A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF REPENTANCE 
PRAYERS IN THE SLAVIC SOUTH DURING THE 15TH CENTURY

Abstract. The article explores and offers a diplomatic edition of A Very Useful Confession for Unction for Every Christian, for the Black and White Clergy. This is an autograph by Vladislav the Grammariian placed in the Trebnik of Monk David (1480s), manuscript 1/42 in the collection of the Rila Monastery. The analysis is based on the working hypothesis that after the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in 1453, the Ottoman invasion of the Balkans was perceived as a God’s punishment for the sins of the Orthodox Christians. This idea became strongly present in a number of texts. Penitential prayer patterns multiply in the literature. The Greek prototype of the text under study has not been identified yet, but features a close relation to the prayers with the so-called accumulation of sins. It is, in essence, a confession which is performed in connection with the sacrament of the eleosvet (anointing of the sick) before receiving communion and the anointing with holy oil. The textual unit was purposefully introduced into Monk David’s Trebnik and reflected topical textual additions to the basic composition of the Slavonic Trebnik.
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Introduction

In the Festive Menaion, published in 1538, Božidar Vuković, a patron of Cyrillic book printing in Venice, states: и видяхъ вреъмена тежка соуть, понеже вреъмена послѣдна есѫ межъкоу вѣзѣци мнѣгѣе рати, и велико попѣренїе ὑ ἰσχαμενъ на хрисѣанѣ, зарадѣ съгрѣшенѣнъ нашѣ. These words, providing the preface of the most voluminous and rarest Cyrillic paleotype from the ‘city of books’ with the mark of historical authenticity, are an acknowledgment of a lasting tendency in the South Slavic literary tradition. After the conquest of Constantinople

* The research was conducted within the National Program “Development and Promotion of Bulgarian Studies Abroad” supported by Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Bulgaria.

1 Πразничен минар на Божидар Вукович Подгоричанин от 1538 г., ed. М. Полимирова, Подгорица–София 2021, p. 1: I saw that times are hard, for many wars have been waged between nations in recent times and there has been great destruction of Christians by Ishmaelites, due to our sins. Hereinafter, all translations from Old Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) are made by the author.
by the Ottoman Turks in 1453, a number of texts indicate a firmly held notion that the Ottoman invasion of the Balkans was a divine punishment for the sins of Orthodox Christians. Examples of repentance prayers grew in number in the literature. This emblematic date marks the start of a new period in the history of Christian Church communities in the Balkans and marks the beginning of all-round transformations, through which the Byzantine material and spiritual legacy continued to exist under the new conditions even beyond the old boundaries of the Empire. The post-Byzantine age began – the so-called Byzantium after Byzantium², when upholding the confession identity became more necessary than ever. This boundary between two epochs was a time when spiritual values were put to the test. Christian books played the role of a formative factor for the social and cultural development under the new conditions. Literature ensured the consolidation of the faithful through a constant reproduction of the tradition. The personalities and cultural models, which they create or support, replace the established social structure of the Orthodox state and legitimize the values of Orthodoxy.

The above general observations can be illustrated by a concrete example, such as the copying practices of South Slavic scribes in the 15th century. The main aim of the publication is to popularize a rare prayer genre from one of the most prosperous literary centers in medieval Bulgaria, and thereby to elucidate the oeuvre of its copyist – Vladislav the Grammarian. The diplomatic edition of the text is accompanied by a brief analysis and an investigation into typological similarities in other South Slavonic textual witnesses, in a diachronic perspective. This corresponds to the aims of the program which the article forms a part of and allows for broadening the range of sources for the study of the Slavonic Trebnik.

The main source

In the present article I will consider a model of prayer that was copied in middle regular calligraphic poluustav (semi-uncial script) with Resava orthography and has been identified as the writing of the noted South Slavic writer Vladislav the Grammarian³. The text is contained in the Trebnik (Ἁγιασμάτιον) of Monk David, dated to the 1480s and preserved in the library of the Rila Monastery, manuscript НМРМ 1/42 (Ms. Slav. 1/42)⁴. The name of the hieromonk David,

² N. Iorga, Byzance après Byzance, Bucarest 1935.
⁴ Е. Спространов, Опис на ръкописите в библиотеката при Рилския манастир, София 1902, p. 30–31; Б. Райков, Хр. Кодов, Б. Христова, Славянски ръкописи..., p. 73–75, where it
the second hegumen of the Rila Monastery after its restoration, is well known: active mainly after 1463, he was the second oldest among Joasaph, David, and Theophanes, sons of Jacob, bishop of Krupnik. The second copyist of Trebnik 1/42 was Vladislav the Grammarian. It is believed that this writer from Novo Brdo, Kosovo, has visited or resided in the Holy Monastery of Rila. His emblematic manuscripts and works, such as the Rila Miscellany (the Rila Panegyric), compiled in 1479, is a rich collection of vitae, instructive sermons, and lectures, including works by Patriarch Euthymius, Gregory Tsamblak, and Joasaph of Bdin. It is precisely in this manuscript that we find some of the most important copies of his original work: the Rila Narrative, or the Story of the Translation of the Relics of St. John of Rila from Tarnovo to the Rila Monastery. Assumptions have been made, though not categorically proven, that he spent the last years of his life in the Rila Monastery. Today the works of Vladislav the Grammarian include seven miscellanies (four of which have been precisely dated), preserved in five different book depositories in Europe. The facts reflect the dynamic life story of this man of letters, who passed through different regions of the Balkans, lived in different monastic communities, under various rulers and patrons, while ever working in the service of literature.

