




Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova (Sofia)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5699-7503>

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 Unc-tion for Every Christian, for the Black and White Clergy*. This is an autograph by Vladislav the Gram-marian 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 Constantino-ple 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 *accumu-lation 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 tex-tual additions to the basic composition of the Slavonic Trebnik.

Keywords: South Slavonic trebnik in the 15th century, Vladislav the Grammarian

Introduction

In the Festive Menaion, published in 1538, Božidar Vuković, a patron of Cyril-lic book printing in Venice, states: *и видѣхъ врѣмѣнна тѣжка соуть, понежѣ врѣмѣнна послѣдна есѣ между ѱѣзѣци многыне рати, и велико попѣреніе ѿ ѱсмайлѣ-тенъ на хрѣтіанѣ, заради съгрѣшенїи наші¹*. 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 tenden-cy in the South Slavic literary tradition. After the conquest of Constantinople

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

¹ *Празничен миней на Божидар Вукович Подгоричанин от 1538 г.*, ed. М. ПОЛИМИРОВА, Под-горица–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 (Ἄγισματάριον) of Monk David, dated to the 1480s and preserved in the library of the Rila Monastery, manuscript HMPM 1/42 (Ms. Slav. 1/42)⁴. The name of the hieromonk David,

² N. IORGA, *Byzance après Byzance*, Bucarest 1935.

³ Б. РАЙКОВ, Хр. Кодов, Б. ХРИСТОВА, *Славянски ркописи в Рилския манастир*, vol. I, София 1986, p. 74. For the life and the activity of this prominent man of letters cf. Г. ДАНЧЕВ, *Владислав Граматик. Книжовник и писател*, София 1969; Ј. ГРКОВИЋ-МЕЈДОР, *Списи Димитрија Кантакузина и Владислава Граматика*, Београд 1993; Б. ХРИСТОВА, *Опис на рѣкописите на Владислав Граматик*, Велико Търново 1996; А. ТУРИЛОВ, *Владислав Граматик*, [in:] *Православная энциклопедия*, vol. IX, Москва 2005, p. 99–101.

⁴ Е. СПРОСТРАНОВ, *Опис на рѣкописите в библиотеката при Рилския манастир*, София 1902, p. 30–31; Б. РАЙКОВ, Хр. Кодов, Б. ХРИСТОВА, *Славянски рѣкописи...*, 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 Rila⁵. 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 Monastery⁶. Today the works of Vladislav the Grammarian include seven miscellanies (four of which have been precisely dated), preserved in five different book depositories in Europe⁷. 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: **ИСПОВѢДАНІЕ СЪКЛѢ ПОЛЪСНО, ХОТѢЩОМОУ СЪБѢ МАСЛО СЪБЪТИ ВЪСЪАКОМОУ ХРІСТІАНИНОУ,**

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: **ВЪНОСНАГО ѠЦА НАШЕГО ІѠАΝΝΑ ΠΟΥΣΤΥΝΗ ЖИТЕЛА** (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. М. 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 – **ИСМАИЛЬТЪСЬКЫЕ ЛЮДИ ДРЪЖАВНО ПОКАРАЮЩЕ** (f. 140r). This formula is also found in the copyist's notes, a favorite genre in his work. Cf. Г. ДАНЧЕВ, *Особености на приписките и бележките в сборниците на Владислав Граматик – извор на сведения за неговите културни интереси и за културата у нас през XV столетие*, [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, p. 181–187.

⁵ Б. ХРИСТОВА, *Владислав Граматик и рилският книжовен център*, [in:] *Рилски манастир. Юбилеен вестник. Специално издание, посветено на научната сесия „Рилският манастир в историята и културата на българския народ“*, София 1981, p. 7.

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...*

чрѣницѹ и бѣлцѹ, *A Very Useful Confession for Unction for Every Christian, for the Black and White Clergy*. More than 30 years ago, after working *de visu* on the entire manuscript, I published the text according to the editing practice of that time, which is unsatisfactory from today's point of view⁸. In the present article, I would like to re-edit it more adequately, based on its digital reproduction⁹, and to focus on the textual specificity and significance of similar texts in the literature of the Slavic South.

