

## A Slavic Translation of the Ohrid Chrysobull of 1273<sup>1</sup>

David J. Birnbaum  
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures  
Harvard University

Copyright © 1988 by David J. Birnbaum  
All rights reserved

### The Greek Text of the Ohrid Chrysobull

According to various accounts,<sup>2</sup> Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus (1259–82) issued a chrysobull in August 1272<sup>3</sup> defining the territory of the Ohrid Archbishopric. Threatened by opponents allied with Charles of Anjou, the emperor sought through this edict to reestablish imperial authority over the autocephalous Serbian and Bulgarian churches by bringing them under the control of the Greek see of Ohrid. Michael was later forced to enlist papal protection against Charles, the price for which was a short-lived union with Rome, proclaimed at the 1274 Council of Lyons, and the Angevin menace was decisively averted only with the Sicilian Vespers of 1282.

The Ohrid chrysobull incorporates the text of three chrysobulls issued by Basil II (Bulgaroctonus),<sup>4</sup> which listed territories subordinate to Ohrid. Michael's preface and conclusion assert that the see of Ohrid is to be equated with Justiniana Prima, that it is proper to show respect to preceding emperors by enforcing their edicts (it is in this context that Basil's chrysobulls are introduced), and that territories that have, for various reasons, left the control of the see of Ohrid should be returned to it.

Michael's original chrysobull has not survived, but two later Greek copies are known. An incomplete copy from the Codex Gerasimi<sup>5</sup> contains only Michael's introduction and the beginning of the first of Basil's included chrysobulls.<sup>6</sup> This copy makes no mention of Michael and bears no date, but a complete and dated copy was later found by Porfirij Uspenskij at the Catherine Monastery in Sinai.<sup>7</sup> The text of the inserted eleventh century chrysobulls from the Sinai copy was published in 1871<sup>8</sup> and the complete text of the chrysobull according to the Sinai manuscript in 1911.<sup>9</sup> A critical edition of Basil's chrysobulls, with variants from the two manuscripts, was published in 1893.<sup>10</sup>

### The Date of the Ohrid Chrysobull According to the Sinai Manuscript

The Sinai copy of the Ohrid chrysobull bears the following closing:

προσέσται τοίνυν ὁ παρῶν χρυσόβουλλος τῆς βασιλείας ἡμῶν τῆ  
ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ πάσης Βουλγαρίας τῇ καὶ Πρώτῃ

Ἰουστινιανῆ εἰς διαρκούσαν τῶν εἰρημένων βεβαίωσιν, ὁ καὶ ἀπολυθεὶς κατὰ μῆνα τοῦτον τῆς ἐνισταμένης ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ἑξακισχιλιοστοῦ ἑπτακοσιοστοῦ ὀγδοηκοστοῦ ἔτους, (π. 125<sup>b</sup>) ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ ἡμέτερον εὐσεβὲς καὶ θεοπρόβλητον ὑπεσημῆματο κράτος:—

Ἐἶχε καὶ ὑπογραφὴν διὰ χρυσῶν γραμμάτων καὶ βασιλικῆς χειρός:

Μιχαὴλ ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ πιστὸς βασιλεὺς καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ Ῥωμαίων  
Δοῦκας Ἄγγελος Κομνηνὸς ὁ Παλαιολόγος:—

The date in the text, κατὰ μῆνα τοῦτον τῆς ἐνισταμένης ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ἑξακισχιλιοστοῦ ἑπτακοσιοστοῦ ὀγδοηκοστοῦ ἔτους, conforms to the standard pattern for dating imperial documents: κατὰ μῆνα ... τῆς ἐνισταμένης ... ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ... ἔτους,<sup>11</sup> but the Sinai manuscript includes τοῦτον after μῆνα and omits the name of the month and the indiction number.

Golubinskij<sup>12</sup> dates the Ohrid chrysobull to August 1272 (= 6780). In his summary of the textual history of this document, Novaković<sup>13</sup> observes that Golubinskij suggested both Michael's authorship and the date without publishing the portions of the text that support these conclusions. Benešević's edition of the Sinai copy explains how Golubinskij determined the year, but there seems to be no direct evidence for assigning this document to August. While the August 1272 dating has been generally accepted by Byzantinists and is regularly repeated in the literature,<sup>14</sup> the Slavic translation of this chrysobull, discussed below, suggests that it should be reconsidered.

### The Slavic Text of the Ohrid Chrysobull in Muz. 3070

In addition to the two Greek copies discussed above, one fifteenth-century copy of a Slavic translation of the Ohrid chrysobull has survived. Muz. 3070 in the Lenin Library in Moscow (Codex Moskva, GBL, Fond 178 [Muzejnoe sobranie], No. 3070) consists of four paper folia removed by V.I. Grigorovič from Zogr. 151, a large miscellany, during an 1844 visit to the Zograph monastery.<sup>15</sup> 1R–2R contains the conclusion of the *Life of Stefan Lazarevič*<sup>16</sup> and 2V–4V contains the text of the Ohrid chrysobull. Apparently, Grigorovič showed this manuscript to Šafařík, for Jireček, after commenting on the August 1272 chrysobull, adds that “в 1273 г. (6781) Михаил утвърдил също тъй и правата на отдавна вече престаналата да съществува църква ‘Justiniana prima,’ която фалшиво се отъждествява с Охридската. Един лош превод на оригинала, направен вероятно от някой влах или грък, се намирал в препис от XVI или XVII в. у проф. Григорович. Извадки от текста има в книгата на покойния Шафарик.”<sup>17</sup> Thus, it seems that Jireček accepted Golubinskij's dating of the chrysobull and assumed that Grigorovič had a copy of a second, similar edict which had been issued the following year.<sup>18</sup>

Despite the reference by de Thallóczy et al.<sup>19</sup> to Grigorovič's account of his travels,<sup>20</sup> there is no specific mention of the Slavic text of the Ohrid chrysobull in this report.<sup>21</sup> And Šafařík's only published comment on the Slavic translation of the chrysobull is a single sentence at the end of his discussion of a different document: "V jiné písemnosti Ochridské od Michala Palaeologa l. 1273, rovněž zkomolené, připomínají se listiny od Justiniana, Basilia II. (976-1025), Manuele (1143-1170) atd."<sup>22</sup> Wenzel, following Šafařík, dates the chrysobull to 1273; he also notes the existence of Grigorovič's Slavic copy.<sup>23</sup>

Aside from the brief notes mentioned above, there was no proper study of the Slavic translation of the Ohrid chrysobull during Grigorovič's lifetime, and the manuscript was not found among his papers. It reappeared as Muz. 3070, first mentioned in the 1889 "Otčet moskovskogo publičnogo i Rumjancevskogo muzeev za 1886-88 gg.," but by this time the provenance of this manuscript and its association with Grigorovič had been forgotten.

Muz. 3070 was rediscovered and described by Seliščev, who published a photographic reproduction of page 3R (which he called 2R).<sup>24</sup> Seliščev's brief article also includes a physical description of the manuscript, excerpts from the texts, and historical and textual comments on the chrysobull. The chrysobull text is on pages 2V through 4V of the manuscript, which Seliščev called 1V through 3V. Unfortunately, Seliščev's discussion of the text of the Ohrid chrysobull in Muz. 3070 is unsatisfactory in several ways.<sup>25</sup>

First, there are inaccuracies in the transcriptions (although the excerpts in Seliščev's article are far more reliable than those in the 1889 "Otčet"). Second, Seliščev believed that all of Muz. 3070 represented a translation from Greek,<sup>26</sup> while the *Life of Stefan Lazarevič* is actually an original Slavic composition. Third, Seliščev incorrectly considered the Slavic text of the chrysobull an abridged translation. Fourth, Seliščev's comments on the discrepancy in dates between the Slavic and Greek texts are inadequate. These last two points are discussed below.

