivated by a dualist view on Adam and Eve's contact in the Garden of Eden. Its manifestation is also to be found in two important monuments of the medieval age, the former having originated in a heterodox environment and the latter being a critical response from the viewpoint of orthodoxy. The *Secret Book of the Bogomils* (also known as the *Liber Sancti Johannis*), a theological work expounding the cosmological, anthropological, eschatological and soteriological views of the Bogomils, written around the 11<sup>th</sup> century, presents a *rather complicated and not always sharp image of the world*<sup>11</sup>, but it also provides a thorough discussion of Satan's *modus operandi* with regard to the first people:

Initiator autem peccati cum sua seductione ita fecit: plantavit paradisum et misit homines intra et praecepit ne comederent ex eo. Diabolus introivit in paradisum et plantavit arundinem in medio paradisi, et de sputo suo fecit serpentem et praecepit ei in arundine manere. Et sic Diabolus ascondebat sapientiam deceptionem suam. Et introibat ad eos, dicens: de omni fructu comedite, qui est in paradise, de fructu iniquitatis ne comedatis. Postea malignus Diabolus, intrans in serpentem malum, et deceptit angelum, qui est in forma mulieris, et effudit super caput ejus concupiscentiam peccati, et fuit concupiscentia Evae sicut fornax ardens. Statimque Diabolus, exiens de arundine in forma serpentis, fecit concupiscentiam suam cum Eva cum cauda serpentis. Ideo non vocantur filii Dei, sed filii Diaboli et filii serpentis voluntates patris facientes diabolicas usque ad saeculi finem. Postea Diabolus effudit suam concupiscentiam super caput angeli, qui erat in Adam, et ambo inventi sunt in concupiscentia luxuriare simul generando filios Diaboli et serpentis usque ad consummationem saeculi.<sup>12</sup>

On the other hand, chapter (*titulus*) 27 of Euthymius Zigabenus' (ca. 1150–1122) treatise *The Dogmatic Panoply / Panoplia dogmatica* (Δογματικὴ πανοπλία) alludes to this account in the following manner:

Ἔπειτα τῆς Εὕας ὁμοίως ἐκείθεν ποιηθείσης, καὶ ταῖς ἴσαις ἀπαστραψάσης λαμπρότησι, φθονῆσαι τὸν Σαταναῆλ, καὶ μεταμελήθησαι, καὶ χινηθῆσαι πρὸς ἐπιβουλήν τοῦ πλάσματος τοῦ ἰδίου, καὶ εἰσρῆναι τοῖς ἐγκάτοις τοῦ ὄψεως, καὶ ἐξαπατήσαι τὴν Εὐάν, καὶ συγγενέσθαι αὐτῇ, καὶ ποιῆσαι ἔγκυον, ἵνα τὸ σπέρμα τούτου προλαβὸν κατακυριεύῃ τοῦ ἀδαμιαίου σπέρματος, καὶ ὡς οἶόν τε διαφθεῖρη, καὶ μὴ συγχωρῇ αὐξάνεσθαι καὶ πληθύνεσθαι. Τὴν δὲ ταχέως ὠδινήσασαν ἀπογεννήσαι τὸν Κάϊν ἐκ τῆς συνουσίας τοῦ Σαταναῆλ, καὶ ἀδελφὴν διδυμον ὁμοιότροπον, ὄνομα αὐτῇ Καλωμενά, ζήλοτυπήσαντα δὲ τὸν Ἀδάμ συνελθεῖν καὶ αὐτὸν τῇ Εὐά, καὶ γεννήσαι τὸν Ἀβελ, ὃν ἀνελῶν εὐθύς ὁ Κάϊν, τὸν φόνον εἰς τὸν βίον εἰσήγαγε. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Ἰωάννην εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ὁ Κάϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονυροῦ ἦν.<sup>13</sup>

The purport of both these passages is quite lucid: firstly, Eden is the work of Satan; secondly, devilish children are born of Eve's relationship with

<sup>10</sup> A.V. VASSILIEV, *op. cit.*, p. XLIX.

<sup>11</sup> M. STAROWIEYSKI, *Zapytania Jana*, [in:] *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, vol. III, *Listy i apokalipsy chrześcijańskie*, ed. M. STAROWIEYSKI, Kraków 2001, p. 312.

<sup>12</sup> Cited from the edition of the so-called Vienna variant of the text: *Ταῖντα βιβλία*, [in:] Ἰ. ΙΒΑΝΟΒ, *Βογομιλски книги и легенди*, София 1925, p. 78–79.

<sup>13</sup> *PG*, vol. CXXXI, col. 1297.

Satan, whereas Godly children do not enter into relationships. The testimony of Euthymius Zigabenus does not diverge substantially from the message in the anathemas of the *Palaea*. Here, evil is additionally multiplied by the birth of two people, i.e. Cain along with his sister Calomena, the children of Eve and the blasphemous, deceitful Satan, who has assumed the form of a serpent<sup>14</sup>. The variant from the *Panoplia dogmatica* also corresponds closely to the primary text, i.e. the *Liber Sancti Johannis*, according to which Eve and Satan's offspring – the “sons of the serpent” – *commit devilish deeds until the end of the world*. Such an interpretation of the history of the world must have appealed to the dualists, who rejected matter as stemming from the evil origin. Still, in no other text accessible to me (be it a theological commentary, historical treatise, nomocanon or synodicon, as e.g. the Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy) does it become the object of the ultimate and decisive rebuke against the heretics, namely the anathema.

