Review Articles

∴

The New Critical Edition of the Martyrdom of the Fifteen Martyrs of Tiberiupolis (*BHG* 1199) by Irini-Sophia Kiapidou and Several Problems of the Text

Θεοφύλακτος Αχρίδος, *Μαρτύριο των δεκαπέντε μαρτύρων της Τιβεριουπόλης*. Κριτική έκδοση, απόδοση στα νέα ελληνικά και υπομνηματισμός Ειρήνη-Σοφία Κιαπίδου (Κείμενα βυζαντινής λογοτεχνίας, 8). Αθήνα: Έκδόσεις Κανάκη, 2015, σσ. 275

Basil Lourié

Leading Research Fellow, Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, Russia
hieromonk@gmail.com

Abstract

The review-article discusses the new critical edition of *BHG* 1199 and its traditional attribution to Theophylact of Ohrid (which is rejected). The legend representing the conversion of Bulgaria with no participation of Cyril and Methodius or their disciples must go back to the tenth century First Bulgarian kingdom.

Keywords

conversion of Bulgaria – hagiography – Theophylact of Ohrid – North Macedonia – Strumica – Fifteen Martyrs of Tiberiupolis – First Bulgarian kingdom

1 Kiapidou's Edition

Irini-Sophia Kiapidou finished a long-awaited work: a new scholarly edition of the *Martyrdom of the Fifteen Martyrs of Tiberiopolis* (BHG 1199) attributed to Theophylact of Ohrid (archbishop from 1088/1089 to the death after 1126¹). The edition is called critical, even though the text survived in a unique manuscript, the *Baroccianus gr.* 197, written by hieromonk Galaktion Madarakes in 1343/1344. This manuscript is, however, very defective, and there were several attempts to improve its readings, namely, the first scholarly edition by Bonifatius Finetti² (reprinted by Jean-Paul Migne in 1864³), the unpublished edition and study by Paul Gautier (1968), a detailed textological commentary by Stoyan Ivanov Maslev⁴ made without knowing Gautier's work, an edition by Iliya N. Iliev⁵, which was not especially helpful and added a number of mistakes, and, finally, reprinting Iliev's text (with correcting errors in Greek and typos) by P. Vlachakos (2008; not a self-standing edition despite author's claim that he had checked the manuscript)⁶. Thus, to produce a critical edition, Kiapidou have had to manoeuvre between the original manuscript readings and the reconstructions by Finetti, Gautier, Maslev, and Iliev; she managed, however, to propose some helpful reconstructions of her own. Kiapidou's *apparatus criticus* normally allows seeing the differences between the six approaches to the text (the manuscript readings and the restorations by Finetti, Gautier, Maslev, Iliev, and Kiapidou herself).

1 A. K[azhdan], "Theophylaktos, archbishop of Ohrid," in: *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. Kazhdan, 3 vols, Oxford, 1991, vol. 3, p. 2068.

2 B. Finetti, *Theophylacti Bulgariae Archiepiscopi Opera omnia, sive quae hactenus edita sunt*. T. III. Venetiis, 1758, cols. 1067'-1068').

3 PG 126, 151-222.

4 С. И. Маслев, *Проучвания върху някои произведения на Теофилакт Охридски. Архиепископ Български (1090-около 1126)* [S. I. Maslev, *Studies on Some Works by Theophylact of Ohrid, Archbishop of Bulgaria (1090-ca. 1126)*] (Извори за българската история, 19; Гръцки извори за българската история, 9: Произведения на Теофилакт Охридски, архиепископ български, отнасящи се до българската история, част 1), Sofia, 1974.

5 И. Г. Илиев, *Житие на св. Климент Охридски, Мъченичеството на 15-те Тивериуполски мъченици, писма, стихотворение, посветено на Никифор Вриений, част от обяснението към писмото на ап. Павел до Римляните* [I. G. Iliev, *The Life of St. Clement of Ohrid, The Martyrdom of the Fifteen Martyrs of Tiberiopolis, Letters, a Poem Dedicated to Nicephorus Bryennios, and a Part of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans by Apostle Paul*] (Извори за българската история, 19; Гръцки извори за българската история, 9: Произведения на Теофилакт Охридски, архиепископ български, отнасящи се до българската история, част 2), Sofia, 1994.

