



Archbishop Gennadii and the Heresy of the "Judaizers"

Author(s): ANDREI PLIGUZOV

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, December 1992, Vol. 16, No. 3/4 (December 1992), pp. 269-288

Published by: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41036479>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*

JSTOR

Archbishop Gennadii and the Heresy of the “Judaizers”*

ANDREI PLIGUZOV

The Novgorodian “heretics” known to scholars as the *Judaizers*¹ never referred to themselves by this name, or, for that matter, by any other name. They considered themselves to be true Orthodox Christians who received Holy Communion and served in Orthodox churches. The Novgorodian archbishop Gennadii (1484–1504) and Abbot Iosif of the Volokolamsk Monastery (1470–1515) were the first to accuse the heretics of being “жидовская мудръствующе” (i.e., adhering to Jewish teachings) and of conversion to Judaism (“стали в жидовскую веру”). The term *Judaizers* (жидовствующие) seems to have been coined by Dimitrii of Rostov (Dmytro Tuptalo), almost two hundred years after the “heresy” had occurred and been condemned.² In Russian legal documents of the first half of the nineteenth century, the term *Judaizers* was used to describe молоканские субботнические sects.³

The earliest description of the heretics’ “crimes,” though not an entirely reliable one, comes from the writings of Archbishop Gennadii. In particular, Gennadii is our source of information on the arrival in Novgorod in November 1470 of a certain “heretical Jew,” a member of the retinue of the Kievan prince Mykhail.⁴ According to Gennadii’s report, this heretic converted some Orthodox priests, who secretly began to profess Jewish beliefs while maintaining the appearance of continued loyalty to Christianity.

The exposure of the heresy took place in 1487, seven years after the subjugation of Novgorod by the Muscovite troops of Ivan the Third (1480) and the elevation of Gennadii, archimandrite of the Chudov Monastery in Moscow, to the Novgorodian see. Gennadii arrived in Novgorod in January 1485, but it was two years before he began his investigation into the heresy, which might have been provoked by the monk Zakhar, who called him a “heretic.”⁵

Gennadii discovered Zakhar’s heresy in the simplest possible way: he summoned Zakhar in order to investigate a complaint by some monks of the Nemchinov Monastery, to whom Zakhar had allegedly refused to give Communion. Under questioning by the Archbishop, Zakhar admitted that he did not trust any of the church bishops since they had been installed “по мзде,” i.e., uncanonically by having paid money for their installation.⁶ Gennadii immediately identified Zakhar’s heresy as that of the *strigol’niki*, heretics who had

* I would like to express my gratitude to Edward L. Keenan, Dana Miller, Donald Ostrowski, Omeljan Pritsak, and Moshe Taube for providing me with very valuable remarks on the history of the “Judaizers.” Deborah Lefkowitz, Jonathan Daly, and Alex Viskovatoff generously offered me a great deal of support in correcting my hesitant English.

lived in Pskov at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and dispatched Zakhar to the hermitage of Gornechno to do penance. Later on, probably after the autumn of 1488, Ivan the Third tried to intercede on Zakhar's behalf. The grand prince allowed the newly-unmasked *strigol'nik* to return to the Nemchinov Monastery. But Zakhar, unwilling to test his luck in Gennadii's sphere of power, immediately left Nemchinov for Moscow.⁷

In Moscow, Zakhar received support from certain powerful patrons and continued to oppose Gennadii by sending letters to his acquaintances in Novgorod and territories under Muscovite control. Archbishop Gennadii intercepted one of Zakhar's letters in September or early October 1490, and submitted a copy of it to Metropolitan Zosima.⁸

The next significant discovery of the heresy occurred in September–December of 1487.⁹ In the course of his pastoral duties, the Novgorodian archbishop learned of drunken conversations among Novgorodian priests, who secretly praised the Jewish heresy.¹⁰ Without delay the archbishop began an investigation, ordering that the testimony (подлинник речи) of the priest Naum, who had repented and voluntarily given Gennadii evidence of his own heresy, be written down. Naum's testimony appears to have been the first and most reliable evidence of the heresy, but it has not survived. We know from letters written by Gennadii that Naum's testimony consisted of no fewer than nineteen chapters. Chapter Twelve argued that the heretics celebrated the Divine Liturgy in an unworthy way, and would swear without fear, i.e., could easily break their oath. Along with the written testimony, Gennadii sent some copybooks, which may have been taken from Naum, to Moscow. These copybooks contained Jewish prayers that were in use among the heretics.¹¹

Gennadii called this newly-discovered heresy the heresy of the “жидовская мудръствующих.” The origin of this term is not quite clear. The form жидовствоующе renders the word ἰουδαΐσται in Canon 29 of the Council of Laodicea.¹² In the Slavonic translation of the *Chronicle* of Georgios Hamartolos one could find the word жидовьцедьмьць, which corresponds to the Greek ἰουδαϊόφρωνος.¹³ The *Pandektai* by Nikon of the Black Mountain cites Canon 29 of the Council of Laodicea: “како не подобает кр(с)тъяном жидовьствити [corresponds to the Greek ἰουδαϊζειν], и в соуботу празновати.”¹⁴ В. Melioranskii noticed a similarity between the Novgorodian “жидовская мудръствующие” and the Greek definition ἰουδαϊκὸν φρονῶν, which appeared in the Canons of the Council of Constantinople in 1336.¹⁵

While Gennadii did not pay much attention to the heretical teachings, in his letter to Bishop Prokhor he wrote about an astronomical treatise by Immanuel ben-Yaakov, a Jew from Tarascon. It remains unknown whether Gennadii found ben-Yaakov's treatise “Six Wings” (*Шестокрыл*) among the papers of the heretics, or whether he received it from a different source. This treatise, containing calculations to determine the phases of the moon, was originally

compiled in the fourteenth century. But the Slavonic version of “Six Wings,” the version found by Gennadii, began its calculations from the year 1389.¹⁶

We know that Gennadii willingly used ben-Yaakov’s treatise in his own calendar calculations, and a citation from it appears in the margin of the calendar tables of Gennadii’s Bible of 1499. The page containing the marginal gloss at the bottom of the table of lunar cycles says: *А по Шестокрылѣ круз лѣдныи починаетса ѿ семтабра после рѣскоз(о), а по рѣскомѣ ѿ марта, а златое число починаетса с генвара преж(е) ѿбѣих.*¹⁷

However, Gennadii’s goal of opposing the heretics’ propaganda required that he condemn literary works of Jewish tradition. Therefore, after closer inspection, he discovered a huge discrepancy: the heretics, in the archbishop’s words, had “stolen” 1,747 years from the Christian calendar. Eager to prove the existence of these years, Gennadii carefully searched the Scriptures for the lifespan of each Old Testament king. With these calculations he was able to restore the calendar of Christian history. The difference between the Jewish and Christian calendars was not due to any malicious intention on the part the heretics, but a result of the Byzantine tradition, which Georgios Hamartolos’s *Chronicle* had introduced to Rus’. Hamartolos held that the Creation took place in 5508 B.C. By contrast, the Jewish calendar began in 3761 B.C.

The calendar dispute with the heretics was to become even sharper, for this was a period of increasing eschatological expectations. In the summer of 1492 the Orthodox calendars, which contained calculations of moveable Christian feasts, were to expire. The year 7000 of the Byzantine calendar would end in August 1492. At the same time, Slavic ecclesiastical scribes had among their books certain theological writings that interpreted the expiration of the seventh millennium from the Creation as the end of Christian history, which would ultimately be heralded by the Second Coming of Christ.