The content of the first anathema is also indirectly related by Euthymius Zigabenus; admittedly, he does not specify where according to the heretics Adam and Eve's act took place, but he makes no mention whatsoever of the expulsion from the Garden of Eden within the timeline of the events he relates. Besides, the story of the conception of Cain and the union of Adam and Eve squares well with the widely known dualist views on the origin and quality of matter: the cohabitation of humanity's original parents still in Eden would indicate that the Garden is a foul place, deriving not from the good God, but the evil demiurge, who thus conduces to the multiplication of matter in yet another fashion. At the same time, Satan's seduction of Eve turns out to bring misery upon himself as well:

In the [...] Bogomil version of the seduction of Eve by the Demiurge she begot twins, Cain and his sister Calomena, from Samael-Satan while Abel was born after her human union with Adam. Cain, the 'seed of Samael', slew Abel, 'the seed of Adam', and brought murder and death into the world. However, after his shape-changing and intercourse with Eve, Samael-Satan lost his creative potency, even his divine form, to become dark and abhorrent.<sup>15</sup>

Already the ancient gnostic cosmogony clearly distinguishes the pleroma, i.e. the seat of the invisible God, from the further heavens and earths situated below it, governed by the evil archon/archons. According to this concept (as endorsed by the Valentinian sect), Paradise is to be situated between the pleroma and the heavens, just beneath the *circle of darkness*; consequently, it is not inhabited by the good God, but rather forms part of the sphere occupied and controlled by the evil demiurge<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> A motif present in a number of pseudo-canonical texts, e.g. the *Legend of the Sea of Tiberias*.

<sup>15</sup> Y. STOYANOV, *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*, New Haven-London 2000, p. 267.

<sup>16</sup> K. RUDOLPH, *Gnosis*, ed. R. McLachlan Wilson, San Francisco 1983, p. 67–69.

This is the very belief denounced in the anathema: the denial of God's having *planted a garden in Eden* (Gn. 2, 8-9). These facts have attracted the attention of researchers for a long time – in one of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century studies devoted to the *Palaea*, we find the following comment with regard to the first (extant) anathema:

Богумиловская ересь проповедовала, что грехопадение прародителей состояло в том, что они считались в раю. Опровержение это важно еще и в том отношении, что оно проливает некоторый свет на время составления греческой исторической палеи.<sup>17</sup>

Still, the author of these words did not proceed to draw any concrete conclusions.

The originality of the anathemas in the *Palaea* consists not only in their content, but also their uniqueness: they are not found in any collections of anathemas known to me, although these abound in formulas condemning dualist beliefs concerning the beginning of the world and matter, e.g.:

τοῖς τὸν Σατανᾶν δημιουργὸν τῆς ὀρωμένης κτίσεως γενέσθαι λέγουσι καὶ οἰκονόμον αὐτὸν ἀποκαλοῦσι τῆς τε βροχῆς, τῆς χαλᾶς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀναδιδομένων ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀνάθεμα. τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ Εὐάν ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐδημιούργησε ἀνάθεμα.<sup>18</sup>

Possibly the belief in the offspring of Eva and Satanael has its echo in another anathema from the *Synodicon of Tsar Boril*:

Глѣщии јако жена зачинаеть (въ) чрѣвѣ съдѣлованіемъ сатанинѣ. прѣвываетъ же ѿтѣждѣ сатана не ѿстѣпно даже и до рождѣства мааденцоу. стѣнимъ же крѣщеніемъ не моци ѿгнаноу быти, нѣ матвожъ тѣкмо и постомъ. Глѣщій оубо тако, анаѣма.<sup>19</sup>

To be sure, this anathema is in principle directed against those who abjure procreation, but the sense of the beginning of the text seems to approach the anathema from the *Palaea*. It makes reference to all of Eve's daughters, however, not merely the primordial mother herself.

Who are the Phundagiagitae, threatened with anathematization in the *Palaea*? In Byzantine literature the term 'Phundagiagitae' only occurs sporadically.

Euthymius of the Periblepton (also known as Euthymius of Acmonia), living in the middle of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, is the author of the lengthy *Letter (Epistula Invective contra phundagiagitas sive bogomilos haereticos)* – a testimony to his own

<sup>17</sup> Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 5–6.

<sup>18</sup> Cited from: *Une source grecque du Sinodik de Boril: la lettre inédite du patriarche Cosmas*, TM 4, 1970, p. 371. A parallel passage from the *Synodicon of Tsar Boril*: Иже сатанѣ видяше твори творца нарицающихъ бытии иконьма нарицающихъ дѣждевн и градоу. и всемоу исходащомоу ѿ земли, анаѣма. Глѣщихъ адам и евеж сатана създа, анаѣма (cited from: И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилев синодик. Издание и превод*, София 2010, p. 123).

