Breaking New Ground in Marginality

Tendencies in the Bulgarian Orthodox Literary Tradition of the
Seventeenth Century

*Du nouveau dans la marginalité : les tendances dans la tradition littéraire
orthodoxe bulgare du XVII^e siècle*

Dilyana Radoslavova

Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/monderusse/10108>

DOI: 10.4000/monderusse.10108

ISSN: 1777-5388

Publisher

Éditions de l'EHESS

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 July 2017

Number of pages: 503-536

ISBN: 978-2-7132-2697-7

ISSN: 1252-6576

Electronic reference

Dilyana Radoslavova, "Breaking New Ground in Marginality", *Cahiers du monde russe* [Online], 58/3 | 2017, Online since 01 July 2019, connection on 06 January 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/monderusse/10108>; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/monderusse.10108>

DILYANA RADOSLAVOVA

BREAKING NEW GROUND IN MARGINALITY

Tendencies in the Bulgarian Orthodox Literary Tradition of the Seventeenth Century

The seventeenth century was the third century in a row in which Orthodox Bulgarians had been living under Ottoman rule.¹ It was also a time of important social and economic changes that were part of a long process, which was to transform the multi-ethnic and multi-religious empire into the modern (nation) state envisaged by the *Tanzimat* reforms² two centuries later.³ Having long ago lost all political

1. For surveys of this period, see Димитър Косев, ed., *История на България*, 4. *Българският народ под османско владичество* [Dimitŭr Kosev, History of Bulgaria, 4. The Bulgarian People under Ottoman Rule] (София: Издателство на Българската академия на науките, 1983); Machiel Kiel, *Art and Society of Bulgaria in the Turkish Period: A Sketch of the Economic, Juridical and Artistic Preconditions of Bulgarian Post-Byzantine Art and its Place in the Development of the Art of the Christian Balkans, 1360/70-1700. A New Interpretation* (Assen-Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1985); Dennis P. Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century. Slavic Orthodox Society and Culture under Ottoman Rule* (Jefferson, NC – London: McFarland, 1993; reprint 2014); Цветана Георгиева, Николай Генчев, *История на България*, 2. *XV-XIX век* [Tsvetana Georgieva, Nikolai Genchev, History of Bulgaria, 2. 15th-19th Centuries] (София: Издателска къща “Анубис,” 1999); Георги Марков, ed., *История на българите*, 2. *Късно средновековие и Възраждане* [Georgi Markov, History of the Bulgarians, 2. Late Middle Ages and the National Revival] (София: Труд, 2004); Ирина Ф. Макарова, *Българският народ в XV-XVII вв.: Етнокултурно изследване* [Irina F. Makarova, The Bulgarian People in the 15th-18th Centuries: Ethno-cultural Research] (М.: КомКнига, 2005); Раймонд Детрез, *Не търсят гърци, а ромеи да бъдат. Православната културна общност в Османската империя. XV-XIX в.* [Raymond Detrez, They do not Seek to be Greeks but Romans: The Orthodox Cultural Commonwealth in the Ottoman Empire, 15th-19th Centuries] (София: Издателство “Кралица Маб,” 2015).

2. Regarding the *Tanzimat* (“reforms,” “re-arrangements,” “re-organization”), see Gábor Ágoston and Bruce Masters, eds., *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Facts on File, 2009), 553-555 and *passim*.

3. See Rifa’at Ali Abou-El-Haj, *Formation of the Modern State: The Ottoman Empire Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries*, (Albany: SUNY Press, 1991; 2nd ed. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2005). Surveys of the socio-economic dynamics in seventeenth-century Bulgarian lands,

independence and ecclesiastical autonomy,⁴ Orthodox Bulgarians⁵ were to be found during the seventeenth century mostly at the bottom of both the Ottoman social ladder and the Orthodox ecclesiastic structures. In the first place, Orthodox Bulgarians' status as non-Muslims under Ottoman protection (called *dhimmis*)⁶ determined the incorporation of most of them into the lowest social class of the *reaya*.⁷ Secondly, in contrast to Greeks and Serbs, they, although finally encompassed in a single state, lacked an autonomous native-controlled religious institution within the Romaic community⁸ or within what was to be eventually institutionalised in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century as the *millet-i Rum* (Greek Church /

including the transformations in Ottoman landholding and tax-extraction patterns and their impact on the life of Orthodox Bulgarians, are offered in Коцев, ed., *История на България*, 125-257; Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, 1-50; Георгиева, Генчев, *История на България*, 117-124; Макарова, *Българският народ в XV-XVII вв.*, 100-120.

4. Medieval Bulgaria, which at that time was already divided, came to an end with the fall of the Tŭrnovo and the Vidin Principalities under Ottoman rule in 1393 and 1396, respectively. By the mid-fifteenth century the last political remnant of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom—the Patriarchate of Tŭrnovo with its three remaining eparchies—was subordinated to the Patriarchate of Constantinople as its metropolitanate. See Олга Тодорова, *Православната църква и българите, XV-XVIII век* [Olga Todorova, *The Orthodox Church and the Bulgarians: 15th-18th Centuries*] (София: Академично издателство "Проф. Марин Дринов," 1997), 38-46, and additional references therein.

5. In the pre-national(ist) epoch, the ethno-confessional substratum of Orthodox Bulgarians, although (self-) identifiable by specific customs and a particular mother tongue, was not necessarily referred to by its ethnonym within the Ottoman context where only the religious affiliation was relevant. The ethnonym, however, was in use in a multi-ethnic milieu, in contact zones with Serbs, in sources, such as some copies of hagiographic works in the local tradition, prefaces to Romanian Cyrillic printed books, journals of foreign travelers, and others. Nevertheless, Orthodox Bulgarians did not possess an explicit notion of ethnic unity in the modern sense of the term. Knowledge of their history existed as blurred memories in folklore, as rare testimonies in hagiographic accounts in Church Slavonic (not always with positive connotations, for some of them described Bulgarians as pagans or as deviating from Orthodox dogma), in monastery beadrolls listing names of medieval Bulgarian rulers, and in the ecclesiastic tradition in general. For instance, "Bulgarians" and "Bulgaria" were present in titles of Orthodox prelates whose domains encompassed Bulgarian flocks. See more details and further references in Макарова, *Българският народ в XV-XVII вв.*, 77-99; Светлана Иванова, "Преди да се роди българският милет [Svetlana Ivanova, *Before the Bulgarian Millet Was Born*]," in Гиньо Ганев et al., *Държава и църква – църква и държава в българската история* [Gin' o Ganev et al., *State and Church—Church and State in Bulgarian History*] (София: Университетско издателство "Свети Климент Охридски," 2006), 135-184 (p. 160-161 in particular); Raymond Detrez, "Pre-national identities in the Balkans," in Roumen Daskalov, Tchavdar Marinov, eds., *Entangled Histories of the Balkans*, 1 (Leiden-Boston: BRILL, 2013), 13-65 (p. 35-45 in particular); Детрез, *Не търсят гърци, а ромеи да бъдат*, 62-94.

6. In terms of Islamic law, *dhimmis* or *zimmis* ("people of the contract") referred to Christians and Jews, or other monotheists ("people of the book"), who were granted rights to property, livelihood, and freedom of worship in exchange for paying an extra tax (*jizya*) and accepting certain restrictions through which they were subordinated to Muslims. See Ágoston and Masters, *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*, 185-186.

7. This group consisted of ordinary folk as opposed to the privileged ruling *askery* class, or the elite of the military, administrative and religious establishment (ibidem, 616 and passim).

8. The term applies to the entire Orthodox community in the Ottoman Empire and is introduced in the aforementioned studies of Detrez who offers an attempt to describe its characteristics as a "popular proto-nation."

Greek nation).⁹ In the seventeenth century, the territories with Bulgarian population in the historical regions of Moesia, Thrace, and Macedonia were divided among three autocephalous Orthodox churches: the Greek-dominated Patriarchate of Constantinople and Archbishopric of Ohrid,¹⁰ and the Serbian Patriarchate of Peć.¹¹ These churches had complicated relations both among themselves and with the Sublime Porte. The supremacy among them, although not yet *de jure* within the Ottoman law context, belonged to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Its head, seated in the imperial capital, had the opportunity to interfere in the relations of Ohrid and Peć with the Ottoman authorities and, according to his ecumenical status in Orthodox terms, did so and was in fact the leader of Orthodox Christians within the empire.¹² Such a constellation in the Balkan Orthodox ecclesiastic

9. Arguments against the irrelevant use of the term *millet* regarding the non-Muslim religious communities in the pre-national epoch, see in Benjamin Braude, "Foundation Myths of the Millet System," in Bernard Lewis, Benjamin Braude, eds., *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society* (New York – London: Holmes & Meier, 1982), 69-88; reprinted in Benjamin Braude, ed., *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society. The Abridged Edition with a New Introduction* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2014), 65-85. Nevertheless, the term tends to appear even in up-to-date historiographical works and is preferred to the contemporary *tayife* ("group"). For the specifics of the Orthodox millet's development and constitution and for some further bibliography, see, among others, Paraskevas Konortas, "From Tâ'ife to Millet: Ottoman Terms Concerning the Ottoman Greek Orthodox Community," in Dimitri Gondicas, Charles Issawi, eds., *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy, and Society in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton, New Jersey: Darwin Press, 1999), 169-180; Evangelia Balta, "The Exploitation of Otherness in the Economic Advancement of the Rum Millet," *Ο Έρμηνεύτης*, 24 (2003): 139-160; Иванова, "Преди да се роди българският милет".

10. The Archbishopric was established by the Byzantine emperor Basil II (976-1025) in 1018 to replace the Patriarchate of Ohrid. It survived the Ottoman conquest and retained its autocephalous status until its subordination to the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1767. See Иван Снегаров, *История на Охридската архиепископия* [Ivan Snegarov, History of the Archbishopric of Ohrid], 1-2 (2nd reprint ed., София: Академично издателство "Проф. Марин Дринов," 1995).

11. Re-established in 1557, the Patriarchate of Peć retained its autocephaly until 1766 when it was subordinated to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The latter, in fact, had never recognised the patriarchate rank of Peć. Regarding the history of the Serbian Church under Ottoman rule, see Олга Зиројевић, *Цркве и манастири на подручју Пећке патријаршије до 1683. године* [Olga Zirojević, Churches and Monasteries in the Diocese of the Patriarchate of Peć before 1683] (Београд: Историјски институт и ИРО "Народна књига," 1984); Татјана Суботин-Голубовић, *Српско рукописно наслеђе од 1557. године до средине XVII века* [Tatjana Subotin-Golubović, Serbian Manuscript Heritage from 1557 to the Middle of the 17th Century] (=Посебна издања, 640. Одељење језика и књижевности, 51), (Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности, 1999); Ђоко Слијепчевић, *Историја Српске православне цркве, 1. Од покрштавања срба до краја XVIII века* [Đoko Slijepčević, History of Serbian Orthodox Church, 1. From the Conversion of Serbs to the End of the 18th Century] (Београд: Култура, 2002), 196-332; as well as Vladislav B. Sotirović, "The Serbian Patriarchate of Peć in the Ottoman Empire: The First Phase (1557-94)," *Serbian Studies: Journal of the North American Society for Serbian Studies*, 25, 2, (2011): 143-169.

12. See Konortas, "From Tâ'ife to Millet," 176; Олга Тодорова, "Един народ в три патриаршии: Православната църква и българите [Olga Todorova, One People under Three Patriarchates. The Orthodox Church and the Bulgarians]," in Марков, ed., *История на българите*, 197-207; Тодорова, *Православната църква и българите*, 21-105 and passim; Detrez, "Pre-national identities in the Balkans," 26-35; Детрез, *Не търсят гърци, а ромеи да бъдат*, 43-61. For more about the status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Ottoman

establishment had solid historical and cultural roots going back to the so-called “Byzantine Commonwealth”¹³ and was not as yet loaded with acute ethno-centric connotations and visible conflicts on national(ist) grounds. On the contrary, in the seventeenth century, within the Romaic community the traditionally prestigious Greek-language liturgical practice and religious writings, including works in the vernacular, co-existed with other-language Orthodox domestic traditions. Some of them were well established, such as the one in Church Slavonic (the *lingua sacra* of Bulgarians, Serbs, and Wallacho-Moldavians); others were newly developing vernacular-based traditions, such as those in Romanian, Turkish, and Bulgarian. It is another matter as to what extent these non-Greek literary practices were institutionally supported and encouraged and whether they had a chance to develop.¹⁴ In this respect, the presence of the Serbian Church, as an autocephalous establishment with predominantly Slavonic high clergy and a liturgical practice entirely in Church Slavonic, was beneficial to Bulgarian Orthodox culture.¹⁵ The close proximity of the Wallacho-Moldavian principalities, where the Church Slavonic liturgical practice and letters had a sound tradition, had also the potential to be supportive of Slavonic literary activities in Bulgarian-populated lands.¹⁶ One should mention here the role

Empire, see Paraskevas Konortas, *Les rapports juridiques et politiques entre le Patriarcat de Constantinople et l'administration ottomane de 1453 à 1600 (d'après les documents grecs et ottomans)* (PhD. diss., University of Paris I, 1985); Παρασκευάς Κονόρτας, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για τὸ Οικουμενικὸ Πατριαρχεῖο. Βεράτια για τοὺς προκαθήμενους τῆς Μεγάλῆς Ἐκκλησίας (17ος-αρχὴς 20οῦ αἰῶνα)* [Ottoman Views of the Ecumenical Patriarchate: Berats for the Ordinations of the Great Church, 17th to the Early 20th Century] (Αθήνα: Αλεξάνδρεια, 1998); Tom Papademetriou, *Render unto the Sultan. Power, Authority, and the Greek Orthodox Church in the Early Ottoman Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

13. Dimitri Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971).

14. Regarding the “supra-ethnic” nature of Greek-language culture and the various non-Greek language domestic trends within the Romaic community, see Detrez, “Pre-national identities in the Balkans,” 45-62; and Дерез, *Не търсят сърци, а ромей да бъдат*, 62-148. Judging by the geography of Slavonic literary activity in Bulgarian-populated eparchies of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the seventeenth century, which is discussed below, incentives for such an activity, with some very rare exceptions, seemed to be entirely absent in the major ecclesiastic and urban centres with a considerable Greek-language cultural presence.

