

### III

Miliana Kaymakamova

## The Cult of the Bulgarian Tsar Peter (927–969) and the Driving Ideas of the Bulgarian Liberation Uprisings against the Byzantine Rule in the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> Century



It is well known that at the time of the Byzantine rule (11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> century), the Bulgarians used to rise periodically in an open conflict against the central authority in an effort to regain their state independence. According to the sources, their activity reached its peak during the 11<sup>th</sup> century when the Empire was deeply shaken by instability. At that time, six uprisings and seven plots were organised<sup>1</sup>. As the Komnenoi Dynasty came to rule during the 1080s, the Bulgarian military resistance subsided and acquired an episodic nature. This is clearly illustrated by the fact that during the 12<sup>th</sup> century only two armed events were recorded, and they took place during the reign of emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180)<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> For further details on the evolution of these movements and on their leaders, see И. Божилков, В. Гюзелев, *История на средновековна България VII–XIV в.*, София 2006, pp. 395–418.

<sup>2</sup> Attention to them was drawn by Vassil Gyuzelev (В. Гюзелев, *Бележки върху историята на българските земи и българите половин столетие преди въстанието*

The hope for liberation was revived in the 1180s when the Empire fell into a deep crisis again. The Assen brothers took advantage of it and in 1185 organised a new liberation uprising, its centre in Tarnovo, which led to the restoration of the Bulgarian Tsardom. In addition to this uprising, among the largest revolts were those organised by Samuel's grandson Peter Delyan in 1040–1041 and by George Voyteh – a boyar from Skopje who originated from a kavkhans family – in 1072–1073.

These three anti-Byzantine movements from the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> century have yet another very significant characteristic that convincingly reveals their liberation character and distinguishes them from the other four anti-Byzantine uprisings (of Bulgarians and Vlachs in Thessaly in 1066, led by a noble citizen of Larissa – Nikoulitzas Delphinus; of the uprising of Bulgarian population in the Theme of Paristrion in 1073, led by the Bulgarian Nestor who was holding a Byzantine office; of the Paulician Leka in Sredets; and of Dobromir in Mesembria in the period 1073–1078). What distinguished the former three was the fact that their leaders were proclaimed as Bulgarian tsars, adopting the name of St. Tsar Peter (927–969). Specifically, these were: Samuel's grandson Peter II Delyan (1040–1041); Peter III (1072) – Constantine Bodin, grandson of tsar Samuel, and Peter IV (1185–1190; 1196–1197) – Theodore, the eldest of the first three Assen brothers<sup>3</sup>.

In previous studies, this specific phenomenon, which has no analogue in other periods of the history of mediaeval Bulgaria, is linked, on the one hand, with the name and the popularity of the Bulgarian tsar Peter I who was canonised after his death and is revered by the church and by the Bulgarian people<sup>4</sup> and, on the other hand, with the need of the rebellion leaders to gain legitimacy as Bulgarian tsars, and who adopted his name

---

на Асеновци (1186–1188), [in:] Проф. д.и.н. Станчо Ваклинов и средновековната българска култура, ed. К. Попконстантинов, Б. Борисов, Р. Костова, Велико Търново 2005, pp. 37–38). These are: 1) the riot of the Bulgarians from Belgrade which broke out in 1154 during the war of the said basileus with the Hungarians; 2) the clash of his troops with the Bulgarians in Sredets district in 1166–1167.

<sup>3</sup> For further details on these Bulgarian tsars, see Й. Андреев, И. Лазаров, П. Павлов, *Кой кой е в средновековна България*, 3 София 2012, pp. 547–550, 553–556.

<sup>4</sup> В. Гюзелев, *Черноморската област в историята на Българското царство от възобновяването му (1186 г.) до възобновяването на Византийската империя*

for that reason<sup>5</sup>. Of course, these explanations are fully justified, but we believe that they do not exhaust the issue of the reason which had caused it as a cultural phenomenon during the period of the Byzantine rule of the Bulgarian lands (11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> centuries).

Some of our preliminary observations on the initial course of these three Bulgarian liberation uprisings against the Byzantine rule show that the above list of tsars named Peter outlines a religious and political concept of the Bulgarian public authority which is focused on St. Tsar Peter I, who embodied the Bulgarian Tsardom of that time. The ‘new Peters’ and the typical way in which they came to rule suggest that the concept in question has a key role for the conceptual understanding of these uprisings, and the name of the Bulgarian Saint Tsar who, in the course of the fight, used to perform the role of ‘rex perpetuus’, is used as a historical argument for proclamation of the Bulgarian state independence and the restoration of the Tsardom (*renovatio imperii*)<sup>6</sup>.

Therefore, the task of this study is to examine in detail the importance of the cult of the Bulgarian tsar Peter (927–969) as the origin of ideas that asserted the liberating character of the three major Bulgarian uprisings against the Byzantine rule and played a major role in the consolidation of the Bulgarians around their leaders. I would like to highlight that the issue of the ideology of these uprisings has not yet been the subject of a purposeful examination in the modern mediaeval studies. The reasons for this

(1261 г.), [in:] *Studia archaeologica. Supplementum II. Сборник в чест на професор Атанас Милчев*, София 2002, p. 248.

<sup>5</sup> Д. Чешмеджиев, *Няколко бележки за култа към цар Петър I (927–969)*, [in:] *Християнската традиция и царската институция в българската култура*, ed. В. Бонева, Е. Иванова, Шумен 2003, pp. 35–36; idem, *Култът към цар Петър (927–969): манастирски или държавен?*, [in:] *Азубав према образувању и вера у Бога у православним манастирима*, 5. Меѓународна Хилendarска конференција. *Зборник изабраних радова I*, ed. Р. Матејић et al., Београд–Columbus 2006, pp. 255–257; И. Билярски, *Покровители на Царството: Св. цар Петър и св. Параскева-Петка*, София 2004, pp. 33–42. Д. Польшаннин, *Царь Петр в исторической памяти болгарского средневековья*, [in:] *Средновековният българин и “другите”*. *Сборник в чест на 60-годишнината на проф. дин Петър Ангелов*, ed. А. Николов, Г.Н. Николов, София 2013, p. 141.

<sup>6</sup> М. Каймакова, *Власт и история в средновековна България (VII–XIV век)*, София 2011, pp. 220–224.