<sup>19</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 123–124.

observations and immediate contact with the followers of the dualist heresy called *the Phundagiagitae or the Bogomils or the Massalians*, from the north-western part of Anatolia in Asia Minor:

[Επιστολή Εὐθυμίου μοναχοῦ τῆς περιβλέπτου μονῆς...] [...] πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ πατριδα στηλιτεύσαν τὰς αἱρέσεις τῶν ἀθεωτάτων καὶ ἀσεβῶν πλάνων τῶν τε Φουνδαγιαγιτῶν ἤτοι Βογομιλων καὶ Μασσαλιανῶν λεγομενῶν<sup>20</sup>.

The epistle constitutes a compendium of sorts, a source of information on the heretics, at the same time issuing a warning for orthodox Christians – Euthymius’ compatriots.

The *Letter* is in all likelihood the most reliable source of information on this religious movement; the author even goes so far as to list the names of the contemporary ‘teachers’ of the heresy (Vatina, Churilo, Racheas)<sup>21</sup>. Apart from an elaborate description of the dogmas, cosmology and anthropology of the dualists, who reject the sacraments and believe in the “evil trinity”, Euthymius of the Periblepton provides some clarification of the terminology involved – he explains that those who are called Phundagiagitae in Asia Minor are known as Bogomils in the West (i.e. the Balkans)<sup>22</sup>.

The Phundagiagitae are mentioned virtually without comment in the mystical treatise by bishop Theodore of Andida:

καὶ ἵνα μὴ ἔχωσιν χώραν τινὲς λέγειν ὅτι ταύτην τὴν εὐχὴν μόνην ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Χριστὸς λέγειν ἡμᾶς, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο τι, ὡσπερ λέγουσι καὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι Εὐχίται αἰρετικοί, οὐς καὶ Μασσαλιανούς καὶ Φουνδαίτας κατονομάζουσιν<sup>23</sup>.

Here in turn the name *Phundagiagitae* functions as an equivalent of ‘Massalians’ and ‘Euchites’. A. Solovjev dates Theodore’s work to the turn of the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>24</sup>, and the editor of his writings in the 140<sup>th</sup> volume of the *Patrologia Graeca* – as late as the 13<sup>th</sup> century<sup>25</sup>. Irrespective of the correct date, difficult

<sup>20</sup> G. FICKER, *Die Phundagiagiten. Ein Beitrag zur Sektengeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters*, Leipzig 1908, p. 3.

<sup>21</sup> А. СОЛОВЬЕВ, *Фундајажити, патерини и кудугери у византијском изворима*, ЗРВИ 1, 1952, p. 122, where the history of the editions of the text (and particularly the relevant passage) is discussed as well.

<sup>22</sup> εἰς δε τὸν Κιβυρραϊώτην, εἰς τὴν Δύσιν καὶ εἰς ἑτέρους τόπους καλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς βογομιλους, cited from: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *Богомилството в България*, София 1969, p. 384 and ἔστιν ἡ αἵρεσις τῶν ἀθέων Φουνδαγιαγιτῶν τῶν ἑαυτοὺς ἀποκαλοῦντων Χριστοπολίτας, ἐν δὲ τῇ Δύσει καλουμένων βογομιλων αὕτη, cited from: PG, vol. CXXXI, col. 47f. On the ‘eastern’ and ‘western’ dualists cf. also: M. JUGIE, *Phundagiagites et Bogomiles*, EO 12, 1909, p. 257–262. Cf. the comprehensive, over 2500-item long bibliography of studies devoted to the heresy in: К. ГЕЧЕВА, *Богомилството и неговото отражение в средновековна християнска Европа. Библиография*, София 2007<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> THEODORUS ANDIDENSIS, *Brevis commentario de divinae liturgiae symbolis ac mysteriis*, PG, vol. CXL, col. 461.

<sup>24</sup> А. СОЛОВЬЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

<sup>25</sup> *Anno Domini MCC...* (?), PG, vol. CXL, col. 414.

to establish today, this source does not contribute significantly to what we know about the religious movement itself.

We find a reference to the Phundagiagitae in a similar context in an ecclesiastical document from Athens, anathematizing Peter known as Lycopetrus: Πέτρῳ τῷ ἀρχηγῷ τῆς τῶν Μασσαλιανῶν ἤτοι Λυκοπετριανῶν καὶ Φουνδαδιτῶν καὶ Βογομίλων αἰρέσεως [...] ἀνάθεμα<sup>26</sup>; the wording corroborates the claim that the views of the Phundagiagitae (Bogomils) were similar, or indeed the same, as those of the Massalians<sup>27</sup>. The crucial source texts on the Phundagiagitae (the letter of Euthymius of the Periblepton, the treatise by Euthymius Zigabenus and the letter of Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, against the Bogomils) were edited over a hundred years ago by Gerhard Ficker<sup>28</sup>.

Relatively shortly after it was composed, the *Palaea Historica* was deemed by the Slavs a text worthy of translating into their own tongue. There are theories according to which it was translated into Slavic as many as three times<sup>29</sup>, although – in the light of recent research – the exact time periods within which these translations were completed remain unclear<sup>30</sup>. The first one is believed to have appeared sometime between the turn of 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> (Verevskij<sup>31</sup>, Stankov<sup>32</sup>) to the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> (Popov<sup>33</sup>, Speranskij<sup>34</sup>, Zhdanov<sup>35</sup>) or even possibly the early 13<sup>th</sup> century (Sumnikova<sup>36</sup>). According to Speranskij, the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> translations date back to the 15<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>37</sup>. However, in his re-

<sup>26</sup> Cited from: J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie. Édition et commentaire*, TM 2, 1967, p. 65.