### The Original Content of the Slavic Translation

As mentioned above, Seliščev considered the text of the Ohrid chrysobull in Muz. 3070 an abridged translation, observing that "Михаил Палеолог по ходатайству Охридского архиепископа утверждает за ним все епархии, какие показаны в грамотах Василия Болгаробойца. Списки с этих грамот включены в хрисовул Михаила. Но в славянский перевод эти грамоты не вошли. Нет и тех строчек грамоты Михаила, которые относятся к грамотам Василия."<sup>27</sup> While Seliščev's observations about the lacunae in Muz. 3070 are correct, the phrase "не вошли" suggests a deliberate or accidental omission by the translator. In fact, the Slavic text was surely complete originally; it breaks off in the middle of a sentence at the end of 2V and resumes in the middle of a word on 3R

(...ЖНТН, probably ΠΟΛΟЖΗΤΗ or ΠΡΕΔΛΟЖΗΤΗ; the Greek reads διεκτεθησαι), which suggests that what has survived as Muz. 3070 is the beginning and end of what was originally a longer text. The missing portion would fill four folia, which may have been removed by somebody interested in the information contained in the inserted eleventh century documents.<sup>28</sup>

### The Date of the Ohrid Chrysobull According to Muz. 3070

In a brief comparison of the text of the Ohrid chrysobull in Muz. 3070 and the Sinai manuscript, Seliščev correctly notes that “не совпадает и дата. Но тут переводчик обнаружил недосмотр: он спутал ‘700’ и ‘80’, рядом находящиеся в греческом тексте.”<sup>29</sup>

The Slavic date reads as follows (4V16–18):

16. по мѣсѣ сѣго юуліа насѣоуцаго прѣваго ѡНДНКЗІОНА <...>
17. ѠМѢСѢСМОСЪМНОМОУ прѣвое лѣпо· бѣ нѣ\* ѡ нѣ бѣгоу <...>
18. нарѣннаа наЗНАМЕНА дрѣжава.

Following Seliščev's suggestion that ὈСМОСЪМНОМОУ should be understood as a mistranslation of οὐδοηκοστοῦ, the year in the Slavic copy can be amended to read (6)781 (= 1273), which still differs from the date in the Sinai copy, which reads 6780 (= 1272). If, however, we assume that the word πρώτου (or simply α) was dropped from the Greek copy, we can reconstruct the original year of issue as 1273. The Sinai manuscript has no indiction number, but 1273 corresponds to the first indiction, which is recorded in the Slavic text and which supports the hypothesis that it is the date in the Sinai manuscript that is defective. The 1273 date still places this edict before the 1274. Council of Lyons, a time when Michael was concerned with consolidating imperial authority. Finally, while it is unclear what external evidence accounted for Golubinskij's attribution of this chrysobull to August, the Slavic text provides direct evidence for dating it to July.

### The Translation of the Ohrid Chrysobull

The unintelligibility of the Slavic text of the Ohrid chrysobull leaves no doubt that it is not the work of a skilled translator with a good knowledge of both languages. Jireček attributes the poor quality of the translation to an inadequate knowledge of Slavic on the part of a Wallachian or Greek translator.<sup>30</sup> Seliščev, on the other hand, asserts that “переводчик не владел свободно греческим языком.”<sup>31</sup> Neither scholar provides any evidence or argument for his evaluation of the nationality of the translator.

A careful comparison of the texts supports Seliščev's analysis. We would expect to find morphological barbarisms in the work of a translator whose knowledge of

Slavic was so poor that he could transform an intelligible Greek text into such unintelligible Slavic, but the Slavic words are basically correct morphologically, and such morphological barbarisms as do occur (e.g., πο ῥλω̄ 3R1) are not uncommon in middle Bulgarian and Macedonian texts. In fact, all the peculiarities of the Slavic text can be explained by hypothesizing that a Slav with a poor knowledge of Greek translated this document word by word, imposing the unwieldy Greek syntax on his translation. There are no unexpected phonological or morphological features in the Slavic text and all the awkwardness can be attributed to the syntax. On the other hand, there are many examples of misreadings of the Greek text, including misconstrued syntax, faulty division of words, and faulty translation of idioms. All of these betoken a failure to understand the sense of the Greek.

Thus, the phrase ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ φιλεῖ πολλάκις μὴ πρὸς τέλος παραμένειν, ἄλλ' ἔστιν ὅπου δὴ καὶ συνεχῶς μετακινεῖσθαι τὰ πράγματα can be understood as 'but whereas it is often usual that things do not remain [stable] until the end, but it is the case that they continuously move in whatever direction . . .' The Slavic translation on 3R4-6 reads: *НѢ ПОНЕ<sup>Ж</sup> ЛЮ/БОВѢ МНѠЖИЦЕЮ НЕ БѢ КОИЦѢ ПРѢБЫВАЕ7Ь. НѢ Е<sup>Ж</sup> ИДѢ<sup>Ж</sup> ОУБО И НЕО/СЛАВНО ПѠВНГНѠ7И СЕ ДѢЛО<sup>М</sup>.* The translator misinterpreted the idiom φιλεῖ 'it is usual' as ЛЮ/БОВѢ, which he considered the subject of 'remain,' in place of 'things.' Such mistakes are more likely to reflect a misunderstanding of the Greek than an inadequate knowledge of Slavic.

Similarly, the phrase καὶ σὺν τῷ εὐλόγῳ δικαίαν ἅμα προὔτεινεν αἴτησιν can be understood as 'and according to the proper conduct of affairs he indeed put forth a just request.' The Slavic translation on 3V11 reads: *И СѢ БЛВѢНІЕМЪ ПРѢВЕНѠЕ КѠПНО ПРѢВА БІМН ИМЖЕ/*, which suggests that the translator felt that προὔτεινεν αἴτησιν included the lexemes πρῶτος, εἶναι, and τίσιν. Even if we were to assume that a Greek might have had difficulty understanding this document, it seems unlikely that he could have arrived at a reading so at variance with Greek grammar.

The phrase εἴ τις ἴσως γε καὶ ἔχει προτείνειν οἰονοῦν ἐκ βασιλέως δικαίωμα can be understood as 'and if someone equally will set forth a justification by an emperor.' The Slavic translation on 4R19 reads: *<...>РѢВНО ЖЕ И ИМА<sup>М</sup> ПРѢВНН ОУМЪ И ОУБО Ѡ ЦРѢ<sup>Ж</sup> ѠПРАВАНИЕ<sup>Ж</sup>*, which suggests that the translator felt that προτείνειν οἰονοῦν reflected the lexemes πρῶτος, νοῦς, οἶος, and οὖν. Once again, this is evidence of a translator who could not understand the Greek, rather than merely a person who could not express himself in Slavic.

Finally, the phrase καὶ τὰ πρεσβεῖα προσοδοίημεν can be understood as 'and we return the prerogative.' The Slavic translation on 4V4-5 reads: *И СТАРѢ/ ЛНЦѠ ДАЕМЪ*, which suggests that the translator interpreted πρεσβ- as стар- and, furthermore, thought he detected the lexeme πρόσωπον in προσοδοίημεν. Once again, the incorrect division of words and the inability to recognize that the alleged Greek words are not properly formed suggests a translator whose weakness is in Greek, rather than Slavic.

Seliščev argues that disagreements between the archbishop of Ohrid and the patriarch of Constantinople in the beginning of the XV century concerning the limits of the authority of the former might have provided a reason for renewed attention to this chrysobull, and perhaps for its translation into Slavic.<sup>32</sup> Seliščev's further assumption, however, that all of Muz. 3070 represents part of translation of a Greek miscellany can not be maintained, although many of the texts in Zogr. 151, the source of Muz. 3070, are translations from Greek. Finally, it remains unclear whether the text of the Ohrid chrysobull in Muz. 3070 represents an immediate translation from Greek or a copy of a Slavic intermediary.

#### Appendix – Texts

This appendix includes the Slavic text of the Ohrid chrysobull according to Muz. 3070 and the portions of the Greek text that correspond to the Slavic according to Sin. 508 (976), as published by Benešević.<sup>33</sup> Variants included by Benešević in footnotes are reproduced here in parentheses in the body of the text. Page references to the Slavic manuscript have been introduced into the Greek text in parentheses.