Such rumors bothered Gennadii, who had embraced a completely different idea about the end of the world. The Novgorodian archbishop was adamant in his expectation not of the expiration of the seventh millennium, but of the “fulfillment of the Divine Dispensation” (наполнения горнего мира), whereupon “the ages would perish” (времена погыбнут).¹⁸ In order to find confirmation for his quite orthodox idea, Gennadii sent a letter to the erudite Greek Demetrios Trachaniotes. In a letter written some time between September 1488 and March 1489, the latter reassured Gennadii with the statement, “The seventh . . . millennium one has to remember, but not believe in.”¹⁹ Gennadii sent a similar written request to Paisii Iaroslavov and Nil Sorskii, monks of the Monastery of St. Cyril of Beloe Ozero.²⁰

The first letters sent by Gennadii to Moscow between September and December 1487 did not provoke a “thorough interrogation” of the heretics, as Gennadii demanded. Consequently, in January 1488 the Novgorodian archbishop was obliged to send new entreaties, containing a description of heretical offenses, to Nifont, bishop of Suzdal’, and Filofei, bishop of Perm’. According

to Gennadii, many citizens of Novgorod had seen crosses tied to crows, and even a pectoral cross (“нагельный крест”) with a picture of “the privy parts of a woman and a man” (an example not of Jewish religious influences, but of popular beliefs, even pagan notions). The bearer of such a cross, according to Gennadii’s report, “began to wither, was ill for a while, and died.”²¹ In the church at Il’ina Street, Gennadii discovered that the icon of the Transfiguration contained, along its border, an image of Basil the Great “cutting off Christ’s hand and foot, with the inscription: The Circumcision of Our Lord Jesus Christ.”²² This baffled not only Archbishop Gennadii, who presented the icon as an obvious example of the Jewish heresy, but also all modern scholars until very recently, when N. Goleizovskii interpreted the image as a curious attempt to struggle *against* Jewish influence (but not necessarily the Judaizers’ heresy).²³

While Gennadii was waiting for the grand prince and the metropolitan to initiate some action in this matter, a lesser council of the metropolitanate gathered in Moscow (some time before 13 February 1488) with Ivan III in attendance. The council condemned three men— Grigorii, a priest of St. Simon’s Church; Eresim, a priest of St. Nicholas’ Church; and the clerk Samsonko, the son of the priest Grigorii. All three received punishments, unspecified in our source, and were sent to Novgorod. The fourth defendant, Gridia, the priest of the SS. Boris and Gleb Church, was returned unpunished to the Novgorodian archbishop for further investigation, because only one witness, the priest Naum, had given evidence against him (for a conviction, the law required that at least two witnesses testify against the defendant). The epistles on the council’s decision, written by Ivan III and Metropolitan Gerontii to Gennadii, approved further investigation of the heretics in Novgorod.²⁴

Upon their return to Novgorod, the accused priests were whipped in the market place. The Moscow chronicle gives an explanation of the priests’ crime: “Being in a drunken state, they profaned the holy icons.”²⁵

Scholars, like critics of the heresy, usually view the development of the Novgorodian heresy in a manner disproportionate to its historical significance. Like their predecessors, the ecclesiastical investigators, they expand the facts concerning the history of the heresy to enormous proportions. They regard each fact as laden with a specific meaning, reflecting not only a single event but an entire constellation of similar events. Each attempt to apprehend the heresy’s origin leads to a kind of hall of mirrors where each object is multiplied, so that a few facts acquire the appearance of a vast multitude, and a virtual historiographic reality is formed.

Unlike modern scholars, the witnesses of the first Novgorodian heretics’ punishment had no such illusions: their attention was more likely occupied not by the whipping of the guilty priests, but by the cruel punitive actions taken by the Muscovite authorities in Novgorod in March 1488 (at the latest). On the order of Ivan III, Muscovite troops forcibly transferred more than seven

thousand people (жИтьИх людеЙ) who allegedly had tried to kill the grand prince's *namestnik*, Iakov Zakhar'ich, from Novgorod to Moscow. The Muscovite chronicle adds coldly: "Iakov did not spare the whip, and hanged many other members of the Duma."²⁶

Meanwhile, for reasons of his own, Archbishop Gennadii seems to have cared less about the fate of the thousands of Novgorodian citizens expelled by Muscovite forces than about those priests who continued to propound the "Jewish" heresy. Some time in July or August 1488, Gennadii enlisted the help of the former archbishop of Rostov and Iaroslavl', Ioasaf, who had abandoned his see in June 1488.²⁷ Beginning with a verbatim copy of his letter to Prokhor of Sarai and Podon'e, the Novgorodian archbishop provided Ioasaf with an account of the most serious crimes committed by the heretics. The fact that after five months Gennadii included no new information indicates that he had been unable to elucidate the obscure teaching of the heretics. This was an indisputable failure, the reason for which Gennadii explained thus: the heretics shamefacedly lie under oath "lacking fear [of God]," and renounce their teachings without hesitation.

Before compiling his letter to Ioasaf, Gennadii had been able to examine the sources of the heretics' teachings. It appeared that the heretics had picked up some of their theological "delusions" from Christian *anti-heretical* compilations. The Novgorodian archbishop provided Ioasaf with a report on twelve books in use among the heretics. Two of the books mentioned by Gennadii were in fact taken from the Bible (I and II Samuel and Kings [*Книги Царств* in the Slavonic tradition], and the Book of Joshua). One book appeared to be a kind of chronological compilation, or the Book of Genesis (*Бытiе*), while two others could be recognized as traditional collections of edifying aphorisms (*Притчи*, perhaps the biblical Book of Proverbs, and *Menandr*, i.e., the so-called Wisdom of Menander), and three were polemical writings against Arianism, the Bogomils, and the like (i.e. the *Sermons* of Athanasius of Alexandria, the *Sermon* of Cosmas the Priest, and the *Letter* of Patriarch Photios to Prince Michael of Bulgaria). Gennadii's list of heretical books also includes dogmatic writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite and the *Vita* of Pope Sylvester.²⁸ The only book on the list connected with the medieval Jewish tradition is the *Logika*, which appears to be a Slavic translation of either the *Logic* of Moses Maimonides or the *Logic* of al-Ghazali, or perhaps a combination of these two works.²⁹

Gennadii's examination of these twelve books gave him no new evidence of the heretics' apostasy. Thus foiled, Gennadii fell back on the old proven methods. With support from the grand prince's lieutenants, the archbishop began a new investigation of the heretics. We do not know the precise date of this action. One can only suggest that the investigation presumably would have begun after the compilation of Gennadii's epistle to Ioasaf (that of July–August 1488), but before the death of Metropolitan Gerontii (27 May 1489), because

the latter received Gennadii's report concerning the new investigation.³⁰ Gennadii gave those heretics who had repented of their sins and confessed them in written form with their own hands permission to stand outside the church during divine worship. Nonetheless, Gennadii prohibited even these heretics from entering churches and receiving Holy Communion. Those heretics who did not confess and, according to Gennadii's report, continued to "praise the Jewish belief" were handed over to the grand prince's lieutenants, Iakov and Iurii Zakhar'ich, and punished in such a way as to make an example of them. Some of the heretics who had confessed prudently fled to Moscow. One priest, Gavrilko of Mikhailova Street, received a position at a Moscow church, and another, Denis, began to serve at the grand princely Dormition Cathedral in the Kremlin.³¹

Obvious success in the second investigation of the heretics would not have satisfied Gennadii. The Novgorodian archbishop was apparently made nervous by the activity of those confessed heretics (like Denis) who passed under the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Gerontii, served in Moscow, and could carry on an intrigue against their former master. According to normal procedure, an action by one bishop in a territory under the control of another bishop required a direct appeal to the head of the diocese. Gennadii sent Gerontii materials concerning his second investigation in order to ask for continuation of the punitive action.³² Meanwhile, on 27 May 1489 Gerontii had died. Since the metropolitan see was vacant, Gennadii was compelled to wait for the nomination of a new metropolitan.