The text under study is found on pages 301r–307r and carries the following title: ισποψεδανε ἐκκλασ πολυς, χονιμους ετοι μαςα ετςιην κασαλους ιστηγιθνου, is described under the signature P 35. The Monk David’s Trebnik contains the official sacraments of the Orthodox Church, including the appointment of some or the ordination of other ecclesiastical degrees: acolyte (δεποτάτος), reader and singer, subdeacon and deacon, priest, protopresbyter, hegumen, and hieromonk (f. 202–215v). This composition supports the conclusion of its use in the precisely defined monastic community of the Rila Monastery, whose patron St. John of Rila is mentioned among the saints in the intercessions of Epiphany: κονιμψαγο κηδα πανιτε Ιωαννα ιοκεκατη ημετηρα (f. 138r). At the same time, the manuscript testifies to the presence of the St. Triphon’s prayer against pests in fields and vineyards (149r–152v), of a prayer against snake bite, attributed to St. Paul, and other non-canonical prayers. They correspond to the combination of two trends – adherence to the flourishing 14th century liturgical tradition, and the dynamic everyday life that hieromonks had to reflect in order to be close to the flock. Cf. M. ШНИТЕР, Молитва и магия, София 2001, p. 97–99. The author notes Vladislav the Grammarian’s participation in this Trebnik as a proof of the book’s value for the monastic brotherhood. Another ‘testimony of the times’ is worth mentioning, namely the petition to the Holy Cross at Epiphany for deliverance from the Ishmaelites – ισιμαηλιτικες μενα δρασανυνο ποκαραμιν (f. 140r). This formula is also found in the copyist’s notes, a favorite genre in his work. Cf. Г. ДАНЧЕВ, Особенности на примисхите и бележките в сборниците на Владислав Граматик – извор на сведения за неговите културни интереси и за културата у нас през XV столетие, [in:] Българската петнаадесети век. Сборник с доклади за българска обща и културна история през XV в., ed. Б. ХРИСТОВА, А. МИЧЕВА, Б. РАЙКОВ, Кл. ИВАНОВА, София 1993, p. 181–187.


6 Г. ДАНЧЕВ, Владислав Граматик..., p. 30, and the relevant bibliography cited by the author.

7 Exhaustive data base for every one of those manuscripts in Б. ХРИСТОВА, Опис на ръкописите...
In the scholarly description of the manuscript, the textual unit under study is referred to as ‘Instruction for the rite of unction’¹⁰. In fact, the text is a repentance prayer, complemented with liturgical instructions and formulas, which was to be read on the occasion of the sacrament of unction (τὸ εὐχέλαιον, *unction olei sacrati*)¹¹. To be read as well at the end are Ps 16 (marked with the first verse) and readings from the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospels. The holy oil (ἄγιον ἔλαιον in Greek, олѣи, масло, ми́ро in Slavic) is a sign of the shedding of God’s grace on the repentant person. This is indicated by the key words and phrases figuring in the title and in the text (κ’ ἐν πολιοβάνη ἀνεμε ἵκεδέσσαι τὰς ἱλαρίας; πολιοβάνη; κ’ ἐν τῇ καθώσαναι ἕλαιον ὁ κ’ ἡς μαζα). Clearly, this is an arrangement of the divine office (*posledovanie, ἀκολουθία*)¹², performed in the presence of seven clergymen, who also perform the rite of anointing with oil.

**Other known sources. Similar texts**

The oldest Slavic Euchologion – the Glagolitic *Euchologium Sinaiticum*, originating from the 11th century, does not contain a developed ceremony of unction. It contains only separate prayers for anointing, which were to be read over the sick and were later preserved in trebniks under the general rubric ‘Молитви вра́чевални’, ‘healing prayers’¹³. The oldest *posledovanie* for unction translated into Slavic is found in the Cyrillic parchment trebnik from the Grujić collection 3.I.65, dated for the third quarter of the 13th century, the main part of which is kept

---

⁹ Comparing the published text with the original was made possible thanks to the ‘Bulgarian Manuscript Book’ Archive at the Faculty of Slavic Studies of SU St. Kliment Ohridski. I would like to express my special gratitude to the hegumen of the Holy Monastery of Rila, Archimandrite Evlogiy, and the whole fraternity there for the possibility they afforded me to work with the digital copy of pages 301–307 of manuscript 1/42 from the Monastery’s Library.
¹⁰ Б. Христова, Владислав Граматик…, p. 7.
¹² М. Арранц, Исторические заметки о чинопоследованиях таинств по рукописям Греческого Евхология, Ленинград 1979, p. 103–124.
in the Belgrade Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church. Described and studied by P. Simić, it is considered to be the oldest known trebnik found in Serbian repositories. G. Pop-Atanasov and D. Milovska discovered a 20-page addition to this work in the Library of the Faculty of Philology of the University in Skopje; the addition comprises of a prayer for unction for an ailing monk and a rite for a monastic burial. This manuscript, called the *Premka Trebnik*, after the village of Premka, Kichevo district, where it was found, was classified under the Macedonian medieval tradition based on its origin and specific features.