6 I have no *de visu* knowledge of the editions by Gautier and Vlachakos.

Kiapidou does not take into account the indirect manuscript tradition, that is, some hagiographical accounts that could or certainly do go back to the same text of *BHG* 1199, albeit in different manuscripts. I will mention them later. In my opinion, taking into account this indirect tradition would strengthen some of her reconstructions.

The critical edition is the end result of Kiapidou's many years of work on the *Martyrdom*. In her Introduction and endnotes, she often summarises her earlier studies on the textological problems⁷ and the sources⁸. These earlier publications, therefore, must still be consulted if we wish to understand her argumentation in a more detailed way.

Kiapidou does not discuss the attribution of the *Martyrdom* to Theophylact that is considered by the present scholarly consensus to be definitely proven in 1986 by Dmitry Obolensky⁹.

The historiography dedicated to the *Martyrdom* is predictably ample due to the fact that it deals with the first steps of Christianity in the modern states of Bulgaria and Macedonia and, therefore, in the *Slavia orthodoxa* as a whole. Nevertheless, the number of critical (*sensu stricto*) studies of the source is – not less predictably – severely limited, due to the trend, especially in the Balkan historiography, to believe to the last detail in the historical reliability of the *Martyrdom*, at least, in the part that deals with the ninth-century events.

Several Kiapidou's achievements are especially important for understanding the legend. She has resolved two problems of the text, namely, the mention of the toponym Strumica (read *Strúmitsa*) and the alleged mention of some "Etimasios" that is either sixteenth martyr or second name of the martyr Komasios.

The preserved manuscript mentions the toponym Strumica uniquely in the title¹⁰: Μαρτύριον τῶν ἁγίων ἐνδόξων ἱερομαρτύρων ἱε' ἐν τῇ βεριουπόλει μαρτυρισάντων, ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς ἰουλιάνου τοῦ παραβάτου· τῆς βουλγαρικῶς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀπονομαζομένης στρουμνίτζης· συγγραφὲν ὑπὸ θεοφυλάκτου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπι-

7 E.-S. Kiapidou, "Critical Remarks on Theophylact of Ochrid's Martyrdom of the Fifteen Martyrs of Tiberiopolis: the Editorial Adventure of a Text from the Middle Ages," *Παρεκβολαί*, 2 (2012), σσ. 27-47.

8 E.-Σ. Κιαπίδου, "Οἱ πηγές τοῦ Θεοφυλάκτου Ἀχρίδος γιὰ τὸ Μαρτύριον τῶν ἁγίων ἐνδόξων ἱερομαρτύρων ἱε' τῶν ἐν Τιβεριουπόλει μαρτυρησάντων ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Παραβάτου," *Βυζαντιακά*, 27 (2008), σσ. 13-46.

9 D. Obolensky, "Theophylaktos of Ohrid and the Authorship of the Vita Clementis," in: *Βυζάντιον. Αφιέρωμα στὸν Ἀνδρέα Ν. Στράτο*, ed. by N. Α. Στράτου, vol. 2: *Θεολογία καὶ Φιλολογία*, Athens, 1986, σσ. 601-618.

10 And also in the later colophon of the whole manuscript written by another scribe. Obolensky ("Theophylaktos," p. 610) mentions this fact as important but without proving that this 14th-century identification could be relevant for the 11/12th centuries too.

σκόπου πάσης βουλγαρίας. Here, as already Paul Gautier pointed out (and Kiapidou agreed), the phrase τῆς βουλγαρικῶς ἐπὶ νόμαζομένης στρουμνίτζης distorts the syntax and should be excluded as a later addition. Nowhere in the text is the toponym Strumica mentioned. The fourteenth-century scribe, however, working when the identification of this Tiberiupolis as Strumica had long since been a *fait accompli*, experienced some difficulties with the name Tiberiupolis distorted by him to τῇ βεριουπόλει¹¹. The name Βεριούπολις is not a creation of our scribe, because it appears as well in type C (no later than 15th cent.) of the lists of renamed cities and rivers¹².

This means that the earliest *written* identification of this Tiberiupolis with Strumica remains an inscription at a fresco in the church of the Theotokos Eleousa in the Veljusa village near (8 km) Strumica datable to 1080 (or no more than several years later)¹³. Anyway, the toponym Strumica does not belong to our text.