The transcription of the Slavic text retains as many of the orthographic peculiarities of the original as possible in a typeset version. I have supplied line numbers and introduced spaces between words, which are run together in the original, and I have added comments in square brackets before any marginal notations in the manuscript.<sup>34</sup>

2V

ЗАВѢТЪ ДАНЫИ ПРѢВѢНЪ ИОНСТИННАНИИ ЦРКВИ ОХРИ<ДА>

1. Елѣма блѣгаа цркаа по конуиѣ блѣговерѣнии проявляе. Мнѡ
2. же и съ блвѣнїе нѡснѣ прѣвѣнѡе. велѣко бѡ блѣлюблѣнїе.
3. коупно бѡ блѣгоразѡмїе прїносѣ и слѣ. и гадѣнїе бсѣ не ма
4. ло, ѣкъ бѡ ѣбъ бываѣт. понѣ бѡ ѡпѡу ѣбсѣю тѣ прѣбѣсхѡдѣ
5. бѣцрѣвшїиѣ. пнѣже дрѡгыѣ нѣкыѣ и црѣкыѣ длѣгъ прѣже и
6. ныѣ оубо лѣты мнѡгыи прѣбывшїи древнѣшїи во
7. спрїепи ѡ дрѡ дрѡга. ѣ аще исповѣдаеѣ ѡ бѣтїи сѡщї<н>
8. ннѣтѡ же бѣзѡмѡже поснѣнѡтїи показѣнїа. нѣ да оубо ѡ зде<...>
9. оудѡбное слѡва ѡбнажѣ. постнѣзѣеѣ нѣкоѣа и ѣже бѣ цр<ѣхъ>
10. прѣпопѡмннмыѣ и оустннїанѣ ѡ. нѣ тѣуїю всѣмн дрѣвн<нмн>
11. лѣтѣ велѣкое. ѣ на дѣлы постнѣгъ прѣславное. нѣ и пѡмеп<ъ>

[Left margin, line 11: бѣуїю]

12. ѡсѣавль прѣсвѣтлѣ оудовлѣнѣ бѣ тѡ оубо жнѡщїи блѣгосло>
13. бѣнїе спѣшно нѣкоѣ прѡмыслѡ. ѣ ѣко да и зѣавнѣтѣ ед<...>
14. ѡ спѣншѣн ѡрхнѣпїи блѣгарѣскѡн показѣвѣ. юже пѡб<...>
15. бѡ и оустннїанїю ѡ своеѡ имене именеѡа. ѡ ѡнѡ бѡ сїѡ <...>
16. ше ѡ ѣбсѣо сїѡ бѡ слѡ и ма плѣтѣскѡе пѡмоу наѣепи рож<...>
17. бсѣ събѣршїи зѡре, и тѣщїанїе велнѣншїи полагаше ѣже оу<...>
18. аще сѣмоу и пнѣсѣ сѣн велнѣко доѡлно. прнлагаеѣ ѡ<...>
19. еѣ и прѣмнѡгаа прнѡдѣ. ѣбсѣн же и свѣтлѡтѡ. ѡ нѡуже и и
20. зѣ далѣ оубѡ блѣоуѣслнпн. ѣко да сѣн ѡ ины сѣарѣншїи сѣо ѡдѣ се
21. и елѣкыи сѣн поѣтѣпн се рѣнѣнымн. и елѣкы тѣ ѡ ѡрхнѣрѣнсѣѣ,
22. поѣтѣннмыѣ црѣкѡвѣ ѡ сн ѡлоуѣн. ѡбѣ ѣко мнѡгыѣ и велѣкыѣ
23. сѣ оѣспнѣвѣ. и ѣ оубо црѣкыѣ и маѣ дѣтн рѣзоу ѡ лѡбоуѣно
24. на и мѣ сѣедннїаен и спѣншїи ѡ сѣдрѣжѣше сѣарѣншїе рїма пѡпа
25. еунгнїлѡ. по елѣкоу сѣн бѣхѡтецоуїю моурѣсѣѡвѣтн слѣ. и

[Left margin, line 25: еурїгнѡ]

26. ѣко оубо сѣпрѣбывѣтн ѡбѣсѣѡнїа всѣмн лѣты дѣнѣнаа и зѡ
27. жѣнїе хрѣсовѣлѣа снмн слѡвѣсѣ и црѣкыи оудрѣжѣтн повѣлѣ
28. нмн. прѣбывѣше оубѡ на мнѡзѣ сѣоѣѡ слѣвою ѡблѣѣна

[Lower margin:] бѣзвратн се<...> бѣ зѣзѣга

## 3R

1. жн7н по глѡ ѡзложѣн'ныи свѣткѡ ѡс7авшии ѡ багрѣнорѡныи само
2. дрѣць. еже ѡсѡу е вѣдома по ѡменн' нмѣше вѡ оубо сѣце сѣа дѣ до.
3. мнѡга' н мнѡзи прѡчии црїе погд сѣ сьмоуженїе приѣше' волю
4. невьзбранно сѣцеваа н сїи на архнѣпїи показаше' нѣ понѣ' лю
5. бѡвъ мнѡжнцїею не съ коиць прѣвыгае7ь. нѣ е' ндѣ' оубо н неѡ
6. слабо пѡвнгнод7н се дѣлѡ' нн на сѣн сврѣшшаа се блжен'нымь
7. сїмъ црѣмъ прѣбїше непрѣлѡна. нѣ оукрѣпн сѣ ѡбїе н на сн'лѣ
8. по. ѡсѡу ѡнын ѡнако прнклоуѣвшии се межѣ. н понѣ' сѣцеваа
9. сѡен'нымь црквамѣ, мнѡгы оубо н дрѡгыѣ ѡ соупротївныи
10. расхїтн7н се оусѡнше' мнѡгыѣ пакы безвѣбнымн вннамн
11. пѣвїю елѣко аще оубо прїнде внога7н се нѣкыи кѣ ѡвлѣнїю
12. на дѣлы падѣнїа, дрѡгаа ѡ дрѡгыи е' ѡ на' архнѣрѣѡ вѣше' ѡсѡу
13. мнѡ' оубѡ по дрѡгыи ѡныи врѣмѣнѣ погрѣшнвшии прѣсѡлѣ
14. спїтншіе архнѣпїе'. Мнѡга же рѣкше н дѣавше, како оубо вѡ
15. <...>мѣ на сн' съзытн, ѡбѣ'нн кѣ вѣмѡ ѡслабн коиць, пѣщадѣмѡ
16. <...>ѣше. сѣ ѡнѣ' мала нѣкаа прѣдѡвѣ'насѡаше пѣвїю кѣ зрѣ
17. <...>о. пѡвнзѡютъ прѣно на себѣ сѣе съзванїе, ѡко ѡ црѣн съспрн
18. <ѣ>млахѡ пнсѣнїа повелѣнїа ѡправдѣнїн' ѡмнѣ ѡсѣцаахѡ лѣпноѣ
19. повелѣнїе' н на вѣсѡва7н пѣ' подѡюции по расѡѡнїю коѣможе'
20. <т>ѡко оубѡ пѡбѣе7ь сѣцеваа нмѣ глѣтн н не всѡко сѣн заключн
21. <п>н. равнѡ оубо н рѣтѣ кѡ дрѡгын ѡко пѣвїю ннїашнѣмѡ архнѣ
22. рѣѡ прнлѡчн сѣ сѣн прѣсѡтн сѣцевыи с7арѣн ѡ ншго блгѡутн
23. <в>ѡго црѣвїа ключьсѡва' н коупно н црѣмѣ ѡнѣ' велнкыи тѣ
24. цднїемѣ ѡко рѣхѡ рѣкше ѡ сѣн прѣлагаахѡ, ѡ ншго црѣвїа
25. досѣже ѡ' по ѡбразѡ поутн' коупно же аще н ѡсѡу вѣ нїеже е'
26. погѡвлѣн'но ѡко да н завѣцднїе мн ѡ нїѣн велнчншїе съ
27. спнѡдемѣ, пѣже послѣдѡвѣтелно помѡ, н прѡвѣно бїтн вѣ
28. спрнѣмѡ7н коиць ѡ сн' прѡшенїн' прнвѣщаше во сѣ не съ мало ѡ мо
29. егѡ црѣвїа. аще сѣн нзрѣсѡва7н до вѡнаа кѣ сѣврѣшен'нѣн
30. шн съ на' блгомїслїе' н моѣ' самѡѣ црѣвїе сѣце ѡ сн' завѣца7н.