‘white spot’ in historiography can be explained, to a certain extent, with the lack of sufficient concrete data in the sources. They cannot, however, be an excuse for its neglect, because the Byzantine and Bulgarian writers of the 11<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> century do give us certain information which, although not so detailed, allows its in-depth study. In view of this, it is necessary to remind of the merits of tsar Peter which subsequently justified his canonisation and turning into a symbol of the Bulgarian State during the period of the Byzantine rule.

### 1. A Brief Overview of the History of the Cult of Tsar Peter in Mediaeval Bulgaria

To explain the importance of the cult of the ruler for the conceptual justification of the three major Bulgarian uprisings against the Byzantine rule in the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> century, we need to trace, although briefly, its occurrence and evolution. The results and achievements of our previous studies devoted to the history of the cult will serve as a basis for tracing it.

The sources that shine light on the cult of the ruler are diverse both in type and in content<sup>7</sup>. These are mostly works of the liturgical literature – gospels, prologues, menaions, troparions in which tsar Peter is commemorated on January 30<sup>th</sup>, because this date is combined with the date of transfer of the remains of Saint Clement of Rome, and not because this is the day on which the earthly life of tsar Peter came to an end<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Й. Иванов, *Български старини из Македония*, ed. Д. Ангелов, София 1970, pp. 383–386; И. Дуйчев, *Из старата българска книжнина*, vol. I, София 1943, pp. 98–102, 220–222; Р. Павлова, *Петър Черноризец старобългарски писател от Х в.*, София 1994, pp. 24–29; П. Димитров, *Петър Черноризец*, Шумен 1995, pp. 39–42; Д. Чешмеджиев, *Няколко бележки...*, pp. 25–26; И. Билярски, *Покровители...*, pp. 21–24; И. Билярски, М. Йовчева, *За датата на успението на цар Петър и за култа към него*, [in:] *Тангра. Сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на акад. Васил Гюзелев*, ed. М. Каймакамова et al., София 2006, pp. 546–547.

<sup>8</sup> For further details on this fixed commemorative date of tsar Peter in liturgical sources, see И. Билярски, М. Йовчева, *За датата на успението...*, pp. 547–552; Д. Полывянный, *Царь Петр...*, p. 143.

Information about the Saint Tsar can also be found in: *Synodikon of Tsar Boril* from 1211, some historical chronicles such as the *Bulgarian Apocryphal Chronicle* (*Tale of the Prophet Isaiah* – 11<sup>th</sup> century), *Narrative of the Martyrs of Zographou* (13<sup>th</sup> century), monuments of trade writings such as *Charter of Virgino Brdo* by Constantine Tih Assen (1257–1277)<sup>9</sup>, as well as some monuments of Bulgarian tsars and tsaritsas, such as the *Drinov's beadroll*<sup>10</sup>.

The main source on the cult is the *Service of St. Tsar Peter*, since no reliable traces of a *Life* of his have been found so far, but there is no doubt that such existed. Yordan Ivanov is of the opinion that there has been a full (the Zograph manual copy – the *Draganov's menaion*) and short (manuscript No 434 of the Belgrade National Library) service for tsar Peter<sup>11</sup>. Subsequently, Stephan Kozhuharov establishes that in fact the 'two services' represent two fragments from one service<sup>12</sup>. His observations on the two texts published by Yordan Ivanov allow him to establish that it has been of a studio type, but incomplete, because of its merger with the service for the transfer of the remains of Saint Clement of Rome. Its full text used to contain chants without which we can speak neither of full service nor of a 'short commemoration' – dismissal hymn, kontakion and oikos, and along with them – another two sticheras of 'Lord I called Thee' and one kathisma. The restructuring of the work allows Kozhuharov to specify that the service was written by only one author who was a talented

<sup>9</sup> The question of whether this charter is authentic or not has not yet found its satisfactory and final solution. Cf. Й. И в а н о в, *Български старини...*, pp. 578–581; G.A. I l y n s k i y, *Gramoty bolgarskih carey*, London 1970, pp. 53–54, 86–87 [= *Грамоты болгарских царей. Трудъ Г.А. Ильинского*, Москва 1911]. However, what is important in this case is that the mentioning of St. tsar Peter among the donors of the 'St. George the Fast' Monastery in Virgino Brdo near Skopje speaks of the ideological significance of the cult of the Saint Tsar in the formation of the rulers' ideology in a Bulgarian and Balkan (Serbian) environment. See И. Б и л я р с к и, *Покровители...*, pp. 23–24.

<sup>10</sup> Й. И в а н о в, *Избрани произведения*, ed. Б. А н г е л о в, vol. I, София 1982, p. 152.

<sup>11</sup> *Service of St. Tsar Peter*, pp. 383–394.

<sup>12</sup> С. К о ж у х а р о в, *Търновската книжовна школа и развитието на химничната поезия в старата българска литература*, ТКШ 1, 1974, p. 288, fn. 28; i d e m, *Служба за цар Петър*, [in:] *Старобългарска литература. Енциклопедичен речник*, ed. Д. П е т к а н о в а, Велико Търново 2003, p. 474; i d e m, *Проблеми на старобългарската поезия*, София 2004, pp. 75–79.

poet hymn-writer and a follower of the monk tsar. He wrote his work in the traditions of the Preslav and Ohrid hymnographic school soon after the death of the ruler. For this dating, the said scholar refers to the passages that mention 'great waves and storms' as well as to the prayer addresses for deliverance from 'the great misfortune that has befallen us', from 'suffering and misfortunes coming from enemies'. According to him, the service for tsar Peter appears to be one of the last works of the Old Bulgarian literature, created before the ruin of the capital Preslav. Almost all researchers of the cult of tsar Peter after Kozhuharov adopt his conclusions and talk about the 'service' (and not of services) for the Saint Tsar.