<sup>27</sup> У познатој формули анатемисања масалијана као оснивач секте спомиње се Петар, са надимком Ликопетар, по коме се и масалијани зову ликопетријани, фундајажити или богомили, cited from: Д. ДРАГОЈЛОВИЋ, *Богомилство на Балкану и у Малој Азији. 1. Богомилски родоначалници*, Београд 1974, p. 68. More on Peter and his followers cf. *ibidem*.

<sup>28</sup> G. FICKER, *op. cit.*

<sup>29</sup> Contrary to the opinion of É. Turdeanu, according to whom the *Palaea* was translated only once, in western Bulgaria, after which subsequent variant 'revisions' arose: cf. É. TURDEANU, *La Palaea byzantine chez les Slaves du Sud et chez les Roumains*, RES 40, 1964, p. 195–206.

<sup>30</sup> A fact helping us indirectly establish the date of the first translation is the (supposed) use of the *Palaea* by the author of the *Tale of Bygone Years* – Nestor, at the beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> century: [...] места из Несторовой Летописи позволяют сделать предположение, что Нестор не только знал о существовании Малой Палеи, но и был знаком с содержанием ея, cited from: Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

<sup>31</sup> Ф. ВЕРЕВСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>32</sup> Р.А. СТАНКОВ, *Обица характеристика на лексикалния състав на Историческата палея*, ЕЛ 5, 1986, p. 39–56.

<sup>33</sup> А.Н. ПОПОВ, *op. cit.*, p. XXXII.

<sup>34</sup> М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

<sup>35</sup> И.Н. ЖДАНОВ, *Палея*, КУИ, 1881, fasc. 9 (сентябрь), p. 235–258.

<sup>36</sup> Т.А. СУМНИКОВА, *К проблеме перевода Исторической палеи*, [in:] *Изучение русского языка и источниковедение*, ed. В.Ф. ДУБРОВИНА, Москва 1969, p. 27–39.

<sup>37</sup> М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

cent study on the history of the Slavic translations of the *Palaea Historica*, based on newly discovered (or rather newly identified) fragments, Johannes Reinhart concludes that the 2<sup>nd</sup> translation (determined to be of Serbian origin, though not devoid of certain Middle Bulgarian linguistic traits) is the product of the 14<sup>th</sup> century<sup>38</sup>.

In the so-called 1<sup>st</sup> Slavic translation of the text, the aforementioned passage is rendered in the following way:

а иже глѡтъ, тако съчетасѧ аѡамъ съ еввоу в рани, анафема. нбо аѡамъ тако изыде из рана .л. лѣ сътвори плача. и тако съчетасѧ съ еввоу. тѣмъ григоріе бгословъ в зачалѣ. иже вчера свѣтлаго бгѡавленіа днь. тако рѣ. тако тсъ въ .л. лѣтъ крѣтисѧ естъ. Позна же аѡамъ еѡвоу женоу свою, и заченши роди канна, и бѣ каннѣ прелоукавъ, и ѡреченъ ѡ бѣ, и все лѣкавое дѣло тѡи стѣжа.<sup>39</sup>

On the other hand, in a 15<sup>th</sup> century manuscript of the *Palaea*, representing – according to M. Speranskij – the so-called 2<sup>nd</sup> Slavic translation (conventionally believed to date back to the 15<sup>th</sup>–16<sup>th</sup> century), the fragment appears in the following form:

глѡще иже тако смѣшнѣе. аѡаму съ еввоу въ рани бѣ анафема да да [!] боудѣ аѡамъ оубо повьнегда изити емоу из рана л сътвори плаче се. и тако потомъ бѣ съ еввоу. бгѡмръскимъ же. фѡгдгагистомъ глѡщійимъ, тако сопостатъ съ еввоу бѣ, и роди канна проклети да боудѣ. познае же аѡамъ женоу свою и зачетъ и роди канна.<sup>40</sup>

(We shall return to the question of the relationship between this passage and the Greek original later below.) A remarkable feature of the Slavic translation of the *Palaea* is the introduction of the term фѡгдгагисти, because it was not in use in the Balkans, ousted by the designation ‘Bogomils’ (although Slavic texts also employ a number of other words to refer to the group in question, mostly derived from the names of other dualist heresies<sup>41</sup>). Nine hundred years after Euthymius of the Periblepton’s identification of the Phundagiagitae with

<sup>38</sup> J. REINHART, *Die älteste Bezeugung der historischen Paläa in slavischer Übersetzung (cod. Slav. Vindob. Nr. 158)*, ПКЖИФ 73, 2007, p. 60.