3V

1. прѣже вѡ завѣщаѡи сѣ, ѣ' ѡсѡи архіерѣнскѡе доѡаніе ѣ' Ѡ на' жнѣсѣѡа
2. далѣ Ѡбѣиде лѣпо' н прѣвѡсѣѡа сѣмоу сѡпрѣвѡвѡтн по подѡннѡ пом
3. ѡ нѡее дръжавы ѡсѡен' понѣ' н сѡвнше помѡ н ѣ' архіерѣнсѡа ѡсѡа
4. ше прѣсѡоль. не велнко оубо ѡко н мнѡ Ѡ сѣ' бѡу бѡхѡм сѡдѣлате
5. лѣ по сѡен'нынѡ дплѣ. прѣ'рѡднше' оубо сѡа, ѡ' н самѡ собою сѡвѡ
6. нѡсн, ѣ' добродѣтлѣен ѣмоу сѡщаа' малы бѡтн сѣмоу прнскрьн <...>
7. зѡрнн. Ѡ'ѡже ѣ' слѡ показѡнїа, по мнѡгыѡ Ѡ прѣмѡдрѡсѡи
8. слѡ сѡсѡопѣ. ѡко да не н дрѡгаа по ѡнслѡ же ѣлнkaa оубо Ѡ всѡ
9. кѡ бѡгыѡ ѡѡвѡіаютъ. Понѣ' оубо бѡжѣн'нѣншїа сѡа нѡсѡннїа
10. нїа прѣваа, н бѡлгарѡ всѣ' архіерѣпїа. сѣ оубо кѡ нѡмѡ црѣвїю
11. слѡ пѡвнже. н сѡ бѡвѣнїемѡ прѡвѣнѡе кѡпно прѣва бѡтн нмже
12. Ѡ нїен сѣн сѡтѣншѣн архіерѣпїн досеѡѡтн ѡ' Ѡ нїен рѣннынѡ сѡе
13. ннынѡ црквы ѡ мнѡгыѡ лѣ ѡ нже ѡ на' архіерѣн Ѡ непраѡднѡе,
14. ѡко' рнше слѡ прѡіавн' ѡ бѡ црѣвїе мн оумнлн се дѡтн пѡ кѡ <...> лѣ  
[In line 14, the penultimate letter may be д, rather than л.]
15. нїю нмже н ходаѡнсѡѡѣтъ ѡвїе насѡоѣщѡ' хрсѡвѡла слѡ <о >ен
16. н Ѡ нже оубо ѡ пѡѡжыхъ сн' ѡсѡен сѡдрѡжнмѡ, архіерѣн с<...>  
[In line 16, ѡ is corrected from н in пѡѡжыхъ.]
17. нже оубо н самїн прѣ'нѡложѣнннѡ вѡспрнѣмлю сѡнѡтцн нн<...>
18. по ѡѡвѡлѡ мнѡжае. ѡко не оубо ѡ нѡго нншнїаго сѡврѡш<...>
19. наѡѣл'сѡ. нлн ѡко бѡпекѡщѣ' Ѡ сѣн, ѣ' ѣсѡ на себѣ на прѣвѣ
20. ѣ'зѣмѡ. кѡко оубо бѡгоѡлн' н сн' ѣ' наѡѣлнынѡ ѡ' ѡннѣ ѣ'зѡ <од>н'
21. н Ѡщаа грѣ' сѡѡѡѡѣтъ оужѡ доѡнїа. Сѣ ѡѡ насѡоѣѣе по
22. ѣелѡѡѣтъ бѡгоѡтнѡѡа нѡа дръжава' н поѡѡѡѡѣтъ н запо
23. велѡѡѡѣ. да Ѡблѡ нмѡтѡ бѡжѣн'нѣншїн сѡ архіерѣпѣ' вѣ ѣ' Ѡ нїѡ.
24. сѡтѣншѣю архіерѣпїею досеѡѡтн всѣ архіерѣнскїе црквы ѣлн
25. кѡ нѡлѡжнше' сѡнѡкѡ Ѡсѡѡвннѡ ѡ бѡгрѣнѡрѡнѡаѡго н прѣо
26. помннмѡго црѡ васнлїа бѡлгарѡѡѡнѡе Ѡсѡѡвшаа' да нн ѡ
27. коѡго ѡ вѡ' архіерѣн ѡ пѣ' рѣннынѡ Ѡбразѣ кѡн лнхѡнмсѡѡѣте'
28. н нже дрѡвннмн ѡнѣмн лѣты на сѣн сѡбрѡвшѡмѡ врѣменю. по
29. слѡдн нзрннѡ пѣ ѡ своѣ' наѡѣлсѡѡѡтн наѡѣл'сѡа сѣн Ѡ себѣ ѣ'злѡ
30. вн пѡ. пакы ѡ сѣе посѡѡвѡлѣн'нынѡ н архіерѣнсѡѡѡен сѣн прнлѡѡѡен се,

## 4R

1. дѡвнѣ да покарѡе7 се блжѣн'нѣншему сѣмоу архнѣпѣѡ. ѡ всѡ дль<sup>ѣ</sup>
2. да бѣздѡ ѡко по снмѣ покарѡѣ. к7о же ѡ въ свое<sup>ѣ</sup> свѣнше оу<sup>ѣ</sup>с7а
3. влѣн'нѣ науел'сѣѣ ѡлн ѡнако кѡко съврѣшнѣѡ. ѡ не полѣжещѣю
4. сѣю спѣншѣю архнѣпѣію ѣднѡ<sup>ѣ</sup> кѡго. ѡлн ѡ двѡ ѡ вѣщшнѣ
5. ѡ бѣ ѣлнко оубѡ прѡс7о свое мѣры по юже архнѣрѣнскою цркѣю
6. врѣме сѣложѣн'ное кѣ самѡн прѣн7н. ѡ снѡ ѡлн сн' ѡбѣ по
7. гѣбнѡ7н, по спѣншѣю архнѣпѣію ѡ ѡбѣ ѡс7аѡтн се. ѡ
8. ѡа ѡще к7о сн' ѡлн ѡнѣ ѡмѡ прѣбѣлѡжн7н прѡвѡ не ѡ пнса
9. ннѡго повелѣннѡ нѣкоѣ спѣи црѣн, ѣлнцн по блжѣнѣ бѣ црѣ
10. багрѣнорѡнѡаго блѣгарооубнцѣ вѡснлнѡ, вѡжѡ грѣѣска<sup>ѣ</sup>
11. науѣ ѡ прѣѣмшн ѡ нсправлѡющн сѣврѣшен'но прѣпѡмнн
12. мнѣ багрѣнорѡннѣ црѣмѣ комнннѡ манѡуѡлѡ. ѡвѡ сѣи сн
13. цѣва прѣвосѣѣнннѡ прѣоуѡго7овлѡѣ бѣ нѡѣ црѣвнѣ, ѡ н7ѣ
14. ѡвлѡѣ цркѡю оуѡ прѡвѡ, прѣвѣва7н по своѣмоу 7нѡу
15. <ѡ> ннѡгѡ ѡскрѣблѡемѣ. ѡже оубѡ внше ѣже ѡще ѡ прнѡѡ
16. <ѡн се> кѡко нѡ сн' коѡ оубѡ повелѣннѡ багрѣнорѡннѣ ѡ само
17. <дрѣжѣ>цѣ вѡснлнѣ прѣн7лѡженннѣ свѣтѡ, ѡс7авлѣннѡ заклѡѡн
18. <...> ѡже по багрѣнорѡннѣ ѡ блжѣн'нннѣ комнннѡ самѣ црѣ
19. <...> рѡвно же ѡ ѡмѡ прѣвнн оумѣ ѡ оубѡ ѡ црѣ ѡправѡннѣ: пѣ
20. мже ѡ ѡже по ѡнѣмѣ нѡ прнклѡѡѡющнмн се послѣдоѡѡтн н ѡѡ
21. <с> ѡлнѡннѣ бѣмѣнѡемѣ, ѡкѡ ѡ въ мѡлѣ лѣпо прѣнѣѣ. ѡ ѡ сн'
22. цркѡго сѣго н7рнѡѡхѡ, нѣпрнѣтнѡ нмѣтн сѣ повелѣбѡемѣ.
23. сѣ же глѣѣ, не ѡкѡ ѡ снѣбѡѡ прѣпѡмнннѡѡ црѣн длѣжнѡѣ зѣѣ
24. зѡс7ѡпѡтн, мѣи не хѡцѣмѣ. нѣ ѡко оубѡ прѡвѣдно ѡ сѣзѡрнхѡ
25. пѡѣѣ: ѡко ѡще к7о оубѡ ѡнѣ рѡвно 77ѡ снѣѣво нѡ архнѣпѣію
26. прѡвѣно пос7нже вѣѡнннѣтн, ѡ вѣс7ѡѡщѣѣ оубѡ нѡѡжѣ, прн  
[In line 26, y is corrected from y in оубѡ.]
27. клѡѡѡющѡмоу се нападѣннѡ врѣмѣннѡго нѣнаѡѡѡннѡ. по оу
28. мѡ же снѣѣѣѣ сѣдрѣжѡ7н ѡ сѣдѣѡтн: ѡнакѡ бо кѡко ѡще бѡ
29. дѣ, ѡ нѣс7нннѡ познѡннѡ ѡнѡ зрѣннѡ, ѡко нн ѡще ѡнѣ блѣгнѣ
30. црѣмѣ самѡѣ сѣблѡс7н блѣгоѡѡѡннѣ, кѣ прѡѡвлѣн'ннѣ прѣ