The observations and the conclusions of Stephan Kozhuharov make researchers after him feel more confident in dating the emergence of the service and the beginning of the cult to the period between 969–971<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup> Д. Чешмеджиев, *Няколко бележки за култа...*, р. 24; И. Билярски, *Покровители...*, р. 22. Bistra Nikolova (Б. Николова, *Цар Петър и характерът на неговия култ*, PBg 33.2, 2009, pp. 68–69), puts in doubt this dating and links the emergence of the service with the first decades of the 11<sup>th</sup> century arguing that the words 'Tsardom' and 'tsar' are not mentioned in one of the places in the service containing prayer addresses to the Saint which speaks about salvation from the 'great misfortune' pending upon the praying people. Therefore, according to her, these prayers do not seem to necessarily target events from 969–971, when Bulgaria is subjected to the attacks of Knyaz Svyatoslav and of emperor John Tzymiskes, but they reflect the attacks of the Pechenegs that took place during the 30s–40s of the 11<sup>th</sup> century and led to their settling down in Preslav and to the decline of the town in the middle of the 11<sup>th</sup> century. According to the author, this is also the *terminus ante quem* for the appearance of the service.

It seems to me that this argument of Nikolova is groundless because the prayer address in question was taken out from the context of this part of the service which begins with the dedication *To Tsar Peter* followed by the prayer addresses quoted by the said author. Here is the whole text: *Just as earlier you wished to live your life in peace, now with your prayers to God on our behalf bring peace to all lands. Hurry up with your prayers, most blessed father Peter, for you see that a great trouble is engulfing us and we are overwhelmed. You appeared to us like the morning star, shining from the earth in recent years and dispersed all of the darkness of the opposing enemy. The sinful lips who attempt to praise you are not able of doing that, Tsar Peter, because of the beauty of your goodness. That is why we beg you: grant us words to praise [you].* A few lines below it reads: *In faith you [reign] over a double tsardom, blessed father Tsar Peter: you reign here and there. (Service of St. Tsar Peter, p. 388; transl. p. 108).* Cf. И. Дуйчев, *Из старата българска...*, pp. 99–100). As it can be seen, the words 'tsar' and 'Tsardom' are expressly mentioned

Even at his time Yordan Ivanov, who has contributed fundamentally to the study of the history of the cult, points out that the service has been intended for performance in the monastery where the Bulgarian tsar used to stay and where his holy body was laid<sup>14</sup>. Its location is determined mainly on the basis of the following addresses to the saint which are contained in its second part: *Rejoice, solid rock of Christ's faith. Rejoice, Peter, strength of the churches in your city of Preslav* (РАУ СѦ ТВОРЪДЫ КАМЕНЮ ВЪРЪ ХЪВЪ. РАУ СѦ ПЕТРЕ ВЪТРЪЖЕНІЕ ЦРКВАМЪ. И ГРАДОУ ТВОЕМОУ ПРЕСЛАВОУ)<sup>15</sup>. The mentioning of the capital in the above-cited text is assessed as a sure indication, on the one hand, that the monastery was located either in the capital or in its surroundings, and on the other hand, that it is precisely where the cult of tsar Peter was born<sup>16</sup>.

In this context, let us point out that a service is usually created after the *Life* of a canonised person, thus reaffirming the cult, and is performed on the day set for its celebration. Unfortunately, sure traces of the *Life of Tsar Peter* have not yet been discovered, but there is no doubt that such existed<sup>17</sup>.

Of particular interest to our study is the observation made by Anatoliy Turilov stating that the menologia preserved in Russian manuscripts from the 11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> century do not contain a commemoration of tsar Peter, which is included in manuscripts of the Bulgarian and Serbian tradition.

---

in this part of the service. Therefore, in my opinion, it is more realistic and historically justified to date the service and the beginning of the cult to an earlier period – 969–971. Dmitriy Polyviannyi (Д. ПОЛЫВЯННЫЙ *Царь Петр*..., р. 142, fn. 26, 145) is of the opinion that the service and troparion of St. Tsar Peter have been probably created no earlier than the 13<sup>th</sup> century in the 'protothrone' bishopric of Preslav. This proposal is based on some observations relating to the fact that the South Slavic Liturgical Books from the 13<sup>th</sup> century did in fact re-enter the practice of liturgical honouring of the 'first' generation of local saints through the drawing up of new texts.

<sup>14</sup> *Service of St. Tsar Peter*, pp. 384, 393–394.

<sup>15</sup> *Service of St. Tsar Peter*, p. 392 (transl. p. 109). Cf. И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Из старата българска...*, р. 101.

<sup>16</sup> В. ИВАНОВА, *Стари църкви и манастири в българските земи (IV–XII в.)*, [in:] *Годишник на Народния музей за 1922–1925*, ed. А. ПРОТИЧЪ, София 1926, р. 172; Й. ИВАНОВ, *Български старини...*, pp. 393–394; И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Из старата българска...*, pp. 221–222; Д. ЧЕШМЕДЖИЕВ, *Няколко бележки за култа...*, р. 24.

<sup>17</sup> Р. ПАВЛОВА, *Петър Черноризец...*, pp. 18–19.



This circumstance is most likely due to the fact that the commemoration of tsar Peter, who died in 969, has failed to spread in the Eastern Bulgarian manuscripts reflected in Old Russian manual copies by the time of the Byzantine conquest<sup>18</sup>. The establishment of this fact by the Russian scholar is of considerable academic value for the history of the cult. The same line is followed in his finding that the practice relating to the 'nationalisation' of different saints, so typical of the first Assen brothers, was also adopted by the Cometopouloi Dynasty. In support, Turilov points out that in 986 tsar Samuel transferred the remains of St. Achilius, who became the patron of the capital Ohrid<sup>19</sup>.

The above observations give us reason to point out that the capture of Preslav by John Tzymiskes (969–976) in April 971 had negative consequences for the spread of the ruler's cult in eastern Bulgaria. The main reason for this is that this part of the territory of the Bulgarian state, after its occupation by Byzantium, was placed under the control of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate. Therefore, in the last quarter of the 10<sup>th</sup> and in the early 11<sup>th</sup> century, the cult of tsar Peter found fertile soil for development in the western limits of the Bulgarian Tsardom which, after 971, remained free and became the staging ground for the Bulgarian fight for liberation of the lands occupied by the Empire. This is mainly attributed to both the secular authority, i.e. the Cometopouloi Dynasty and especially to tsar Samuel, and to the independent Bulgarian church which, after 971, had as its centres the towns of Triaditsa (Sredets-Sofia), Voden, Moglena, and Prespa. According to the second Charter of emperor Basil II to the Ohrid Archbishopric, the Bulgarian patriarch has resided in them consecutively, at different times, to eventually settle down in Samuel's capital Ohrid<sup>20</sup>.