<sup>39</sup> А.Н. Попов, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

<sup>40</sup> The so-called *Krušedol Palaea*, from the collection of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Belgrade, call number 42, f. 57’ (consulted personally). Cf. the fragment of a copy of the 2<sup>nd</sup> translation of the *Palaea* in the manuscript originating from the Velika Remeta monastery, now № 141 in the collection of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, 1420–1430, f. 60–60’: глѡще иже тако смѣшнѣе аѡамъ съ еввоу въ рани бѣ анафема да вѣдѣтъ. аѡамъ оубо повьнегда изити емоу из рана л сътвори плаче се и тако потомъ бѣ съ еввоу. бгѡмръскимъ же фѡгдгагистомъ глѡщійимъ. тако сопостатъ съ еввоу бѣ. и роди канна. проклети да [вѣтъ]. Познае же аѡамъ женоу свою. и зачетъ и роди канна.

<sup>41</sup> *Прието е да се счита, че към този тип еретици [богомили, М.С.] се отнасят още следните названия: бабуни, патарени, навликяни, манихеи, масалиани, кутугери, торбешии и др.* – М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, М. РАЙКОВА, *Богомитите в църковноюрисдикционните текстове и паметници*, СЛ 39/40, 2008, p. 198. Cf. also: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 384–385.



the Bogomils, some scholars derive their name from the Latin word *funda* (via Greek φούντα < φούνδα), denoting a sack or bag<sup>42</sup> that heretic preachers would carry when traversing what is now the state of Macedonia. This name would have been replaced by the local terms торбеши, торбоносци (supposedly translated from Greek), which appear in sources contemporaneous to the Turkish invasion of the Balkans<sup>43</sup>. Accordingly, the two key terms: the Slavic ‘Bogomils’ (богомили) and the presumably Slavicized ‘Torbeshi’ (торбеши) are used to denote the group called the ‘Phundagiatae’ in the East<sup>44</sup>.

In the second anathema, present in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Slavic translation, we find a noteworthy syntactic peculiarity; one even gets the impression that the construction might be flawed. The usual syntax is the following: the addressee of the anathema in the dative or accusative (Subst<sub>Dat</sub>, Subst<sub>Acc</sub>) + the word ‘anathema’, e.g.: Гл҃ѣшихъ јако къ б҃гѡмъ хрїстїанѣ къ икѡнамъ пристѣпающе, анафема от Гл҃ѣмъ

<sup>42</sup> Latin dictionaries also give other meanings, some of them closely related to ‘sack, bag’: ‘ventrale, belly-band, band with a pocket’ (E.A. SOPHOCLES, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, repr. Hildesheim–Zürich–New York 1992); ‘sling’ (CH.T. LEWIS, CH. SHORT, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1879: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A-1999.04.0059%3Aentry%3Dfunda>); ‘money pouch’ (M. PLEZIA, *Słownik łacińsko-polski*, vol. II, Warszawa 1962).

<sup>43</sup> A. СОЛОВЬЕВ, *op. cit.*, p. 126. Other theories concerning the etymology of the term ‘Phundagiatae’ are reported by Д. ДРАГОЛОВИЋ, *op. cit.*, p. 68–69. According to one of them, the lexeme is derived from the Italian toponym Funde. More intriguing is the hypothesis by which the religion of the Phundagiatae is a continuation of a branch of Massalianism, founded by the aforesaid Lycopetrus and revived by Churilo and Racheas, while the word ‘Phundagiatae’ itself is of Semitic origin and is semantically akin to Greek ‘entusiast’ or ‘euchite’ (*ibidem*). On the relationship between terms denoting various neo-Manichaean movements in Syriac, Byzantine and Slavic texts, cf.: G. MINCZEW, *Observations on the Letter of Patriarch Theophylact to Emperor Peter in the Context of Certain Byzantine and Slavic Anti-heretic Texts*, SCer 3, 2013, p. 113–130. Conversely, D. Angelov links the terms торбеши and торбоносци to certain toponyms found in the southern Balkans: Torbal’ (south of Smyrna) as well as the village Torbači in the region of Debar in modern Macedonia. According to this theory, these places are considered to have witnessed intensive activity on the part of the Bogomils (and to have acquired their names from that of the heretic group), cf.: Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 384–385. All the same, the word *torba* is not to be found in any dictionary of Old Church Slavonic or historical lexicon of any of its recensions, since in all probability the lexeme entered the Slavic linguistic sphere from Turkish, where it had the same meaning (‘bag, sack, pouch’); different variants (*tobra/tovra > torba*) are attested starting in 1341 (following the *Turkish Etymological Dictionary*, [www.nisanyansozluk.com](http://www.nisanyansozluk.com)). The Torbeši were considered members of Bogomil communities by J. Ivanov, who emphasized that the population thus called converted partly to Islam and partly (in northern Albania) to Catholicism, *preserving the original name funda*, cf. Й. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 36. A number of supposed (often popular) etymologies of the term Torbeši originating from the Balkans, predominantly Albania, are cited by the Albanian scholar Nazif Dokle, cf. N. DOKLE, *Torbeši – posljedni sljedbenici bogumila*, trans. M. BALJE, [http://www.prizren-web.com/magazin/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=225:torbei-posljednji-sljedbenici-bogumila&catid=60:historija&Itemid=184](http://www.prizren-web.com/magazin/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=225:torbei-posljednji-sljedbenici-bogumila&catid=60:historija&Itemid=184) [03 V 2013]. Almost all of them relate in one way or another to the process of Islamization of the local communities.