During this time of compulsory idleness, Gennadii made an inquiry concerning the service of the Novgorodian heretics in Moscow. Unknown well-wishers informed the archbishop that Denis had allegedly danced behind the altar during the Liturgy, and "blasphemed the cross" (кресту ся наругал).³³

At the same time, rumors had been spread in Moscow about the Jew from Venice, *мистро*³⁴ Leon. Doctor Leon arrived in Rus' with members of the retinue of Andrew Palaeologue, and offered, or was forced, to treat the terminal illness of the grand prince Ivan Ivanovich, the heir of Ivan the Third. Prince Ivan died on 7 March 1490. The foreign—Jewish—doctor was blamed for his death, and was decapitated at the Bolvanovskii field on 22 April.³⁵

On 12 September 1490 Zosima Bradatyi, archimandrite of the Moscow Simonov Monastery,³⁶ was nominated (возведен на двор) metropolitan of "all Rus'." Gennadii was willing to come to Moscow for the consecration of Zosima, but Ivan the Third prudently prohibited the Novgorodian archbishop from showing up in the capital. Gennadii thus was forced to confirm the elevation of Zosima by correspondence, and sent his charter of trust to Moscow.³⁷ Zosima was consecrated metropolitan on 26 September.³⁸

After Zosima's consecration, Gennadii sent an epistle to the new metropolitan (the letter was written after 26 September and before the 17 October council meetings on the heretics). The Novgorodian archbishop demanded immediate

punishment for the heretics Denis and Gavrilko, and an announcement of the council's damnation of the heretics who had already died (Aleksei, Istoma and Ivashko Chernyi) and of those individuals who had been investigated during the second investigation, whose names had been written down in the "original" acts (подлинник). At the same time Gennadii cited the Apostolic Canon that prohibits, under threat of excommunication, participation in church services celebrated by heretics. Gennadii could expect opposition to the proposed punitive actions and hence singled out the heretics' principal supporter (печальник) Feodor Kuritsyn, the clerk (*d'iak*) of the grand prince.³⁹ According to Gennadii, the heretics Aleksei, Istoma, Sverchek, Denis and others had come to Kuritsyn several times seeking advice.

In his letter Gennadii paraphrased the speeches of Georg von Turn, the ambassador of the Holy Roman Empire, written down in Novgorod shortly after 19 August 1490.⁴⁰ The ambassador related to the archbishop a story about the king of Spain (Ferdinand the Catholic) who had "purged" his country, presumably of the Jewish heresy.⁴¹ The Inquisition's troops in Spain had investigated about four thousand people, young and old, and subsequently had burned them, and "the glory... and the praise... of the king of Spain have spread throughout all the countries of the Latin belief, because [the king] is adamantly opposed to criminals."⁴²

When repeated by Gennadii, the ambassador's story clearly sounded like a call to begin mass executions of heretics. Gennadii could not have been unaware, however, that the very practice of execution of heretics, which was known in the Byzantine Empire, had never been in use in Rus', and that such an innovation would touch the roots of powerful social institutions and provoke negative reactions from many sides.

Before September 1490 some individuals lodged a complaint against Gennadii's investigation because of his alleged abuse of power. Arguing against this accusation, the archbishop related to the council of bishops the interrogation of a certain Samsonka, who named the clerk Feodor Kuritsyn as chief patron of the heretics.⁴³ Hence, one might speculate, Gennadii expected resistance from the clerk of the grand prince.

Gennadii gave his colleagues in Moscow a fresh account of the newly-discovered crimes of the heretics concerning the act of the scrivener (*pod'iachii*) Alekseika, who "had poured dirty water" on an icon of the Dormition of the Mother of God, and "turned some other icons upside down."⁴⁴ Gennadii's demand to convoke a council against the heretics without delay was accompanied by a concealed threat to the Muscovite clergy: those "archimandrites and abbots, and archpriests, and council priests who have served with the heretics," even if they did not commit the same heresy, should be excommunicated and deprived of holy orders.⁴⁵

The Novgorodian archbishop had warned his colleagues not to turn the anti-heretical council into a council on confessional matters. Gennadii expressed

the point thus: “Our people are simple, they do not understand even ordinary books, so do not allow any speeches with the heretics. A council should be called only for one purpose: to punish the heretics, that is, to burn them, and hang them.”⁴⁶

The hearing of the heretics’ case took place in Moscow on 17 October 1490. A day earlier, on 16 October, the heretic Denis was expelled with dishonor from the Cathedral of the Archangel as he was preparing to celebrate the liturgy together with the bishops. The next morning Archbishop Tikhon of Rostov, Bishop Nifont of Suzdal’, Bishop Semion of Riazan’, as well as archmandrites, abbots, archpriests, and “honored elders” gathered at the chamber of the metropolitan. The council of prelates had informed Ivan the Third about the case, and Ivan, acting like a Byzantine emperor, ordered an investigation of the heresy. Shortly after, perhaps on the same day, the bishops gathered once more and began a session in the presence of boyars and the clerk of the grand prince. Nine heretics had been presented to the council—the monk Zakhar, the “head of the heresies”; the Novgorodian archpriest Gavriil; the priests Denis, Maksim, and Vasilii; the deacon Makar; the clerks Gridia, Vasiuk, Samukha; and “their collaborators.”⁴⁷

Metropolitan Zosima specified the main accusations against the heretics in his speech to the council. According to the investigators’ report, the heretics did not venerate the icons of Christ and of the Mother of God and of the Cross, paid no respect to other icons, broke and burned icons, bit into a cross made from an aloe tree,⁴⁸ and threw icons and crosses to the ground and into a washtub. After such heinous actions, some heretics had begun to verbally abuse even Christ and the Mother of God, refused to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God, blasphemed against many saints and the seven Ecumenical Councils, and ate forbidden food during the fast days of Wednesday and Friday. Furthermore, all the heretics respected Saturday more than Sunday, and some of them did not believe in the Resurrection of Christ. Summing up, Metropolitan Zosima gave a short description of the heretics’ crimes: “They have carried out all these following the Jewish custom, in violation of God’s law and the Christian belief.”⁴⁹

After Zosima’s speech, the epistles of Gennadii and lists containing the descriptions of the heretics’ crimes were read to the defendants. They denied all charges.⁵⁰ Thereupon Zakhar, who had been known earlier as a *strigol’nik*, not as a heretic seduced by Jews, was questioned. The Metropolitan accused Zakhar of refusing to prostrate himself before holy icons. According to the report made by the court, Zakhar in his reply allegedly “blasphemed against Jesus Christ our Lord, and his Immaculate Mother, and all the great hierarchs—the miracle workers Peter, Alexis, and Leontius, and all the saintly fathers of the seven Councils.”⁵¹ There then followed a confrontation in which “many people” gave evidence about the heretics’ crimes and “abuses of holy icons.” New lists of depositions were immediately sent to Ivan the Third. The grand

prince appeared in person in the chamber of the metropolitan and gave an order to read aloud Gennadii's letters and copies (списки) of the Novgorod materials. He heard oral testimony of "Muscovite people" as well.

Following Ivan the Third's order, Metropolitan Zosima "looked at the Book of Canons of the Holy Fathers" and determined that the heretics, because of their sins, deserved deposition from holy orders. They were also to be excommunicated and consigned to ecclesiastical perdition. The *Procheiros Nomos* (градские законы), which traditionally was copied alongside the traditional Book of Canons, called for the public punishment (казнити) of such heretics, and their imprisonment.⁵²

The ecclesiastical laws found by the metropolitan appeared to be more humane than any plans of the Novgorodian archbishop himself (i.e., "burn and hang," жечи и вешати), and the council of the metropolitanate followed the directions of the Book of Canons. The heretics were consigned to ecclesiastical punishment and sent to Novgorod.⁵³

The council obviously did not fulfill the expectations of the Novgorodian archbishop, and not only because of the relatively humane verdict. The accusations had been deliberately organized in such a way that Zakhar—a *strigol'nik*, who had never been accused of Jewish heresy—would be proclaimed the head of the heresy. The homily by Zosima and the description of the council very cautiously used Gennadii's characterization of the heresy as being due to Jewish influence. In Zosima's speech, one could find a detailed account of the heretics' iconoclastic crimes, and only at the end of the verdict were the actions of the newly-discovered iconoclasts explained as a deviation toward the Jewish religion ("то чинили есте по обычаю жидовскому"). In the homily of Zosima the only reference to the Jewish inspiration of the heretics could be found in the preamble ("жидовскую веру хвалят"). These two accusations do not draw one's attention; the accusations of Jewish heresy were almost completely obscured by the description of the other, non-Jewish deviations.