Important evidence, seen from the fact that the greater part of the liturgical sources of tsar Peter originate in the southwestern limits of the Bulgarian Tsardom, points to the cult of of tsar being particularly

<sup>18</sup> Б.Н. Флорья, А.А. Турилов, С.А. Иванов, *Судьбы Кирило-Методиевской традиции после Кирилла и Методия*, Санкт-Петербург 2000, p. 91, fn. 1.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 89–90.

<sup>20</sup> Й. Иванов, *Български старини...*, p. 566; И. Божилов, В. Гюзелев, *История...*, p. 365.



developed in this region<sup>21</sup>. Highly significant in this respect are the Banitsa (National Library ‘Cyril and Methodius’ 847, the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century) and the Curzon Gospels (Add. Mss. 39 628 of the British Museum, 14<sup>th</sup> century), in which the commemoration day of the tsar is January 30<sup>th</sup>. With regard to their calendars, it has been proven that they ascend to a common old protograph and are of a compilatory nature<sup>22</sup>.

During Byzantine rule (11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> century), the western Bulgarian lands continued to be a centre of the cult of tsar Peter. The immediate reaction to its preservation can primarily be found in the information about the Saint Tsar contained in the *Bulgarian Apocryphal Chronicles* and *Daniel’s Interpretation*, which were the work of Bulgarian monks who worked in the monasteries of Sredets and Velbazhd bisphorics<sup>23</sup>. Further important evidence is provided by the adoption of the tsar’s name by the leaders of the liberation uprisings against Byzantium which broke out in 1040–1041 and in 1072–1073. The popular (Anonymous) *Life of John of Rila* which tells the story of the meeting of the Saint with tsar Peter is another evidence of the existence of the tsar’s cult during the period of the Byzantine rule<sup>24</sup>. At the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, in parallel with the displacement of the centre of the liberation struggle in the lands to the north of the Balkan Mountains, the cult of tsar Peter was present in Tarnovo where, in the autumn of 1185, the liberation uprising of the Assen brothers broke out and eventually led to the sustainable restoration of the Bulgarian Tsardom. The adoption of the name Peter by Theodore – the eldest among them – became an external expression of their tribute to the Saint Tsar.

In the early 13<sup>th</sup> century, the name of tsar Peter was introduced in the official liturgical practice, as it was included for eternal commemoration on the Orthodox Sunday in the Book of the Bulgarian church, and from there – in the commemoration lists of the Bulgarian and the Mount

<sup>21</sup> Д. Чешмеджиев, *Няколко бележки...*, p. 36.

<sup>22</sup> И. Билярски, М. Йовчева, *За датата...*, p. 546.

<sup>23</sup> М. Каймакова, *Власт и история...*, pp. 129–130, 133; V. Таркова-Zaimova, A. Miltenova, *Historical and Apocalyptic Literature in Byzantium and Medieval Bulgaria*, transl. M. Paneva, M. Lilova, Sofia 2011, pp. 181, 293.

<sup>24</sup> Д. Чешмеджиев, *Култът към цар Петър...*, p. 256.

Athos monasteries<sup>25</sup>. After *Synodikon of Tsar Boril* (1211), information about St. Tsar Peter is only found in two monuments from the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century – the *Charter of Virgino Brdo* by Constantine Tih Assen<sup>26</sup> and *Narrative on the Martyrs of Zographou* from the last quarter of the 13<sup>th</sup> century<sup>27</sup>. In liturgical sources, the earliest record of the memory of the Bulgarian tsar also refers to the said period. The two manual copies of the Old Bulgarian *Service for Tsar Peter* (in the Draganov Menaion and the Belgrade Menaion No 434) also originated during that time. Their occurrence is connected with one of the trends in the development of the South Slavic liturgical literature during the 13<sup>th</sup> century – namely the emergence of compilations that reflect to a greater extent the reformed Preslav's literature from the middle and up to the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century<sup>28</sup>. These facts clearly show that, after the time of the first three Assen brothers, the reverence for tsar Peter exhausted its function as an active conceptual propaganda means used by the Bulgarian Tsardom. However, the mention of the name of St. Tsar Peter in monuments of the representative literature proves that his cult retained its official character. Another particular characteristic is that during the 13<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> century, the memory of him was only literary – the remains of the saint were apparently lost and not transferred to Tarnovo, which is the reason why the cult in the capital faded away<sup>29</sup>. The most prominent place in Tarnovo's calendar started to be given to the cults of St. Demetrios of Thessalonike and of the saints whose remains were transferred to the new Bulgarian capital of the Assen brothers at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> and during the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century (these were: John of Rila, Hilarion of Moglena, John of Polivot, Michael Voin, Filoteya

<sup>25</sup> *Synodikon of Tsar Boril*, p. 149; Д.И. ПОЛЫВЯННЫЙ, *Царь Петр...*, pp. 141–142.

<sup>26</sup> *Charter of Virgino Brdo*, pp. 578–587.

<sup>27</sup> *Narrative on the Martyrs of Zographou*, pp. 437–440. Yordan Ivanov (p. 438) dates the work to the early 14<sup>th</sup> century (1311 at the latest), but in the latest studies, the creation of the work is referred to the very end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century and is, in form and in purpose, classified as a Short Life, cf. *Стара българска литература*, vol. IV, *Житийни творби*, ed. К. Иванова, София 1986, pp. 602–603; ИБСЛ, pp. 457–458.

<sup>28</sup> И. Билярски, М. Йовчева, *За датата...*, p. 547; М. Йовчева, *Южнославянската литургическа книжнина от XIII в.*, ЗРВИ 46, 2009, p. 355.

<sup>29</sup> Д. Чешмеджиев, *Култът към цар Петър...*, pp. 256–257.