Another important reading is first established by Kiapidou. In § 17, the text is corrupted, as one can see from the photograph of the relevant folio (f. 600^v) published by Maslev¹⁴. The text runs as follows (with a line break):

...τιμόθεος καὶ κο·· καὶ ἔτι·
μάσιος, εὐσέβιός τε καὶ θεόδωρος...

11 Cf. Kiapidou's introduction, σσ. 23–28.

12 Βεριούπολις ἢ νῦν Στρούμιτζα: A. Diller, "Byzantine Lists of Old and New Geographical Names," *BZ*, 63 (1970), pp. 27–42, at p. 33.

13 As it was pointed out by Constantin Jireček (1854–1918, in normalised modern Czech spelling: Konstantin) in 1897, who then provided the date of 1080 with the question mark: C. Jireček, "Das christliche Element in der topographischen Nomenclatur der Balkanländer," *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 136 (1897), Abh. XI., S. 69). The modern dating is due to Vojislav J. Đurić: B. Джурич, *Византийские фрески. Средневековая Сербия, Далмация, славянская Македония* [Byzantine Frescoes. Mediaeval Serbia, Dalmatia, Slavic Macedonia]. Пер. с сербского под ред. Э. С. Смирновой. Moscow, 2000 [authorised and augmented translation from the 2nd Serbian ed., 1975], pp. 31, 331–333. Cf. also: D. Cheshmedjiev, "Notes on the Cult of the Fifteen Tiberiupolitan Martyrs in Medieval Bulgaria," *Studia Ceranea*, 1 (2011), pp. 143–156, at p. 149; I refer to this important paper according to the English translation; cf. the Bulgarian original: Д. Чешмеджиев, "Бележки върху култа на Петнадесетте Тивериуполски мъченици в България," in: *ПОЛУХРОНИА. Сборник в чест на проф. Иван Божилов*, Sofia, 2002, сс. 251–263, – and the Russian translation: Д. Д. Чешмеджиев, "Култ пятнадцати тивериупольских мучеников в средневековой Болгарии," *Bulgarian Historical Review*, (2007), issue 3–4, pp. 158–169.

14 Маслев, *Прочувания*, p. 161.

The previous modern editors have read this in the sense of “...Timotheos and Ko[masios], (who is) and Etimasios, and Eusebios and Theodore...” Despite some variations in their reconstructions of the original Greek text¹⁵, they have agreed that the hagiographer mentioned here the second name of Komasios, Etimasios, – even though this second name never appeared elsewhere and, I have to add, is otherwise unknown as a personal name at all.

Kiapidou became the first who appreciated the meaning of the colon after ἔτι (I would add, also that of the acute accent, dismissed by the previous editors as well) and read this ἔτι as a self-standing word “also”. Then she interpreted καὶ ἔτι as a gloss written on the margin in some protograph and later erroneously inserted into the running text. Therefore, the accentuated μάσιος at the beginning of the next line became readable as the ending of the name Κομάσιος whose first syllable was written before the inserted gloss. Thus, no Etimasios survived after Kiapidou’s reading.

Kiapidou’s resolution of the problem is elegant and convincing, even though the scale of the problem is larger than the unique manuscript that Kiapidou dealt with. As Athanasios Angelopoulos has shown, the composers of Greek eighteenth- and nineteenth-century synaxaria whose knowledge of our legend was independent from our unique manuscript mention the sixteenth martyr Etimasios and even add some verses in his honour¹⁶. The only reason for this would have been an alternative reading (or reconstruction) of this very place in § 17.

Nevertheless, in another witness of the indirect manuscript tradition, the rather long epitome (which should be catalogued in *BHG* but is not) placed after the sixth ode of the canon in the 1741 *editio princeps* of the service to the Fifteen Martyrs, the relevant place is preserved in the form “...Τιμόθεος, Κομάσιος, Εὐσέβιος, καὶ Θεόδωρος”¹⁷, thus supporting Kiapidou’s reconstruction.

Now we can be sure that the number of the martyrs in *BHG* 1199 is fifteen, and that their names are bishops Theodore and Timotheus, priests Peter, John,

15 Cf. Kiapidou’s apparatus (p. 102) and, in more details, Kiapidou, “Critical Remarks,” pp. 39–40.

16 Α. Ἀγγελόπουλος, “Οἱ 15 ἱερομάρτυρες Τιβεριουπόλεως-Στρωμνίτζης. Ἱστορικά προβλήματα καὶ λατρευτικὴ πραγματικότητα,” *Μακεδονικά*, 11 (1980), σσ. 475–482, at 474–475; cf. Ches-hemdjiev, “Notes on the Cult,” p. 152, fn. 53.