## Sinait. 508 (976) — Ohrid Chrysobull

(2V) (π. 113<sup>a</sup>) Ἡ περὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν βασιλέων μετὰ τέλος εὐλάβεια μέγα μὲν τὸ θεοφιλὲς ὑπεμφαίνει, πολὺ δὲ [καὶ] μετὰ τοῦ εὐλόγου φέρει τὸ δίκαιον ὁμοῦ τε γὰρ εὐγνωμοσύνης ἀποφέρεται δόξαν καὶ δεῖγμα πάντως οὐχὶ μικρὸν τοῦ πρὸς θεὸν σεβάσματος γίνεται, εἴ γε δὴ καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰ τῆς τιμῆς διαβαίνει, τὸν αὐτοὺς βασιλεύσαντα· ὅτι δὲ (δεῖ codd.; τῶν вставлено) τῶν ἄλλων τιμὴ καὶ βασιλεῖ χρεῶν πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τοῖς γε δὴ τῷ χρόνῳ πλείστον προειληφόσι τὸ πρεσβείον ἀποπέμειν κατὰ ἄλληλον, ὡς ἂν εἰ τῶν ὁμολογουμένων περιετύγχανεν (παρετύγχανεν) ὄν, οὐδὲ μῶς προσδεῖται τῆς ἀποδείξεως· ἀλλ' ἵνα γοῦν ἐντεῦθεν τὸν σκοπὸν τοῦ λόγου παραγυμνώσωμεν, φθάει ποτὲ καὶ ὁ ἐν βασιλεύσειν ἀοίδιμος Ἰουστινιανὸς ἐκεῖνος, ὁ μὴ μόνον τὸν ἅπαντα τῆς ἀρχῆς χρόνον μέγα τὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔργοις διασώσας ἐπίδοξον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ μνήμῃ καταλειοπῶς περιφανῶς διαρκούσαν τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν γε ἤκουσαν εὐκλειαν, σπουδῆν τινα προμηθείας οὐχ ὅπως καὶ λεχθῆναι ῥαδίως (ραδίως) περὶ τὴν ἀγιωτάτην ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν Βουλγαρίας ἐπιδειξάμενος, ἣν δὴ καὶ Πρώτην Ἰουστινιανὴν (π. 113<sup>b</sup>) ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας κλήσεως [κατ]ωνόμασεν. ἄτε δὴ οὖν πατρίδα ταύτην λαχὼν — ταύτην γὰρ λόγος ἔχει τῆς σωματικῆς αὐτῷ κατάρξει γενέσεως — πάντα διετέλει ποιῶν καὶ διὰ σπουδῆς μεγίστης ἐτίθετο, πῶς ἂν ἀξίως ἑαυτοῦ τὰ τροφεῖα ταύτη μεγαλοτελῶς ἀποτίσῃ κἀπὶ πλείστον προαγάγῃ καὶ τιμῆς καὶ λαμπρότητος. ὅθεν καὶ μακρὸν ἂν εἴη καταριθμῆναι, ὅπόσον αὐτῇ παρὰ τὰς ἄλλας τὸ πρεσβείον ἀπέδοτο, καὶ ὅσας αὐτὴν ἐσέμνυνε προτερήμασι καὶ ὅσας αὐτῶν ἐπ' ἀρχιερατεία τετιμημένων ἐκκλησιῶν περὶ ταύτην ἀφώρισε, πλὴν ὅτι πολλάττα καὶ μεγάλα ταύτην ἀποσεμνύνας καὶ ἅπερ ἂν βασιλέως ἔχει δοῦναι γνώμη φιλότιμος, ἐφ' οἷς ὁμοιοῦντα καὶ τὸν ἀγιωτάτον ἐκεῖνον ἔσχε τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης πάπαν Βιγίλιον, ἐπὶ μᾶλλον αὐτῇ τῆς εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐ[π]εφρόντισε δόξης, καὶ ὅπως ἂν παραμένειν τὰ τῆς ὑπεροχῆς παντὶ τῷ χρόνῳ διαδιδόμενα, ἔνθεν τοι καὶ χρυσοβούλλοις ταῦτα λόγοις καὶ βασιλικοῖς (καὶ βασιλικοῖς προπηγ.) ἐκράτυνε διατάγματασιν. ἔμενε γοῦν ἐπιπολὺ τῆς οἰκείας δόξης ἐμφορουμένη (end of 2V; break in Slavic text) ... (3R) διεκτεθῆναι κατὰ ῥῆμα τὰ προεκτεθειμένα σιγίλλια τοῦ διαληφθέντος πορφυρογεννοῦς αὐτοκράτορος, ἵν' ἐντεῦθεν εἰεν ἐγνωσμένα κατ' ὄνομα. εἶχε μὲν οὖν οὕτω ταῦτα μέχρι πολλοῦ· καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἐφεξῆς εὐσεβῶν βασιλέων τῷ γε τούτου σκοπῷ λαβόντες γνώμην ἀκόλουθον, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ οὗτοι περὶ τὴν ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν ἐνεδείξαντο. ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ φιλεῖ πολλάκις μὴ πρὸς τέλος παραμένειν, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὅπου δὴ καὶ (π. 121<sup>b</sup>) συνεχῶς μετακινεῖσθαι τὰ πράγματα, οὐδ' ἐπ' αὐτῇ τὰ τελεσθέντα τῷ μακαρίτῃ τούτῳ βασιλεῖ διέμεινεν ἀπερίτρεπτα. ἀλλ' ἴσχυσε καὶ αὐθις κατὰ τούτων ὁ χρόνος καὶ ἡ ἐντεῦθεν ἄλλοτ' ἄλλως ἐπισυμβαίνουσα σύγχυσις, καὶ δὴ τῶν τοιούτων ἱερῶν ἐκκλησιῶν πολλαὶ μὲν καὶ ἐφεξῆς ὑπὸ τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἀρπαγεῖσαι κατέστησαν, πολλὰ δὲ πάλιν ἐπαλλήλοισι ταῖς αἰτίαις εἰ μὴ ὅσον ἂν γε ἤκη αἰτιᾶσθαι τινα πρὸς τούμφανες τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων περίπτωσιν, ἄλλαι παρ' ἄλλοις τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχιερέων

γεγόνασιν. έντεϋθεν πολλοί μὲν κατ' άλλους άλλος καιρούς τῶν διέπειν λαχόντων τὸν θρόνον τῆς άγιωτάτης ταύτης άρχιεπισκοπῆς, πολλά τε εἰπόντες καὶ πράξαντες πῶς ἂν γένοιτο τούτοις ταύτας έπανελθεῖν, ὅμως πρὸς μηδέν άνύσαι τέλος τὸ σπουδαζόμενον έδοξαν. τοῦτο δέ τισιν εκείνων μικρὸν κέρδους παρέιχε μόνον πρὸς τὸν σκοπὸν άνακινουσίην αἰεὶ τὴν εἰς έαυτοὺς αὐτῶν έπανάκλησιν, ὅτι παρὰ βασιλέων έλάμβανον (π. 122<sup>a</sup>) έγγράφους προσταγὰς δικαιοώσεων, οἰοεὶ διατεμνόντων τὴν τῶν χρόνων έπίτασιν καὶ άρχὴν εκείνους παρεχόντων κατὰ διαστάσεις εκάστοτε, πῶς ἂν έξέσται τοῖς τοιούτοις λαλεῖν καὶ μὴ τὴν δίκην παντελῶς αὐτοῖς άποκλείεσθαι. ἴσως δ' ἂν καὶ φαίη τις έτερος, ὡς μόνῃ δὴ τῷ νῦν άρχιερατικῶς λαχόντι ταύτης προϋστασθαι τοῦτ' αὐτὸ πρεσβεῖον παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβοῦς βασιλείας έταμιεύετο, ἵν' ἅμα μὲν καὶ βασιλεύσιν εκείνους, οἱ μεγάλην τὴν σπουδὴν ὡς γε έφθημεν εἰπόντες ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς κατεβάλοιντο, παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας βασιλείας άποσωθείη τὰ τῆς προσηκούσης αἰδοῦς, ἅμα δὲ κάντεϋθεν εἴη καταφανές, ὅπόσον δὴ καὶ διαθέσεως ἡμεῖς περὶ αὐτὸν μεγίστης εκτρέφομεν. ὅθεν άκολούθως αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ εἶναι λαμβάνειν πέρας παραντὰ τῶν αίτήσεων μετέσχε γάρ οὐκ εἰς μικρὸν εκ τῆς έμῆς βασιλείας, άλλ' έαυτὸν(?) διερεθίζειν ικανὰ πρὸς τελεωτάτην περὶ ἡμᾶς εὐνοίαν καὶ τὴν έμῆν δὲ αὐθις βασιλείαν οὕτως περὶ αὐτὴν διατίθεσθαι. (3V) πρὶν γάρ ἡ (π. 122<sup>b</sup>) περιτεθῆναι τούτῳ τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς άρχιερατείας αξίωμα, τῆς περὶ ἡμᾶς τε οἰκειώσεως μακρὸν άπέλαυσε χρόνον καὶ τὰ τῆς άγιωτάτης αὐτῷ συνυπήρχε προήγοντα μετὰ τῶν άποδοδομένων αὐτῷ παρὰ τοῦ ἡμετέρου κράτους τιμῶν. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄνωθεν αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ τῆς άρχιερωσύνης επεψήφιστο θρόνος, οὐ μέγα εἰπεῖν, ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τουτῷ θεοῦ γεγόναμεν συνεργοὶ κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν καὶ θεῖον άπόστολον. προήγηνται μὲν οὖν ταῦτα. ἃ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀφ' έαυτοῦ συνεισφέρει, τὸ τῆς άρετῆς αὐτῷ περιὸν ὀλίγους εἶναι τούτῳ παραπλησίους ποιεῖ. τὰ δ' ἐς τὴν τῶν λόγων παιδείαν μετὰ τῶν οἷς πολὺς (cod. perepravliet iz πολλοῖς v πολλῦς.) ἐπὶ σοφία λόγος συνάπτεται, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τάλλα καταριθμοῦμεν, ὅποσα τὸν διὰ πάντων άγαθὸν άποφαίνουσιν. ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ μακαριώτατος οὗτος τῆς Πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς καὶ Βουλγαρίας πάσης άρχιεπίσκοπος ἤδη πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν βασιλείαν καὶ τὸν περὶ τούτων λόγον κεκοινώνηκε καὶ σὺν τῷ εὐλόγῳ δικαίαν ἅμα προϋτεινεν αίτησιν πρὸς τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν δὴ ταύτην άγιωτάτην άρ(π. 123<sup>a</sup>)χιεπισκοπὴν έπανασωθῆναι τὰς ἐφ' αἷς τῶν εἰρημένων άρχιερατικῶν εκκλησιῶν ἀπὸ πολλοῦ τοῦ χρόνου παρὰ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν άρχιερέων, ἡδίκηται ὡς ἄνω διῶν ὁ λόγος έδήλωσεν, ἡ εκ θεοῦ βασιλεία μου επικλινὲς παρέσχε τούτῳ πρὸς τὴν δέησιν οὗς καὶ έπιβραβεύει παραντὶκα τὸν παρόντα χρυσόβουλλον αὐτῆς. καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τῶν άλλοτρίων μέρους κατεχομένων άρχιερατικῶν εκκλησιῶν, ἃς δὴ καὶ ταύτας τὰ προεκτεθειμένα διαλαμβάνει σγίλλια, οὐδέν άποφαινόμεθα πλέον, ὅτι μηδ' ὑπὸ τὴν ἡμετέραν άρτίως διατελοῦσιν άρχὴν, ἡ ὅτι θεῷ μελήσει περὶ αὐτῶν, ᾧ καὶ πάντα τὰ καθ' έαυτοὺς αναρτῶμεν, πῶς ἂν εἰ εὐδοκήσει, καὶ ταύτας εἰς τὴν άρχαίαν εκείνην τάξιν έπαναγάγη καὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Ῥωμαίων έπισυνάψοι σχολιόνματι. τὸ δ' οὖν παρὸν θεσπίζει τὸ εὐσεβὲς ἡμῶν κράτος καὶ προστάσει