Temnishka, Paraskeva-Petka). This phenomenon is not accidental but is conditional upon the process connected with the formation of the idea of Tarnovo as a 'New Constantinople' – 'Third Rome' in the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. As a result of this substantial change connected with the universalisation of the Bulgarian capital, the authority of the family, as was correctly established by Klimentina Ivanova, was replaced by the authority of the city<sup>30</sup>. This new trend in Bulgarian spiritual culture during the 13<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> century has led to the displacement of the cult of tsar Peter in the state ideology. Without losing its importance as an official, state cult, it gives way to the cults of saint warriors, martyrs and clergymen, turning the capital Tarnovo into a God-protected city and as a major centre of the Eastern Orthodox religion along with Constantinople, Thessalonike, Mount Athos, Jerusalem, Nikaia and Trebizond<sup>31</sup>.

In short, the thus delineated history of the cult of tsar Peter in mediaeval Bulgaria allows us to draw some conclusions. It is obvious that the tsar's cult is characterised by its uneven development. Its evolution and place in the state ideology are justified by the specific conditions under which it has been shaped throughout the different periods of the history of the Bulgarian autocracy. It has also become clear that, after the death of tsar Theodore-Peter IV in 1197, none of the representatives of the young Assen Dynasty adopted the name of the Saint Tsar, which is indicative of the fact that his cult had no longer been relevant as an active propaganda means used by the Bulgarian tsarist authority at the time of the heirs

<sup>30</sup> *Стара българска литература...*, pp. 18–19.

<sup>31</sup> И. Д у й ч е в, *Българско средновековие. Проучвания върху политическата и културната история на средновековна България*, София 1972, pp. 413–431; В. Г ю з е л е в, *Училища, скриптории, библиотеки и знания в България (XIII–XIV век)*, София 1985, pp. 16–18; В. Т ъ п к о в а - З а и м о в а, *Търново между Ерусалим, Рим и Цариград*, ТКШ 4, 1985, pp. 249–261; *Българската литература и книжнина през XIII век*, ed. И. Б о ж и л о в, С. К о ж у х а р о в, София 1987, pp. 7–37; Е. Б а к а л о в а, *Култът към мощите и реликвите: Изток–Запад*, [in:] *Средновековна християнска Европа: Изток–Запад*, ed. В. Г ю з е л е в, А. М и л т е н о в а, София 2002, pp. 611–616; е а д е м, *Общество и изкуство в България през XIII век*, ЗРВИ 46, 2009, pp. 239–253; И. Б и л я р с к и, *Покровители...*, pp. 43–55; М. Й о в ч е в а, *Южнославянската литургическа книжнина от XIII в.*, ЗРВИ 46, 2009, p. 356; М. К а й м а к а м о в а, *Власт и история...*, pp. 267–268; е а д е м, *Идеята "Търново-нов Цариград": "Трети Рим" през XIII–XIV век*, BMd 3, 2012, pp. 469–470.

of the first three Assen brothers during the 13<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> century. This fact comes to show us that the name of Saint Tsar Peter, as a sustainable element of the tsarist legitimacy, remains a ‘brand’ only of the leaders of the three major Bulgarian revolts against Byzantium in the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> century.

## 2. The Importance of the Cult of Tsar Peter for the Conceptual Justification of the Bulgarian Liberation Uprisings in the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> Century

In previous studies, the reasons why leaders of the liberation movements from the period of the Byzantine rule adopted the name of tsar Peter were sought in two areas. According to some scholars, Peter was the first legitimate, according to Byzantium, Bulgarian tsar who was related by his marriage with Maria-Irene to two of the Byzantine dynasties (Macedonian and that of the Lekapenos). In this respect, it is highlighted that in the period of the Byzantine rule of the Bulgarian lands importance was given to the Byzantine state and dynastic tradition and not to the Bulgarian state tradition of khan Boris I-Michael, tsar Symeon and tsar Samuel. This is why the cult of tsar Peter, the ‘New Constantine’, the restorer of the Bulgarian Tsardom, was developed<sup>32</sup>. Other historians believe that the honouring of St. Tsar Peter is closely related to the cults of rulers who converted their states to Christianity, pointing out that Peter is the one during whose rule Bulgaria was built as the truly Christian state of the Bulgarians. This defines the importance of this ruler in the history of the country. It is also pointed out that the apparent connection between

<sup>32</sup> Д. Чешмеджиев, *Няколко бележки...*, pp. 35–36; i d e m, *Култът към цар Петър...*, p. 256; i d e m, *Българската държавна традиция в апокрифите: цар Петър в Българския апокрифен летопис*, [in:] *Българско средновековие: общество, власт, история. Сборник в чест на проф. д-р Милияна Каймакамова*, ed. Г.Н. Николов, А. Николов, София 2013, pp. 266–267.

the memory of this saint ruler and the movements for the recovery of the Bulgarian statehood after 1018 was religious, and not dynastic<sup>33</sup>.

Although the above explanations do have their grounds, it seems to us that they do not exhaust the answer to the significant and not at all easy question – why did the leaders of the three major Bulgarian uprisings chose to revive the name of the Saint Tsar? An answer to this, we think, may be found in the story by Michael Psellos (1018 – after 1096/97) about the outbreak of the uprising of Peter Delyan. So far, it has not been discussed from the perspective of the issue which is of interest to us, even though it contains the point of view of those Bulgarians who took part in the liberation movements on the matter of the choice made by their leaders. This is why we will go into greater detail on this work. It is included in the fourth chapter of his *Chronography*, dedicated to the rule of emperor Michael IV (1034–1041). Pointing out that it will take him a long time to enumerate what the emperor has done and what he decreed *during the internal riots and foreign wars*, the prominent Byzantine intellectual states that he would make *only one exception*, taking into account the fight of the emperor with the barbarians (i.e. the Bulgarians – M.K.). In this regard, Psellos specifies that he will only briefly and in passing mention the main events. His story begins with a brief presentation of the capture of their state by emperor Basil II (976–1025), described as *prince of emperors, who attacked their country and destroyed their power*<sup>34</sup>. Further on, Michael Psellos explains that for some time the Bulgarians, persistently called by him ‘barbarians’ and ‘tribe’, accepted their defeat and submitted to the power of the Byzantines, but then regained their previous loftiness, yet still not rising openly, *until the appearance among them of a political agitator when their policy at once became hostile to the Empire*<sup>35</sup>. With much hatred and malice Psellos goes on to explain that the man (Peter Delyan – M.K.) who roused them was from the same tribe and *member of a family unworthy of mention, but cunning, and capable of practising any*

<sup>33</sup> И. Билярски, *Покровители...*, pp. 33–34.