17 Ἀκολουθία τῶν ἁγίων πεντεκαίδεκα ἱερομαρτύρων τῶν ἐπὶ Ἰουλιάνου τοῦ Παραβάτου Μαρτυρισάντων ἐν Τιβεριουπόλει τῇ κοινῶς ἐπικαλουμένη Στρωμνίτζῃ. Παρὰ Γρηγορίῳ Ἱερομονάχῳ τῷ Κωσταντινίδῃ. Ἐν Μοσχόπολει, 1741, σ. 13 (the page number at this page is printed as “31”, from right to left; the same *typos* at several other pages); cf. reprint of this edition: Γρηγορίου τοῦ Βυζαντίου, Ἀκολουθία τῶν ἁγίων πεντεκαίδεκα ἱερομαρτύρων τῶν ἐπὶ Ἰουλιάνου τοῦ Παραβάτου Μαρτυρισάντων ἐν Τιβεριουπόλει τῇ κοινῶς ἐπικαλουμένη Στρωμνίτζῃ, [Constantinople,] 1830, σ. 12.

Sergius, Theodore (the second Theodore in the list), and Nicephorus, deacons Basil and Thomas, monks Hierotheos, Daniel, Charitonos, Komasios, and Eusebius, and soldier Socrates.

These data are further confirmed by a pair of hymnographic canons composed by Constantine Kabasilas¹⁸, where several *troparia* are paraphrases of recognisable episodes of our legend.

Kiapidou's work makes it possible to address the *Martyrdom* with the tools of critical hagiography. The *Martyrdom* is an overtly hagiographical text created for the purposes of and within some cult. Most historians are not sufficiently sensitive to this fact and, therefore, neglect to explore some relevant hagiographical data¹⁹.

2 Author: Not Theophylact

The attribution of *BHG* 1199 to Theophylact by Dmitry Obolensky contains, at least, two logical flaws that make it impossible to accept it at face value. Indeed, there are serious reasons for rejecting it.

The whole discussion about the authorship was initiated in 1968 by Paul Gautier within the triangle formed with three groups of texts: (1) *BHG* 1199, (2) the longer Greek *Vita* of Clement of Ohrid *BHG* 355 attributed to Theophylact in the manuscript tradition (which is richer than that of *BHG* 1199), and (3) the corpus of the works for whom Theophylact's authorship is certain. The established fact is that all the three groups of texts have sensible affinities between each other including textual overlapping. There are, however, several logical possibilities of its interpretation²⁰, and all of them must be pondered.

18 PLP 10097, *fl.* 1235-1259; the exact dates of his life are unknown; see, for the complete bibliography, Цв. Грозданов, "О св. Константину Кавасили и његовим портретима у светлу нових знања" [Tsv. Grozdanov, "On st. Constantine Kabasilas and His Portraits in the Light of New Knowledge"], *Зборник радова Византолошког института*, 44 (2007), pp. 313-324. The canons are published in *Ἀκολουθία* (1741) and *Βυζάντιος, Ἀκολουθία*, (1830).

19 As a summary of the current scholarship related to the cult of the Fifteen Martyrs, one can consult И. Христова-Шомова, *Служебният апостол в славянската ръкописна традиция*. Т. II: Изследване на синаксарите. (*Християнските празници в славянските апостоли*) [I. Khristova-Shomova, *The Liturgical Apostolos in the Slavonic Manuscript Tradition*. II. *A Study of the Synaxaria (Christian Feasts in the Slavonic Apostoloi)*]. Sofia, 2012, pp. 323-327 (I am grateful to Iskra Khristova-Shomova for having kindly presented me this book).