καὶ διατάττεται, ἵν' ἄδειαν ἔχει τοαποτοῦδε ὁ μακαριώτατος οὗτος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος πρὸς τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν ἀγιωτάτην ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν ἐπανασώσασθαι πάσας (π. 123<sup>b</sup>) τὰς ἀρχιερατικὰς ἐκκλησίας, ὅσαι τοῖς προεκτεθείσι σιγλλίοις τοῦ διαληφθέντος πορφυρογεννοῦς καὶ αἰοιδίμου βασιλέως Βασιλείου τοῦ Βουλγαροκτόνου διελημμέναι παρ' οἰουδήτηνος τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχιερέων οἰωδήτην τῶν εἰρημένων τρόπων πεπλεονέκτηται· καὶ ἦτις μὲν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἐκείνοις χρόνοις ὑπ' αὐτὴν συνετάττετο, καιρῷ δὲ ὕστερον ἀποσεισασμένη τὸ ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἄρχεσθαι ἄρχειν αὐτῆ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἠγάπησε μᾶλλον, πάλιν ὑπ' αὐτὴν κατασταίη καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερατεῦεν τῆς τοιαύτης λαχῶν (4R) πνευματικῶς ὑποταγείη τῷ μακαρίῳ τούτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ ἅπαν τὸ κατ' ὀφειλὴν ἀποδώσει, ὡς ὑπὸ τούτῳ ταπτόμενος. εἴ τις δὲ καὶ εἰς ἰδίαν ἄνωθεν καθισταμένη ἀρχὴν ἢ ἄλλως πως διατελοῦσα καὶ μὴ ὑποκειμένη τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ μίαν τινα ἢ καὶ δύο καὶ πλείους, καὶ εἰς ὅσον ἂν ἀπλῶς ἤκοιεν μέτρον τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὴν ἀρχιερατικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῷ καιρῷ ξυνεπιτεθείσα πρὸς ἑαυτὴν μεθεικύσατο καὶ ταύτην ἢ καὶ ταύτας παρευθὺς ἀπολύση ὑπὸ τὴν ἀγιωτά(π. 124<sup>a</sup>)τὴν ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν καὶ αὐθὺς καθίστασθαι, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τις τούτων τε κάκεινων ἔχει προβαλέσθαι δικαίωσιν ἐξ ἐπιγράφου διαταγῆς τινὸς τῶν αἰοιδίμων βασιλέων, ὅσοι μετὰ τὸν μακαριστὸν ἐν βασιλεῦσι τὸν πορφυρογεννῆ Βουλγαροκτόνον Βασιλείον τὴν ἡγεμόνα τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴν καὶ κατεδέξαντο καὶ διῦθνον, σὺν τελευταίῳ δὴ τῷ ἀεμνήστῳ προφυρογεννεί βασιλεῖ τῷ Κομνηνῷ Μανουῆλ· ὁ γὰρ τοι τοιοῦτος ἀρχιερεὺς προσκομίζων εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν βασιλείαν καὶ διεμφανίζων τὴν βασιλικὴν ἐκείνην δικαίωσιν διαμενεῖ κατὰ τὴν οἰκειάν τάξιν παρὰ μηδενὸς διοχλούμενος· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄνω εἴ τι καὶ συμβέβηκέ πως ἐπὶ ταύταις οἰασοῦν περιπετείας, ὁ πορφυρογεννῆς ἐκείνος αὐτοκράτωρ Βασίλειος διὰ τῶν προεκτεθέντων τούτου σιγλλίων διαλελυκῶς ἀπεκλείσατο. τὰ δὲ μετὰ τὸν πορφυρογεννῆ καὶ μακαρίτην Κομνηνὸν Μανουῆλ ἐκείνον αὐτάνακτα εἴ τις ἴσως γε καὶ ἔχει προτείνειν οἰονοῦν ἐκ βασιλέως δικαίωμα, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ μετ' ἐκείνον (π. 124<sup>b</sup>) ταῖς ἐπισυμβαίνουσαις ἐπηκολουθηκένας μᾶλλον συγχύσει λογιζόμεθα, ὅτι καὶ μικρὸν ὁ χρόνος προέβη καὶ παραυτὰ τῆς βασιλίδος ταύτης ἐξώσθημεν, μὴ τὸ στέργον ἔχειν τοῦτο διαταπτόμεθα. τοῦτο δὲ φαμεν οὐχ ὅτι δὴ καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις αἰοιδίμοις βασιλεῦσι τὴν ὀφειλομένην αἰδῶ διασφύζειν ἡμεῖς οὐ βουλόμεθα, ἀλλ' ὅτι γε δικαίως ὑπειλήφαμεν μᾶλλον ὡς ἂν εἴ τις γε ἐκείνων ἴσως τι τοιούτου ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς δικαίων ἐφθασε διατάξασθαι ἐκτὸς ἰσταμένης ἂν ἀνάγκης τῶν ἐπισυμβαίνουσῶν περιπτώσεων τῆς καιρικῆς ἀνωμαλίας, κατὰ νοῦν τε τὸ τοιούτου ἔσχε καὶ διεπράξατο· ἐτέρως γὰρ πῶς ἂν οἰήσετο τις ἀληθῆς ἐπινώμων τοῦ ἐκείνων σκοποῦ, ὡς οὐκ ἂν κάκεινοις ἀγαθοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἢ αὐτῇ συνετηρεῖτο εὐλάβεια πρὸς τοὺς δηλωθέντας (4V) πρὸς αὐτὸν αὐτοκράτορας, ἐφ' οἷς ἐκείνοι διεφθάσαντο πράξαντες. ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ γέ φιλανθρώπως (φιλάνως cod.) θεὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπανήγαγεν εἰς τὸ πατρῶον τοῦτο καὶ βασιλείον ἔδαφος, τί μὴ καὶ αὐτοί, ὅσον εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν δύναμιν ἤκει διὰ τῆς ἄνωθεν χάριτος, (π. 125<sup>a</sup>) τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ κατὰ τὸν τοῦ εἰκότος σύμβαλλοίμεθα λόγου, καὶ τὰ πρεσβεῖα

προσαποδοίημεν τρόπον, ὃν διὰ τοῦ παρόντος χρυσοβούλλου διεξεθέμεθα, καὶ ἅμα μὲν θεῶ τε καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ τὸ προσήκον ἔνθεν ἀφοσιώσαιμεν, εἰς ὃν καὶ τὰ τῆς τοιαύτου διαβαίνει τιμῆς, καθὼς ἅμα δὴ καὶ τῷ τοῦ λόγου κατάρξαι παραντικά διεσημηνάμεθα, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὴν ὀφειλομένην ἀποτίσαιμεν χάριν τοῖς φιλευσεβέσιν ἐκείνοις μακαριστοῖς αὐτοκράτορσιν, ὧν ὁ μὲν τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ δεξιὰ τις ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐγεγόνει τῶν μεγάλων καὶ τιμῶν καὶ πρεσβείων ἀρχῆ, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐφεξῆς καλῶς ποιούντες τῶν ἐκείνῳ περὶ ταύτην δοξάντων ἐξ ἑαυτῶν παρέσχον ἀσφάλειαν. προσέσται τοίνυν ὁ παρῶν χρυσοβούλλος τῆς βασιλείας ἡμῶν τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ ταύτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ πάσης Βουλγαρίας τῇ καὶ Πρώτῃ Ἰουστινιανῇ εἰς διαρκούσαν τῶν εἰρημένων βεβαίωσιν, ὁ καὶ ἀπολυθεὶς κατὰ μῆνα τοῦτον τῆς ἐνισταμένης Ἰνδικτιῶνος τοῦ ἑξακισχιλιοστοῦ ἑπτακοσιοστοῦ ὀγδοηκοστοῦ ἔτους, (π. 125<sup>b</sup>) ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ ἡμέτερον εὐσεβὲς καὶ θεοπρόβλητον ὑπεσημηνάτο κράτος: — (End of Slavic text)

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>I am grateful to Panagiotis A. Agapitos and Paul Hollingsworth for comments and suggestions, and particularly for assistance with the Greek text, to András Riedlmayer for help with the Hungarian commentary in Wenzel 1870, to V.A. Dybo for bringing Muz. 3070 to my attention, and to Robert Mathiesen for advice on numerous problems of this manuscript. They are not, of course, responsible for any error of fact or interpretation. This research was assisted by grants from the Joint Committee on Soviet Studies of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies with funds provided by the U.S. Department of State, from the National Graduate Fellowship Program, from the Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Fellowship Program, and from the International Research and Exchanges Board.