P. Simić considers that this divine office for unction has no precise Greek counterpart. Subsequently, the first edition, with its large hymnographic section covering the ancient liturgical cycle, was abridged; starting from the 14th century, this ritual form gained ascendency and can be found in the first printed trebnik books from the late 15th and early 16th centuries: **Последование на щенение масло**.

Consequently, *A Very Useful Confession for Unction* concerned both the sacraments of repentance and unction. The latter can heal physical and spiritual disabilities and be used for the forgiveness of sins and for giving communion after confession. Two other copies of the same text are known to me thus far. The first, which I have worked with *de visu*, is found on leaves 3b–8b in Trebnik № 194 from the collection of the Church Historical and Archive Institute at the Bulgarian Patriarchate; the book dates likewise from the 15th century. It entered the collection as a donation from Neophyte, the Metropolitan of Skopje. Although this second copy is severely damaged, it complements the title with valuable indications establishing a close link between confession and the granting of Divine grace through holy oil: *млтву до конца болезни или епикопия или мных словесник или попъ. аще не словесник болезни да мох читать духовникъ, а шня по ний да говорить да самъ исповѣдуйтися стѣда ради къ мltre грѣха его и тако врѣшь мltre до конца та почеть масло крѣтить. мltre*. The second copy is known to me only by its bibliographical data. I am referring to M10, a trebnik from the mid-15th century, preserved at the University Library in Skopje; in this book, the *Very Useful Confession for Unction* is found on pages 34v–41r, surrounded by prayers to be read in miscellaneous cases, and the rite of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross. Data

---

16 Л. Макаријоска, Б. Павлевска-Горгиевска, *Лексиката на средновековните молитвеници*, Скопје 2021, р. 16.  
18 Based on the printed Prayer Book published by Jacob Kraykov in Venice, f. P III. Copy Ru. 1570.16 from the National Library St. St. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia, has been used for this article.  
about this text, excerpts from it, and an analysis of some lexemes can be found in the quoted book by L. Makarijoska and B. Pavleska-Georgievska from 2021. There is only one difference between the two, in the heading: 

\[ \text{стѣо мѣсло пѣти} \]

instead of 

\[ \text{сти҃ти} \].

It becomes clear from the discussion above that, before being anointed with holy oil, the penitent must confess his/her sins. Thus, a specific particularity of the prayer is that it develops as a formula of repentance by the enumeration of sins, some of which have not necessarily been actually committed but, according to M.V. Korogodina’s accurate observation, reflect the gravity and impermissibility of those sins\(^20\). These formulas offer a verbal summary of human sinfulness. Also typical for this model of prayer is the \( I \)-form, used for stronger expressiveness, whereby every person may personally identify with the state of original sin, typical for man according to the Christian paradigm. Byzantine literature is exceptionally rich in such texts, but so far the precise Greek original of this confession remains unknown. Some previous studies, however, provide a basis for reasoning:

1. A.I. Almazov writes about the spread and growing diversity of repentance models, starting from the 15\(^{th}\) century in South Slavic and East Slavic literature. In his fundamental work on the sacrament of repentance, this great expert in liturgical canon examines cycles of repentance prayers of a subjective kind which are addressed to the person who pronounces them: чтеение которых предполагается по адресу самого совершителя их\(^21\). They are not related to the rules of repentance in the specific sense, but rather to contrition, and are thus a preventive measure against sin. The great abundance of such models was determined by the growth of asceticism in the 14\(^{th}\) century. Their form is characterized by a detailed listing of sins, by exclamatory and rhetorical elements, by an enumeration of epithets describing the sinner, and by their abstract vocabulary. The same particularities are found in the prayer in question.

2. Other authors have also contributed to the present topic. E. Koschmieder published a prayer of confession, contained in Codex 1318, Prayer Book, from the City Library of Wroclaw; the work is written in Bulgarian uncial script and dates in its greater part to the 15\(^{th}\)–16\(^{th}\) century, while the source of the book is most probably from the 14\(^{th}\) century. The author did not discover any Greek parallel to it\(^22\). Later, R. Katičić discussed this prayer in detail, considering its use

---


\(^{21}\) А.И. АЛМАЗОВ, Тайная исповедь в православной восточной церкви. Опыт внешней истории, vol. II, Специальные уставы, Одесса 1894, р. 293.

of antique stylistic devices, grammatical rhymes, isocolons, and homeoteleutons, which make the abstract vocabulary very recognizable in structure and highly concentrated\(^{23}\). The author divides the prayer into parts, each of which begins with an enumeration of sins expressed in words with a similar ending, and concludes with a supplication for God's pardon. The scholar not only emphasizes the frequent recurrence of such patterns starting from the 15\(^{th}\) century but lingers in detail on the Byzantine models containing the so-called ‘accumulation of sins’ in works of authors such as Simeon Metaphrastes, 10\(^{th}\) century, and Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, 14\(^{th}\) century\(^{24}\). In the former, we find an accumulation of 24 homeoteleutonic noun accusatives, and in the latter, approximately 112 such examples. The conclusion R. Katičić draws is that the South Slavic translators had creatively reworked these texts without knowing them in detail or without copying the ancient rhetorical technique, but set themselves the same task, to express the accumulation of sins, from which only God’s mercy can save the sinner\(^{25}\). It is precisely in connection with confession that they created specific models of rhetorical prose in the Slavic South. From there, some of these models passed into the Eastern Slavic sphere.