<sup>44</sup> On the relationship between the Phundagiatae and the Torbeši cf.: Д. ДРАГОЛОВИЋ, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

тако крѡмѣ х̄а б̄а нашего. инь н̄а избави ѿ кѡумирскыа льсти, анафема<sup>45</sup>. In Greek texts we likewise find two solutions: the addressee of the anathema in the dative (Subst<sub>Dat</sub>) + 1) ‘anathema’ (τοῖς δὲ λέγουσιν... ἀνάθεμα), or alternatively 2) *let there be anathema* (ἀνάθεμα εἶναι or ἀνάθεμα ἔστω). In the anti-Phundagiagitae anathema from the *Palaea*, the closing phrase *may they be cursed* (проклетѣи да боѿтъ) requires a subject in the nominative; the Phundagiagitae, however, are in the dative (Фонѡдагѣиѣгѣистѡмъ глѣщѣимъ...). It is a curious fact that the grammatical and stylistic sloppiness of the author surfaced in this very sentence; the reason is perhaps to be sought in the Greek original. Quite conceivably, had the Slavic translator been confronted with the sentence Τοῖς δὲ ἀπευκταίοις Φουνδαῖταις τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι ἀντικείμενος συνῆλθε τῇ Εὐᾶ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔτεκεν τὸν Κάϊν ἀνάθεμα, he would not have added да боѿтъ at the end. However, the variant of the Greek text as found in the manuscript Cod. Marc. Gr. 501 ends precisely in this way: ἀνάθεμα εἶναι<sup>46</sup>. Was it also the case in the text that served as the basis for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Slavic translation?

Above all, however, how did the anathemas find their way into the *Palaea*, a narrative based for the most part on the *Old Testament*? Let us try to uncover the intentions of the author, based on the presence of these warnings in the text.

The evidence for the supposed strong ties between the *Palaea* and dualist circles is discussed in modern historical interpretations. A considerable part of the debate on this issue originates from scholars working primarily on the Slavic text, as well as those studying the history of the southern European/Bulgarian dualists, the Bogomils. In the monograph by Dragoljub Dragojlović and Vera Antić we read:

Хронолошки најстара забелешка за богомилите во овој књижевен вид се наоѓа во Историската Палеја [...]. Во еден грчки ракопис од првата половина на XI век, во поглавјето *За Адам*, се анатемосуваат „фундајантите“ што учат дека Ева со Сатанаил го родила Каина. Оваа интерполација на анонимниот преписувач на *Историската палеја* е двојно интересна. Прво, што тој ги нарекува еретиците со малоазискиот апелатив „фундајант“ место поновиот и новообичаен „богомил“, а, второ, што и во XI век космогониски апокрифи со дубиоза ортодоксност се читани и препишувани и од страна на правоверните.<sup>47</sup>

If the Greek variant of the *Palaea* containing the second anathema could be shown to date back to the late 9<sup>th</sup> century, the time at which the text is traditionally thought to have been written, there could be no doubt that it is indeed the first source to speak of the Bogomils (or rather their Byzantine/Asia Minor

<sup>45</sup> И. Божилов, А. Тотоманова, И. Билярски, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

<sup>46</sup> In a text written in the classical period, εἶναι should have imperative sense; if we assume that the text of the manuscript underwent later revisions, the meaning of the verb can be 3 sg./pl. ind. praes. I would like to thank Dr. Anna Maciejewska of the University of Łódź for her help with interpreting the Greek text.

<sup>47</sup> Д. Драголовиќ, В. Антиќ, *op. cit.*, p. 167–168.

equivalent). In the case at hand, however, there can be no certainty. It is also rather dubious to posit the existence of the Phundagiagitae/Bogomils in the period before the 11<sup>th</sup> century, given the evidence furnished by the letter of Euthymius of the Periblepton.

Steven Runciman delivers the following remarks on the *Palaea [Historica]*:

[The *Palaea*] retells the narrative given in Genesis and Exodus, with a brief summary of events till the time of David, but it retells it with a luxuriant embroidery of apocryphal legend in which all the old Judeo-Gnostic and Dualist-Gnostic stories reappear. [...] Now the Bogomils particularly disapproved of the Pentateuch, which they found inconsistent with Christian doctrine. The *Palaea* seems to be a deliberate attempt to provide an Old Testament which would not be liable to that objection. [...] Like the individual legends it was either the translation of a Greek version or was compiled from various Greek versions; and it was almost certainly disseminated at first by Bogomil sympathizers [emphasis mine – M.S.], but eventually circulated on its own merits as a story-book. Theologically, however, it does not reproduce strict Bogomil truths.<sup>48</sup>

Sir Runciman's tone is so general that he seems not to differentiate between the *Palaea Historica* and the *Palaea Interpretata (Commented Palaea, Толковая палея)*, citing the anti-Jewish invocations from the latter. More to the point, however, in spite of manifestly siding with the "Bogomil faction" in the discussion on how the text of the *Palaea* evolved, he never suggests that the text arose within or under the influence of dualist circles – judging by the last sentence of the cited passage<sup>49</sup>.