15. During the seventeenth century Serbian influence was more visible in the traditionally good relations between Bulgarian and Serbian lower clerical circles involved, for instance, in joint literary activity, mainly within the Constantinopolitan diocese, and was probably less due to activities on a higher church administrative level. As shown by the extant manuscripts, the few eparchies with a Bulgarian population located in the periphery of the Peć diocese, including the stauropegic Rila monastery (see Тодорова, *Православната църква и българите*, 68-69) did not enjoy a vigorous literary life.

16. Even though this issue is under-examined, some facts support such a supposition. For instance, seventeenth-century Slavonic books printed in Wallachia were addressed to all the Balkan Slavs. See Virgil Căndeă, “L’humanisme d’Udriște Năsturel et l’agonie des lettres slaves en Valachie,” *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes*, 6, 2 (1968): 239-287 (p. 247, 282 in particular). Some sources from that period testify also to cases of joint work between Bulgarian and Romanian men of letters, as it is pointed out in Margarita Kuyumdzhieva, “On the Interrelations between Wallachia and Bulgarians during the 17th Century: Benefactors and Beneficiaries,” *Revue des études sud-est européennes*, 54 (1-4), 2016: 151-170 (p. 153, note 7). And, last but not least, the general codicological and paleographic similarities

of the pan-Orthodox monastic community on Mount Athos. It was the paramount cultural centre where Bulgarian literati had the opportunity, as either residents or visitors, to benefit from ample monastery libraries, to acquaint with current literary tendencies, and to interact with co-workers of various ethnic backgrounds.¹⁷

Nevertheless, during the period under discussion the absence of a Bulgarian nobility and of a native-controlled church establishment as patrons and promoters of a Slavonic literary tradition was apparent,¹⁸ and sponsorship was handed over mainly to wealthier members of the community who were involved in various services to the Porte or had occupations of special status, such as mining or merchandising.¹⁹ Along with the parish flock, the main pillar of Orthodox faith and culture in the Bulgarian milieu were the lower monastic circles and the parochial clergy. Bulgarian Orthodox monasteries in the seventeenth century, although

between Wallacho-Moldavian manuscripts and books copied in a Bulgarian milieu imply close Bulgarian-Romanian relations that deserve further investigation. See Божидар Райков, "Етрополската калиграфско-художествена школа през XVI-XVII в. Към историята на българския ръкописен орнамент [Bozhidar Raïkov, The Etropole Calligraphic School during the 16th-17th Centuries. Towards the History of Bulgarian Manuscript Ornamentation]," *Известия на Народната библиотека "Кирил и Методий"*, 12(18) (1971): 23-39; and Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, 110-111.

17. For observations on the cultural relations of the Bulgarian lands with Athonite monasteries, and especially with Zograf and Hilandar, see Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, 87-98.

18. There were no recognizable figures of Bulgarian origin in high positions from the Ottoman ruling class or in the ecclesiastical structures who were involved in cultural programs. To a certain degree, the role of noble *ktitori* of Orthodox churches and monasteries in seventeenth-century Bulgarian lands—primarily in the metropolitanate centre of Tŭrnovo and its vicinity, in some Dunabian towns, and in the Peć diocese (Rila monastery)—was played by the Wallachian rulers. See Pavlina Bojčeva, "Sur un acte de donation de Constantin Brâncoveanu à l'Église orthodoxe de Târnovo," *Études balkaniques*, 1 (2001): 71-82; Ivanka Gergova, "Das älteste Gedenkbuch des Rila-Klosters," *Bulgarian Historical Review*, 1-2 (2009): 164-179; Margarita Kuyumdzhieva, "Some Remarks on Donations by the Wallachian Prince Matei Basarab in Bulgarian Territories," in Radu G. Păun, ed., *Histoire, mémoire et dévotion. Regards croisés sur la construction des identités dans le monde orthodoxe aux époques byzantine et post-byzantine* (Seyssel: La Pomme d'or, 2016), 187-206; Eadem, "On the Interrelations between Wallachia and Bulgarians during the 17th Century: Benefactors and Beneficiaries." It was also the regular practice of Bulgarian monasteries to dispatch alms delegations to the Danubian principalities and Russia. See Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, 70. In any case, after the conquest, which put an end to the prestigious Tŭrnovo literary school and forced many Bulgarian prelates and monks to flee to Mount Athos, Serbia, the Romanian principalities, and Russia, the potential for literary activities on a large scale in the Bulgarian lands was for a long time reduced to a minimum.

19. Categories of possible promoters of Orthodox Christian culture during the Ottoman rule are listed in Kiel, *Art and Society of Bulgaria in the Turkish Period*, 56-142; and Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, 18-50. In the seventeenth century, the most substantial financial contributors in the field of Bulgarian Orthodox literacy were mainly representatives of the privileged *reaya*, such as *derbendjis* (guardians of mountain passes), *madancis* (miners), *celeps* (sheep traders), *voynuks* (soldiers in auxiliary military units), workers in *vaqfs* (villages that provided funds for religious institutions), and members of the *esnafs* (guilds). See Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, 53-54. A significant change in the profile of financial support was that individual acts of donations gave way to collective donations. The process was underpinned economically and also correlated with the so-called "tendency towards the democratization of the Church," which presumed a greater involvement of the laity in church affairs. See Тодорова, *Православната църква и българите*, 178-187.

reduced in number and deprived of some of their previous rights as property holders and almost levelled in taxpayer status with the ordinary mass of Christians, continued to play their role as religious centres and take over the duties of parish churches in regions suffering a substantial shortage of parish priests.²⁰ The monastic and parochial systems were in the worst shape in the eastern parts of Moesia and Thrace and in the Rhodope and Pirin mountains, i.e. in those Bulgarian-populated regions that experienced the most widespread Turkish colonisation and conversion to Islam.²¹ Parish priests were the backbone of the parochial network as well as the real leaders of the Bulgarian Orthodox community. In addition to being priests—which was often a matter of inheritance from father to son—and sometimes following another occupation or rendering special services to the government, they were also representatives for their parishioners in dealings with the Ottoman authorities.²²

High clerics were natural advocates of Orthodoxy and for the Orthodox people, although their ambiguous position as mediators between the congregation and the Ottoman authorities often obstructed the performance of their duties as Christian shepherds.²³ However, in the seventeenth century, as it was mentioned, there was no obvious antagonism among Orthodox Christians of various ethnic backgrounds and, as subjects in an empire of a foreign creed, they felt united by their faith. In terms of religion they had other, in their view, more dangerous opponents, such as the Roman Catholic Christians whose activity within the empire escalated after the Council of Trent (1545–63) and the establishment of the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* in 1622.²⁴ Nevertheless, some Orthodox high clerics show a

20. Тодорова, *Православната църква и българите*, 77–92.

21. Ibidem. See also Dennis P. Hupchick, “A Statistical Overview of Seventeenth-Century Bulgarian Orthodox Society and Culture,” in Dennis P. Hupchick and Donald D. Dyer, eds., *Bulgaria: Past and Present. Transitions and Turning Points* (=Balkanistica, 9. Special Edition), (Pittsburgh: Design Systems Printing, 1996), 74–102.

22. See Тодорова, *Православната църква и българите*, 106–123.

23. Some of the metropolitans and bishops of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Archbishopric of Ohrid were well educated and politically active, and took good care of their congregations. Others were more careless and focused mainly on collecting taxes and fees that enabled them to retain their positions in the church hierarchy (ibidem, 142–161).

24. Centres of Bulgarian-speaking Roman Catholics were to be found in regions, such as Sofia, Chiprovtsi, Plovdiv, Nikopol and Svishtov. On their activity, see Ivan Dujčev, *Il cattolicesimo in Bulgaria, nel sec. XVII secondo i processi informativi sulla nomina dei vescovi cattolici*, (=Orientalia christiana analecta, 111), (Rome: Istituto Pontificio Orientale, 1937); Иван Дуйчев, *Софийската католичка архиепископия през XVII век: изучаване и документи* [Ivan Dujčev, The Sofia Archbishopric of the Roman Catholic Church in the 17th Century: A Study and Documents] (София: Печатница на военно-издателския фонд, 1939); Свилен Станимиров, *Политическа дейност на българските католици през 30-те – 70-те години на XVII век* [Svilen Stanimirov, Political Activity of Bulgarian Catholics during the 1630s–1670s] (София: Наука и изкуство, 1988); Маргарет Димитрова, “Книжнината на българските католици [Margaret Dimitrova, The Letters of Bulgarian Roman Catholics],” in Анисава Милтенова, ed., *История на българската средновековна литература* [Anisava Miltenova, The History of Medieval Bulgarian Literature] (София: Изток-Запад, 2008), 744–752; Красимир Станчев, “Литературата на българите католици: маргинална за Изтока, периферна за Запада, но индикатор за бъдещия модел на българското развитие

susceptibility to Uniate ideas in their political activities aiming at the creation of anti-Ottoman coalitions.²⁵

Life in a social and cultural periphery and in relative marginalisation translated for Bulgarian Orthodox Christians also into isolation from the European cultural achievements.²⁶ Suffice it to say that even printing was not widely available in the Ottoman Empire²⁷ and did not exist in the Bulgarian lands before the nineteenth century. Therefore, during the seventeenth century the creation of manuscripts in the Bulgarian Orthodox milieu remained a primary method for providing books for the liturgy, preaching, and education, along with the scarce supply of printed copies issued by Russian, Ukrainian and Romanian typographies.²⁸

Under these social, economic, and cultural circumstances, the maintenance of the Slavonic liturgy and literary tradition that had their roots in the Bulgarian milieu

[Krassimir Stantchev, The Literature of Bulgarian Catholics: Marginal to the East, Peripheral to the West but an Indicator of the Future Model of Bulgarian Development],” in Рая Кунчева, ed., *Маргинално в/на литературата* [Raia Kuncheva, Marginality in/of Literature] (София: Издателски център “Боян Пенев,” 2011), 192-207. Conflicts between Catholics and Orthodox high clerics were typical of the first half of the seventeenth century in the Tŭrnovo eparchy where Orthodox metropolitans preached and collected taxes in the Catholic towns too. See Иван Тютюнджиев, *Търновската митрополия през XV-XIX в.* [Ivan Tiutiundzhiev, The Metropolitanate of Tŭrnovo during the 15th-19th Centuries] (Велико Търново: Издателство “Ровита,” 2007), 199-220.

25. See Тодорова, “Един народ в три патриаршии,” 214-216.

26. Unlike their Orthodox fellow-countrymen, some of the Bulgarian Catholics received education abroad, mainly in Italy, and created literary works within a Baroque framework. See Димитрова, “Книжнината на българските католици.”

27. Ágoston and Masters, *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire*, 471-472.