The present copy of Monk David’s Trebnik follows immediately after the Καθώστρος τῆς ἁγίας αἰφενίδος, Office for the Holy Communion (ff. 275–307). This fact supports the assumption that, imitating the early Byzantine models, including the listing of names, the enumeration of sins became a model preceding the reception of the Holy Communion and could be combined with the liturgical-canonic elements of other rites, such as unction, burial, etc. At the same time, the universal nature of pure and sincere repentance is precisely what determines the text’s mobility and free location. Prayers with a similar structure not exclusively meant for specific rites or sacraments found a place in South Slavic trebniks. We can illustrate this by two of the most interesting South Slavic examples, the copying and printing of which became more common starting from the 15\(^{th}\) century:

1. Μιθήρα ἢ ζῆτε τὸ ἀρχιερέα πρὸς γγῆς κολάης καὶ κακὰς κλητείας καὶ κακαίνης (according to the printed Prayer Book of Jacob Kraykov from Venice, 1570, l. MmVa). Not surprisingly, it is also found in Monk David’s Trebnik under the heading Μιθήρα περὶ κακὰς κλητείας καὶ κακαίνης (216r–218r). In regards to it, A. Almazov points out that, while it did not enter into the Greek printed Euchologion, it was widespread among


\(^{25}\) R. Katičić, Σχήματα Ἰσποβεδίας..., p. 243.
the Slavs and could perform the role of a permissive prayer at various occasions inasmuch as it did not refer to a concrete category of person praying or time of prayer. It is distinguished by a long list of sins enumerated without precise system or order. Found in collections, trebniks, liturgical books, it is known to be present in all the 16th-century Venetian printed trebniks featuring bishop rites. It was even placed in Božidar Vuković’s Venetian printed Octoechos of the Fifth Tome from 1537, which includes at the end several texts that would be typically found in the Slavonic Trebnik.

2. The second example, already familiar to scholars as soon as the 19th century, is Молитва просвещенного архиепископа Константина города Киева Михаила рикомаго Асхалона, which also appears under the title Раздръщениѥ просвещенного архиепископа Константина города Михаила рикомаго Асхалона митька исповѣданіѥ. This is not the same kind of prayer book as it does not include enumeration of sins, but it is a valuable example of an accumulation of confessional models related to unction. The prayer is already present in the first Slavic trebnik, printed in Cyrillic under the patronage of the Montenegrin ruler Gyurg Crnoević in 1495–1496, a text that has not been preserved with its original features and in full in any known copy. Its contents are still being reconstructed. This prayer book remained a model for the printed trebniks of Božidar Vuković, dating from 1538–1540, and Jacob Kraykov’s trebnik published in 1570. They all contain the sacrament of unction, a separate liturgical rite for unction over deceased monks and laypersons, with the permission prayer of Michael Aschalon added to that rite. Despite V. Mošin’s opinion that, in the printed Mileševa trebnik of 1545 (which generally has a different order of the prayers and altered content) the prayer is attached to the rite of unction, detailed analysis shows that it has the usual placement in this product of the local Serbian printing houses in the Balkans. We also find it in the printed Prayer Book from Targovište, 1545, after Чинъ въкала бихъ на свѧщенѫ масло оумрьшш҃емъ инокѡмь.

---

28. И. А. Алмазов, Тайная исповедь…, vol. II, p. 269–271; vol. III, Приложения, p. 77. This is precisely under the title of Раздръщениѥ, Absolution, and referring to курѧ Михаила рикомаго Асхалона that we find it in the Monk David’s Trebnik, ff. 159v–160r. Consequently, the composition of the trebnik is distinguished by the most up-to-date repentance models of that time.
30. The most complete copy of this edition in Bulgaria is found in the collection of the Church Historical and Archive Institute of the Bulgarian Patriarchate in Sofia, № 192. It was printed by deacons Damyan and Milan at the order of Hegumen Daniil in the Monastery of Mileševa, where a printing workshop functioned in the 1540s.
и крецъмь²¹. It was copied in prayer manuscripts and liturgical books since the 15th century and later, surrounded by confessional prayers of pardon or prayers for ‘various purposes’. It is also testified to in the above mentioned trebnik M10, which contains the copy of A Very Useful Confession for Unction²². All the facts support A. Almazov’s opinion that the prayer represents a charter of indulgence – if not after death, at least before an impending death³³. Its importance for our topic lies in the fact that it illustrates the development of Slavic repentance models in the age of the Ottoman invasion of the Balkans, as well as the impossibility of identifying these models with any precision in relation to the Greek tradition. To this day, it has not been established who the Michael in question was, whose second name is spelled variously as Aschalon, Ascholon, and even Chalon³⁴. The assumptions range from this being a fictional character to the name being a sort of pseudo- attribution or an incorrect identification with Patriarch Michael IV Autoreianos (1206–1212), who indeed created similar models of prayers³⁵.

Some linguistic peculiarities of the main source

Coming back to A Very Useful Confession for Unction, we may point out its following peculiarities:

1. Prayers of confession in general were a sort of manual of Christian morality. It could hardly be said the rhetorical device of using similar endings was systematically applied in this particular prayer. But indisputably the Very Useful Confession for Unction is a model of the mentioned accumulation of sins. The connection with the confessional formula is evident most of all in the designations of the carnal sins placed foremost in the enumeration, some of which are precise equivalents of the respective Greek terms in the discipline of repentance: прелюбодѣꙗніѥ (μοιχεία), блѫдъ (πορνεία), мѫжеложиѥ (ἀρρενοκοιτία), крьвомѣсиѥ (αἱμομιξία), скотоложиѥ (κτηνοβατία), рѫкоблѫдиѥ (μαλακία). They were influenced by the seminal Rules of Repentance by John the Faster, which developed the liturgical and disciplinary-canonical aspect of penitence simultaneously in connection with the imposition of penance³⁶.