20 Given that the likelihood of dependency from some sources outside the three groups mentioned was reduced near to zero (due to the contents of the overlapped parts), the total number of other possibilities is equal to ten: one variant that all the three groups

I will not repeat here Obolensky's argumentation in favour of Theophylact's authorship of the *Vita Clementis BHG* 355, because I agree with it and with the additional argument brought forward by Sergei A. Ivanov²¹. I share, in this matter, the consensus opinion that *causa finita est*. I would only to emphasise that Obolensky was, at the first stage of his demonstration, considering three possible explanations for the affinity between the works of groups (2) and (3): an influence in each of the two directions and the identity of the author²². One would have expected from him an analogous procedure in respect to the groups (1) and (2). Obolensky, however, limited himself to a reference to Gautier's argument in favour of the identity of the authors of (1) and (2): "His [Gautier's] crucial argument is based on a number of textual parallels"²³. This statement is an example of the *ignoratio elenchi* logical fallacy: the textual parallels *per se* would never be sufficient for substantiating a "crucial argument" in demonstrating identity of the author. They could demonstrate only *some* kind of relation but not any specific kind of relation such as identity of the author. This error seems to go back to Gautier, but Obolensky has certainly repeated it. With this first logical error in background, Obolensky proceeded to the second one.

For Obolensky, the task of verifying or falsifying Theophylact's authorship of *BHG* 1199 became simplified, because he would take for granted the identity between the authors of (2) and (3) groups²⁴. Thus, there was a way to demon-

belongs to a unique author plus three variants that only two of them belong to a unique author (= the number of combinations per two from three) plus six variants that all of them belong to three different authors with different ways of borrowing (the number of permutations – ordered combinations – per two from three).

21 See Б. Н. Флоря, А. А. Турилов, С. А. Иванов, *Судьбы Кирилло-Методиевской традиции после Кирилла и Методия* [B. N. Florea <Florja>, A. A. Turilov, S. A. Ivanov, *The Destiny of the Cyrillo-Methodian Tradition after Cyril and Methodius*] (Bibliotheca Slavica), St. Petersburg, 2000 (2nd ed., 2004), pp. 36–53 (penned by Ivanov).

22 See Obolensky, "Theophylaktos," p. 607: a discussion of these three possibilities. Although a possibility of Theophylact's borrowing from *BHG* 355 (in supposition that it is a different author's work) is named but rejected without specific discussion, it is justified given that the common passage is of theological nature and deals with the *Filioque*.

23 Obolensky, "Theophylaktos," p. 609. Cf. a similar statement in Ivanov (Флоря, Турилов, Иванов, *Судьбы*, p. 43): «оба текста [*BHG* 355 and *BHG* 1199] имеют одинаковый язык, стиль, композицию, много общих мест и библейских цитат» ("the two texts have the identical language, style, composition, many common places and biblical quotations"). I do not see how the compositions could be especially similar, given that *BHG* 355 deals with the activity of its main character, whereas *BHG* 1199 is a long "serial" dedicated to different saints and events from the fourth to the ninth century. On the difference in style, pointed out by Ivan Snegarov, see below.

24 Cf. Sergei Ivanov's observation that the discussion on the authorship of *BHG* 1199 was never as hot as that on the authorship of *BHG* 355: «Это логично, ибо нет никаких

strate Theophylact's authorship of *BHG* 1199 *via* the textual affinity with those genuine texts of Theophylact that have no affinity with the *Vita Clementis BHG* 355. Obolensky, however, did nothing of the kind (otherwise, I suppose, he would have found that there is no such affinity). Instead, he proceeded with a false syllogism: if (2) and (3) have the same author, and (1) and (2) have textual intercessions, then, (1) has the same author as (2) and (3). This is the fallacy of the undistributed middle (*non distributio medii*): such a reasoning, to become true, would imply an additional claim "the texts having textual intercessions belong to the same author", which is obviously false.

Therefore, Obolensky and Ivanov, however convincing are they in demonstrating Theophylact's authorship for *BHG* 355, failed to demonstrate the same for *BHG* 1199. There are, however, proofs of the opposite, namely, that the author of *BHG* 1199 was not only not Theophylact, but also that his views were incompatible with those of the latter.

The relevant path of demonstration has been outlined in the study by Ivan Snegarov (1883-1971) where he formulated the definitive conclusions of his life-long work on the history of the Ohrid archbishopric²⁵. Among his arguments, the three considered by himself as the most important are still worth of attention, and two of the three are even more important than Snegarov thought.

The first argument is about what Snegarov calls "style" but we would call, after Hippolyte Delehaye, "genre hagiographique"²⁶. It says nothing decisive about the authorship but is still of interest because adequately undermines –

сомнений в принадлежности обоих текстов одному автору» ("This is logical, because there is no doubt that both works belong to the same author") (Флоря, Турилов, Иванов, *Судьбы*, 62, fn. 3).