28. Some data on the circulation of printed Slavonic books during this period can be found in Николай М. Дылевский, “Русские и украинские рукописи и старопечатные книги в болгарских книгохранилищах [Nikolai M. Dylevskii, Russian and Ukrainian Manuscripts and Old Printed Books in Bulgarian Repositories],” in Лидия П. Жуковская, Нина И. Тарабасова, eds., *Исследования источников по истории русского языка и письменности* [Lidiia P. Zhukovskaia, Nina I. Tarabasova, Studies of Sources on the History of the Russian Language and Literature] (М.: Наука, 1966), 206-224; Пётр Атанасов, “Украинские кириллические старопечатные книги XVI-XVII вв. в Болгарии (К вопросу о болгаро-украинских культурных связях) [Petŭr Atanasov, Ukrainian Old Printed Cyrillic Books of 16th-17th Centuries in Bulgaria (Towards the Question of Bulgarian-Ukrainian Cultural Ties)],” *Советское славяноведение*, 6 (1972): 72-83; Игор И. Калиганов, “Книги московской печати XVII столетия в библиотеке Рильского монастыря [Igor I. Kaliganov, Books of the Moscow Printing House of the 17th Century in the Library of Rila Monastery],” *Славянский альманах 1997* (М.: Издательство “Индрик,” 1998): 281-288; and Virgil Cădea, *Mărturii românești peste hotare: creații românești și izvoare despre români în colecții din străinătate* [Romanian Traces Abroad: Romanian Monuments and Sources on Romanians in Foreign Collections], 1 (Bukurești: Biblioteca Bucureștilor, 2010), 315 (No. 185), 358 (No. 520), 359 (Nos. 521-523). Apart from the general bibliographic information, there is no substantial overview of the actual distribution and use of early printed books in the Bulgarian lands of the seventeenth century and of their influence upon the local manuscript tradition. It seems that the latter stood resistant to producing duplicates of prints and selectively adopted only some stylistic features of the layout or fragments of text. On the whole, during this time there was no substantial market for printed books in the Bulgarian lands and the printed tradition was viewed as supplementary to manuscript practice. See more in Vassja Velinova, “Il libro stampato come fonte della tradizione manoscritta dal XVI al XIX secolo,” in Roland Marti, Maria Chiara Pesenti, eds., *Libro manoscritto e libro a stampa nel mondo slavo (XV-XX sec.)* (Milano: Bulzoni, 2015), 77-92.

as far back as the ninth century played a key role in keeping up both the Orthodox faith among Bulgarians and their sense of ethnic identity. In the seventeenth century, literature and literacy in the Bulgarian lands retained their strictly religious nature, although their predominantly monastic countenance was beginning to change because of the increased involvement of parochial priests and laymen in education and book production.²⁹ The scribal and literary activities, discussed below, were attested in a few centres of monastic or parochial type in or near settlements of relative economic prosperity located in mountainous regions. The main of these centres were the stauropegic Rila monastery, several monasteries around Sofia, Vratsa and Etropole with their adjacent monasteries, Karlovo, Adzhar, and the monastery of Kuklen.³⁰ They happened to be in the peripheries of the Peć diocese and of several eparchies of the Constantinopolitan Church.³¹ Despite all the obstacles, Orthodox Bulgarians managed to stick to tradition and to go beyond it. On one hand, manuscript production had a narrow repertoire of liturgical and edifying books containing mostly translations from the Greek. The inherited literary models turned out not to be productive under the current circumstances, so that no original work arose and no recognisable name of a Bulgarian author appeared.³² On the other hand, it was in the seventeenth century that the Bulgarian Orthodox community awakened its creative potential and invented—although within the framework of medieval Orthodox letters and ways of thinking—a new literary language based on the Bulgarian vernacular,³³ and used it in the compilation of a new type of religious books called

29. Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, 195–197.

30. For overviews of their activities, see *ibidem*, 143–182; as well as Dilyana Radoslavova, “The Repertoire of Bulgarian Manuscripts from the Seventeenth Century as a Source for Studying Literary Centres,” *Solanus*, 23 (2013): 169–187.

31. Дилиана Радославова, “Граничният седемнадесети век. Българската православна книжнина – феномен от периферията [Diliana Radoslavova, *The Frontier 17th Century. The Letters of Bulgarian Orthodox Christians—a Phenomenon from the Periphery*],” in Кунчева, ed., *Маргиналното в/на литературата*, 208–232.

32. The only exception is the *Vita* of St Pimen of Zograf by his pupil Pamfilii, an Athonite monk, which is supposed to have been written in the monastery of Cherepish near Vratsa. The work did not disseminate and is known in a 1916 copy made from a 1683 manuscript that has not been preserved. About St Pimen and his activities involving the restoration of monasteries in the Bulgarian lands and manuscript production in the early seventeenth century, see Elissaveta Moussakova, “Pimen of Zograph’s Manuscripts as an Example of Collaboration among Scribes,” in Элина Н. Добрынина, ed., *Хризозграф*, 2 [Élina N. Dobrynina, *Chrizograf*], 2 (М.: Скарнус, 2005), 169–199; Иванка Гергова, “Житието на Пимен Зографски – критически прочит [Ivanka Gergova, *The Vita of St Pimen of Zograf—a Critical Reading*],” in Елисавета Мусакова, Елена Узунова, eds., *Етрополската книжовна школа и българският седемнадесети век* [in Elissaveta Mussakova, Elena Uzunova, *The Etropole Literary School and the Bulgarian 17th Century*] (София: Национална библиотека “Св. св. Кирил и Методий,” 2011), 268–280.

33. Generally called in Bulgarian *novobŭlgarski* or “new-Bulgarian,” this language has also some specific designations, such as “written Bulgarian language of the seventeenth century based on the vernacular,” see Евгения И. Дѣмина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин. Болгарский памятник XVII в. Исследование и текст* [Evgeniia I. Dëmina, *The Tikhonravov Damaskin: a 17th-Century Bulgarian Manuscript. A Study and Text*], 3 (София: Издательство Болгарской академии наук, 1985); or “New Bulgarian written language,” see Roger Gyllin, *The Genesis of the Modern Bulgarian Literary Language* (=Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Slavica

damaskini (sg. *damaskin*). The latter contained popular readings, addressed to a less educated or illiterate audience, that were used in preaching and education. In linguistic terms, the new literary language was a significant departure from the tradition and its appearance was a result of an intentional linguistic program aiming at the creation of texts understandable to the widest possible public.³⁴ Along with bringing the message of salvation to ordinary folk, the new-Bulgarian *damaskini* made additional contributions that were of long-term significance, like the cultivation of a literary taste among a wider audience and the generation of a sense of ethnic self-confidence and self-awareness against the backdrop of an Orthodox literature in an understandable native language. Thus, in the seventeenth century, Orthodox Bulgarians in their own manner and scale joined the humanistic wave of the epoch.³⁵

The *damaskini*—facts and questions

The appearance of the first texts in the new literary language was closely related to the Bulgarian reception of the vernacular Greek anthology Θησαυρός³⁶ [Treasure] compiled by St Damaskenos Studites (d. 1577), a prominent clerical figure and author who adhered to the humanistic trend in sixteenth-century Greek literature.³⁷ The *Treasure* was first published in 1557/8 in Venice and

Upsaliensia, 30), (Uppsala, 1991), or “Early Modern Bulgarian language,” which preceded the Modern Bulgarian literary language of the period of the National Revival in the nineteenth century, see Боряна Велчева, Диана Иванова, *И от зазоряването започва денят... Изследвания върху приемствеността в развоя на българския книжовен език* [Boriana Velcheva, Diana Ivanova, And It is at Dawn that the Day Begins... Studies of the Continuity in the Development of Literary Bulgarian Language] (Пловдив: Университетско издателство “Паисий Хилендарски,” 2010).

34. In contrast to the archaic language of the Church, which had a synthetic structure, the Bulgarian vernacular had by the seventeenth century developed into an analytic language. While applying archaic orthographic rules and borrowing archaic specialized lexis, the new written language adopted the grammatical structure of the vernacular and massively introduced vernacular vocabulary. The appearance of this new language was not a haphazard process of recording texts in particular dialect(s) but obeyed a thought out linguistic concept. See Gyllin, *The Genesis of the Modern Bulgarian Literary Language*, 46-62.

35. Regarding the extra-linguistic break with the tradition and the significance of the new-Bulgarian *damaskini* for the future development of the modern Bulgarian language, literature, and culture, see *ibidem*, 62-69, and references therein.

36. Βιβλίον ὀνομαζόμενον Θησαυρός [The Book Called Treasure]. See the edition by Ειρηναῖος Δελιδήμιος, *Θησαυρός Δαμασκηνοῦ τοῦ ὑποδιακόνου καὶ Στουδίτου* [Treasure by Damaskenos, a Subdeacon and Studites] (New York: Atlantis Greek Book, 1943). Details about the *Treasure*'s content and compilation are available in Ελισάβετ Αντωνιάδου, *Δαμασκηνοῦ Στουδίτου “Θησαυρός,” Περιστατικά Συγγραφῆς, Περιεχόμενο, Σπουδαιότης* [Treasure by Damaskenos Studites: Writing Cases, Content, Importance] (Θεσσαλονίκη: Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 2012), PhD. diss. available at <http://ikee.lib.auth.gr/record/129176?ln=en> (accessed 3 November 2016).

37. He was only recently, on 26 November 2013, canonised by the Church of Constantinople and his date of commemoration was assigned to 27 November. For a bibliography, see Λαμπρινή Ν. Μάνου, *Δαμασκηνός ὁ Στουδίτης: ὁ βίος καὶ τὸ ἔργο του* [Damaskenos Studites:

was to become a bestseller among Greeks, being reprinted until the twenty-first century. Initially, Damaskenos Studites' book included thirty-six homilies, sermons, and vitae composed or compiled in vernacular Greek (Post-Byzantine koiné) from earlier sources and intended for a less literate audience.³⁸ Unlike the rest of *Slavia Orthodoxa*, in the Bulgarian milieu the works from the *Treasure* gained popularity as great as that they enjoyed with Greeks. The Bulgarian reception of the book began with its translation into Church Slavonic³⁹ in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. Traditionally, three independent translations in this archaic language have been distinguished:⁴⁰ the so-called

His Life and Works] (Αθήνα: Σύνδεσμος των Εν Αθήναις Μεγαλοσχιολικών, 1999); Marios Philippides and Walter K. Hanak, *The Siege and the Fall of Constantinople in 1453: Historiography, Topography, and Military Studies* (Farham, UK, and Burlington, US: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 55-56; as well as Αντωνιάδου, *Δαμασκηνού Στουδίτου "Θησαυρός"*, 15-23; but consult also Dean Sakel, "A Non-Existent Byzantine-Style Historian in a New Encyclopaedia of Ottoman Historians," *Revue des études byzantines*, 68, 1 (2010): 209-217. Overviews of the Bulgarian reception of the *Treasure* can be seen in Елка Мирчева, *Недамаскинови слова в новобългарските дамаскини от XVII век* [Elka Mircheva, Non-Treasure Texts in New-Bulgarian Damaskini of the 17th Century] (Велико Търново: Фабер, 2001), 24-52; and Маргарет Димитрова, "Дамаскинарска литература [Margaret Dimitrova, Damaskini Literature]," in Милтенова, ed., *История на българската средновековна литература*, 729-740, with the relevant bibliography.

38. Димитрова, "Дамаскинарска литература," 729-731.

39. The Church Slavonic recension used at that time by South Slavonic bookmen is usually called "Serbian," "Resava" or "Serbian-Bulgarian." One of its main characteristics was the use of Resava (or Tŭrnovo-Resava) orthography, see *ibidem*, 731-732; as well as Боряна Велчева, "Книги, писани "общимъ языкомъ." Сръбската и българската писменост през XV-XVIII век [Boriana Velcheva, Books Written in a Common Language. Serbian and Bulgarian Letters during the 15th-18th Centuries]," in Велчева, Иванова, *И от зазоряването започва денят*, 74-77, with additional references. The latter began to develop in the thirteenth-fourteenth century on the basis of the Serbian Raška orthography characterised by reflexes *u* and *e* for the Old Church Slavonic back and front nasals (*big ius* ѡ and *little ius* ѡ), respectively. In the fifteenth century, Resava orthography was codified by Konstantin of Kostenets, a Bulgarian man of letters trained in the traditions of the Tŭrnovo literary school, who fled the Bulgarian lands and worked in Serbia under the patronage of Stefan Lazarević (1389-1427). The orthographic rules recommended by Konstantin in his treatise *О письменех* [On the Letters] were followed more or less strictly in real practice. In accordance with Tŭrnovo norms, they aimed at the restoration of all graphemes present in Old Church Slavonic, as well as at the systematic use of punctuation and diacritics following a Greek model. The non-*ius* Resava norms were gradually accepted by Bulgarian scribes in place of the two-*ius* Tŭrnovo orthography and by the seventeenth century had become the predominant norm in manuscripts created in the Bulgarian milieu. See Анна-Мария Тотоманова, "Правопис, ресавски [Anna-Mariia Totomanova, Resava Orthography]," in Донка Петканова, ed., *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник* [Donka Petkanova, Old Bulgarian Literature. An Encyclopedic Dictionary] (Велико Търново: Абагар, 2003), 388-389, with further references. Thanks to the prestige of the Serbian Church the non-*ius* orthography also spread within the Wallachian and Moldavian, but especially the Wallachian Slavonic tradition. See Петар Хр. Илиевски, *Крнински дамаскин* [Petar Ilievski, Krnino Damaskin] (=Стари текстови, 3), (Скопје: Универзитетска печатница "Кирил и Методиј," 1972), 99; Pandele Olteanu et al., *Slava veche și slavona românească* [Old Church Slavonic and Romanian Slavonic] (București: Didactică și Pedagogică, 1975), 239-263.

40. Димитрова, "Дамаскинарска литература," 731-734.

“Macedonian,”⁴¹ “Athonite,”⁴² and “Sredna Gora”⁴³ translations.⁴⁴ In comparison with the other two, the “Sredna Gora” translation circulated more broadly and became popular within some Bulgarian eparchies of Constantinople. Presumably, as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century, works from this translation were rendered in the vernacular, thus triggering the early modern Bulgarian literary tradition. “Sredna Gora” and vernacular-based versions of the *Treasure* texts, together with other works known from the previous literary tradition or from early printed books, were the sources from which the various collections of readings were mostly compiled.⁴⁵ These were the books called *damaskini* by Bulgarian literati after the name of the original anthology’s author. The *damaskini* were to have a long tradition, and they were copied and compiled until the end of the nineteenth century. Both the archaic and the new-Bulgarian anthologies were in such demand that, because of their extensive use and frequent resale, virtually all of the extant witnesses of the earliest *damaskini* types have lost their colophons, remaining anonymous and with no documented places of origin.⁴⁶ Therefore, the locations where the “Sredna Gora” and the new-Bulgarian versions originated have been the subject of various hypotheses. In scholarly publications, a few literary centres compete for being the place of origin of the “Sredna Gora” translation, for

41. It is ascribed to Grigorii, bishop of Pelagonia and Prilep, Ohrid diocese, and was made in the last decades of the sixteenth century. It strictly followed the composition of the original *Treasure* and had a limited dissemination. See Илиевски, *Крински дамаскин*, 31-48.