---

²² Л. Макариjosка, Б. Павлєска-Георгієвска, Лексиката на средновековните..., p. 102.
³³ А.И. Алмазов, Тайная исповѣдь..., vol. II, p. 269.
³⁵ А.И. Алмазов, Тайная исповѣдь..., vol. II, p. 196, 267.
The positioning of carnal sins in first place suggests a monastic environment, in which such texts were most often disseminated, inasmuch as a monk had to break all ties with the world and to preserve his physical and moral purity. The fasting scheme of John the Faster, exceptionally important, was contained in practically all confessional regulations and compilations of penances known in the Slavic literary tradition.

2. Secondly, we note some *nomina personalia* (common nouns for persons) describing the perpetrators of a certain sin or the carriers of negative qualities. The search for Greek prototypes is a difficult task but the Greek terms in the indicated semantic fields are abundantly present in the mentioned prayers of Simeon Metaphrastes and Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos. We see blocks of similarly ending lexemes: златолюбьць, славолюбьць, сребролюбьць; самоотдадьцы ‘who eats apart from the fraternity’\(^ {37} \), скоропадьцы ‘who is gluttonous and eats quickly’; вратроненавистьники, клеветники, лъкудообрьтики ‘who deceives for material benefit’, подхъбицы ‘a flatterer, servile person’, преклѣтивьники ‘a person who curses, utters false oaths and curses’, салохютикь ‘a reclusive, selfish person’, тычеславьники ‘vain, proud person’, юкунинци ‘a person who slanders, insults’. The text comports a rich layer of epithets with positive or negative meanings, built upon two of the most frequent Old Bulgarian models for the creation of composite words referring to ethical concepts. Those with first component всес- and прѣ-, such as всесвѧщенъ, всеседръ, прѣблагъ, прѣпросвѧщенъ, прѣчистъ, refer to spiritual advisors and clergymen who perform the sacramental rites and grant absolution, while the sinner is qualified as всескврьнъ ‘entirely foul, vile, lowly, impure’, всеславта диаколу ‘a servant of the Devil in all things’, всесокданыкъ ‘entirely abject’, трѣокданыкъ ‘thrice abject’, etc. They express the notion of completeness, fullness, a superlative degree of the positive or negative trait they designate.

3. One of the typical stylistic devices used in this type of prayers is the accumulation of stable phrases and biblical idioms that suggest the depth and all-encompassing nature of sin, the chronification of the sinful state. This is achieved through the use of key words referring to time, space and a person’s age in order to define sin as an eternal condition present since the beginning of existence. Examples from other similar prayer patterns: по всѧ дни и по всѧ нощи и по всѧ часы; от юности до старости, многажды многыхъ, тысѫща тысѫщами, тмы тьмамы, наѫвѣ и вь снѣ , and others\(^ {38} \). From the Vladislav the Grammarian’s copy: вьсѧ въ мои́м тⷭ҇во� GetEnumerator() и дшуеть, є͠ще и тѣ́ломь; ѿ прь́ваго възра́ста

37 Л. Макариюшка, Б. Павлецка-Горгийевска, Лексиката на средновековните…, p. 130, translated as "greedy, selfish".

38 Е. Koschmieder, Grammatischer Prosareim…, p. 335–356.
A Contribution to the History of Repentance Prayers in the Slavic South…

Stylistic opposition helps to skillfully weave verbal rhetoric, as ne тъ́кмо н҄ъ и͗. Contrasting symbolic oppositions point out that sin turns man from the Grace of baptism to the lows of evil: хра́мь бжїи – врь́топь нечи́сть и͗ скврь́ньнь разбои́никѡⷨ. Among the expressive devices of the Confession is found a paraphrase of the famous Old Testament biblical simile υмно́жише па́че вла́сь главы̀ мо̀е беза́конїа моа̀ ‘my sins have multiplied more than the hairs of my head’ (as in Ps 39: 13, αἱ ἀνομίαι μου, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθην τοῦ βλέπειν· ἐπληθύνθησαν ὑπὲρ τὰς τρίχας τῆς κεφαλῆς μου)39.

Conclusion

There is no doubt, that A Very Useful Confession for Uction for Every Christian, for the Black and White Clergy was purposefully introduced in the Monk David’s Trebnik and reflects current textual additions to the basic composition of the Slavonic Trebnik. The text supplements the picture of Vladislav the Grammatian’s literary activity, but testifies as well to the important aspects of the medieval mentality. It might be assumed with greater certainty that this was one of the last texts copied by Deacon Vladislav, but to what extent it was in the nature of a personal prayer of repentance can hardly be established. If we are guided by the fact that the anointing of the sick takes place after communion is given, including the last one, that it cures bodily and mental diseases, this question would not be deprived of logic, although it cannot be answered definitively. The currently incomplete source base for the distribution of the prayer exemplar locates its known copies in the Western Bulgarian regions and parts of Northern Macedonia. With these regions the scribe himself is closely connected. Before the identification of the copy in the Monk David’s Trebnik, G. Dančev pointed to the lack of any precise information about the life and the activity of Vladislav the Grammarian after 148040. The text published here is a piece addition to the obscure moments in his biography. Beyond the biographical aspect, the studied text gains importance for several reasons. Firstly, it enriches the understanding of the development trends in the penitential texts of the Slavonic South and their dynamics after the era of the great flowering of liturgical literature in the 13th–14th centuries. South Slavic translations of Greek texts featuring an accumulation of sins, and perhaps also some original Slavic compilations, establish a link with the prevalent