More importantly, even Gennadii himself, passionate expositor of heretics that he was, gradually changed his attitude toward the newly-discovered heresy. The first letters sent by Gennadii in September 1487–August 1488 had accused the heretics of being "жидовская мудръствующие" (adherents to Jewish teachings). The above-mentioned definition scarcely reflected the character of the heresy, and at the same time was not intelligible to the Novgorodian archbishop's addressees. This is why Gennadii was obliged to give a more detailed explanation of the heresy: "That the heretics be excommunicated like Marcionites and Messalians" (покрыты ... суть онех еретик клятвою укоризною маркианския глаголю и месалианския)⁵⁴, "And they use every Messalian heresy that there is for their false wisdom, but they deceive people [by calling it] the Jewish Ten Commandments, so that they might think themselves virtuous" (да что есть ересеи месалианских, то все они

мудръствуют, толко то жидовским десятословием люди прельщают...),⁵⁵ and further: “This is not only Judaism; it is mixed with Messalian heresy” (ино то в них не одно иудейство, смешано с месалианскою ересью).⁵⁶ Gennadii did not specify the source of his theoretical knowledge of Messalianism, but one could speculate that he was thinking about the Bogomils, according to the description of this heresy given in the *Merilo Pravednoe*.⁵⁷ The heresy of Marcionitism was known to Gennadii from the Book of Canons: “Those chapters about the Marcionites,” wrote Gennadii to Prokhor of Sarai, “you would find in your Book of Canons.”⁵⁸ The Book of Canons that belonged to Bishop Prokhor was discovered in the Library of the Perm’ Pedagogical Institute. It appears to be a Book of Canons in an original Muscovite version, associated with the *Merilo pravednoe* (hitherto the oldest and only copy of that version was the well-known *Chudovskaia kormchaia* of 1499⁵⁹), approximately from the third quarter of the fifteenth century.⁶⁰ Gennadii mentioned “Marcionites,” and it is difficult to guess what kind of heresy he had in mind. Canon 1 of the Second Ecumenical Council treats the heresy of “Marcellianites,”⁶¹ while Canon 95 of the Sixth Ecumenical Council⁶² and Canon 47 of Basil the Great discourse on the heresy of the “Marcionites.” We know very little about the Marcellianites, and somewhat more about the Marcionites. The latter, according to Basil the Great, did not accept marriage, prohibited the drinking of wine, called God’s creation “dirty” (скверное), and represented God as creator of all evil on earth.⁶³

The mention of the Book of Canons does not at all clarify the nature of the heresy. Rather, it raises some new questions. For instance, why did Gennadii not refer to those regulations of the Book of Canons that applied more precisely to the heresy under examination, if it really was the Jewish heresy? He might, for example, have referred to Canon 8 of the Seventh Council, on certain Jews who “pretend to convert to Christianity, although they secretly reject Christianity, keep the custom of honoring Saturday, and follow other Jewish traditions.”⁶⁴ A similar example can be found in Canon 29 of the Council of Laodicea.⁶⁵

After February 1488, the Novgorodian archbishop had abundant time and opportunity to confirm his preliminary hypothesis concerning the Jewish character of the heresy. Gennadii launched two investigations, involving many interrogations and cross-examinations of various suspects, but he was not able to find any new information that would shed light on the heretical teaching. In September 1490, Gennadii did not repeat his previous characterization of the heretics as “adherents of Jewish teachings” (жидовская мудръствующие) in terms of their doctrines, but rather emphasized the “Jewish custom” that they followed.⁶⁶

It was not until September 1490 that the Novgorodian archbishop finally pointed out the main perpetrator of the crime—an anonymous “heretical Jew” (жидовин еретик) who had arrived from Kiev twenty years earlier, on 8

November 1470, with the retinue of the Kievan prince Mykhail Oleŭkovich.⁶⁷ Such a belated and scarcely trustworthy discovery by Gennadii would attach a political significance to the heresy, and would have led to the immediate intervention of the grand prince, for the heresy was to be explained as the result of intrigues of hostile Lithuania. In September 1490 the Novgorodian archbishop began to refer to the heresy as the “accursed Lithuanian affair” (литовские окаянные дела).⁶⁸

As more accusations against the heretics were brought forward, the resistance to the Novgorodian archbishop grew. Some enemies cast aspersions (“сшивали ложь”) on Gennadii, and doubted the impartiality of the investigation.⁶⁹ Thus, Gennadii was forced to attack in order to defend himself from his enemies. In his attempt to find new evidence of the Jewish heresy, Gennadii enlarged the circle of suspects. At the same time, lacking the sound support of Moscow, the archbishop became more and more dependent on priests of his own eparchy—the very priests Gennadii suspected of the heresy. It must be remembered that Gennadii was the second Muscovite protégé in the history of Novgorod to occupy the archepiscopal see. Gennadii’s predecessor, Sergii, could not keep his position for even a year (4 September 1483 to 26 June 1484),⁷⁰ because “the citizens of Novgorod did not want to bend to his will.”⁷¹ In his attempt to overcome the resistance of the Novgorod citizens, Gennadii looked for help from Muscovite officials. Gennadii could obtain such support in only one eventuality: if his accusations against the Novgorodians were to grow to a certain extent, so that Gennadii’s fate would become part of the sphere of Ivan the Third’s political interests (for instance, accusations of treason, or of a “Lithuanian affair,” literally, “литовские дела”).⁷² As one might speculate, Gennadii’s intervention in the field of interest of the Muscovite political elite would not be accepted as appropriate conduct. One of the heads of Ivan the Third’s foreign office, the clerk Feodor Kuritsyn, certainly did not readily take on trust the accusations of the Novgorodian priests. After the first investigation of the heretics, after July–August 1488, the Novgorodian priest Denis, who was proclaimed a heretic in Novgorod and soon escaped from Gennadii, was appointed to serve at the grand princely Archangel’s Cathedral. Gennadii’s struggle against the heresy gradually developed into a struggle for Gennadii’s own future: in attacking the heretics, the Novgorodian archbishop was defending himself.

The virtue one can least expect from one in such a situation is impartiality. Moreover, Gennadii not infrequently received information secondhand. Therefore, a historian cannot find conclusive evidence in his reports, but rather a reflection of certain events as seen through the wide-open eyes of medieval spectators who were scarcely able to understand what they saw.

Like any Christian society, the medieval Orthodox world was not indifferent to the Jewish issue. One of the strongest preoccupations of the Christian mind kept obstinately tearing away at the Jewish roots of historical Christianity.⁷³

One could expect a great deal of misunderstanding: even a distant historical similarity of phenomena could be treated by medieval writers as a complete and undisputable identity. Accordingly, of all the accusations that had been brought forward against the heretics at the trial of 1490, the only accusation that bears evidence of Jewish customs maintained by the heretics was, as Constantine Zuckerman has pointed out,⁷⁴ their reverence for Saturday “more than for Sunday” (паче воскресения Христова). However, the same “Jewish” sin, according to medieval Orthodox writings, plagued even the Catholic Church. The earliest East Slavic polemical work, the epistle of Metropolitan Ioann II to the anti-Pope Clement III (1088–1089), explicates the Catholic tradition of feasting on Saturday, as well as some other Catholic “deviations,” as an imitation of the “Jewish custom and belief.”⁷⁵ This problem was seen in a similar manner in the late fifteenth century, when the *posadnik* of Pskov Filipp Petrov⁷⁶ wrote to his archbishop (perhaps in 1485–1487), “The grey monks, my lord, came from the Germans to Pskov, and began to argue about faith....” Later on, Filipp called “Latins” those monks who had tried to induce the citizens of Pskov to recognize the decisions of the Council of Florence; thus, one could not question the confessional allegiance of the “grey monks.” The development of a discussion between priests from Pskov and some uninvited guests merits attention. The Catholics said, “Our pope united the faith with your [representatives] at the Eighth Council, and you as well as we are Christians, we believe (they say) in the Son of God.” The Pskovian priests answered, “Not everyone’s faith is right; God is right; if you trust in the Son of God, then why do you follow the Jews, who killed God; why do you revere and keep a fast on Saturday, and why do you eat unleavened bread, and therefore keep Jewish customs [жидовствуете] against the will of God...[?]”⁷⁷ Thus, as a consequence of the Pskovian perception of the 1480s, the teachings of pious Catholic monks could be easily called by Russians “the Jewish teachings.” How should one treat the “trustworthy” evidence in the case of the Novgorodian heretics?