42. An anonymous and partial translation that is preserved in a single copy. It appeared in the late sixteenth or the early seventeenth century somewhere in the south western part of the Bulgarian lands or on Mount Athos. See Димитрова, “Дамаскинарска литература,” 732.

43. Yet another anonymous and partial translation, made most likely by the end of the sixteenth century. It included twenty-six *Treasure* texts, as well as two further Modern Greek works: *On the Ten Commandments* by Damaskenos Studites, and *On Orthodox Faith* by his teacher Theophanes Eleavoukos (ibidem, 733). Scholars have named this translation after one of its areas of dissemination: the Sredna Gora highlands, located south of the Balkan Mountain range.

44. According to Dmitrii I. Polyviannyi and Anatolii A. Turilov (Дмитрий И. Полювианный, Анатолий А. Турилов, “Дамаскин,” in *Православная энциклопедия* [Orthodox Encyclopedia], <http://www.pravenc.ru/text/168722.html>, accessed 3 November 2016), there was also an early Church Slavonic translation made in the Serbian milieu. This supposition is groundless as the only alleged witness (the *Nezhin damaskin* of the last third of the sixteenth century, GIM [Gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii muzei], Sokolov 130) represents beyond any doubt the “Sredna Gora” translation; cf. Евгения И. Дёмина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин. Болгарский памятник XVII в. Исследование и текст* [Evgeniia I. Dëmina, *The Tikhonravov Damaskin: a 17th-Century Bulgarian Manuscript. A Study and Text*], 1 (София: Издательство Болгарской академии наук, 1968), 45. See more notes on the Serbian reception of the *Treasure* in Боню Ангелов, *Из историята на старобългарската и възрожденската литература* [Boniu Angelov, *From the History of the Old Bulgarian Literature and of the Literature of Bulgarian Revival*] (София: Наука и изкуство, 1977), 91-95. The notes in question are only preliminary and do require some revision and further investigations.

45. According to the most exhaustive and widely accepted classification, there were two groups of miscellanies comprising texts from the *Treasure* in the “Sredna Gora” translation and four groups of new-Bulgarian miscellanies going back to originals of the seventeenth century. See Дёмина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин*, 1, 44-65.

46. There are only two preserved scribal notes to the archaic *damaskini* and none are to be found in the seventeenth-century new-Bulgarian books.

example, Rila⁴⁷ in the diocese of Peć, and several centres of Bulgarian literacy in the diocese of Constantinople, including Etropole⁴⁸ and Lovech⁴⁹ (both of which were in the Lovech eparchy of the Tŭrnovo Metropolitanate), and a literary centre of an unspecified location in the Plovdiv Metropolitanate.⁵⁰ Based on dialectal data, it is presumed that new-Bulgarian adaptations were undertaken in three literary centres;⁵¹ two of which have tentatively been localised around the settlements of Etropole, Lukovit, and Teteven in the eparchy of Lovech, and a third one that has northeast Bulgarian dialect features.⁵²

The complicated history of the *damaskini* has been the subject of an impressive number of publications devoted to their language, textual tradition, and literary characteristics. Nevertheless, many controversial topics and outstanding questions remain. The main ones, along with the localization of the “Sredna Gora” translation and its new-Bulgarian adaptations, concern the genealogy of the various groups of *damaskini*, the simultaneous dissemination of archaic and modern anthologies, and, of course, the reasons behind their extraordinary popularity with Bulgarians.

The latest research on the correlation between some of the new-Bulgarian *damaskini* texts and their respective archaic counterparts has allowed for a hypothesis about a Church Slavonic proto-translation, common to the three archaic translations mentioned above, and has led to the reconsideration of the previously suggested localisation of the new-Bulgarian adaptations and chronology of the

47. Донка Петканова-Тотева, *Дамаскините в българската литература* [Donka Petkanova-Toteva, *The Damaskini in Bulgarian Literature*] (София: Издателство на Българската академия на науките, 1965), 47-48.

48. Беньо Цонев, *История на българският език* [Ben'о Tsonev, *The History of the Bulgarian Language*], 1 (София: Придворна печатница, 1940), 280-281; Божидар Райков, “Етрополски ръкописен сборник от 1640 година [Bozhidar Raïkov, *An Etropole Manuscript Miscellany from 1640*],” in Михаил Бъчваров, Екатерина Дограмаджиева, Светлина Николова, eds., *Хиляда и осемдесет години от смъртта на св. Наум Охридски* [Mikhail Büchvarov, Ekaterina Dogramadzhieva, Svetlina Nikolova, *One Thousand and Eighty Years from the Death of St Naum of Ohrid*] (София: Издателство на Българската академия на науките, 1993), 263-276; Velinova, “Il libro stampato come fonte della tradizione manoscritta,” 81.

49. Боряна Христова, “Ловеч [Boriana Khristova, *The Town of Lovech*],” in Петканова, ed., *Старобългарска литература*, 283-284; Radoslavova, “The Repertoire of Bulgarian Manuscripts from the Seventeenth Century,” 179-180.

50. Елена Коцева, “Славянски ръкописи в библиотеката на Пловдивската митрополия [Elena Kotseva, *Slavonic Manuscripts from the Library of the Metropolitanate of Plovdiv*],” *Старобългарска литература*, 15 (1984): 144-160.

51. Дѣмина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин*, 1, based on Боряна Велчева, “Показателни местоимения и наречия в новобългарските паметници от XVII и XVIII век [Boriana Velcheva, *Demonstrative Pronouns and Adverbs in New-Bulgarian Manuscripts from the 17th and the 18th Centuries*],” *Известия на Института за български език*, 10 (1964): 159-233.

52. See Дѣмина, *Тихонравовский дамаскин*, 3, 260-262, and Любомир Милетич, *Свищовски дамаскин: новобългарски паметник от XVIII век* [Liubomir Miletich, *The Svishtov Damaskin: a New-Bulgarian Manuscript from the 18th Century*] (София: Придворна печатница, 1923).

new-Bulgarian *damaskini* groups.⁵³ A breakthrough in the studies on the initial stage of the early modern literary trend came with the recent edition of the newly discovered seventeenth-century *Lovech Damaskin*.⁵⁴ The critical text and linguistic analysis of this manuscript offered a few crucial conclusions. First, the group of the *Lovech Damaskin*, which had been otherwise neglected in the extant studies, turned out to be the earliest of all of the types of new-Bulgarian collections.⁵⁵ Second, the analysis proved that the very first text from the *Treasure* to be adapted into the new literary language was Damaskenos Studites' *On the Second Coming of Christ*. This work was disseminated as a separate book and could well be part of a variety of collections of readings, including one in which it was the only text extracted from the *Treasure*. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that, at the earliest stage of new-Bulgarian literacy, preference was given to eschatological themes. The complicated textual history of the new-Bulgarian version of *On the Second Coming* has also made it possible to postulate an oral tradition of this homily preceding its multiple written variants.⁵⁶ And last but not least, the linguistic analysis of the *Lovech Damaskin* adds to the presumed dialectal basis of the new-Bulgarian *damaskini* the vernaculars of Lovech and the nearby town of Troian.⁵⁷ Other recent studies have focused more on the typology of *damaskini*, based on their macro-compositional models.⁵⁸ This approach has revealed a variety of compilation strategies that were dependent on a particular overall thematic frame(s) and sheds more light on how Bulgarian literati used the original *Treasure* as a source.⁵⁹ The outcome of these analyses clearly shows the need for further investigation that would unveil

53. See Olga Mladenova, "On Damaskin genealogy," *Linguistique balkanique*, 2 (2006): 233-246; Olga Mladenova, "Отново за локализацията на първоначалния новобългарски Дамаскинов превод [Olga Mladenova, Once again on the Localization of the Initial New-Bulgarian Damaskini Translation]," in Петя Асенова, ed., *Това чудо езикът!* [Petia Asenova, This Miracle, the Language!] (София: Университетско издателство "Св. Климент Охридски," 2007), 309-316; Eadem, "A pilot project in Bulgarian historical dialectology: dialect attribution of the Troian damaskin," *Linguistique balkanique*, 2-3 (2007): 145-162; Eadem, "Нов поглед към взаимоотношенията на новобългарските дамаскини от XVII век [Reconsideration of the Relations between the 17th-Century New-Bulgarian Damaskini]," in Мусакова, Узунова, eds., *Етрополската книжовна школа и българският седемнадесети век*, 132-148.

54. Олга Младенова, Боряна Велчева, *Ловешки дамаскин: новобългарски паметник от XVII век* [Olga Mladenova, Borianna Velcheva, *The Lovech Damaskin: a New-Bulgarian Manuscript from the 17th Century*] (София: Национална библиотека "Св. св. Кирил и Методий," 2013).

55. Олга Младенова, "Ловешкият дамаскин на фона на дамаскинската традиция [Olga Mladenova, *The Lovech Damaskin against the Backdrop of the Damaskini Tradition*]," in Младенова, Велчева, *Ловешки дамаскин*, 13-100.

56. *Ibidem*, 51-70.

57. Боряна Велчева, "За езика и правописа [Borianna Velcheva, *About the Language and the Orthography*]," in Младенова, Велчева, *Ловешки дамаскин*, 101-134.

58. Диляна Радославова, "Памети извън състава на Съкровище в българските дамаскини [Dilyana Radoslavova, *The Calendar Entries in the Bulgarian Damaskini not Presented in Damaskenos Studites' Treasure*]," *Старобългарска литература*, 47 (2013): 336-361.

59. *Ibidem*; and Dilyana Radoslavova, "Semantics on the Book's Macro-Compositional Level? A Visualisation Method of Analysis," *Scripta & e-Scripta*, 14 (2015): 251-280.

more details of the complicated *damaskini* tradition. Whatever the outcome of such investigations may be, the study of the *damaskini* phenomenon should be carried out within the broader framework of the overall literary tradition in the seventeenth-century Bulgarian lands and against the backdrop of the activities of the known literary centres and scribes, as well as the specifics of the repertoire of books they have produced.

Profile of the known scribes and scribal centres

The first comprehensive account of the literary activities of seventeenth-century Bulgarian Orthodox Christians belongs to Khristo Gandev who published in 1943 a great deal of data from primary sources in an attempt to overcome the stereotypical definition of this century as “a period of darkness” and to prove its significance as an interesting transition period from the middle ages to modernity.⁶⁰ Subsequent archaeographic works by scholars such as Boniu Angelov, Donka Petkanova, Bozhidar Raïkov, Nevena Doncheva-Panaïotova and others further developed the profiles of seventeenth-century scribal centres and scribes.⁶¹ Fifty years after Gandev, Dennis Hupchick summarised the known facts, and his overview of seventeenth-century Bulgarian Orthodox culture (education, letters, and art) based on historiographical and statistical analyses remains unique.⁶² More details on the social profiles and manuscript repertoire of Bulgarian Orthodox scribes, including a comparative study of the literary activities in the respective literary centres and church eparchies, have been provided in a recent interdisciplinary PhD dissertation, which, based on a coherent approach combining palaeographic, codicological, text-critical and statistical methods of analysis, was able to introduce some addenda and corrigenda to previous studies.⁶³

According to the latter study and some further investigations that have brought new facts to light, the geography of seventeenth-century scribal activity in the dioceses of Constantinople and Peć—or in the dissemination area of “Sredna Gora”

60. Христо Гандев, *Фактори на Българското възраждане, 1600-1830* [Khristo Gandev, *Factors of the Bulgarian Revival, 1600-1830*] (София: Българска книга, 1943).

61. See the relevant bibliography provided in Маргарет Димитрова, “Книжовници и средища [Margaret Dimitrova, *Men of Letters and Literary Centres*],” in Милтенова, ed., *История на българската средновековна литература*, 727-728.

62. Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*; Idem, “A Statistical Overview of Seventeenth-Century Bulgarian Orthodox Society and Culture.”

63. Дилана Радославова, *Репертоарът на българските ръкописни паметници от XVII век като източник за проучване на книжовните средища* [Dilyana Radoslavova, *The Repertoire of Bulgarian Manuscripts from the 17th Century as a Source for Studying Literary Centres*] (София: Институт за литература, 2010). The study is based on more than 290 signed and anonymous Bulgarian manuscripts produced in the dioceses of Constantinople and Peć. It excludes from its scope the manuscript production within the diocese of Ohrid, due to its insufficient preservation and underrepresentation in archaeographic studies. The conclusions of the thesis are partially published in Radoslavova’s “The Repertoire of Bulgarian Manuscripts from the Seventeenth Century” and other articles.

and new-Bulgarian *damaskini*—appears as follows. There were at that time at least eighteen localities and nineteen monasteries with scribal activity (see the appended map and Table 1), as testified by extant manuscript colophons.⁶⁴ Most scribal centres fall within neighbouring eparchies of the Constantinopolitan metropolitanates of Sofia, Tŭrnovo, and Plovdiv, in the highlands of the Central Balkan Mountain range and Sredna Gora, where some Serbian influence can be attested. Scribal activity was concentrated in centres at, or close to, prosperous localities at the periphery of eparchies. Slavonic books were rarely copied at the metropolitanate and episcopate sees. Manuscripts were also created at the stauropegic Rila monastery, which was at the time dependent on the patriarch of Peć. Scribal activity within the borders of the Metropolitanate of Tŭrnovo must have been most vigorous, as the majority of the known scribal centres were in the Episcopate of Lovech and in the region of Vratsa, a mining centre in the Balkan Mountains, which at some point in the seventeenth century also became the episcopal see of Tŭrnovo.⁶⁵ The extant data about the Sofia and Plovdiv metropolitanates is scantier. Manuscripts from Sofia's eparchy are associated with a few monasteries, and from Plovdiv's eparchy—with only two localities and two monasteries.