<sup>34</sup> Michael Psellos, IV, 39 (transl. p. 75).

<sup>35</sup> Michael Psellos, IV, 39 (transl. p. 75).

*deceit on his compatriots, a fellow called Dolianus*<sup>36</sup>. Directly afterwards Michael Psellos stated: *I do not know whether he inherited such a name from his father, or if he gave himself the name for an omen*<sup>37</sup>. Then, the author continues to expand the image of Peter Delyan by providing details on his further activity, namely:

He knew that the whole nation was set on rebellion against the Romans; indeed, the revolt was merely a project only because no leader had hitherto risen up among them able to carry out their plans. In the first place, therefore, he made himself conspicuous, proved his ability in council, demonstrated his skill in the conduct of war. Then, having won their approval by these qualities, it only remained for him to prove his own noble descent, in order to become the acknowledged leader of the Bulgarians. (It was their custom to recognize as leaders of the nation only men of royal blood). Knowing this to be the national custom, he proceeded to trace his descent from the famous Samuel and his brother Aaron, who had ruled the whole nation as kings a short time before. He did not claim to be the legitimate heir of these kings, but he either invented or proved that he was a collateral relation. He readily convinced the people with his story, and they raised him on the shield. He was proclaimed king. From that moment Bulgarian designs became manifest, for they seceded openly. The yoke of Roman domination was hurled from their necks and they made a declaration of independence, emphasizing the fact that they took this course of their own free will. Whereupon they engaged in attacks and plundering expeditions on Roman territory.<sup>38</sup>

If we put aside the prejudices and antipathy of Michael Psellos toward the Bulgarians, his narrative about the outbreak of the uprising is of particular interest with a view to clarifying the ideas on which Peter Delyan relied in obtaining the approval of the Bulgarians as their leader and tsar. But before proceeding further, we would like to point out that

<sup>36</sup> Michael Psellos, IV, 40 (transl. p. 75).

<sup>37</sup> Michael Psellos, IV, 40 (transl. p. 75).

<sup>38</sup> Michael Psellos, IV, 40 (transl. p. 75).

the relatively detailed information provided by Michael Psellos makes it clear that Peter Delyan has spread some propaganda among the people. Although the author focuses on the 'false' origin of Peter Delyan, which links him with the last Bulgarian tsarist dynasty of the Cometopouloi, it is not difficult to understand that this is the case of a phenomenon which is well known in mediaeval reality. As it was properly pointed out by Ivan Bozhilov, the deeds of pseudo-persons in a society have been part of the political ideology<sup>39</sup>. Of course, it does not mean that Peter Delyan should be associated with this tradition.

The propaganda of Peter Delyan, connected with the beginning of the fight for the restoration of the Tsardom with the aim of uniting the people around him and recognising him as their tsar is also evident from the information provided about him by Bishop Michael of Devol in one of his additions to the chronicle of John Skylitzes. It includes the following passage:

That year there was an uprising in Bulgaria [twenty-first year of its enslavement and subjection]; it happened like this. A Bulgar named Peter Deleanos, the slave of a citizen of Byzantium, escaped from the city and was wandering in Bulgaria. He came to Moravos and Belgrade, fortresses of Pannonia lying across the Danube, neighbours to the Kral of Turkey, and let it be known that he was the son of Romanos, son of Samuel [born to him by the daughter of the Kral of Hungary whom Samuel hated when he was still alive, drove her out and married the very beautiful Eirene of Larissa,] and he stirred up the Bulgarians who had recently bowed the neck in subjection and were yearning for freedom<sup>40</sup>.

Some time ago, Vassil Gyuzelev reasonably suggested that the additions made by Michael of Devol to the work of John Skylitzes are derived from the Bulgarian tsarist chronicles which have not reached present times<sup>41</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> И. Божиллов, В. Гюзелев, *История...*, pp. 396–397.

<sup>40</sup> John Skylitzes, p. 409 (transl. pp. 384–385; with my minor change – М.К.).

<sup>41</sup> В. Гюзелев, *Извори за средновековната история на България (VII–XV в.) в австрийските ръкописни сбирки и архиви*, София 1994, pp. 56, 263.



Part of this propaganda, as is evident from the story by Psellos, has been linked to highlighting the martial qualities possessed by Peter Delyan, with which he tried to win *their approval*, as indicated by the author himself. Based on the data provided by him and by Michael of Devol, it is clear that the main purpose of the propaganda created by Samuel's grandson was to disclose his tsarist backgrounds. Most valuable in this regard is the clarification made by Michael Psellos of the Bulgarian custom to *recognise as leaders of the nation only men of royal blood* and of the fact that Peter Delyan was aware of *the national custom*<sup>42</sup>. The data contained in the above-cited addition of Michael of Devol, according to which Peter Delyan *proclaimed himself as the son of Radomir, Samuel's son, who was born to him by the daughter of the Hungarian king*, is essential for us to gain an idea of how he managed to convince the people that he was of a tsarist descent. Thus combined, the information provided by the two Byzantine authors allows us to suggest that having escaped from Constantinople, Peter Delyan first pointed out that he was well aware of which authority Bulgarians considered legitimate, and then he provided some details not only about Peter Delyan's unhappy fate, but also about the fate of his mother who, although a royal daughter, had been banished by his father. In this way, he was probably trying to prove his imperial descent.

Here we would like to make a necessary digression by pointing out that, on the basis of a comparative analysis of the information provided by Michael Psellos and the additions of Michael of Devol to the chronicle of John Skylitzes on Peter Delyan, Vassil N. Zlatarski convincingly specified that Delyan *is nothing but the popular name of the son of Gabriel-Radomir*, along with his given name Peter, *following the Bulgarian custom to give double names especially of persons of tsarist origin*<sup>43</sup>. It is important to note that in the *Tale of the Prophet Isaiah (Bulgarian Apocryphal Chronicle)* of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, Peter Delyan is referred to as the tsar (...)

<sup>42</sup> Michael Psellos, IV, 40 (transl. p. 75).