As the discussion of Gennadii’s letters has shown, the archbishop does not provide sufficient evidence of the heretics’ deviation toward the Jewish belief. Numerous bodies of evidence that had been found during the course of the first investigation (the copybooks of priest Naum) probably could not endure closer examination, and were struck off a list of questions disputed with the “Judaizers.” A general accusation of the heretics of abuse of the Orthodox faith could not prove anything, for any innovation and any deviation from the customary rite could be seen in Rus’ as an “abuse” (похуление) of the faith. Such an accusation was made against Maksim the Greek and Vassian Patrikeev in 1531,⁷⁸ and against the elder Artemii in 1554.⁷⁹ Those heretics who, according to Gennadii’s report, beyond any doubt had “converted to the Jewish religion” (встали в жидовскую веру) could not be questioned in public, for they had died before the council of 1490.⁸⁰ The heretics Denis and Gavrilkо

miraculously survived all the persecutions, continued acting as Orthodox Christians, celebrated the liturgy, and gave and received Holy Communion.

The inquisitive Gennadii, who (as one can speculate on the basis of his writings) could easily communicate with “Latins” and Muslims,⁸¹ knew almost nothing about the real life and traditions of the Jewish communities in Lithuania and Kiev. The latter was called by some Jewish writers “God’s great city of sages and writers.” It was there that Gennadii tried to trace the roots of the “Jewish heresy.” In Kiev, Rabbinic and Karaite communities interpreted the Torah in varied ways;⁸² the latter followed the Babylonian rite of the Gaonim, while the former held to the Roman rite transplanted from France and the German lands, and struggled against each other. It was also in Kiev that Moses ben Yaakov ha-Goleh (Rabbi Moses the Exiled), the master of the Masorah, wrote his commentaries on the Pentateuch, on the Book of Ecclesiastes, on a calendar and cabalistic writings.⁸³ But Gennadii, like the Novgorodian heretics, seems to have had absolutely no idea of any of these facets of the life of the Jewish communities.

History has seen to it that Gennadii’s frightened but unconvincing account, which treated heretics as Judaizers, survived the contemporary testimonies of the heresy and became part of many historical writings in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, as we have seen, Gennadii’s interpretation of the heresy was based on his own preconceptions, and his idea of the Jewish character of the heresy is not supported by an examination of the various sources.

Gennadii’s view prevailed because of the polemical writings of the Novgorodian archbishop’s correspondent, the abbot of the Volokolamsk Monastery Iosif Sanin—especially his *Book against Heretics* (the book is known as the Просветитель, “Enlightener”; the short version of this book in ten chapters was compiled in 1492–1494).⁸⁵ Iosif was not himself involved in the first period of the anti-heretical polemic and could receive only circumstantial evidence about the heresy. He began to dispute with the alleged heretics after the council of 1490 and, without any hesitation, called their belief the “Jewish faith.” While he remained far from Novgorodian events, Iosif was able to determine the name of the “heretical Jew” (Skharia) who allegedly had taught the heresy to the Novgorodian priests.⁸⁶ For the first time, Iosif mentions names of other Jews who came to Novgorod from Lithuania (Iosif Shmoilo Skariavei,⁸⁷ Moses Khanush).⁸⁸ And “the head and teacher” of the heretics, according to Iosif’s report, paradoxically appeared to be the head of the Russian Orthodox church, Metropolitan Zosima. Such a sharp turn in the course of the investigation led to the beginning of a new period of discussion on the origin and nature of the Novgorodian-Muscovite heresy.

*Institute of Russian History,
Russian Academy of Sciences,
Moscow*

ABBREVIATIONS

- AAE *Akty, sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiiskoi imperii Arkheograficheskoiu ekspeditsieiu Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk*. Vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1836)
- AFED N. A. Kazakova and Ia. S. Lur'e, *Antifeodal'nye ereticheskie dvizheniia na Rusi XIV–nachala XVI veka* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1955)
- AI *Akty istoricheskie, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoiu komissiei*. Vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1841)
- ChOidr *Chteniia v Moskovskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh*
- DRV N. Novikov, ed. *Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofika....* Vol. 14 (Moscow, 1790)
- Eparkh Eparkhial'noe sobranie, GIM
- GBL Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka im. V. I. Lenina, now Rossiiskaia Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka (Moscow)
- GIM Gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii muzei (Moscow)
- GPB Gosudarstvennaia publichnaia biblioteka im. M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina, now Rossiiskaia Natsional'naia biblioteka (St. Petersburg)
- HUS *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*
- PL A. N. Nasonov, ed. *Pskovskie letopisi*. Vol. 2 (Moscow, 1955)
- PSRL *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*. Vol. 12 (St. Petersburg, 1901); vol. 13, pt. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1906); vol. 20, pt. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1910); vol. 26 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1959); vol. 28 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1962)
- RFA A. I. Pliguzov et al., eds. *Russkii feodal'nyi arkhiv XIV–pervoi treti XVI veka*. 5 vols. to date (Moscow, 1986–)
- RIB A. S. Pavlov, ed. *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, izdavaemaia Arkheograficheskoiu komissiei*. Vol. 6 (St. Petersburg, 1880)
- Sinod Sinodal'noe sobranie, GIM
- Solov Solovetskoe sobranie, GPB
- TODRL *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury*. 48 vols. to date (Leningrad / St. Petersburg, 1934–)
- Troitsk Troitskoe sobranie, GBL
- ZhMNP *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* (St. Petersburg, 1834–1917)

NOTES

1. Even the most comprehensive descriptions of the medieval *European* heresies never consider the heresy of “Judaizers” as a part of European (or Byzantine) religious dissent, and have never mentioned the Novgorodian-Muscovite heretical sect among those heretics. See N. G. Garsoïan, “Byzantine Heresy: A Reinterpretation,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 25 (1971): 85-113; R.I. Moore, *The Origin of European Dissent* (New York, 1977); M. Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus* (New York, 1977), etc.

2. W. Strojev, “Zur Herkunftsfrage der ‘Judaisierenden’,” *Zeitschrift für Slawische Philologie* 11 (1934): 345; cf. Ia. S. Lur'e, *Ideologicheskaia bor'ba v russkoi publitsistike kontsa XV–nachala XVI veka* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1960), p. 77.

3. I. Berlin, "Zhidovstvuiushchie," *Evreiskaia entsiklopediia*, vol. 8 (St. Petersburg, n.d.), col. 582–87.

4. AFED 375; on the date of Mykhail Olel'kovych's arrival in Novgorod see PL, pt. 2, p. 172, cf. p. 175.

5. AFED p. 378

6. Contrary to Zakhar's accusation, the obligation to pay money for installation appeared to be the routine practice of the Christian Church. See R. J. Macrides, "Simony," *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 3 (New York, Oxford, 1991), pp. 1901–1902; V. Preobrazhenskii, *Sv. Tarasii patriarkh tsaregradskii i VII Vselenskii sobor* (St. Petersburg, 1893), pp. 115–18; A. P. Dobroklonskii, *Prep. Feodor, ispovednik i igumen studiiskii* (Odessa, 1913), pp. 160–163; A. I. Pliguzov, "Protivostoianie mitropolich'ei i vassianovskoi kormchikh nakanune sudebnykh zasedanii 1531 goda," in *Issledovaniia po istochnikovedeniiu istorii SSSR dooktiabr'skogo perioda* (Moscow, 1985), pp. 32, 50.