At the beginning of the century, several monastic centres were active: the monastery of Eleshnitsa and probably the monastery of Seslavtsi in the region of Sofia, as well as the monastery of Holy Trinity near Vratsa.⁶⁶ Supposedly, organized copying of books at that time also took place in the epoch's largest and most influential centre, that of Etropole. Etropole was a small highland multi-ethnic mining and *derbendji*⁶⁷ town in the Lovech eparchy. Scribal activity at the monastery of Holy Trinity, newly established nearby, and at the parish church of St Michael in the Serbian neighbourhood of Etropole flourished from the 1620s to the mid-1640s. Data suggests that the monastery accommodated a school and a well-organized scriptorium.⁶⁸ The centre enjoyed a great prestige and apart from Bulgarian literati attracted also pupils and men of letters of Serbian and Wallachian-Moldavian origins.⁶⁹ During the second half of the century, copying activities were

64. See Боряна Христова, Даринка Караджова, Елена Узунова, *Бележки на българските книжовници: X-XVIII век, 2. XVI-XVIII век* [Boriana Khristova, Darinka Karadzova, Elena Uzunova, *Colophons of Bulgarian Men of Letters: 10th-18th Centuries, 2. 16th-18th Centuries*] (София: Народна библиотека "Св. св. Кирил и Методий," 2004), 35-68, 120-122.

65. See Тютюнджиев, *Търновската митрополия през XV-XIX в.*, 453-454.

66. A revision of profiles of the scribal activities in these centres can be found in Радославова, *Репертоарът на българските ръкописни паметници от XVII век*, 55-98 (unpublished).

67. See above, footnote 19.

68. Диляна Радославова, "Етрополският книжовен център: проблеми и перспективи на изследванията [Dilyana Radoslavova, *The Etropole Literary Centre: Problems and Perspectives of Studies*]," in Мусакова, Узунова, eds., *Етрополската книжовна школа и българският седемнадесети век*, 63-79, with additional references therein.

69. Among the bookmen who left their names in Etropole manuscripts there were, for instance, a priest Uroš, see Райков "Етрополската калиграфско-художествена школа през XVI-XVII век," 19-39 (p. 27 in particular); and Matei Grămătic, see Căndea, *Mărturii românești peste hotare*, 1, 349-350 (No. 442).

concentrated within the territory of the Metropolitanate of Plovdiv—in the prospering Sredna Gora localities of Sushitsa (Karlovo) and Adzhar (Svezhen), as well as at the monastery near Kuklen in the Rhodope Mountains. A scriptorium of a parochial type, most likely in connection with a school for training priests, was formed in Adzhar, which had *derbendji* status.⁷⁰ It is highly probable that Avram Dimitrievich, who was from the *vaqf*⁷¹ town of Karlovo, and his student Krūstiu, who is known to have worked at Kuklen, managed a calligraphic school. The canon of their elegant script is attested in most of the new-Bulgarian *damaskini* and other unsigned manuscripts copied by pupils or less skilful followers of the school.⁷² There is no extant data about a scriptorium operating at Rila with specific calligraphic norms.⁷³ However, the monastery, which had a well-stocked library and treasured the relics of the Bulgarian patron saint John of Rila, was a favourite destination for visiting literati. The known leading centres and their scribes developed a few genetically related local variants of the period's dominant type of script: a geometric semi-uncial,⁷⁴ which resembled the fourteenth-century Tŭrnovo uncial and the Wallacho-Moldavian calligraphic semi-uncial. In terms of orthography, the Resava norm⁷⁵ predominated, but relics of Tŭrnovo two-*ius* orthography can also be found in some new-Bulgarian *damaskini*.⁷⁶

The known scribal centres and scribes worked in close cooperation with each other and kept in contact with the Athonite monasteries. Bulgarian pilgrims brought donation books copied at Etropole, Rila, Karlovo, and Adzhar to Athos and to other places as far as St Catherine's monastery on Mount Sinai. Bookmen migrated from one centre to another. Calligraphers from Sofia, such as Dragan and Vasilii, moved

70. Dilyana Radoslavova, "The Scribal Centre at the Village of Adžar in the 17th Century. New data," *Scripta & e-Scripta*, 2 (2004): 291-309.

71. See above, footnote 19.

72. Диляна Радославова, "За Карловско-Кукленската калиграфска школа и нейните ръкописи [Dilyana Radoslavova, About Karlovo-Kuklen Calligraphic School and Its Manuscripts]," in Антоанета Лесенска, ed., *По следите на българската книга. Описи. Находки. Библиология* [Antoaneta Lesenska, In the Traces of Bulgarian Book. Catalogues. Finds. Bibliology] (Пловдив: Народна библиотека "Иван Вазов," 2015), 237-246.

73. Диляна Радославова, "Рилските ръкописи от XVII век [Dilyana Radoslavova, The 17th-Century Rila Manuscripts]," in Светлана Куюмджиева, ed., *Културното наследство на Рилския манастир – състояние и перспективи на проучването, опазването и реставрирането му* [Svetlana Kuyumdzhieva, The Cultural Heritage of Rila Monastery—a State and Perspectives of Its Study, Conservation and Restoration] (София: Изток-Запад, 2011), 202-214.

74. The scholarly tradition usually labels it as "Sredna Gora script," a term introduced in the studies of Ben'ò Tsonev, or as "Etropole (Sredna Gora) script," as it was proposed in Райков "Етрополската калиграфско-художествена школа през XVI-XVII век," 27-30. Provisionally, one can recognize an Etropole script, a Vratsa script, an Adzhar script, a Karlovo-Kuklen script, and yet another older version with unclear localisation; see Radoslavova, "The Repertoire of Bulgarian Manuscripts from the Seventeenth Century," 175-176.

75. See above, footnote 39.

76. See Димитрова, "Дамаскинарска литература," 732 and the provided bibliography. A few seventeenth-century Bulgarian manuscripts testify about an influence of Russian Church Slavonic though it was to become apparent only in the next century.

eastwards in search of better working places when literary activity at the metropolitan centre, which had flourished in the preceding century, declined. Etropole pupils established their own schools. For instance, priest Їovko moved from Etropole to Adzhar where he founded the local calligraphic atelier. Among the scribes who worked in the Bulgarian lands there were also bookmen such as Jov Šišatovac who was born in Timișoara and became a monk in the monastery of Šišatovac in Fruška Gora. He stayed at the monastery of Dragalevtsi near Sofia and at the Vratsa monastery of Holy Trinity on his way to Mount Athos and took part in the local manuscript production.⁷⁷

Scribal centres produced manuscripts mainly for their own needs and specialized in book copying according to the type of liturgical practice they followed—monastic or parochial (Table 2). Monastic centres such as Eleshnitsa, Vratsa, Etropole, and Kuklen concentrated on producing sets of *menaia*—books of everyday services for the twelve months. In Etropole, scribes also copied *sluzhebniṣi* (*leitourgika*)—services of the Divine Liturgy, *prolozi* (*synaxaria*)—collections of short *vitae* assigned to each day during the entire year and prescribed for everyday services, as well as traditional monastic anthologies of readings, like *panegyrika*—collections of homilies and saints' lives. Parochial scriptoria, such as those of Adzhar and Karlovo, produced books most needed in everyday parochial practice and in education: festal *menaia*—selected services for the entire year; psalters; many *trebnitsi* (*hagiasmataria*)—euchological books of rites and prayers; as well as various anthologies for reading, including the so-called “miscellanies of mixed content,”⁷⁸ *damaskini*, and others, such as the *Miracles of the Theotokos*⁷⁹ and *Alexandria* (the *Romance of Alexander the Great*)⁸⁰. The extant data supports the suggestion that *damaskini*, while typical for the parochial repertoire, were more of an exception in the monastic one. For instance, only a few of the *Treasure* texts were copied in Etropole and they were included with other works in two books of traditional type—a *panegyrikon*, which was intended for the monastery, and a liturgical miscellany for the parish church of St Michael.

The preserved colophons outline the following social and professional profiles of the forty-five known scribes. They were representatives of the lower clergy and the flock: monks, hieromonks, priests, deacons, and presumably laymen

77. See Боню Ангелов, “Книжовна дейност на Їов Шишатовац [Boniu Angelov, The Literary Activity of Jov Šišatovac],” *Научни скупови. Српска академија наука и уметности*, 10. *Одељење језика и књижевности*, 2 (1981): 321–334.

78. Miscellanies with didactical, catechetical, apocryphal, and other readings. They were compiled, copied and disseminated during the Ottoman rule among the lower clergy and literate laumen. See Анисава Милтенова, “Сборници със смесено съдържание [Anisava Miltenova, Miscellanies of Mixed Content],” in Петканова, ed., *Старобългарска литература*, 442–443.

79. It was part of Agapios Landos' *Amartolon Sotiria* [Salvation of the Sinners] published in Venice in 1644. See Донка Петканова, “Агапий [Donka Petkanova, Agapios],” in Eadem, ed., *Старобългарска литература*, 18.

80. See Мая Їонова, “Александрия [Maia Їonova, Alexandria],” in Петканова, ed., *Старобългарска литература*, 25–26, with further bibliography.

(see Table 3). Some of them bore the literary titles *diak* (pl. *diatsi*),⁸¹ *gramatik* ("grammarian," pl. *gramatitsi*)⁸² and *daskal* ("teacher," pl. *daskali*).⁸³ Statistical analysis⁸⁴ reveals that during the seventeenth century the scribes associated with parish clergy and laity prevailed in number and productivity in comparison with the scribes from the ranks of monks, although during the first half of the period the tendency had been quite the opposite. Nearly half of the copyists were priests and they were responsible for approximately half of the known manuscripts. Hieromonks were the most numerous and productive group throughout the century. Initially, they were the more active and productive scribes and, conversely, the number and production of parish priests grew throughout the duration of the century. The data on the scribal activity of the lowest priestly rank of deacons is most uncertain. The information about ordinary monks who were copyists comes primarily from the first half of the century. Data on the activity of *diatsi* stems from the same period. The relative number of *gramatitsi* remained stable throughout the century, but their output increased. In the same way, there was an increase in the productivity of *daskali*, notwithstanding the decrease in their relative number.⁸⁵ *Gramatitsi* ranked first in the variety of the types of centres in which they worked, in terms of their repertoire of manuscripts and in the amount of team work carried out with scribes from the other groups. Most of them copied books in and for the needs of parish centres, where they worked together with *daskali*, but they also participated in the copying of books at monasteries. The *diatsi* also worked both in monastic and parochial centres. As a rule, village priests and *daskali* carried out their literary activity exclusively in parish

81. Most probably influenced by the Serbian tradition, this title may equally be interpreted as: 1) deacon, the title of the lowest priestly rank within the hierarchy of parochial clergy; 2) a literary title, synonymous with *knizhovnik* [man of letters], *prepisvach* [copyist] or *gramatik* [grammarian], borne by laymen primarily in a monastic context; 3) a literary title, lower in rank than *gramatik*, for clergymen or laymen with a basic command of literacy and a beginner's experience in literary activities.

82. A title used by clergymen or laymen, and perhaps by parish deacons who were more advanced in literary work and who may have received their education either in monastic or in parish contexts. The term *gramatik* likely referred to men who were sufficiently educated to take part in the copying of books and to be given commissions.

83. A title given to priests from the parochial clergy with literary experience or laymen entrusted with the right and responsibility to teach reading and writing and to preside over the copying of books in parish contexts. It most likely reflected a higher degree of literary experience than that of *gramatik*.

84. See in more detail in Дилиана Радославова "Състав на българските книжовници преписвачи от XVII век според запазените приписки [Dilyana Radoslavova, The Profile of Bulgarian Copyists from the 17th Century according to the Extant Colophons]," in Боряна Христова, Елена Узунова, eds., *Факти и мистификации в старите текстове* [in Boriana Khristova, Elena Uzunova, Facts and Mystifications in Old Texts] (София: ИК "Гутенберг," 2011), 102-138; and Radoslavova, "The Repertoire of Bulgarian Manuscripts from the Seventeenth Century," 172-174. The statistical data, updated to reflect new evidence, can be seen here in Table 4.