The *Palaea* is described as an *apocryphal Old Testament book* by the expert and editor of Slavic apocryphal writings, Jordan Ivanov<sup>50</sup>. Dimitri Obolensky also counts the *Palaea* among the works that display *the dualistic bent of a Bogomil intermediate*, claiming that it *shows evidence of having been remodelled on its way from Byzantium by the Bulgarian Bogomils*<sup>51</sup>. Rostislav Stankov, a modern student of the text, highlights the fact that:

Историческая Палея не является богомилским сочинением, но могла побывать в руках богомилов, о чем свидетельствует отсутствие второй антибогомилской анафемы в болгарском тексте ИП.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>48</sup> S. RUNCIMAN, *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of Christian Dualist Heresy*, Cambridge 2003, p. 85.

<sup>49</sup> It bears emphasizing that Runciman is possibly the sole author who calls the *Palaea* a holy book. I concur with this assessment, since the *Palaea* is a sacral narrative dealing with the origins of the world and the chosen people; it is also not listed in any index of prohibited (or even unrecommended!) books.

<sup>50</sup> Й. ИВАНОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

<sup>51</sup> D. BOLENSKY, *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge 2004, p. 281.

<sup>52</sup> Р. СТАНКОВ, *Историческая палея – памятник древней болгарской культуры*, Pbg 10.4, 1986, p. 57. Also, elsewhere: *Текстологични и други данни – връзка на ИП с Тайната книга на богомилиите [...]; отсъствие на втората антибогомилска анафема, която по всяка вероятност се отнася към началото на XI в.* – Р. СТАНКОВ, *Обща характеристика на лексикалния състав на Историческата палея*, ЕЛ 5, 1986, p. 55.

As I see it, this statement can be reversed: the lack of the second anathema cannot be treated as evidence for that the *Palaea* was compiled by the Bogomils.

An attempt to prove that the *Palaea* functioned in both spheres, i.e. heterodox and orthodox, is vulnerable to the charge of internal incongruity of the text. It can probably be assumed – provided the text was confined to orthodox circles after all – that its author tried to ‘neutralize’ the non-canonical, ‘heretic’ narratives (i.e. so-called apocrypha) that he had collected and utilized as a commentary or extension of the text of the *Old Testament*. Thus, the purpose behind placing the anathemas at the beginning of the *Palaea* would be to protect the readers from receiving the apocrypha as credible/officially sanctioned works, and from endorsing the heretic, dualist truths of faith as valid.

It appears fairly pointless to ask the question who wrote the *Palaea*.

What shows through the text of the *Palaea* are indubitably the traits of an author educated in the spheres of orthodox Christianity, displaying expertise in and making exquisite use of *Old Testament* texts, the writings of the Church Fathers, as well as liturgical works of the orthodox Church (rejected by just about all heretic movements of the period in question). Hence, we can assume that even if the *Palaea* did in fact infiltrate heretic spheres, it was merely a secondary development<sup>53</sup>. Incidentally, we know that the Bogomils also accepted and used other pseudo-canonical *Old Testament* texts (such as the *Gospel of Thomas*, the *Vision of Isaiah*, or the *Apocalypse of Baruch*)<sup>54</sup>. If the original Greek text had contained two anathemas, to what end would the heretics who adapted it (be they the Phundagiagitae of Asia Minor or the western/Bulgarian Bogomils) have eliminated only one of them, in spite of being called by name in both? The first anathema challenges their beliefs no less than the second one. Even if we assumed that the work did indeed originate within the heretic/dualist zone of influence, wouldn't we still expect the author to have omitted (or removed, in case of revising an earlier text) all the accusations in his first step? Certainly he would have disposed of any passages discrediting his own beliefs.

The notion of the *Palaea* being a ‘Bogomil’ text can likewise be entirely rejected. To be sure, the work does contain elements that are irreconcilable with the official doctrine of the Church, but the presence of the anathemas seems an

<sup>53</sup> As noted by Stanisław Bylina, *it is remarkable that the Bogomil elites boasted a relatively high level of education, which was partly caused by the development of the ecclesiastic school system (as we know, some of the ‘perfect’ were former members of the Eastern Church clergy). The theological knowledge they possessed enabled them not only to undertake missionary work, but also to compose religious works and perform doctrinal censorship of foreign texts translated into the Slavic tongue* – S. BYLINA, *Bogomilizm w średniowiecznej Bułgarii*, BP 2, 1985, p. 142.

<sup>54</sup> Д. АНГЕЛОВ, *op. cit.*, p. 220–221; M. ANGELOVSKA-PANOVA, *Eastern Dualistic Heresies: the Challenge of Bogomilism*, Исто 66.1/2, 2010/2011, p. 15–25.

argument sound enough to prove the author's awareness of these elements' non-canonicity<sup>55</sup>.

The hypothetical history of the *Palaea*, connected with the many modifications of its text, is no less important – especially in the light of the passages adduced above. Thus e.g. according to M. Speranskij, the fragment ('chapter') retelling the history of Uzziah is a secondary addition, inserted at some indefinite time into the original text<sup>56</sup>. The views on the creation of the world and mankind presented in the *Palaea* also presumably underwent an 'update' of sorts. It can be assumed that the original variant of the text was indeed composed before or around the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, perhaps shortly after the rejection of iconoclasm<sup>57</sup>. Inasmuch as its author successfully related the 'non-canonical' motifs from the lives of Adam and Eve (including their expulsion from Eden, their penance and the place of their act), providing a suitable interpretation sanctioned by the Church, he would not have been able to show that they were characteristic of the Phundagiagitae – dualists who probably only emerged as a group and acquired their name one hundred years later, if not more. Possibly a later editor of the (Greek) *Palaea* linked the content of the first anathema with the views of the Phundagiagitae and decided to include them in the text in a thematically appropriate place. Unfortunately, since a (Greek) variant of the text not containing the second anathema is wanting, this surmise must remain speculative. Nevertheless, modifications of the Greek text of the *Palaea* are indirectly attested through its Slavic copies/translations.