7. AFED p. 380.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 379.

9. For the date of the beginning of the investigation of the heretics, see the direct evidence in Gennadii's letter to Metropolitan Zosima. Between 26 September and 16 October 1490, Gennadii wrote about the date of the discovery of the heresy, "Three years have passed, and now the fourth has come," AFED p. 378.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 375.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 310. Some scholars identify the copybooks of Naum with the well-known Psalter of the newly converted Fedor the Jew, preserved in manuscript codices of the scribe Efosin from the Kirillov-Beloozerskii Monastery. See the edition: M. N. Speranskii, ed., "Psal'tyr' zhidovstvuiushchikh v perevode Fedora Evreia," *ChOIDR*, bk. 2 (221) (1907), pt. 2, pp. 1–72, and analysis: Constantine Zuckerman, "The 'Psalter' of Fedor and the Heresy of the 'Judaizers' in the Last Quarter of the Fifteenth Century," *HUS* 11 no. 1/2 (June 1987): 77–99. The most recent scholar of the Psalter does not speculate on the connections between the heresy and Fedor's literary work. See E. B. Rogachevskaiia, "Iz nabliudeniia nad 'Psal'tir'iu' Fedora evreia," *Slaviane i ikh sosedi. Evreiskoe naselenie tsentral'noi, vostochnoi i iugo-vostochnoi Evropy. srednie veka – nachalo novogo vremeni* (Moscow, 1993), pp. 76–78. Henceforth the correspondence of the heretics does not mention the "Jewish" psalms; therefore, additional investigation could not discover any heretical deviations in Naum's copybooks.

12. *Slovar' drevnerusskogo iazyka (XI–XIV vv.)*, vol. 3 (Moscow, 1990), p. 260.

13. I. I. Sreznevskii, *Materialy dlia slovaria drevne-russkogo iazyka po pis'mennym pamiatnikam*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1893), col. 871.

14. *Slovar' drevnerusskogo iazyka*, p. 260.

15. B. Melioranskii, "K istorii protivotserkovnykh dvizhenii v Makedonii v XIV veke," in *Στέφανος. Sbornik statei v chest' F. F. Sokolova* (St. Petersburg, 1895), pp. 71–72, cf. G. M. Prokhorov, "Prenie Grigorii Palamy 'skhionyi turki' i problema 'zhidovskaia mudrstvuiushchikh,'" *TODRL* 27 (1972): 331.

16. See A. I. Pliguzov and I. A. Tikhoniuk, "Poslanie Dmitriia Trakhaniota novgorodskomu arkhiepiskopu Gennadiiu Gonzovu o sedmerichnosti schisleniia let," in *Estestvennonauchnye predstavleniia Drevnei Rusi* (Moscow, 1988), pp. 53–55. For publication of the Slavonic translation of "Six Wings" (the copy compiled in 1503–1522), see A. I. Sobolevskii, *Perevodnaia literatura Moskovskoi Rusi XIV–XVII vekov. Bibliogr. materialy* (St. Petersburg, 1903), pp. 413–17, and plates; cf. M. Steinschneider, *Mathematik bei den Juden* (Frankfurt a. M., 1901), pp. 79–84.

17. GIM, Sinod. 915, f. 907.

18. AFED pp. 311–12.

19. Pliguzov and Tikhoniuk, "Poslanie," p. 74.

20. See proposed text of the letter by Paisii and Nil published on the basis of the August volume of Makarii's *Velikie chetii minei*: RFA 3:695–96.

21. AFED p. 313.
22. Ibid, pp. 312–13.
23. N. K. Goleizovskii, “Dva epizoda iz deiatel’nosti novgorodskogo arkhiepiskopa Gennadiia,” *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 41 (1980):127–30.
24. AFED pp. 313–15.
25. PSRL vol. 28, p. 319.
26. Ibid. For more information see A. A. Zimin, *Rossia na rubezhe XV-XVI stoletii* (Moscow, 1982), pp. 78–79, 285. The number of persons punished, as Edward L. Keenan has pointed out to me, seems exaggerated.
27. The Compilation of 1497 (PSRL vol. 28, p. 154) reports that Ioasaf left his see during the Apostles’ Fast (*zagovenie*) in 1488. The Apostles’ Fast in 1488 began on 30 May and ended 28 June. Gennadii’s letter to Ioasaf usually has been dated from February 1489, on the basis of the scribe’s remark, “In the year 6997, February 23, 24, 25, I copied this letter; in the letter are ninety and five lines” (AFED p. 320). However, this remark does not inform us of the time of composition of the letter, but only indicates the time when the only copy of Gennadii’s letter (which indeed contains ninety-five lines) was made. All the chronological calculations one could find in the letter to Ioasaf coincide with the calculations in the letter to Prokhor of Sarai (from the end of 1487, i.e., the beginning of 6996). Therefore, the letter to Ioasaf should be dated the same year (6996: September 1487–August 1488). Since Gennadii’s epistle to Ioasaf was compiled after Ioasaf had left his see (June 1488), the only possible time of composition of the letter to Ioasaf would have been July–August 1488.
28. AFED p. 320.
29. Moshe Taube has pointed out to me that by the end of the fifteenth century both treatises had been translated into Slavonic and circulated in manuscript copies. See Sobolevskii, *Perevodnaia literatura*, 401–409; P. Kokovtsev, “K voprosu o ‘Logike Aviasafa,’” *ZhMNP* no. 5 (1912); Lur’e, *Ideologicheskaia bor’ba*, pp. 194–97.
30. PSRL, vol. 20, pt. 1, p. 354; cf. vol. 28, pp. 154, 319.
31. AFED p. 375.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Cf. “мистръ веницейский Аристотель,” PSRL, vol. 25, p. 303 (1475); vol. 28, p. 309 (1475), and A. Zoltan, “Zapadnorussko-velikorusskie iazykovye kontakty v oblasti leksiki v XV v. (K voprosu o zapadnoi traditsii v delovoi pis’mennosti Moskovskoi Rusi),” diss. abstract (Moscow, 1984), p. 22.
35. PSRL, vol. 28, pp. 154–55, 320.
36. From the beginning the Simonov Monastery maintained strong relations with the court of the grand prince. See L. I. Ivina, *Krupnaia votchina Severo-Vostochnoi Rusi kontsa XIV–pervoi poloviny XVI v.* (Leningrad, 1979). One can speculate that the Simonov Monastery was in opposition to the Chudov Monastery, whence Gennadii was elevated to the Novgorodian see.
37. Gennadii’s charter of trust (повольная грамота) had been partly cited by the compiler of the Vologda-Perm’ Chronicle: PSRL, vol. 26, pp. 280–81. It was from this chronicle that the text of the charter was derived by the compiler of the Nikon Chronicle: PSRL, vol. 12, p. 224.
38. PSRL, vol. 28, p. 320.
39. AFED p. 377. The editors of AFED published Gennadii’s letter according to the MS. GPB, Q.XVII.15, with variants from the MS. GPB, Solov. 962/852, but they were unable to discover the copy of the letter that was published in 1836 in *Akty arkheograficheskoi ekspeditsii* (A. S. Pavlov cited the variants of the 1836 publication in RIB, vol. 6, no. 115.I). I have managed to find the copy published in AAE—it is GIM, Eparkh. 416.
40. The ambassador Georg von Turn must have arrived in Novgorod directly from Moscow; he left Moscow on 19 August 1490 (PSRL, vol. 26, p. 280), accompanied by Georgios Trakhaniotēs (the author of the letter to Gennadii on the chronological matters and the interpreter of von Turn’s “Speeches”), and by the grand prince’s clerk Vasilii Kuleshin.

41. AFED p. 378.

42. See GBL, Muz. 3271, f. 4v.–5v. and the publication in A. D. Sedel'nikov, "Rasskaz 1490 g. ob inkvizitsii," *Trudy Komissii po drevne-russkoi literature Akademii nauk SSSR*, vol. 1 (Leningrad, 1934), p. 50: "Сказывал посол цесаревъ Юрюю про шпанског(о) корола, а имени емѣ не помнит.

Тот деи корол(ь) очистил свою землю *от* ересеи жидовскихъ, а за тѣм королем шес(ть) земел(ь): Шпанскаа, Католоніа, Биско, Каstellіа, Серденіа, Корсига, а тѣ шес(ть) земел(ь) всѣ великіе, а тот имъ корол(ь) шпанскои всѣм г(о)с(у)д(а)рь. И в тои ег(о) земли на Шпаніе тѣ жидовскіе ереси почали прозабат[и]. И тот корол(ь) шпанскои, избрав великог(о) ч(е)л(ове)ка из своих велмож, да послал послом к папѣ римскомѣ, что тои еретич(ь)ство въ его землях в великих людех в бискѣпѣх и въ архимандритѣх и в попѣх и въ ц(е)рковных людех и в миранех въ многих почало прозабати.