<sup>2</sup>Голубинский, Е. *Краткий очерк истории православных церквей болгарской, сербской и румынской или молдо-валашской*. Москва. 1871. 126–27, 258–63; Дринов, Марин С. 1873/1911. “Три грамоти дадени от императора Василий II на Българский Охридски архиепископ Иоан около 1020 лято.” *Съчинения* 2. 205–08; Дринов, Марин С. 1873/1911. “Въпрос за българската и сръбската църкви пред съдилището на Лионский събор в 1274 год.” *Съчинения* 2. 224; Иречек, Константин. [= Konstantin Josef Jireček.] 1876/1978. *История на българите*. София: Наука и изкуство. (NB: The first edition appeared simultaneously in Czech and German in 1876. I cite from the 1978 Bulgarian edition, edited by P. Petrov, which is a combination of the 1929 Bulgarian edition, edited by V.N. Zlatarski, and Jireček's notes for a projected revised edition, which were edited by St. Mladenov and first published separately in 1939.) 320–32; Hertzberg, Gustav Friedrich. 1883. *Geschichte der Byzantiner und des Osmanisches Reiches bis gegen Ende des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts*. Berlin. 430; Gelzer, Heinrich. 1893. “Ungedruckte und wenig bekannte Bistümerverzeichnisse der orientalischen Kirche.” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* II. 41–42; Gelzer, Heinrich. 1897. “Abriß der byzantinischen Kaisergeschichte.” In Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*. 2. Aufl. München. 1053; Gelzer, Heinrich. 1902. *Das Patriarchat von Achrida. Geschichte und Urkunden*. [Abhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften XX:5.] Leipzig. 13; Marc, Paul. 1903. *Plan eines Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der Neueren Zeit*. München. 98; Norden, Walter. 1903. *Das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Trennung der beiden Mächte und das Problem ihrer Wiedervereinigung bis zum Untergang des byzantinischen Reichs (1453)*. Berlin. 483–84; Новаковић, Стојан. 1908. “Охридска архиепископија у почетку XI века.” *Глас српске краљевске академије LXXVI*. У Београду. 1–3; Иречек, Константин. [= Konstantin Josef Jireček.] 1911/1922. *Историја срба*. Београд. 237; de Thallóczy, Ludovicus, Constantinus Jireček et Emilianus de Sufmay. 1913. *Acta et diplomatica. Res Albaniae mediae aetatis*. I. Vidobonae. #281; Снегаров, Иван. 1924. *История на Охридската архиепископија. Първи том*. София. 157–58; Charman, Conrad. 1926. *Michel Paléologue. Restaurateur de l'empire byzantin (1261–1282)*. Paris. 91–92; Dölger, Franz. 1932. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches. Teil III. (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit, Reihe A, Abt. 1.)* München–Berlin. #1992; Селищев, Афанасий Матвеевич. 1934. “Завет первой юстиниани.” *Македонски преглед IX/2*. 12–13; Станојевић, Ст. 1935. “Краљ Урош.” *Годишњица Николе Чушића XLIV*. 164; Ostrogorsky, George. 1969. *History of the Byzantine State*. New Brunswick: Rutgers. (English translation of the third German edition of 1963.) 457; Динић, М. 1961. “Comes Constantinus.” *Зборник радова византолошког института* 7. 2; and Dölger, Franz. 1977. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches. Teil III. (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit, Reihe A, Abt. 1.)* Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Peter Wirth. München. #1989a.

<sup>3</sup>Dölger 1932:#1992, Dölger 1977:#1989a.

<sup>4</sup>Dölger, Franz. 1924. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches. Teil I. (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit, Reihe A, Abt. 1.)* München–Berlin. #806–08.

David J. Birnbaum

Ohrid Chrysobull

<sup>5</sup>First published in Rhalles, G.A. and M. Potles. 1855. *Σύνταγμα τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, V. Athens. 266–69.

<sup>6</sup>Michael's introduction is reprinted in Wenzel, Gusztáv. 1870. *Codex diplom. arpadianus continuatus*. VIII. [Monumenta Hungariae Historica. Diplomataria XIII.] Pest. 431–34. The excerpt from Basil's edict is reprinted in Zachariae von Lingenthal, Carl Edward. 1857. *Jus Graeco-Romanum. Pars III. Novellae constitutiones*. Lipsiae. 319–20.

<sup>7</sup>It is part of a large XVI–XVII century manuscript; see Бенешевич, В.Н. 1911. *Описание греческих рукописей монастыря Святой Екатерины на Синае*. Том I. С.-Пб. 323–47 for a description of the contents.

<sup>8</sup>Голубинский, *op. cit.*, 259–63.

<sup>9</sup>Бенешевич, *op. cit.*, 542–54.

<sup>10</sup>Gelzer, "Ungedruckte...", 42–46.

<sup>11</sup>Dölger, Franz und Johannes Karayannopoulos. 1968 *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre. Erster Abschnitt: Die Kaiserurkunden*. [Byzantinisches Handbuch im Rahmen des Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaft XII.3.1.1.] München. 123.

<sup>12</sup>*Op. cit.*, 126–27.

<sup>13</sup>*Op. cit.*, 3.

<sup>14</sup>Голубинский, *op. cit.*, 127, 263; Дринов, "Три грамоты...", 207; Дринов, "Въпрос...", 224; Norden, *op. cit.*, 483; de Thallóczy et al., *op. cit.*, #281; Снегаров, *op. cit.*, 157; Chapman, *op. cit.*, 91; Dölger 1932:#1992; Динић, *op. cit.*, 2; and Dölger 1977:#1989a give the date of issue as August 1272. Hertzberg, *op. cit.*, 430; Gelzer, "Ungedruckte...", 42; Gelzer, "Abriß...", 1053; Gelzer, *Das Patriarchat...*, 13; Marc, *op. cit.*, 98; Станојевић, *op. cit.*, 164; and Ostrogorsky, *op. cit.*, 457 give the year as 1272, with no indication of the month.

<sup>15</sup>For descriptions of Muz. 3070 and Zogr. 151 and a discussion of Grigorovič's acquisition of the former, see Birnbaum, David J. 1987. "The Life of Stefan Lazarevič: a Contribution to the Study of the Manuscript Tradition." *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* XXXIV (1986), 7–31.

<sup>16</sup>Serbian despot, 1389–1427. His *Life* was composed in 1431 by Konstantin Kostenečki. See Birnbaum, *op. cit.*, for discussion and bibliography.

<sup>17</sup>*История...*, 321.

<sup>18</sup>Similarly, Jireček, (*Историја...*, 237) explains that "Да нашкоди српској и бугарској автокефалној цркви, порицао им је Михаило правну подлогу, обновивши Охриду старе привилегије Василија II (у авг. 1272), а тако исто и оне, које су ову цркву везивале за старо место Justiniana Prima (1273)."

<sup>19</sup>*Op. cit.*, #281.

<sup>20</sup>Григорович, Виктор Иванович. 1848. *Очерк ученого путешествия по европейской Турции*. [Ученые записки, издаваемые императорским казанским университетом 3.]

<sup>21</sup>There is, however, the following brief comment (pp. 113–14): "С падением первой династии болгарских царей, с властью латинов и деспотов эпирских, наконец с преобладанием сербским, город и эпархия [i.e. Ohrid – DJB] мало помалу теряли свое значение. В целой

истории южных Словян этот пункт быть может, самый темный, и тем не менее в исследовании хода просвещения Словян будет всегда предметом, от раскрытия которого ожидать можно важных пояснений." Grigorovič visited Ohrid in May 1845, and his comments may have been inspired by his already having discovered, during his visit to Zograph some five months earlier, the documents whose absence he laments.

<sup>22</sup>Šafařík, Pavel Josef. 1851/1873. *Pamětky dějného písemnictví jihoslovánův*. [Subsection entitled *Okázky občanského písemnictví*. 1870.] (Vydání druhé, doplňky z pozůstalosti Šafaříkovy rozmnožené, upravil Josef Jireček.) V Praze. 27.

<sup>23</sup>*Op. cit.*, 431, 434. The remarks on p. 431 concerning a signature on the chrysobull are puzzling. These late copies could not, of course, bear the emperor's signature, and Muz. 3070 does not mention Michael's name at all.

<sup>24</sup>*Op. cit.* Dölger's 1977:#1989a reference to Seliščev's 1934 article errs in labeling this South Slavic manuscript as Russian.

<sup>25</sup>As is his treatment of the text of *Life of Stefan Lazarevič*. See Birnbaum, *op. cit.*, for details.

<sup>26</sup>*Op. cit.*, 10.

<sup>27</sup>*Op. cit.*, 12.

<sup>28</sup>Whether the note on the bottom margin of 2V, Ⲅⲃⲱⲣⲁⲙⲏ ⲥⲉ<...> Ⲅⲉⲧⲉⲛⲁⲣⲁ, refers to the missing folia is unclear. This note seems to be in the same hand as the rest of the manuscript, but perhaps in a different ink.

<sup>29</sup>*Op. cit.*, 12.

<sup>30</sup>*История...*, 321.

<sup>31</sup>*Op. cit.*, 11.

<sup>32</sup>*Op. cit.*, 10-11.

<sup>33</sup>*Op. cit.* 542-54.

<sup>34</sup>For a discussion of editorial principles in reproducing accented Slavic manuscripts, see Birnbaum, David J. 1987. "On the Methods of Analyzing Accented Slavic Manuscripts." *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* XXXIV (1986), 123-42.