40 Г. Данчев, Владислав Граматик…, р. 30.
in East Slavic literature *ponovlenia* (renewals) – preliminary questionnaires with the fullest possible nomenclature of human sins, which the confessant reads aloud if literate, or repeats after the priest if not. Their profiling for different age and social groups, for men and for women, is a further important stage in the development of the pattern of the accumulation of sins in direct relation both to the rite of confession and to the nomocans. The model of *ponovlenie* was not commonly spread on the Balkan, but the enrichment of the penitential prayer patterns of the Slavic South with the enumeration of sins illustrates the general historical genesis of the confession as a liturgical sacrament and of the penance as its disciplinary form. Secondly, the text under study reveals the rich vocabulary of human sinfulness and the developed stylistics of the rhetorical prose in a Slavic context. Thirdly, it leaves open the question of Greek-Slavic interactions in the liturgical literature, which did not cease to be a major factor in the development of the Slavonic Trebnik after the 15th century, when, under Ottoman domination, this liturgical book acquired a more utilitarian character with the expansion of the cycle of prayers ‘for every need’, the inclusion of apocryphal texts, and became closer to the everyday life of the ordinary Christians.

The text under study demonstrates the active *manifestation of the ability of inner self-preservation* in the spiritual traditions of the Southern Slavs during the whole 15th century, the guardians of which were monasteries and the literature they produced.

**Appendix. Diplomatic edition of the text as preserved in the source**
(Monk David’s Trebnik, Ms. Slav. 1/42 from Rila Monastery)

The publishing principles aim to reproduce the graphic characteristics of the text as accurately as possible. The edition does not give the end of the line or the page. The original orthography, text segmentation and superscripts are preserved without keeping neither stylistic allographs of the letters ό, ε, and τ, nor the ligatures.

Исповедание сказ польско, хочещою сбое масло стытин късакому християнику, чюцо у къачоку прьжу позлаванія глаўк, стаак поерлак, сэдаки сиенникъ. я начятьъ съ сувыленіе и съ страа́хъьъ ужѣнъ къкоунъ съ сильаны Исповѣдае се гла́ти сице:–