<sup>43</sup> В.Н. Златарски, *История на българската държава през средните векове*, vol. II, *България под византийско владичество*, София 1994, p. 49: *е нищо друго освен народното име; съгласно с българския обичай да се дават двойни имена особено на лица от царски род*.

by the name of Gagan, and his nickname was Odelean. He took over the Bulgarian and the Greek kingdom<sup>44</sup>. Undoubtedly, the letter 'O' here represents the Greek definite article of the name Delyan, which shows that the author of the work borrowed it from a Greek source<sup>45</sup>.

Based on all that has been said so far, we have reason to suggest that it was probably tsar Samuel's initiative to name his grandson after the Saint Tsar as an expression of the idea of continuity in the ruling of the state. We will provide yet another fact in support of this hypothesis. According to the data provided by John Skylitzes, one of the names of Samuel's son, Gabriel-Radomir, was Roman, which is interpreted in literature as a proof of the close relations of the 'mutineer' Samuel with the son of tsar Peter, Roman<sup>46</sup>. It is well known that the choice of certain names, especially in the Middle Ages, was, as a rule, motivated by political interests.

Therefore, the adoption of the name of Saint Tsar Peter by the leaders of the three major Bulgarian liberation uprisings against Byzantium in the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> century can be assessed as a key conceptual accent. The change in names speaks about their desire to establish at least a fictitious continuity of the tsarist dynasty from the end of the First Bulgarian Tsardom, whose last representative was tsar Peter. Thanks to such change, they proclaimed themselves as his successors and their connection with the ancient Bulgarian dynastic family ensured their right to bear the title of a tsar.

In this respect, it is necessary to remind that during the Middle Ages the idea of continuity was defining for the legitimacy of the ruler and was mainly based on the blood coursing through his veins. His authority won recognition because he descended from, or was convinced that he descended from, an ancient and famous ruling family. The power of the state rested mainly on its ancient origin, on the continuity of its history and institutions. The idea of continuity also played a decisive role in the

<sup>44</sup> *Tale of the Prophet Isaiah*, 402d (transl. p. 21).

<sup>45</sup> В.Н. Златарски, *История...*, pp. 48–49, fn. 2; V. Тапкова-Займова, А. Милтенова, *Historical...*, pp. 284, 295, 300, fn. 43.

<sup>46</sup> С. Пириватрич, *Самуиловата държава. Обхват и характер*, София 2000, pp. 100–101, 249.

consolidation of the political community<sup>47</sup>. Tsar Peter himself was guided by this idea in his rule. When John Skylitzes described the surrender of Skopje, to the name of Peter's son – Roman – he added that: *This Romanos was the son of King Peter of the Bulgars and the brother of Boris; he had changed his name to that of his grandfather, Symeon*<sup>48</sup>.

Therefore, it may be assumed that the proclamation of the leaders of the three major uprisings as Bulgarian tsars named Peter had a strong effect on the common people. With the renewal of the name of the Saint Tsar, they revived his memory among the Bulgarians, thus succeeding in uniting them around themselves. Therefore, according to us, the connection between the memory of Saint Tsar Peter and the liberation movements is not only religious, but first and foremost dynastic.

This is also evident from the information provided by the Continuator of John Skylitzes on the uprising of the Skopje bolyar George Voyteh which broke out in the spring of 1072. According to the Byzantine historian, the foremost men of Bulgaria gathered to discuss the situation, choosing as their leader George Voyteh, who was descended from the 'kavkhan family'. However, that alone was not sufficient for him to lead all of Bulgarians, and in particular to become the ruler of the restored Tsardom. For this reason, the people who had gathered in Prizren sent their messenger to the Serbian knyaz – King Michael (1055–1082) – asking him to give them his son, Constantine Bodin, who would be proclaimed the tsar of Bulgaria. The reason for this choice is not accidental, because as we know from the sources that he was the grandson of tsar Samuel on his mother's side. Constantine Bodin arrived in Prizren with 300 troops. This number is especially indicative of the fact that Bulgarians sought a person from a dynastic family, not military aid. Then Constantine Bodin was crowned Bulgarian king under the name Peter<sup>49</sup>.

Based on the information contained in the Byzantine sources, we have every reason to conclude that the leaders of the uprisings had a well-developed sense of historicity. Thanks to it, they continued a Bulgarian

<sup>47</sup> B. Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiéval*, Paris 1980, pp. 332–333, 347–349.

<sup>48</sup> John Skylitzes, p. 346 (transl. p. 328).

<sup>49</sup> Continuator of John Skylitzes, pp. 714–715.

tradition associated with the observance of the law for the selection of the tsar and with the continuation of the cult of the Saint Tsar in the course of the fight of Bulgarians with Byzantium for the restoration of the Bulgarian Tsardom. Its beginnings are to be found with the uprising of the Cometopouloi which broke out in 976<sup>50</sup> and with the ideological programme of tsar Samuel (997–1014) for ‘renovatio imperii’ which also included the cult of tsar Peter. In support of my opinion on the ideology followed by tsar Samuel, I will recourse to several important manifestations of his policy. They are connected with the transfer of the remains of St. Achilles, after the looting of the town of Larissa in 985–986, and of St. Tryphon of Kotor in 997 to his capital. Srdjan Pirivatrić has every reason to point out that in the basis of this transfer lays the intention to render the necessary sacred dimension to the gradually created cult of the Bulgarian tsars<sup>51</sup>. Another argument in support of our statement is the dating of the service performed in memory of tsar Peter and the written tradition associated with the spread of the cult. They are an evidence that the honouring of the Saint Tsar did not find fertile soil for development in Eastern Bulgaria, which had been under Byzantine rule since 971, but spread in the southwestern Bulgarian lands with the active assistance of tsar Samuel.

In general, the ideology of the liberation uprisings against Byzantium and the conversion of St. Tsar Peter into its focus is best seen in the course of the uprising of the Assen brothers which broke out in the autumn of 1185. In this case, it is especially important to refer to the second doxology according to which the eldest brother Theodore adopted the name Peter<sup>52</sup>. It shows us that the Assen brothers took advantage of their own past in a quite an emblematic way. Niketas Choniates fails to take note of this, yet he reports on the crowning of the first of the Assen brothers: *Peter, Asan's brother, bound his head with a gold chaplet and fashioned scarlet buskins to put on his feet*<sup>53</sup>. The combination of the data contained in the

<sup>50</sup> И. Божил ов, В. Гюз е л е в, *История...*, pp. 315–318; С. П и р и в а т р и ч, *Самуиловата държава...*, pp. 179–183.