85. The actual share of *daskali* in the number of scribes and in manuscript production was higher, as the percentage presented here in Table 4 has been calculated excluding literati who before this title bore that of a grammarian or those who were simultaneously priests.

contexts, while monks copied books only in and for monasteries. A natural environment for the close interaction between monks, on the one hand, and representatives of the parochial clergy and the laity, on the other hand, existed in Etropole. There, representatives of both groups taught or were trained and copied books at the monastery of Holy Trinity and at the parish church of St Michael. Statistical evidence about the social profiles of scribes and the participation of various groups in the creation of books undeniably indicates that over the course of the century there was a tendency towards an increase in manuscript copying activity in parish contexts.

Among the most productive copyists were calligraphers such as hieromonk Danil of Etropole, Vasilii of Sofia, priest Avram Dimitrievich from Karlovo, *daskal* Filip from Adzhar, and some others who played an important role in the literary process. Danil of Etropole is the calligrapher with the greatest number of preserved copies. He worked in the metropolitan see of Tŭrnovo and for several centres, including the monasteries of Vratsa and Etropole, and received commissions from metropolitans, Athonite monks, village priests, and laymen.⁸⁶ It can be presumed that besides Etropole, where he prepared books for the Athonite monastery of Zograf, the scribe Vasilii also worked at Rila. Some studies have uncovered the possibility that he, most probably together with his co-worker (and presumably son) Stefan, received a commission from the Serbian Patriarch Gavrilо I Rajić (1648-1655) to copy the grammatical treatise *On the Letters* by Konstantin of Kostenets.⁸⁷ Among the known scribes, the parochial priest and *daskal* Filip from Adzhar produced the greatest number of psalters, *trebnitsi* and archaic *damaskini*.⁸⁸ Data about the scribes from the Plovdiv eparchy suggests that besides being engaged in copying manuscripts and in managing scriptoria of parochial type, some of them were probably devoted preachers, such as Avram Dimitrievich who appears to have been one of the most intriguing Bulgarian bookmen of the time. He was a parish priest and an

86. Божидар Райков, "Иеромонах Даниил и етрополският книжовен център през първата половина на XVII в. [Bozhidar Raikov, Hieromonk Danil and the Etropole Literary Centre in the First Half of the 17th Century]," *Старобългарска литература*, 1 (1971): 263-287.

87. Анатолий А. Турилов, "Кем и с какой целью был изготовлен карловацкий список грамматического трактата Константина Костенецкого? [Anatolii A. Turilov, By Whom and with What Goal was the Karlovac copy of the Grammatical Treatise of Konstantin of Kostenets Prepared?]," in Зорица Витић, Томислав Јовановић, Ирена Шпадијер, eds., *Словенско средњовековно наслеђе* [Zorica Vitić, Tomislav Jovanović, Irena Špadijer, Slavonic Medieval Heritage] (Београд: Чигоја штампа, 2001), 673-687 (reprints: "Эпизод болгаро-сербско-русских связей середины XVII в. (Гипотеза о происхождении карловацкой рукописи "Сказания о письменах" Константина Костенецкого) [An Episode from Relations among the Bulgarians, Serbs, and Russians of the Middle of the 17th Century (A Hypothesis about the Origin of the Karlovac copy of the Grammatical Treatise of Konstantin of Kostenets)]," *Славяноведение*, 2 (2003): 87-97; and in Анатолий А. Турилов, *От Кирилла Философа до Константина Костенецкого и Василия Софийнина. История и культура славян IX-XVII вв.* [Anatolii A. Turilov, From Cyril the Philosopher to Konstantin of Kostenets and Vasilii of Sofia. The History and Culture of Slavs, 9th-17th Centuries] (М.: "Индрик," 2011), 289-307). About Gavrilо I Rajić, see Слијепчевић, *Историја Српске православне цркве*, 237-239.

88. Radoslavova, "The Scribal Centre at the Village of Adžar in the 17th Century."

excellent calligrapher who, apart from copying traditional books for parochial use and also for the monastery of Sopot, is supposed to have been actively involved in producing new-Bulgarian *damaskini*.

It seems that most bookmen received training in local monastic and parochial schools within the framework of the domestic medieval tradition. It is well-known that hieromonk Stefan of Lovech, for instance, studied in Wallachia⁸⁹ but his case appears to be the only documented one testifying to an education received by an Orthodox Bulgarian far from home. It could be presumed that some skilled calligraphers may have studied on Athos or in Serbia, although there is no direct evidence of that. Some Bulgarians had apparently a certain command of Greek literacy that they may have acquired at schools in the metropolitan sees such as Tŭrnovo or in monasteries such as the stauropegic one in Bachkovo in the Plovdiv eparchy, yet there is no unambiguous evidence in support of this hypothesis.

The *damaskini*'s share in the overall repertoire of books

An overview of the signed and anonymous Slavonic manuscripts copied in the Bulgarian lands in the seventeenth century (Table 5) shows that nearly 85% of the repertoire was intended for narrowly defined liturgical needs. It is noteworthy that, in comparison with the preceding tradition, there was a complete absence of books specific only for a monastic library, such as *paterika* or collections of theological-philosophical works. The repertoire also lacked chronographic collections. The list of liturgical books included psalters, *evangelia*, *apostoloi*, *sluzheb-nitsi*, *trebnitsi*, *horologia*, *oktoechoi*, *triodia*, ordinary and festal *menaia*, *prolozi*, various liturgical anthologies, including books with services and vitae of St John of Rila, and other books, such as *typika* and beadrolls. As was previously mentioned, the repertoire also comprised grammatical works: the only ever known copy of the unabridged version of *On the Letters* by Konstantin of Kostenets and a copy of the *Church Slavonic Grammar* by Meletius Smotrytskii (ed. 1618/19). The anthologies for collective or individual reading constitute around 15% of the total production. They consisted of a few collections of traditional type: two *panegyrika*,

89. He was a student of the prominent Romanian man of letters Daniil Andrean Panoneanul. About him, see Neculai A. Ursu, *Contribuții la istoria culturii românești în secolul al XVII-lea. Studii filologice* [Contributions to the History of Romanian Culture in the 17th Century. Philological studies] (Iași: Cronica, 2003), 7-133. In 1655, during his stay at Tărgoviște, hieromonk Stefan copied Meletius Smotrytskii's *Church Slavonic Grammar* (Ev'e, 1618/19). This copy, now lost, is known because of its apograph made by Mikhail from Vrachesh, near Orkhanie (Botevgrad), in 1666. Stefan wrote a poem in praise of his teacher Daniil—the first poetic attempt in metric verse made in Russian Church Slavonic by a Bulgarian, which, however, did not set a literary trend. Nevertheless, Stefan of Lovech should be considered one of the earliest known Bulgarians who were adepts and disseminators of Russian Church Slavonic. See Боряна Христова, Даринка Караджова, Нина Вутова, *Опис на славянските ръкописи в Софийската народна библиотека* [Boriana Khristova, Darinka Karadzova, Nina Vutova, Catalogue of Slavonic Manuscripts from the National Library in Sofia], 5 (София: Народна библиотека "Св. св. Кирил и Методий," 1996), 184-187, and additional references therein.

one *Uchitel'noe evangelie* (Sunday and festal sermons),⁹⁰ five of the so-called “miscellanies of mixed content,” and a copy of the *Alexandria*. A greater share belonged to the new type of miscellanies with readings translated from the vernacular Greek—two copies of the *Miracles of the Theotokos*, and a remarkable number of *damaskini*—thirteen archaic and twenty-three new-Bulgarian miscellanies, or more than 12% of the total.⁹¹

In general, the shrinking of the scope and the renewal of the repertoire of copied books in the seventeenth-century Bulgarian Orthodox milieu came with an important change not only in the linguistic but also in the macro-genre characteristics of the collections of readings. The reasons behind the major macro-structural transformation of the repertoire were closely related to the specifics of Damaskenos Studites' anthology and the practical approach that seventeenth-century Bulgarian bookmen adopted when using it as a source. As a type of book, the original *Treasure* resembled the traditional Greek *panegyrikomartyrologia*⁹² and was a collection of readings for the feasts of Our Lord and the Theotokos, for the Sundays of the Paschal cycle, for the Holy Archangels and for selected saints who were particularly venerated: the enlightener Nicholas of Myra, the venerable Mary of Egypt and the warrior martyrs George, Demetrios, Theodore Stratilates, Theodore Tyro and Eustace Placidus (Table 6). The book had a rather unusual composition. Its complicated calendar order was arranged within a general chronological framework from March to February, taking into account the hierarchy of the feasts and putting an emphasis on the Paschal theme. A key role in the composition was played by the readings for the saints as most of them had more than one calendar address, which allowed for the effective usage of the book throughout the entire year. This compilation strategy seemed to obey, quite in accordance with the spirit of the epoch, the overall thematic framework of the book: about Christ's incarnation and earthly life; about life in Christ and aiming at salvation—through fasting, penance and martyrdom; and about God's blessing manifested through the *descent* of the *Holy Spirit and the miracles of the saints*. Both on the macro-structural level and on the

90. The book was commissioned by hierodeacon Mikhail from the monastery of Xenophon on Mount Athos, and created by Danil of Etropole at Tŭrnovo in 1626. According to Petŭr Atanasov, Danil based his copy on the 1568/69 Zabludov edition printed by Ivan Fëdorov and Pëtr Mstislavets, see Петър Атанасов, *Българо-руски литературни връзки през XVII и XVIII в.* [Petŭr Atanasov, *Bulgarian-Russian Literary Ties during the 17th-18th Centuries*] (София: Наука и изкуство, 1983), 13-26. This statement needs further investigation in order to be confirmed.

91. See a preliminary list of seventeenth-century *damaskini* in Dilyana Radoslavova, “The *Damaskini* in the 17th-Century Bulgarian Literary Tradition,” *Literary Researches*, 32 (2011): 222-233. Here the number of the miscellanies has been adjusted to reflect the results of additional research.

92. Regarding this specific type of collections of homilies for the movable and immovable cycles of major feasts and vitae of selected saints, see Иван Добрев, “Агиографската реформа на Симеон Метафраст и съставът на Супрасълския сборник [Ivan Dobrev, The Hagiographic Reform of Symeon Metaphrastes and the Composition of Codex Suprasliensis],” *Старобългарска литература*, 10 (1981): 16-38, with additional references therein.

level of the composition of each text there was a fusion among the panegyric, homiletic, hagiographic, sermonic, didactic, and catechetical discourses.⁹³

The selective nature of the *Treasure* and its complex composition opened its macrostructure to interpolations and restructuring. Bulgarian literati seemed to have taken this opportunity and, in accordance with their actual needs for books, to have used constructively Damaskenos Studites' anthology for the compilation of their own collections. In this process, they departed from the overall calendar and thematic framework of the *Treasure*, utilized its texts together with other works in books of various compositions that mimicked more traditional macro-structural models, and even introduced their own compilation strategies that created overall thematic frameworks and accents that differed from the ones the original anthology had to offer. The outcome was the appearance, in the archaic language of the Church or in vernacular Bulgarian, of two main types of miscellanies: calendar-oriented collections and collections that had no calendar affiliation.⁹⁴

Most of the calendar-oriented "Sredna Gora" and modern *damaskini* were books of large format that had lavish illumination worthy of a *Tetraevangelion*. They were, by all means, suitable for reading in public at the monastery refectory and might have well been combined with the parish church *Menaion* and *Triodion* and read before the congregation on major feasts. On the other hand, the smaller, not only in size but also in volume, calendar-unaffiliated *damaskini* replaced the traditional miscellanies of mixed content in their use for private reading in lower clergy and laymen circles and were most probably used in education. In a sense, while coming from a low-code literary level in the Greek tradition, in Bulgarian letters the *Treasure* faced a positional inversion within the macro-genre hierarchy and acquired an additional sacred value. On the other hand, along with the change *damaskini* brought to the traditional literary repertoire, the freedom Bulgarian literati exercised in compiling *damaskini* both on a macro-structural level and on the level of the text indicated a transition from medieval to quasi-modern writing and literary communication which was to become much more apparent in the eighteenth century.⁹⁵

Place of origin of the *damaskini* tradition

Having reconsidered the activity of the seventeenth-century scribal centres and scribes in light of the latest discoveries elucidating the beginnings of early modern Bulgarian letters, we can turn again to the question about the place of origin of

93. See in more detail in Радославова, "Памети извън състава на Съкровище в българските дамаскини."

94. In most cases, both the calendar-oriented and the collections unaffiliated with the church calendar opened either with Damaskenos Studites' *On the Ten Commandments* or with his *On the Second Coming*. See *ibidem*, 347.

95. See Velinova, "Il libro stampato come fonte della tradizione manoscritta," 81-82; as well as Младенова, "Ловешкият дамаскин на фона на дамаскината традиция," 95-100.

the *damaskini* tradition and catalogue the arguments in favour of Lovech and its vicinity as the most probable candidate.