42 М. Шнитпер, Молитва и магия…, р. 14, 69, 114.
43 Б. Христова, Българската книжнина и култура през XV в., [in:] Българският петнадесети век. Сборник с доклади за българска обща и културна история през XV в., ed. Б. Христова, А. Минчева, Б. Райков, Кл. Иванова, София 1993, р. 117.
Бѣ́къ тѣ́мь вѣ́й и вѣ́дьки мои́, вѣ́сѣ́бѣ́земны́ и ѣркѣ́проекза́нны́, слѣ́кь приклонны́ и жи́воттѣ́рій га бѣ́ и сѣ́л о на́шаго нѣ́ ы хъ таинъ. ѭгъ дѣ́ же късѣ́съкръ́нны́ и ѣйдыра́въ́нны́, и въ ѣкстьлоу́тъ моукѣ́валоу гіа́ноу ѣйду ѣъ кь ѣркѣ́нъ. прѣ́зажаю ѣй въся полоняти въ ѣсѣ́мърдаго и ѣркѣ́лаго бѣ́ на́шъ, въ ѣкѣ́вѣ́янны ѣ пе́цилънны́ и лотѣ́нъ мѣ́ сърѣ́къннны́. въ ѣполаза́нъ ѣй ѣлкданные главы́. паче же ѣкъ ѣй преъраля́ пръ ѣсткии ѣыравы вѣ́йки мои́ се и прѣ́звалъ и ми́а се ѕ. Ѧоунаўкрытъ мрава ѣгъ стгла ѣырѣ́вкъ, и еъ іолокнкны вѣ́сть слоу́хъ. и ѣй въркѣ́къ ѣлы іоуъкѣ́ланнама ѣвъноуши. пѣ́рькъ ѣоуъкѣ́ланнама ѣвъсь ѣыдъжки, вѣ́йканы и ѣелънны. въ ѣкъ ѣкѣ́вѣ́жы́дры ѣбанкѣ́нны сърѣ́кънннъ и нѣ́йцитство. ѣкѣ́къ моийн ѣйдо и дѣ́же, и ѣкъ ѣлъмъ трѣ́лкданные дѣ́ же вѣ́лаго мѣ́ и ѣркѣ́лаго вѣ́йки моего́ и ѣ бѣ́законно прегъклау, іако и ѣнъ дѣ́ иъ въ нѣ́ сърѣ́кий. и ѣ ѣако влассъ іолыусъ ѣ вѣ́йканы вѣ́йки ѣдѣ́же пѣ́рькъ ѣыцѣ́кънаннъ и ѣпѣ́ръмъкнаннъ ѣвънаўкры́лъ. еъ ѣже ѣдъжъ ѣвъъскстъ ѣвъсѣ́ннъ, лотѣ́й ѣ ѣйдиннъ і непрѣ́щенны ѣй вѣ́йканъ. и ѣ си́нъ ѣтѣ́нъ матъ. ѣсъянниценькоусъ сънъ кнігу и ѣполаза́нъ, въ ѣъскѣ́ннѣ́ вѣ́йкаго въ дѣ́са. ость́ ѣкѣ́вѣ́рнаго і нѣ́йцитства, і и непѣ́ръкенаго гоу и вѣ́анъ и ѣоунылънанъ и рабоу е. і и ѣакстрилъкъ и ѣ дрѣ́ланнны ѣ ѣрѣ́ланнны на́шаго ѣсъдъжде, ѣй и тѣ́жда сътъкора ѣз тѣ́го оуъцѣ́ста, ѣз вѣ́йкожно моє съдѣ́канъ. іына іъ вѣ́къ пѣ́рькъ прѣ́вѣ́чнѣ́ вѣ́йки ѣсыравы прѣ́къеъ, іако на страшнѣ́къ и нѣ́яелъкѣ́крѣ́лъ соулицы ѣдъ нѣ́шаго. сѣ́д вѣ́лѣ́лолоу ѣтмоу ѣдѣ́монъ, іаки ѣ тайналъ въ съдъ іоуъткъ ѣвъканнѣ́ на на́шъ ѣйстатото, і и ѣспѣ́щенъ ѣдого, і и ѣспѣ́спстъ къ ѣ дѣ́ланнѣ́ къ ѡнинъ. і ѣ тѣ́мъ стъёрлъ стьйлъ кѣ́рѣ́лъ вѣ́йкъ, і ѣ сътъкорѣ́хъ ѣвъѣ́тъ нѣ́чиесь і ѣспѣ́кънны разъкоинникъ, іына стрѣ́мъ мои вѣ́йкъ і вѣ́щи, въъкъ вѣ́лѣ́и и ѣдобъ ѣ нѣ́чѣ́къ вѣ́къ ѣдѣ́же рѣ́ко ѣспѣ́шеннѣ́ ѣдѣ́лъ, і не как іоуъзчытъ боулау ѣлъмъ вѣ́йканнъ вѣ́йкоу. і иынъ на то́ рѣ́кого. і къжу́ку, ѣстъ ѣвъканнѣ́ ѣ прѣ́ваго възраста моего ѣдѣ́ле вѣ́йкъ ѣеъ ѣвъкоуънны вѣ́стъъ вѣ́рнѣ́хъ. іако и ѣвъкѣ́нъ і нѣ́чѣ́сть мѣ́ сто ѣ тѣ́мъ рѣ́къ, и ѣ прѣ́слѣ́дъ ѣдого, і ѣ встѣ́ ѣсъдѣ́лоу, и ѣ въмѣ́сто ѣвъкоуънѣ́ пѳ́несусть ѣвъканнѣ́ ѣ нѣ́чѣ́сть ѣдѣ́не ѣсъдѣ́лоу мѣ́. іыі пеоулали вѣ́къ ѣсоу, ѣ ѣкѣ́стъмъ вѣ́щи съ сълѣ́клонѣ́лъ і ѣслѣ́данъ мѣ́нѣ́хъ і ѣспѣ́къннънк неы. дѣ́же ѣ вѣ́кѣ́нъ ѣ възраста моего са́мъ се ѣбѣ́зумнѣ́ ра́стлй. і скврѣ́нны і ѣнѣ́чѣ́сть пльлъ ѣтмоу ѣскврѣ́нны ѣскврѣ́нны. і ѣ ракъ ѣрланъ і ѣслѣ́доу ѣслѣ́лоу и ѣскврѣ́нны мѣ́дѣ́пѣ́. і акъ ѣбѣ́лъ вѣ́кѣ́нъ ѣ възраста моего ѣ дѣ́же і ѣнъ ѣкѣ́нъ ѣдъ же ѣсъдѣ́лоу, и ѣнъ ѣдѣ́ле и ѣдѣ́лоу ѣскврѣ́нны, къ ѣскврѣ́нны ѣ дѣ́лоу ва́ртъ моау ѣдѣ́же. и ѣнъ ѣдѣ́лоу къ ѣскврѣ́нны ѣдѣ́лоу ѣскврѣ́нны. іакъ ѣдѣ́лоу къ ѣскврѣ́нны, къ ѣскврѣ́нны ѣдѣ́лоу ѣскврѣ́нны. и ѣдѣ́лоу къ ѣскврѣ́нны. іакъ ѣдѣ́лоу къ ѣскврѣ́нны, къ ѣскврѣ́нны ѣдѣ́лоу ѣискврѣ́нны.