25 Iv. Snegarov, "Les sources sur la vie et l'activité de Clément d'Ochrida," *Byzantinobulgarica*, 1 (1962), pp. 79-119, at pp. 105-106. I have to note, nevertheless, that I agree with Obolensky ("Theophylaktos," p. 610) who argued, against Snegarov and Gautier, that the silence about Theophylact in the epitome of *BHG* 1199 is not a valid argument against Theophylact's authorship. Even less I would second Snegarov in his hypothesis that *BHG* 1199 belongs to the author of the Greek liturgical *akolouthia* to the Fifteen Martyrs, Constantine Kabasilas, who served as the bishop of Strumica and, in his late years, archbishop of Ohrid (Snegarov, "Les sources", p. 106). In the thirteenth century, it was too late – especially by the pen of a Byzantine author – for a legend to appear where the baptism of Bulgaria was performed without any trace of Cyril and Methodius.

26 "Les deux œuvres diffèrent sensiblement par le style. Alors que la première [*BHG* 1199] est essentiellement une historiographie, la seconde adopte un caractère pathétique d'hommélie" (Snegarov, "Les sources", p. 105). Taken Delehaye in mind, we have to reformulate: the first is a *Passion épique* simulating a *Passion historique*, whereas the second is a habitual hagiographical panegyric whose author was trying to follow the historical truth, although without putting aside his own agenda; cf. H. Delehaye, *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*. Deuxième éd., revue et corrigée (SH, 13B), Bruxelles, 1966. Anyway, what is the point by Snegarov, the hagiographical genres are quite different. Perhaps a

in comparison with some modern evaluations – the degree of similarity between *BHG* 199 and *BHG* 355.

The two other Snegarov's main arguments deal with the authorship directly. They are the following:

1. “Des différences peuvent être constatées en ce qui concerne la propagation du christianisme en Bulgarie : la Vie des 15 martyrs ne fait pas mention de la contribution de Cyrille et Méthode à la conversion du peuple bulgare, à laquelle la Vie détaillée [*BHG* 355] fait expressément allusion”.
2. In *BHG* 199, “...il est simplement fait mention de la messe slave dans le cathédrale de Bregalnica, sans qu'il soit indiqué que l'activité de Clément se trouve à son origine”.²⁷

Snegarov's first claim is excessively modest. *BHG* 199 not only does not make any mention of Cyril and Methodius or any of their disciples but describes (§ 34) the conversion of Bulgaria as uniquely an initiative of Khan Boris put forward by him for personal reasons without assistance of anybody but also as a warranty for his peace proposal to Byzantium. The hagiographer specifies that the Romans (that is, the Byzantines) were surprised: Ῥωμαῖοι δέ, τὸ μηδέποτε παρὰ Βουλγάρων ἐλπισθὲν αὐτοῖς [τὸ] περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης μήνημα ἀσμένως δεξάμενοι, πάντα διὰ τάχους ἐτέλεσαν²⁸ – “And the Romans, after having joyfully accepted the peace proposal that *they have never expected from the Bulgarians*, performed everything in a hurry”. This statement simply does not leave any room for the Cyrillo-Methodian mission which – let us recall – has been sent by the emperor. Our legend lets us know univocally that there were no activities of Byzantine state missionaries in Bulgaria.

No wonder that our legend does not mention Clement of Ohrid either. The Slavonic liturgy in Bulgaria has, for our hagiographer, other than Cyrillo-Methodian or Clementine roots. He did not go into details what specifically they were.

Such a historical concept would hardly have pleased Theophylact, especially as the author of the *Vita Clementis*. For him, Cyrillo-Methodian legacy as well as the personal contribution of Clement of Ohrid were quite important

unique author would have been able to work in both, but, anyway, one should not to consider such a capacity as something self-evident.

27 Snegarov, “Les sources”, p. 106. Obolensky (“Theophylaktos,” p. 610) does mention and reject (as “not more convincing”) the first of these two arguments – without formulating any specific objection – and does not mention the second at all. The British would qualify this as his third logical error called by them *argumentum ad lapidem* (“appeal to the stone”); dismissing something as absurd without giving proof of absurdity.

28 Ed. Κιαπίδου, p. 164.27–29.

and served to emphasise the role of the Byzantines as the only enlighteners of the Bulgarian “barbarians”²⁹.