In the last decades of the sixteenth century—the presumable time when the “Sredna Gora” translation came into being—the climate for Slavonic literary activity in the Lovech region seemed to be opportune. Church prelates of the Tŭrnovo eparchy, such as the metropolitan Dionysios Rallis-Palaiologos (1580-1590, d. 1620)⁹⁶ and his subordinate episcopal bishops, who were involved in anti-Ottoman resistance and the First Tŭrnovo uprising (1598),⁹⁷ were most likely eager to raise the Orthodox awareness of their flock. If Damaskenos Studites’ *Treasure* was officially recommended by the ecclesiastical authorities to be read at churches in the area, as it was in the eparchies of Greece and Thrace,⁹⁸ then the choice of the *Treasure* by Bulgarian bookmen from the Tŭrnovo eparchy might not have been an accident. Whatever the case might have been, the episcopal centre of Lovech seems to have been the most plausible hypothetical place where the “Sredna Gora” translation might have appeared. Lovech was a former metropolitanate see of the Tŭrnovo Patriarchate and an old and important literary centre with roots going back well before the thirteenth century.⁹⁹ The Lovech monastery of the Theotokos, also known as *Iastreb* [Hawk] monastery, survived the conquest and in the sixteenth century continued to be an active scribal centre featuring an extensive library and well-trained bookmen. As a matter of fact, one of the earliest extant witnesses of the “Sredna Gora” translation of the *Treasure*, the so-called “Drinov copy,” comes from this monastery.¹⁰⁰ By the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century *Iastreb* was destroyed—according to local legends, due to fire or flooding—and, as it is presumed, around 1600 members of its brotherhood moved to the region of Troian and founded (or restored) the local monastery, of which the Theotokos was also the patron.¹⁰¹ The move of the Lovech monks to Troian could be also explained by their

96. He has to be distinguished from Dionysios Palaiologos, the metropolitan of Cyzicus. See Ιωάννης Χασιώτης, “Ο Μητροπολίτης Κυζίκου Διονύσιος Παλαιολόγος και η δράση του στη δυτική και ανατολική Ευρώπη κατά τον 16ο αιώνα [The Archbishop of Cyzicus Dionysios Palaiologos and His Trajectory in Western and Eastern Europe in the 16th Century],” *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 44 (2010): 575-680.

97. Тютюнджиев, *Търновската митрополия през XV-XIX в.*, 167-194, 427.

98. Пётр А. Лавров, *Дамаскин Студит и сборники его имени “дамаскины” в юго-славянской письменности* [Pëtr A. Lavrov, *Damaskenos Studites and the Miscellanies in His Name “Damaskins” in South Slavonic Literature*] (Одесса: “Экономическая типография,” 1899), 2.

99. See Христова, “Ловеч”; Тютюнджиев, *Търновската митрополия през XV-XIX в.*, 421-433; Боряна Велчева, “Преводът [Boriana Velcheva, *The Translation*],” in Младенова, Велчева, *Ловешки дамаскин*, 108-131 (p. 121 in particular).

100. Елена Узунова, “Ловчански манастир [Elena Uzunova, *Lovech Monastery*],” in Петканова, ed., *Старобългарска литература*, 284-285.

101. See Красимира Мутаfoва, “Още за историята на Троянския манастир [Krasimira Mutafova, *More on the History of Troian Monastery*],” *Духовна култура*, 1 (2001): 22-29. The legendary account states that a wonderworking icon of the Theotokos from the monastery of Lovech had survived the destruction and as a hawk (!) flew off from the ruins and landed on a walnut tree near the place where the monastery of Troian was established (ibidem).

urge to find a safer place, deep in the Balkan Mountains and further away from the episcopal centre, out of fear of Ottoman reprisals after the defeat of the First Tŭrnovo uprising. If Lovech with its *Iastreb* monastery was the place of origin of the “Sredna Gora” translation, then the archaic *damaskini* trend might have suffered a certain disruption while being transplanted (presumably to the monastery of Troian).¹⁰² On the other hand, the troubled years of the 1593-1603 Ottoman-Habsburg war and the First Tŭrnovo uprising, together with the distress the Lovech monks suffered losing their cloister, might well have ignited apocalyptic feelings and provoked the appearance of the new-Bulgarian version of Damaskenos Studites’ *On the Second Coming*. In this regard, it could be presumed that the Troian monastery might well have become the main hub for the dissemination (or the place of origin) of the very first new-Bulgarian texts. If nothing else, the scenario proposed here coincides with and is strongly supported by linguistic data pointing at the dialectal basis of the *Lovech Damaskin* and its counterpart miscellanies of eschatological readings, as well as by their textual history.¹⁰³ It also gives a possible answer to the question how exactly the *damaskini* trend reached the Sredna Gora region to flourish there.

The possible directions of dissemination of the Lovech *damaskini* tradition, which might have been hosted by the Troian monastery, were westward in the northern Balkan Mountains and southward through the Troian pass (*Traianovi vrata* ‘Emperor Traian’s gate’) to the Sredna Gora scribal centres. Thus the archaic *damaskini* tradition might have developed further west, reaching Etropole where it did not manage to prevail in the “classic” repertoire of readings, and south, to the educational centre of Adzhar where future parish priests received a traditional education and became familiar with the archaic *damaskini* translation. Similarly, the new-Bulgarian *damaskini* trend might have spread in the same geographic directions and developed further through more adaptations into the new literary language that were compiled in various collections by pupils of the Lovech, Etropole, and Adzhar schools,

Over time, the Lovech icon had been “associated” with the Troian wonderworking icon of the Theotokos *Troeruchitsa* [Three-handed], a copy of the famous Hilandar relic, see Иванка Гергова, *Чудесата на Пресвета Богородица в културата на Българското възраждане* [Ivanka Gergova, The Miracles of the Most Holy Theotokos in the Culture of the Bulgarian Revival] (София: Фондация “Покров Богородичен,” 2012), 153-162; Елка Бакалова, *Култът към реликвите и чудотворните икони. Традиции и съвременност* [Elka Bakalova, The Cult of Relics and of Wonderworking Icons: Traditions and Contemporary Practices] (София: Издателство на БАН “Проф. Марин Дринов,” 2016), 99-101.

102. This would explain the time gap between the first copies of the “Sredna Gora” translation in the sixteenth century and the next extant witnesses, which are from the 1640s.

103. Although there is no evidence to support the supposition that there was a scriptorium operating at the monastery of Troian, if one takes in account the outcome of Olga Mladenova’s studies, the location fits well with the profile of the hypothetical literary centre that she posits. This would be where the very first new-Bulgarian texts were put on paper and kept for copying or further dissemination as separate booklets before the final compilation of the proto-book of the group of the *Lovech damaskin*, see Младенова, “Ловешкият дамаскин на фона на дамаскината традиция,” 67-70. It is also significant that the Troian monastery is the place of provenance of two important new-Bulgarian manuscripts ascribed to Avram Dimitrievich. These manuscripts shed light on the initial activity of the centre in question, as well as on the stage at which literati contributing to the literary activity there began to include in their collections texts adapted in the second hypothetical centre of the early modern Bulgarian trend (ibidem).

by prominent bookmen such as the Karlovo priest Avram Dimitrievich and his followers who disseminated the new-Bulgarian writings in the localities that were to become in the next century the nests of the so-called “Bulgarian National Revival.”

The overall tendencies of the seventeenth-century literary tradition and prospects of further study

Along with the wave of *democratisation* and *modernisation* of letters brought by the *damaskini* trend, seventeenth-century Bulgarian book production submitted to yet another strong tendency—that of *archaisation*.¹⁰⁴ There were various aspects to this archaisation, which was manifested at the levels of selecting book compositional models and constituent texts/translations, orthography, and manuscript graphic appearance. This tendency was a conscious turn towards the classical literary heritage of the Old and Middle Bulgarian periods. Thus, texts deriving from the Glagolitic tradition of the ninth to the eleventh centuries were included in some Bulgarian *trebnitsi*, along with works by St Kliment of Ohrid and St Euthymios of Tŭrnovo that found a place in traditional miscellanies for reading and in new-Bulgarian *damaskini*. Again, in the *damaskini*, one can detect a preference for old authoritative translations. Another manifestation of deliberate archaisation was the application of Middle-Bulgarian two-*ius* orthography in some new-Bulgarian texts. The Middle Bulgarian tradition was also referenced by the preference for a script stylising the Tŭrnovo liturgical uncial.

Adhering to tradition also meant maintaining the cults of pan-Slavonic and local saints. In seventeenth-century Bulgarian books the veneration of St Cyril the Apostle of the Slavs,¹⁰⁵ the Tŭrnovo saints Hilarion of Moglena and Mikhail of Potuka,¹⁰⁶ as well as the anchorites Prochorus of Pčinja, Gabriel of Lesnovo, and Joachim of Osogovo reappeared.¹⁰⁷ The cult of St John of Rila was maintained in Rila and also

104. Radoslavova, “The Repertoire of Bulgarian Manuscripts from the Seventeenth Century,” 176-179.

105. A service for the saint was included in the Seslavtsi, Etropole, and Adzhar *menaia*, and his commemoration appeared in church calendars in manuscripts from the Plovdiv eparchy.

106. The relics of these two saints were transferred to Tŭrnovo during the reign of Tsar Kaloian (1197-1207). One can find thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Tŭrnovo hagiographic narratives about St Hilarion, Bishop of Moglena in the repertoire of Etropole scribes. For more about St Hilarion, see Климента Иванова, “Житие на Иларион Мъгленски [Klimentina Ivanova, Vita of St Hilarion of Moglena],” in Петканова, ed., *Старобългарска литература*, 178-179; and Janet Hamilton and Bernard Hamilton, *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650-c. 1450* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1998), 225-227. Regarding the dragon-slayer martyr Mikhail of Potuka, see Климента Иванова, “Житие на Михаил Воин от Потука [Klimentina Ivanova, Vita of St Mikhail, Soldier of Potuka],” in Петканова, ed., *Старобългарска литература*, 181.

107. The cults of these three South Slavonic saints originated in the eleventh or the twelfth century and bear parallels to the cult to St John of Rila. See Димо Чешмеджиев, “Култовете на българските светци през XI-XII век [Dimo Cheshmedzhiev, The Cults of the Bulgarian Saints during the 11th-12th Centuries],” *Пловдивски университет “Паисий Хилендарски.” Научни трудове*, 41, 1 (2003): 495-503; Ирена Шпадијер, “Јужнословенски пустињаци

in some monasteries in the Sofia eparchy, Vratsa, and Etropole.¹⁰⁸ According to the manuscript tradition, the cult of the popular Balkan saint Paraskevi of Epivates (Petka of Tŭrnovo / Petka of Serbia), whose relics were transferred from Constantinople to the Moldavian town of Iași in 1641, was spread everywhere.¹⁰⁹

Texts devoted to the Serbian saints Simeon,¹¹⁰ Sava¹¹¹ and Stefan of Dečani,¹¹² are to be found in Bulgarian *menaia* as the names of St Simeon and St Sava are attested—usually as the only Slavonic saints—in *menologia* (church calendars) copied in all known Bulgarian centres, which is a sign of a strong Serbian influence. This influence, which is also suggested by the mass acceptance of the Resava ortho-

X-XIII века у најстаријој литературној традицији [Irena Špadier, South Slavonic Hermits from the 10th-13th Centuries in the Earliest Literary Tradition],” *Старобългарска литература*, 47 (2013): 108-120; as well as the following publications on specific cults: Анатолий А. Турилов, “Гаврил Лесновский [Anatolii A. Turilov, Gabriel of Lesnovo],” in Православная энциклопедия, <http://www.pravenc.ru/> (accessed 3 November 2016); Илија Велев, *Свети Гаврил Лесновски во книжевната традиција* [Ilija Velev, St Gabriel of Lesnovo in the Literary Tradition] (Скопје: Менора, 1996); Викторија Поповска-Коробар, *Лесновски манастир Св. Архангел Михаил и Св. Гаврил Лесновски* [Viktorija Popovska-Korobar, Lesnovo Monastery of the Holy Archangel Michael and St Gabriel of Lesnovo] (Скопје: Музеј на Македонија, 2000); Анатолий А. Турилов, Димо Чешмеджиев, “Иоаким Осоговский [Anatolii A. Turilov, Dimo Cheshmedzhiev, Joachim of Osogovo],” in Православная энциклопедия, <http://www.pravenc.ru/text/468939.html>, (accessed 3 November 2016); Јордан Михајловски, “Свети Јоаким Осоговски во народната и духовната традиција [Jordan Mihajlovski, St Joachim of Osogovo in the Folkloric and the Orthodox Traditions],” *Славишки зборник*, 2 (2013): 330-333; Danica Popović, “Paying Devotions to the Holy Hermit: The Shrine of St Prochorus of Pčinja,” in Evangelia Hadjityphonos, ed., *Routes of Faith in the Medieval Mediterranean. History, Monuments, People, Pilgrimage Perspectives* (Thessalonike: European Centre of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Monuments, 2008), 215-226. In seventeenth-century Bulgarian manuscripts, the names of Sts Gabriel, Joachim, and Prochoros were listed in hymns of praise to saints. Such hymns were appended to the liturgical miscellany of Rila monastery compiled in 1601, and to the *panegyrikon*, copied at Tŭrnovo by Danil of Etropole in 1622-1623. The service for St Prochoros was included in a *menaion* donated to the monastery of Zemen in the western part of the Bulgarian lands.

108. Дилиана Радославова, “Култът към св. Иван Рилски, отразен в българските ръкописи от XVII век [Dilyana Radoslavova, The Cult of St John of Rila as Reflected in Bulgarian Manuscripts of the 17th Century],” *Старобългарска литература*, 33-34 (2005): 247-262.