помраченики оны мой на ико не слито, в огненны и прокляты дьялы мой, код огне и злодея, боже ады не сътвори и не твороу паче и доселе дын. кое я зло еже ады не въмькразихъ, и на въмльва че еже въмьерзяло въ вѣлканную мою дыш. коеюо везаконио и осквернением и нечистоткъ не быых ады огудниник и махччтитель, я како логоу поклати се в моей дьял нечистин, и дыных ячея огудчичар равно дыкалуют и тых покладию и исповѣдание нессыланецуо ми, еже съдѣакъ ады логоакны. не тѣйло съ чычскаым итволн тодялъ боу сътворихъ. и въ съ ескто ады огуднин, клептчиникъ, ады лѣжнинны съкрептникъ. грядднин и сляхтоутворцы и дѣлаттель. послѣпхчикъ пѣаница, блоудниникъ. чырѣоу разоотаг. линнаго счна туркою, лоркъва ненакиснис. срервложыа залголюев. разгнѣдил лиштна лобе, иако никто же в чыкъ: сладкелобацъ тычеслаакникъ, чыолникъ, логоаква. вретенаккстини, пошунникъ. салоомъникъ. гычканникъ. скорки злодяя, и посу- пливъ. скороудзацъ самозадацъ, тать, чыикникъ, непраходятникъ. логоакводокытникъ. въ на въцли съ страсти чыщуоо глата съ, іже съладает лише лидалоо дыбно и тѣлло. въ моей везакониа. въ моей съдѣакъ логоааква, творилла лине логоаклямъ и пога- нияй. и полывшаоо оутано ли се днѣ огоо и наочи, въ нѣчъ съдѣакъ зала и логоаква лода дыла. въ вѣдѣ извѣстне, и ста ли вѣдѣочнить. и исповѣдѣ на мѣ везако- ниа мой, иако нѣча не снѣчиоу мои лбо боу и ваашон стосоти. не отолъкнит бо тоааа дын не наочи, нѣже пакыа часъ. вѣйтъ съ дѣлоо его на мѣ скврьнеаго. и гдѣ оукрыы въ ли съдѣачооутюн исполъ, землъа и нѣо и съдѣачъ и лицъ и яѣкъды и моо и рѣкъы и вѣнны вѣѣлнъ на мѣ. і вѣго рада вѣкъ итворованныны вальъ вѣ бадръ кевати и каишнит винъчъ чычскаымъ сътѣккенин. еже бо сжетет на землѣ, и на нѣеъка сѣзвано вѣ. і еже разрѣкнит на землѣ, разрѣкено вѣ и на нѣеъка. і пришвъ ваше иболяа съ чыстнны цыцъ, іако да моаалдоо и прѣблѣаго бад помолите вѣмъ касоанно. і да вѣмъ разрѣкнит ей вѣмъ и прощенны моя иръхолъ. лине мо вѣлежъ лиыйтаг праведаго. вѣѣторъ бо еяе непотрѣка счтѣоруух боу и чыкынъ. вѣѣторъ оутъ осквернняхъ и рѣситъ и истынчиъ. и бывъ дѣлатель въ вѣсъ нѣялъ. і вѣчыи оукрыы въ лихъаа съдѣакъусъ, непотрукенны и нечистин и вѣсъсклнаняетъ ады. нѣже прѣстаетъ когда не дѣка везаконано дѣка съ тоѣдѣали жены инноѣзвыннѣки. і съ логоаксясвымы дѣтлн. оукрыдынит въ счны моей логоаква исплетена. непотрѣкнал и лорскъ вѣсаакненитнъ. тѣлъо же срлдаго лобе, оукрыла вѣтъци съйлоо моо и пыциоо и тоокылъ. і конны самовонны вѣсакъы и миноѣы сляк- шенныры аролаты. да съца приялъву въ тѣлънѣ дынъ тоѣдѣалихъ. вѣ вѣйт и стра- ха ейля николики прѣ бѣлнла моаал постѣкыхъ. да вѣтсopolюя оудынцъ ейля, і вѣздалаа съдѣаканы моя. тыссыны тыссуаланы краты съя прокланаа, въ еже прѣстата ли въ логоаквы дѣка мой, і пакы съ вѣсъ часъ прѣстооуникъ клейтъ шыргтае сс. і ёгоже арыкъ токрея цылѣатъ. поеть и ёдѣитъ, то бѣикъ по съйлъ моой ѣндаа вѣять правъ, і моей поганности оуцахъ и привлѣчи шосуждда юнкъ, а съмъ боудахъ дывали. въ вѣсъ нѣляйсъ и окуврынъ ваышъ, і съ вѣсъльны тыплѣниѣнъ салъ сей оудааны вѣ бд. тѣлъже господинъ и вѣцъ і сложжителъ бѣ вашиного, оуцдриите ли слѣкканаго і оуяснаго. іакако ѵъ чылуданицы оноъ і развоонника прѣ
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ма́лаго радѝ и͗сповѣда́нїа. си́це и͗ вы̀ хѡпоⷣбници и͗ ме́ не прїи́мѣте и͗ прости́те.

И приве́дѣте въ ѡ͗традѹ, ѿ н͗е же и͗зы́дохь безѹ͗мнїи. и͗ да́рѹите ми проще́нїе и͗
ѡ͗ставл́нїе грѣ́хѡмь их же и͗сповѣ́дахь. и͗ спобⷣите ми съ ва́ми мл͠твами
се́го прѣстго ма́сла помаза́нїю. и͗ помоли́те въсѐблгаго и͗ незло́бливаго ба и га на́
шего въ трої试题 мо̀е покла́дѣне въ отда́вь. и͗ спобⷣите ми прище́нїе съ ва́ми ми́лостї
и͗ въ вѣ́ки вѣ́кѡмь а͗ми́нь.

та́же прїи́дѣте поклони́м се црю на́шемѹ бѹ. г.ⷳ и͗ ѱалѡ,ⷨ ѕ҃і. ѹ͗слышѝ ги пра́вдꙋ
мⷪю: и͗ та́ко по се́мь, проⷦ҇. и͗ апⷭлы. ї е͗ѵⷢлїа, сь мл҃итвами. по ре́дѹ
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