И папа римскыи с тѣм ег(о) послѣм послал двѣ писков великих людеи к томѣ шпанскомѣ королю во его землях тог(о) лиха искати. И как *от* папы два бискѣпа пришли и корол(ь) шпанскои к папиныи биском избрав своих два бискѣпа великі[е], да два боарина болших своих, кои под тѣм королем всѣ тѣ земли держат, да велѣл имъ с папиныи бискѣп[ы] того лиха обыскивати. И папины бискѣпы и королевы, и королевы боаре обыскали в нач(а)лѣ двѣ бискѣпов королевых, да их казнили многыи казнми и многыи ранами, да и сожгли. Да после тог(о) обыскали шес(ть) архимандритов и попов и игѣменов, а по тамошнемѣ зовжт ихъ обаты, да тѣх казнили нем(и)л(о)стиво, да и сожгли. Да после тог(о) боарѣ обыскали и земледержьцев и попов, и мирских людіи и ц(е)рковных людіи многих, да мѣчили их многыи розныи мѣками, да и пережгли всѣх.

А всѣх тѣх обыскали в тои ереси бискѣпов и боарѣ и архимандритов и попов и земледержьцов, и мирских людеи и малых и великих с четыре тысащи, да тѣ всѣ съжжены, а животы их [и и]мѣніа на корола поимали. А иные лихіе ко[их н]е поспѣли поимати, и тѣ стѣпили из земли вонъ без вѣсти, а животы их и имѣніа на корола поимали. А же томѣ четвертой год как тѣх лихих обыскали да и пережгли. А и н(ы)нѣ и сег(о) дни тѣ папины два бискѣпа ѣ корола живжт и папа ѣздити к себѣ не велѣл, а корол(ь) ихъ проч(ь) *от* себе не *отпѣстит*, а лихых так и обыскивают, да хотѣт ихъ искоренити, чтобы то лихо в тѣх землях не было.

А вѣра ѣ тог(о) корола латинскаа, а бискѣпы папины тѣх живот не емлют, а корол(ь) деи имъ хочет дати многое множ(ь)ство, как их станет проч(ь) *отпѣшати*. А тѣ деи земли на запад за Вфранцовскіи королевствомъ шелса рѣбеж с рѣбежом.

А слава деи и хвала тог(о) шпанског(о) корола пошла по всѣм землам по латиньскои вѣрѣ, что на лихих крѣпко стоит, да же деи въ его землях лихих мало чюти."

For a detailed description of the Jewish communities in Spain prosecuted by the Inquisition in Castile in 1483–1485, see H. Beinart, ed., *Records of the Trials of the Spanish Inquisition in Ciudad Real*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1974), vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1985), esp. Index of Subjects, pp. 632–56. Cf. H. Ch. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of Spain*, vol. 2 (London, 1906), pp. 11–12ff.

43. AFED p. 380–81.

44. Ibid, p. 380.

45. Ibid, p. 381.

46. "Да еще люди у нас простые, не умеют по обычным книгам говорить: таки бы о вере никаких речей с ними [еретиками — АУТОР] не плодили; токмо того для учинили собор, что их казнити—жечи да вешати!"; see AFED p. 381. Compare the attempt of the elder Artemii to dispute confessional questions with the German (Catholic) dwellers of Novyi Gorodok (Navahrudak), and the decisions made by the council of the Metropolitanate of Moscow in January 1554, when the Russian bishops rejected any plan to dispute with Catholics for the simple reason of the obvious superiority of the true Orthodox belief, AAE 1:251–52.

47. AFED p. 383.

48. Силолоен крест in the Slavonic original. I. I. Sreznevskii pointed out the same word in the epistle of Vasilii Kalika to Feodor Dobryi (1344–1352), see Sreznevskii, *Materialy dlia slovaria*, vol. 3 (1891), col. 352.

49. AFED p. 383.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 385.

51. *Ibid.*

52. *Ibid.*; *Kormchaia* (Moscow, 1649–1653), f. 486v–487; I. Žužek, *Kormčaja Kniga: Studies on the Chief Code of Russian Canon Law*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 168 (Rome, 1964), pp. 88–89.

53. In Novgorod the same heretics were punished by Gennadii according to the Byzantine model, which could be known in Rus', for instance, from the text of the anonymous *Vita* of Amphilochius of Ikonion (see GBL, Troitsk. 670, f. 563). Compare the description of the punishment in Amphilochius's *Vita* (Emperor Theodosius ordered the heretic Eunomius to be seated on an unsaddled camel and conveyed through the city for humiliation, and commanded the public to say, "He is an enemy of God!") Gennadii, like his Byzantine predecessors, ordered the heretics to be put on a horse and conveyed through the city, and ordered those who met the procession to spit upon the heretics and say, "They are enemies of God and abusers of Christ." See AFED p. 472 (publication of Iosif's "Skazanie o novoiaivshseia erezii," 1492–1494).

54. *Ibid.*, p. 310.

55. *Ibid.*

56. *Ibid.*, p. 316. On Messalianism see N. Garsoïan, *The Paulician Heresy: A Study of the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire* (The Hague-Paris, 1967), pp. 207–209; R. Staats, *Gregor von Nyssa und die Messalianer* (Berlin, 1968); A. Louth, "Messalianism and Pelagianism," *Studia Patristica* 17.1 (1982), pp. 127–35.

57. Lur'e, *Ideologičeskaia bor'ba*, p. 155. On the heresy of the Bogomils see D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils* (Cambridge, 1948); M. Loos, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages* (Prague, 1974); Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, pp. 12–23.

58. AFED pp. 310. Despite such direct evidence, G. M. Prokhorov speculates that the source of Gennadii's knowledge of the Marcionite heresy appeared to be the treatise "On Heresies" by John of Damascus: see Prokhorov, "Prenie Grigoriia Palamy," pp. 355–56. J. R. Howlett in her unpublished article "Svidetel'stvo arkhiepiskopa Gennadiia o erezii 'novgorodskikh eretikov zhidovskaia mudrstvuiushchikh'" points out the direct source of some of Gennadii's canonical knowledge of the history of heresies. Gennadii cited (AFED p. 310) *A Treatise of Timothy, a Priest of Constantinople, on the Reception of Heretics into the Church*. For publication of the original Greek version see Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus... Series Graeca Posterior*, vol. 86 (Paris, 1860), col. 11–74. For the Slavonic text, see *Spomenik*, Srpska Akademija Nauka i umetnosti, 202, Odeljenje Društvenih Nauka, Nova Serija, 4 (1952), pp. 91–92. On the heresy of Marcionitism see A. Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig, 1921); H. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginning of Christianity*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1963), pp. 130–46; Garsoïan, *The Paulician Heresy*, p. 205.

59. R. G. Pikhōia, "Permskaia kormchaia (o predystorii poiavleniia Chudovskoi kormchei 1499 g.)," in *Obshchestvennoe soznanie, knižnost' i literatura perioda feodalizma* (Novosibirsk, 1990), pp. 171–75; N. S. Demkova and S. A. Iakunina, "Kormchaia XV v. iz sobraniia Permskogo pedagogičeskogo instituta," *TODRL* 43 (1990): 330–37. M. N. Tikhomirov, and later Ia. N. Shchapov dated the redaction of the Book of Canons shortly after 1326 (Ia. N. Shchapov, *Kniažheskie ustavy i tserkov' v Drevnei Rusi XI-XIV vv.* [Moscow, 1972], p. 242), although the proposed date seems to me not well grounded; see RFA 5:961–62.

60. For the facsimile edition of this literary work see *Merilo pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow, 1961).

61. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus... Series Graeca Posterior*, vol. 137 (Paris, 1865), col. 312; on the Second Council see J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (New York, 1981), pp. 296–331.

62. Migne, *Patrologiae*, col. 841; on the Sixth Council see E. X. Murphy and P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et III* (Paris, 1974), pp. 133–260.

63. *Kanony ili kniga pravil...* 2nd ed. (Montreal, 1974), pp. 43, 94, 252.