Gautier, Snegarov, and others with them were right in their negation of Theophylact's authorship for *BHG* 1199, despite them being wrong in some other related matters.

3 Preliminary Considerations for Dating

The considerations that we have just developed require us to go further than merely excluding the authorship of Theophylact. They allow us to perceive that *BHG* 1199 is at odds with any form of the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition, as applied to the conversion of Bulgaria. It simply excludes any role of the brothers and their disciples. Appearance of such text after Theophylact's lifetime is extremely unlikely, given that the tradition of veneration of Cyril and Methodius with their disciples as the enlighteners of the Slavs including Bulgaria was then firmly established. In this epoch, such a document as our *BHG* 1199 must have become marginalised, as we actually see, given that it survives in a unique manuscript and is protected by the name of a respected author.

Therefore, we need to conclude that the work is earlier than Theophylact's activity, and that Theophylact made use of it in his own writing. Theophylact was depending on *BHG* 1199 in his *BHG* 355. The time of Theophylact's work on the latter is the natural *terminus ante quem* for the former.

One can easily see that the “ideology” of *BHG* 1199, that is, Christian Bulgaria without Cyril and Methodius (and Clement of Ohrid either), is in a sharp contradiction with Theophylact of Ohrid's program.

BHG 1199 is a document composed in the First Bulgarian kingdom that ceased to exist in 1018. There are, in the text, clear marks of the tenth century, which we will partly discuss below.

Normally, the miracles are the most historical part of hagiographical texts. They often mention persons known from other sources and can be used for defining the date. Thus, the *translatio* of the relics of martyrs Socrates and

29 See, in more details, Ivanov in Флоря, Турилов, Иванов, *Судьбы*, pp. 56-57; cf.: “Солунские братья выступают в его труде как посланцы культурного византийского мира, действующие в варварской среде” (“The brothers of Thessalonica are presented in his work [*BHG* 355] as messengers of the Byzantine culture world acting within a barbarian milieu”)(*ibid.*). In a private conversation, Sergei A. Ivanov said me that one has not to exclude a possibility that Theophylact, if he was the author of *BHG* 1199, has simply followed his Bulgarian source. This seems to me *a priori* not especially plausible due to the Byzantine sensibilities of Theophylact, which would have been affected in such case.

Theodore is said to have taken place under Tsar Simeon (893-927) but not necessarily at the beginning of his rule, and was performed by *comes* Dristros (§ 47). This Δίστρος ὁ κόμης³⁰, as his name is written down in *BHG* 1199, is considered as the same person as *comes* Dristros mentioned (in Genitive: ΔΡΙΣΤΡΟΥ ΚΟΜΙΤΟΥ, to read κομήτου, a later form instead of κόμητος) in the inscription on a marble border pillar between Bulgaria and Byzantium dated to AM 6412 = AD 904³¹. Thus, the beginning of Simeon's reign is the certain *terminus post quem* of our text.

We would be able to establish, albeit with a less rigour, a somewhat later date if we take into account that there are, in *BHG* 1199, miracles reported from an explicit chronological distance, whereas there is no miracle reported by an eyewitness (fictive or not). Thus, in § 51, a three-year period after the healing is mentioned (p. 206), and, in § 52, the lifespan of the healed person is indicated as an indefinitely long interval (p. 208: ...ἡμέρας... πάσας τὰς τῆς ὑπολειπομένης αὐτῷ ζωῆς). These mentions imply some significant chronological distance, such as decennia, whereas, possibly, after some earlier date than 893, the first year of Simeon. Anyway, *BHG* 1199 acquired its actual shape hardly earlier than in the second quarter of the tenth century. A more precise dating will require an analysis of the concept of the conversion of Bulgaria, which this legend expresses in its language of hagiographical symbolism.³²

30 Cf. Kiapidou's apparatus (p. 198) for emendations of Δίστρος to Δρίστρος.

31 Nr 46 in B. Бешевлиев, *Първо-български надписи (второ преработено и допълнено издание)* [V. Beshevliev, *Protobulgarian Inscriptions (second reworked and augmented edition)*], Sofia, 1992, pp. 182-185, образи (plates) 120-121, esp. pp. 184-185 for the name and identification of Dristros.

32 I am grateful to Sergei A. Ivanov for several discussions on these matters and to Dirk Krausmüller for improving my English.