This gets us close to answering the question concerning the Byzantine originals of the Slavic translations. It can be conjectured that the so-called 1<sup>st</sup> translation was based on the 'old' variant, which only included the first of the two anathema (the one concerning Adam and Eve's union in Eden) – a version that presumably arose soon after the end of the iconoclast period. It can furthermore be

<sup>55</sup> It remains problematic, however, that numerous episodes appear in the *Palaea Historica* in manifestly different form than in the *Old Testament*. Some typical examples are the stories of Abel's funeral, priest Melchizedek, the penance of Lot, or the death of Moses. The fact that their non-canonicity is not indicated in the text in any way can of course be regarded as the manifestation of a concealed heretic (or at least 'subversive') plan. Another explanation seems more plausible to me, however: namely, that so-called apocrypha were not thought of as 'unholy' or 'improper', but as a kind of natural supplement or commentary to the Scripture, and therefore something 'endemic' and inherently acceptable. Addressing the issue of so-called apocrypha in detail would be beyond the scope of this paper; we may add that it has already been dealt with in a number of studies on the Slavic translations (cf. for instance: D. FLUSSER, *op. cit.*; É. TURDEANU, *Apocryphes bogomiles et pseudo-bogomiles*, RHR 138, 1950, p. 22–52; 139, 1951, p. 176–218; É. TURDEANU, *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament*, Leiden 1981, p. 392–403; G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, *Słowińskie starotestamentowe utwory pseudokanoniczne: między literaturą oficjalną a kulturą ludową*, [in:] *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych*, ser. XI, *Literaturoznawstwo – kulturologia – folklorystyka. Prace na XIV Międzynarodowy Kongres Slawistów w Ochrydzie 2008*, ed. L. SUCHANEK, K. WROCLAWSKI, Warszawa 2008, p. 17–26).

<sup>56</sup> М.Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

<sup>57</sup> Another fact corroborating this hypothesis is the inclusion of the *Sermon* (*Slovo*) on Icons into the 'chapters' of the *Palaea* (as seen in the material from the fragmentary 14<sup>th</sup> century Slavic copy from the Synodal Library of the Romanian Orthodox Church in Bucharest, SB III 22).

hypothesized that the so-called 2<sup>nd</sup> translation derives from a variant like the one seen in Vasiliev's edition or the manuscript from the Biblioteca Marciana, i.e. already featuring the anathema against the Phundagiagitae. This would have likely been an 11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup> century manuscript.

\*\*\*

The anathemas against heretics contained in the *Palaea Historica* are only seemingly an insignificant fragment. Byzantine sources attest the name of this religious movement in a number of divergent forms: Φουνδαῖται, Φουνδαγιαῖται, Φουνδαδίται. Writing on the heretics, the Slavic translator simply adapted the Greek word: Фундагигисти, possibly indicating the existence of yet another Greek variant of this name – or perhaps merely deforming the original word. It was apparently a cryptic term in the Slavic linguistic sphere – otherwise the Phundagiagitae would surely have been referred to by their customary Balkan name, 'the Bogomils', especially since the memory of the Bogomils (and even some limited activity on their part) remained alive into the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

Regarding the aspect of cosmogony and theology of the dualists mentioned in the anathemas, two beliefs are particularly noteworthy: firstly, Cain's being born as the son of Satanael, and secondly, Adam and Eve's act prior to their expulsion from Eden. This variant, also known from sources other than the *Palaea*, shows the Bogomil view on mankind's place in the history of the world and salvation – a view no doubt prone to incite outrage among orthodox circles.

Thus, consulting the Byzantine original(s) enables us to formulate a reasonable explanation for the ostensibly bizarre 'lack' of the second anathema in the older Slavic translation of the *Palaea Historica*.

*Translated by Marek Majer*

**Abstract.** The original text of the *Palaea Historica*, a Byzantine narration based on the initial books of the Old Testament, contains two anathema directed against the Phundagiagitae (adherents of a medieval neo-Manichaean heresy), accusing them of the belief in Cain's being the son of Satanael and in that the union of Adam and Eve occurred in the Garden of Eden already. The analysis of the relevant passages and their counterparts in two Slavic translations of the *Palaea*, as well as certain other Byzantine and Slavic medieval texts with related content, contributes to illuminating the circumstances under which the Slavic translations arose. The paper also discusses the very term *Phundagiagitae* (practically absent from all other Slavic sources) and addresses the issue of the supposed non-canoncity of the *Palaea*.

**Małgorzata Skowronek**

Katedra Sławistyki Południowej,

Wydział Filologiczny

Uniwersytet Łódzki

ul. Lipowa 81

90–568 Łódź, Polska

malgorzata.skowronek@uni.lodz.pl