64. Migne, *Patrologiae*, col. 913; *Kanony*, p. 102.

65. Migne, *Patrologiae*, col. 1376; *Kanony*, p. 136.

66. AFED pp. 376, 377, 381.

67. *Ibid.*, p. 375. Cf. note 4.

68. *Ibid.*

69. *Ibid.*, p. 380.

70. PSRL, vol. 25, p. 330; RFA, vol. 2, no. 70.

71. PSRL, vol. 28, p. 152; cf. Sedefnikov, “Rasskaz 1490 g.,” p. 52.

72. This question is considered in the unpublished dissertation of J. R. Howlett, “The Heresy of the Judaizers and the Problem of the Russian Reformation” (Oxford, 1976).

73. For more information on the history of Jewish-Christian relations in the Slavic medieval world see B. D. Weinryb, “The Beginnings of East-European Jewry in Legend and Historiography,” in *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Newman* (Leiden, 1962), pp. 445–502; C. J. Halperin, “Judaizers and the Image of the Jew in Medieval Russia: A Polemic Revisited and a Question Posed,” *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, 9, no. 2 (Summer 1975): 141–55; H. Birnbaum, “On Jewish Life and Anti-Jewish Sentiments in Medieval Russia,” in *Essays in Early Slavic Civilization* (Munich, 1981), pp. 215–55. For more general observations from a European perspective see G. Kisch, *The Jews in Medieval Germany: A Study of Their Legal and Social Status* (Chicago, 1949), pp. 305–41; E. A. Synan, *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages* (New York and London, 1965); W. Seifert, *Synagoge und Kirche im Mittelalter* (Munich, 1964), pp. 71–97; G. I. Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford, 1990), pp. 57–310.

74. Zuckerman, “The ‘Psalter’ of Feodor,” p. 98.

75. RFA 2:380.

76. Cf. PL, vol. 2, p. 213, where in the entry for 1477 there is mention of Filipp Andreevich, *posadnik* of Pskov.

77. “Прислали, г(о)с(поди)не, къ мнѣ из Юр(ь)ева серіи [херіи, in the manuscript copy.—Аутор] чернци грамоту о ѡсмом съборѣ, что въ ѳларензѣ с папоу Евгеном патріархъ греческои Іосію и рѣскои митрополит Исидор и инѣя митрополиты и еп(и)ск(о)пи, и тую грамотѣ кн(я)зю и посадником есми явил. И княз(ь) себѣ възвѣ. И пришли, г(о)с(поди)не, серіи чернци из немец во Псков, да ѡчали молви о вирѣ. И были ѡ с(вя)щ(е)нников, и на ту же был. А к тебѣ, г(о)суд(а)рь, не похотѣли они ити, и с(вя)щ(е)нники мног(и) их поизгнавал. И преприли их ѡт б(о)ж(е)ств(е)ных писаниі.

И рѣч(ь) их такова: Съединил деи вѣрѣ наш папа с вашими на ѡсмом соборѣ, да и мы деи и вы хр(и)стіане, а вѣрѣм деи въ С(ы)на Б(о)жіа. И ѡтвѣщали н(а)ш(и) с(вя)щ(е)нники к ним: Не всѣм вѣра права, вѣрен ест Бог, аще вѣрѣте въ С(ы)на Б(о)жіа, то почто б(о)гѡбѣвцом жидом послѣдѣте сѡбѡтствѣте постащес(я) в ню, і опрѣ[с]нок жрете, и тѣх ради б(о)гѡпротивно жидѡвствѣте и еще г(лаго)лете и в Д(у)ха С(вя)т(о)го животворяща ѡт Отца и ѡт С(ы)на исходящаго, и два д(у)ха безаконно въводите. И тог(о) ради во двѣ началѣ сходите в Македон(и)я д(у)хоборца пропасть низ влачитес(я), и инангога вас извонб(о)ж(е)ств(е)ных правилъ събордѣствѣю[т]са. А еж(е) г(лаго)л(е)те нам о ѡсмом съимищи иж(е) во Италиі сквернаго събора латынских(о), съ Евгеном папом събраннѣю кѡстѣдію въ ѳларентіи, тое нам добрѣ свѣдомо, тое съборище окаанное на н(а)шеи памети было, и едѣва гдѣк гардинал Исидор ѡт н(а)шег(о) г(о)суд(а)ря великаго кн(я)зя Васил(ь)на Васил(ь)евича, ц(а)ра всеа Рѣси, и злѣ в Римѣ живот скончал.” See GPB, Q. XVII. 50, f. 93v. The letter by Filipp Petrov has been published in DRV 14:216–17 (without date), and in AI, vol. 1, no. 286 (in this publication the letter was dated “around 1491”). Evidently, Metropolitan Zosima accused the heretics in 1490 because they revered “a Saturday more than a Sunday, that is, the day of Christ’s resurrection”; see AFED p. 383.

78. RFA 4:801–803; N. N. Pokrovskii, ed. *Sudnye spiski Maksima Greka i Isaka Sobaki* (Moscow, 1971); N. A. Kazakova, *Vassian Patrikeev i ego sovremenniki* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1960); A. I. Pliguzov, “Sudnyi spisok Maksima Greka,” *Arkhiv russkoi istorii* 1 (1992): 50–79.

79. PSRL, vol. 13, pt. 1, p. 233; AAE 1:251–52.

80. AFED p. 376.

81. *Ibid.*, pp. 319–20.

82. G. M. Prokhorov (“Prenie Grigoriia Palamy”) considers the heresy of the Judaizers as a reflection of the teaching of Karaite (not Rabbinic) communities, but his arguments are based on selective citation of Gennadii’s letters and Iosif’s *Book on Heretics*, and are not convincing.

83. See I. Berlin, *Istoricheskie sud’by evreiskogo naroda na territorii Russkogo gosudarstva* (Petrograd, 1919), pp. 122, 179–92; S. A. Bershadskii, *Litovskie evrei. Istorii ikh iuridicheskogo i obshchestvennogo polozheniia v Litve ot Vitovta do Liublinskoi unii, 1388–1569 gg.* (St. Petersburg, 1883); O. Pritsak, “The Pre-Ashkenazic Jews of Eastern Europe in Relation to the Khazars, the Rus’ and the Lithuanians,” in *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, ed. P. J. Potichnyj and H. Aster (Edmonton, 1988), pp. 14–16; B. D. Weinryb, *The Jews of Poland: A Social and Economic History of the Jewish Community in Poland from 1100 to 1800* (Philadelphia, 1973).

84. For a survey of the literature, see Lur’e, *Ideologicheskaia bor’ba*, pp. 75–95; Prokhorov, “Prenie Grigoriia Palamy,” pp. 329–69; Howlett, “The Heresy of the Judaizers.”

85. See my paper “‘Kniga na eretikov’ Iosifa Volotskogo,” in *Istorii i paleografiia* (Moscow, 1993), pp. 90–139. In sixteenth-century literature the description of the Novgorodian-Muscovite heresy usually repeated Iosif’s *Book against Heretics*; see A. I. Pliguzov, “Vtoraia redaktsiia mineinogo zhitii Iosifa Volotskogo,” in *Issledovaniia po istochnikovedeniiu istorii SSSR dooktiabr’skogo perioda* (Moscow, 1984), pp. 44–46, 55.

86. Skharia could be Zakhar’ a Skara Guil Gursis, the correspondent of Ivan the Third, who could have visited Novgorod in 1470; in that year, however, having just turned twenty, he was too young to be an experienced teacher for the heretics. For more information see Lur’e, *Ideologicheskaia bor’ba*, pp. 130–34; Prokhorov, “Prenie Grigoriia Palamy,” p. 354; F. Brun, *Chernomor’e. Sbornik issledovaniu po istoricheskoi geografii*, pt. 1 (Odessa, 1877), pp. 213–15; Iu. Brutskus, “Zakhariia, kniaz’ tamanskii,” *Evreiskaia starina* 10 (Petrograd, 1918): 140–41.

87. Skariavei is probably Skaria-bey, as Constantine Zuckerman thinks; see Zuckerman, “The ‘Psalter’ of Feodor,” p. 78.

88. AFED p. 469.