109. Дилиана Радославова, “Службата за преподобна Петка в българските ръкописи от XVII век [Dilyana Radoslavova, The Service for the Venerable Petka in Bulgarian Manuscripts of the 17th Century],” in Анисава Милтенова, Елена Томова, Радослава Станкова, eds., *Християнска агиология и народни вярвания* [Anisava Miltenova, Elena Tomova, Radoslava Stankova, Christian Hagiology and Popular Beliefs] (София: Изток-Запад, 2008), 123-133.

110. The thirteenth-century service for St Simeon written by St Sava was included in the Vratsa and Etropole *menaia*. These Bulgarian copies are witnesses of the earliest recension of the work. See Радослава Станкова, *Сръбската книжнина през XIII век (контекст и текст)* [Radoslava Stankova, Serbian Letters during the 13th Century: Context and Text] (София: Академично издателство “Проф. Марин Дринов,” 2007), 145.

111. The fourteenth-century service for St Sava by the Hilandar bookman Teodosije (ibidem, 182-183) is present in an Etropole *menaion*.

112. The service for Stefan III Uroš (1322-1331) composed by the Tŭrnovo hesychast Grigorii Tsamblak was included in a *menaion* composed in the Vratsa monastery. See Мария Йовчева, “Химнографското творчество на Григорий Цамблак [Mariia Iovcheva, Hymnographic Works of Grigorii Tsamblak],” in Милтенова, ed., *История на българската средновековна литература*, 544-546.

graphy in Bulgarian scriptoria and by the aesthetic canon of script and illumination shared by Bulgarian and Serbian scribal centres, deserves further investigation that would specify the Serbian contribution to the maintenance of the Orthodox tradition among Bulgarians, as well as the parameters of Serbian-Bulgarian mutual influence. Also little is known of the Bulgarian-Romanian literary collaboration,¹¹³ as well as the probable impact Romanian Church Slavonic manuscripts and printed books had upon literary production in Bulgarian lands. Yet another unstudied aspect of seventeenth-century Bulgarian Orthodox letters is the codification of book production and liturgical practice. Signs of such process are the unification of book compositions and contents in manuscripts of the major Bulgarian scribal centres as well as the reduced number of forbidden readings included in manuscripts at that time. The question of what *typika* rules were applied by Bulgarian bookmen working in a complex constellation of ecclesiastical abeyances, literary influences, and a domestic tradition remains open.

The important conclusion here is that during the seventeenth century the Bulgarian Orthodox community, although lacking a native-controlled church establishment, managed to cultivate literati who, leaning on tradition, developed a new literary language based on the vernacular. The vernacular Greek anthology *Treasure* became as popular with Bulgarians as it was with Greeks due to the similar cultural circumstances in which they lived,¹¹⁴ but mainly because of the approach Bulgarian bookmen took to satisfy their need for texts to be included in collections for liturgical and individual reading. The reception of Damaskenos Studites' anthology changed the traditional repertoire of copied books, triggered the early modern Bulgarian literary trend and introduced a new attitude towards the book and the written word. In the long run, the first new-Bulgarian *damaskini* which initiated a stable tradition of a literature in an understandable native language contributed to cultivating the national identity of Bulgarians and to constructing the Bulgarian nation within the context of ethno-linguistically based nationalism in the Balkans.¹¹⁵

Institute of Literature, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

radoslad@yahoo.com

113. Important data, but for an earlier period, are provided by Emil Turdeanu, *La littérature bulgare du xiv^e siècle et sa diffusion dans les pays roumains* (P.: Institut d'Études slaves, 1947); Idem, *Études de littérature roumaine et d'écrits slaves et grecs des Principautés Roumaines* (Leiden: Brill, 1985).

114. Джузепе Дел'Агата, *Студии по българистика и славистика* [Giuseppe Dell'Agata, *Essays in Bulgarian and Slavonic Studies*] (София: Издателство "Лик," 1999), 51-52.

115. See some of its aspects discussed in Jouko Lindstedt, "When in the Balkans, Do as the Romans Do—or Why the Present is the Wrong Key to the Past," in Jouko Lindstedt, Max Walhström, eds., *Balkan Encounters—Old and New Identities in South-Eastern Europe* (=Slavica Helsingensia, 41), (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2012), 107-123.

ANNEXES

On the Second Coming (MS 119, Ivan Vazov Public Library of Plovdiv, Bulgaria, f. 1)

**Places of 17th-century scribal activity of Orthodox Bulgarians
in the dioceses of Constantinople and Peć**

Table 1
Geography of the scribal activity: manuscript production and scribes

Patri- archate	Metropoli- tanate	Episco- pate	Place	Monastery	Manu- scripts	Scribes
Constanti- nople	Tŭrnovo		Tŭrnovo		≤ 4	1
			Batoshevo		1	1
			Svalenik		1	1
		Lovech	Lovech		1	1
				The Theotokos, Lovech	1	2
			Etropole		6	≥5
				Holy Trinity, Etropole	≈ 32	>32
			Glozhene		1	1
				St George, Glozhene	1	1
			Teteven		1	1
				St Elias, Teteven	2	2
		(?) Vratsa	Dolni Dŭbnik		1	1
			Dermantsi		1	1
			Slavovitsa		1	1
			Radomirtsi		2	1
			Vrachesh		1	1
				Holy Archangels, Kalugerovo	1	1
			Vratsa		2	2
				Holy Trinity, Vratsa	≈9	>8
				(?) St John the Theologian	≈2	1
				The Theotokos, Cherepish	1	1
	Plovdiv		Adzhar		≈22	>8
			Sushitsa (Karlovo)		≈6	>1
				The Ascension, Sopot	2	1
				Sts Healers, Kuklen	≈6	>5
			Chardak		1	1
Constanti- nople	Sofia			St Nicholas, Seslavltsi	>3	>1
				The Theotokos, Eleshnitsa	≈5	>4
				The Theotokos, Dragalevtsi	1	1
				St Johh of Rila, German	1	1
				Holy Archangel, Kokaliane	1	1
				St. John the Theologian, Zemen	1	1
				The Ascension, Lozen	1	1
				St Athanasios, Dobrevtsi	1	1

Patri-archate	Metropoli-tanate	Episco-pate	Place	Monastery	Manu-scripts	Scribes
Pec		Samokov (?)	Razlog Kovachevtsi	The Theotokos, Rila	≈12 1 1 1	≈5 1 1 1

Table 2
Repertory of the most productive centres

	Rila Monastery	Kuklen Monastery	Elshnitsa Monastery	Vratsa Monastery	Etropole Monastery	Etropole	Adzhar	Sushitsa
Psalter	1						4	1
<i>Tetraevangelion</i>		1		1		2	2	
<i>Apostolos</i>					2			
<i>Sluzhebnik (Leitougikon)</i>					1	1		
<i>Trebnik (Hagiasmatarion)</i>					1	1	7	
<i>Sluzhebnik and Trebnik (Euchologion)</i>	2							
<i>Horologion</i>							1	
<i>Oktoechos</i>					1		1	
<i>Triodion</i>	1				2		1	
<i>Menaion</i>	3	5	5	7	20			
<i>Festal Menaion</i>							2	
<i>Prolog (Synaxarion)</i>					2	1		
Liturgical miscellany				1				1
Liturgical miscellany with damaskin						1		
Services and vitae of St John of Rila	4							
<i>Kanons</i>	1				1			1
<i>Panegyrikon</i>					1			
<i>Damaskin, archaic</i>							3	
<i>Damaskin, new-Bulgarian</i>								2
<i>Miracles of the Theotokos</i>								1
<i>Alexandria</i>							1	
Beadroll					1			

Table 3
Copyists' titles and scribal activity

Religious Group	Church rank/ Literary Title	Name	Manu- scripts	Monas- tery	Parish milieu
Monks	Hieromonk	Atanasiĭ	3	1	0
		Vasiliĭ	1	1	0
		Gerasim	1	1	0
		Danil	≈19	≥3	≥2
		Evstratiĭ	1	1	0
		Kalinik	1	1	0
		Nikifor	1	1	0
		Pimen of Zograf	3	≥1	0
		Rafail	4	1	0
		Roman of Zagorie	1	1	0
	Diak and Deacon	Jov Šišatovac	5	3	0
Parish clergy and laity	Hieromonk or ordinary monk	Unknown	1	1	0
		Gavril	1	1	0
	Priest	Avram Dimitrievich	≈10	?1	1
		Argirie	1	0	1
		Bogdan	1	0	1
		Georgi	1	1	0
		Ĭovko	2	?1	1
		Manasie	1	1	0
		Nikola	1	0	1
		Stoĭo	1	?	?
		Tikho	1	0	1
	Priest (former Gramatik and Diak)	Ĭoan	≈5	1	1
	Priest and Daskal	Nedialko	≥2	0	1
		Dragan	1	0	1
		Peĭo	1	0	1
		Petŭr	6	≥1	?1
		Rasho	1	0	1
	Daskal (former Gramatik)	Koĭo of Brestnitsa	2	1	1
		Filip	≈13	0	1
		Ban	2	0	1
	Gramatik	Bogdan	1	0	1
		Dushko	1	0	1
		Koĭko	1	1	0
		Krŭstiu	≈5	≥1	≤1

Religious Group	Church rank/ Literary Title	Name	Manu- scripts	Monas- tery	Parish milieu
	Diak	Priia Dragul	3 ≈3	? 1	? 0
Unclear	Priest or Hieromonk No title	Nikifor Dimitŭr the Sinner	2 ≈3	≥1 ?	0 ?
		Mikhail of Vrachesh	1	0	1
		Nikita	1	0	1
		Vasilii of Sofia	≈11	>1	?
		Stefan	≈9	>1	?
		Teodosii	1	1	0
		Teofil	1	0	1

Table 4
Percentage of the scribes of various ranks and of their production

	17 th c.		17 th c. 1 st half		17 th c. 2 nd half	
	Copyists	Manuscripts	Copyists	Manuscripts	Copyists	Manuscripts
All monks	30%	41%	35%	56%	29%	13%
Ordinary monks	7%	7%	9%	10%	6%	3%
Hieromonks	23%	34%	26%	46%	23%	10%
All priests	40%	52%	39%	55%	40%	43%
Parish priests	17%	18%	13%	9%	17%	33%
Deacons	unclear	unclear	unclear	unclear	unclear	unclear
Diatsi	4%	3%	6%	5%	unclear	unclear
Gramatitsi	20%	13%	17%	11%	25%	18%
Daskali	7%	15%	6%	5%	7%	33%
The whole parish clergy and laity	48%	49%	42%	30%	53%	84%
Copyists of unclear profile	22%	10%	23%	14%	18%	3%

Table 5
The overall repertoire of 17th-century Bulgarian manuscripts

Type of book	Number of copies
Psalter	13
<i>Tetraevangelion</i>	28
<i>Evangelion Aprakos</i>	2
<i>Apostolos</i>	8
<i>Sluzhebnik (Leitourgikon)</i>	17
<i>Trebnik (Hagiasmatarion)</i>	33
<i>Sluzhebnik and Trebnik (Euchologion)</i>	2
<i>Horologion</i>	14

Type of book	Number of copies
<i>Oktoechos</i>	19
<i>Triodion</i>	13
<i>Menaion</i>	49
<i>Festal Menaion</i>	9
<i>Katavasia</i>	1
A saint's Service	1
Calendar with troparia and kondakia	2
<i>Prolog (Synaxarion)</i>	10
Liturgical miscellany	5
Liturgical miscellany with damaskin	1
Liturgical book with services and vitae of St John of Rila	5
<i>Kanons</i>	7
<i>Panegyrikon</i>	2
<i>Uchitel'noe evangelie (Sunday and festal sermons)</i>	1
<i>Damaskin, archaic</i>	13
<i>Damaskin, new-Bulgarian</i>	23
Miscellany of mixed content	5
<i>Miracles of the Theotokos</i>	2
<i>Alexandria</i>	1
Nomocanon	1
<i>Typikon</i>	1
Beadroll	3
<i>On the Letters by Konstantin of Kostenets</i>	1
<i>Church Slavonic Grammar by Meletius Smotrytskii</i>	1
TOTAL	293

Table 6
Macro-composition of the original *Treasure*

Feast	Date	Feasts/Sermons	Date/Calendar address
1. Annunciation	25 Mar	14. St George the Great Martyr	[23 Apr/6 Nov/26 Nov]
2. Christmas	25 Dec	15. <i>Against lamenting for the deceased</i>	[7 th Saturday after Pascha]
3. Epiphany	6 Jan	16. <i>On fasting and forbearance</i>	Cheesefare Sunday
4. Candlemas	2 Feb	17. St Theodore Stratilates	8 Feb/8 Jun
5. Lazarus Saturday		18. Holy Archangels	08 Nov [/6 Sep/26 Mar]
6. Palm Sunday		19. St Eustace Placidus	20 Sep
7. Easter Eve		20. St Nicholas of Myra	6 Dec
8. Easter		21.-34. Homilies from the Sunday of the Pharisee and the Publican to the Sunday of All Saints, including the Vita of St Mary of Egypt	04 Apr/5 th Sunday of Holy Lent
9. Ascension			
10. Pentecost			
11. Transfiguration	6 Aug		
12. Assumption	15 Aug	35. St Demetrios of Thessaloniki	26 Oct
13. Presentation of the Theotokos	21 Nov	36. St Theodore Tyro	1 st Saturday of Lent/[27 Feb]