<sup>51</sup> С. П и р и в а т р и ч, *Самуиловата държава...*, p. 248.

<sup>52</sup> *Synodikon of Tsar Boril*, p. 150.

<sup>53</sup> N i k e t a s C h o n i a t e s, p. 372 (transl. p. 205).

two sources outlines the sequence of actions related to the proclamation of Theodor as the Bulgarian tsar. It is clear that first he received the name of Peter and was crowned afterwards.

Therefore, the change in the name of the eldest brother is the other key conceptual accent in the political propaganda of the Assen brothers, together with the linking of their uprising with the cult of St. Demetrios. Through it, they proclaim themselves the successors of St. Tsar Peter. The linking of the people's leaders with the Old Bulgarian tsarist family had a huge importance to justify the legitimacy of their authority. Ivan Duychev interprets this change just as an expression of the desire of the Assen brothers to establish at least a fictitious continuity of the ruling dynasty since the end of the First Bulgarian Tsardom<sup>54</sup>. Undoubtedly, the proclamation of the eldest Assen brother as the Bulgarian tsar under the name of Theodore-Peter had a strong effect on the residents of Tarnovo, who had come to the consecration of the church of St. Demetrios. With the renewal of the name of tsar Peter, the leaders of the Tarnovo uprising revived his memory among the Bulgarians, successfully unifying them around themselves. At the same time, with this act the Assen brothers linked their activities as restorers of the Bulgarian Tsardom with the cult of tsar Peter. Thanks to their sense of historicity, they continued the Bulgarian tradition associated with the perpetuation of the cult of the Saint Tsar in the course of the fight of the Bulgarians with Byzantium for the restoration of the Bulgarian Tsardom.

The analysis which is based on the facts referred to above allows us to draw a general conclusion that the first two of the Assen brothers have had certain knowledge of the Bulgarian history. Part of this knowledge was connected with the liberation uprisings, while another part was linked with the law and custom established by the ancestors custom *to recognize as leaders of the nation only men of royal blood*, which is mentioned by Michael Psellos. In this way, they proved their 'renowned origin' and connected their activity as restorers of the Bulgarian Tsardom with the cult of

---

<sup>54</sup> И. Д у й ч е в, *Проучвания върху средновековната българска история и култура*, София 1981, p. 73; i d e m, *Българско средновековие...*, pp. 52–53; Ch. K o l a r o v, J. A n d r e e v, *Certaines questions ayant trait aux manifestations de continuité d'idées en Bulgarie médiévale au des XII–XIV siècles*, EHi 9, 1979, pp. 77–82.

tsar Peter. The honouring of the Saint Tsar, who embodied the idea of the priestly tsar and called for unity<sup>55</sup>, becomes an essential part of the ruling ideology of the Assen brothers at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> and during the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. The idea of continuity and the associated imperial idea they revived became the core of such ideology. With the spread of these ideas, the Assen brothers laid the beginnings of the family's strategy aimed at the conversion of their family into a dynasty. It is based on the Bulgarian tradition that, in the new political situation in the Balkans at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, is revived with the cult of St. Demetrios. In this initial stage of the state's development, the Assen brothers were obviously trying to resolve the issue of the transmission of hereditary power in order to keep it within the family, by making it follow certain principles<sup>56</sup>. In the application of the principle of primogeniture which was also typical of Byzantium, they likely saw a possible solution<sup>57</sup>.

In his *History*, Niketas Choniates gives us some information which expands even more our idea of the aspirations of the first Assen brothers to suggest the idea of continuity, relying on the past. It is as follows:

An assault was made upon Pristhlava [Preslav] (this is an ancient city built of baked bricks and covering a very large area), but they realized that a siege would not be without danger, and so they bypassed it. They descended Mount Haimos.<sup>58</sup>

It is not hard to understand that behind these rebellious actions lies the idea of a state continuity of the restored state with the state of the Bulgarians from the First Tsardom and can also be connected with

<sup>55</sup> For the importance of this fundamental idea in the Byzantine political theory and in the Christian Middle Ages, see: Ж. Дагрон, *Императорът и свещеникът. Етюд върху византийския "цезаропатизъм"*, София 2006, pp. 25–36.

<sup>56</sup> К. Господинов, *Легитимизъм и узурпация. Власт и политически взаимоотношения в Българското царство: 1241–1279. Автореферат*, София 2009, pp. 5–6.

<sup>57</sup> Ж. Дагрон, *Императорът...*, pp. 48–50, 55–58, examines in detail the importance of this principle in the founding of the dynasty and the elaboration of the family strategies of the Byzantine emperors.

<sup>58</sup> Niketas Choniates, p. 372 (transl. p. 205).

the cult of tsar Peter<sup>59</sup>. The Bulgarian church played an important role in its spread at the state level during the reign of the first three Assen brothers. At that time, the name of the Saint Tsar was also introduced in the official liturgical practice as it was included for eternal commemoration on the Orthodox Sunday in the Book of the Bulgarian church, and from there – in the commemoration lists of the Bulgarian and the Mount Athos monasteries<sup>60</sup>.

The above deliberation gives us grounds to conclude that the honouring and the continuation of the cult of tsar Peter in the Bulgarian historical memory generated a few especially significant ideas which were used by the leaders of the three major liberation uprisings of the Bulgarians from the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> century. These are: the idea of continuity of the Bulgarian dynasty of khan Krum whose representative was St. Tsar Peter, the idea of the sanctity of the tsarist authority, the idea of the restoration of the Bulgarian Tsardom, and the idea of the antiquity of the Bulgarian state tradition. Their embodiment in the person of the Saint Tsar makes it central for the concept of the Bulgarian Tsardom and its patron saint. By nourishing the cult of their holy ancestor, his heirs moved the people and their state forward toward recognition of their national identity and sovereignty.



<sup>59</sup> И. Д у й ч е в, *Проучвания...*, р. 74.

<sup>60</sup> *Synodikon of Tsar Boril*, р. 149; Д.И. П о л ы в я н н ы й, *Царь Петр...*, рр. 141–142.