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 (ἅγιον ἔλαιον in Greek, оуби, масло, миро 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 (вѢ ПОМАЗАЊИЕ МОЇЕ ѠКЛАЊНИИЕ ГАЛѢВЪ; ПОМАЗАЊИЕ; вѢ ѠЦѢНИЕ БѢВШАГО Ѡ БѢ МАСЛА). 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 врачевални', 'healing prayers'¹³. The oldest *posledovanie* for unction translated into Slavic is found in the Cyrillic parchment trebnik from the Gruić collection 3.I.65, dated for the third quarter of the 13th century, the main part of which is kept

⁸ М. ЦИБРАНСКА, *За един молитвен текст автограф на Владислав Граматик*, БЕ 5, 1997–1998, р. 58–63.

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...*, р. 7.

¹¹ А.А. ТКАЧЕНКО, *Елеосвящение*, [in:] *Православная Энциклопедия*, vol. XVIII, Москва 2008, р. 325–337.

¹² М. АРРАНЦ, *Исторические заметки о чинопоследованиях таинств по рукописям Греческого Евхология*, Ленинград 1979, р. 103–124.

¹³ R. NANIGAL, *Euchologium Sinaiticum. Starocerkvenoslovanski glagolski spomenik*, vol. II, *Tekst s komentarjem*, Ljubljana 1942, р. 58.

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 repositories¹⁴. 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 burial¹⁵. 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 features¹⁶.

P. Simić considers that this divine office for unction has no precise Greek counterpart¹⁷. 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 ascendancy and can be found in the first printed trebnik books from the late 15th and early 16th centuries: ПОСЛЕДОВАНИЕ НА ВЪЩЕЩЕНИЕ МАСЛО¹⁸.

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 Skopje¹⁹. 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: мѣтвѡу до конца волещїи или ѡпоуѣ или мнѡхѣ словесныхѣ или поупѣ. аще нѣ словесныхѣ волещїи да моу чѣтетѣ дѡвнникѣ, а вѣнь по нимѣ да говоритѣ да самѣ исповѣдоуетѣ стѣда радї въ мѣтѡвѣ грѣха своего и тако рекше мѣтвѡу до конца тѣ почнетѣ масло крѣтити. мѣтѡвѡ. 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

¹⁴ П. СИМИЋ, *Требник српске редакције XIII в.*, ЗИК 10, 1976, р. 53–87; Р. СТАНКОВА, *Старобългарското книжно наследство в сръбски преписи от XIII и началото на XIV в.*, ECLNet 02 I 2004, № 1.50, <https://litternet.bg/publish4/rtrifonova/stb.htm> [12 I 2023].

¹⁵ Ѓ. ПОП-АТАНАСОВ, Д. МИЛОВСКА, *Нови листови од Премчанскиот требник (пергаментен книжевен споменик од XIII век)*, Кир 1, 2003, р. 135–186.

¹⁶ Л. МАКАРИЈОСКА, Б. ПАВЛЕСКА-ГЕОРГИЈЕВСКА, *Лексиката на средновековните молитвеници*, Скопје 2021, р. 16.

¹⁷ П. СИМИЋ, *Требник српске...*, р. 55.

¹⁸ Based on the printed Prayer Book published by Jacob Kraykov in Venice, f. P III. Copy Рц. 1570.16 from the National Library St. St. Cyril and Methodius, Sofia, has been used for this article.

¹⁹ И. ГОШЕВ, *Стари записи и надписи*, ГСУ.БФ 4.1, 1927, р. 353–354.

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: *сѣбѣ мѣсло ꙗ҃кѣти* instead of *сѣити*.

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 sins²⁰. 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 15th 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: *чтение 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 14th 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 Wrocław; the work is written in Bulgarian uncial script and dates in its greater part to the 15th–16th century, while the source of the book is most probably from the 14th century. The author did not discover any Greek parallel to it²². Later, R. Katičić discussed this prayer in detail, considering its use

²⁰ М. КОРОГОДИНА, *Проблемы изучения русских средневековых исповедных текстов как исторического источника*, [in:] *Русский исторический сборник*, vol. II, ed. В.М. ЛАВРОВ, Москва 2010, p. 112.

²¹ А.И. АЛМАЗОВ, *Тайная исповедь в православной восточной церкви. Опыт внешней истории*, vol. II, *Специальные уставы*, Одесса 1894, p. 293.

²² E. KOSCHMIEDER, *Grammatischer Prosareim in Kirchenslavischen Beichtgebeten*, BZ 44, 1951, p. 336–339.

of antique stylistic devices, grammatical rhymes, isocolons, and homeoteleutons, which make the abstract vocabulary very recognizable in structure and highly concentrated²³. 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 15th century but lingers in detail on the Byzantine models containing the so-called 'accumulation of sins' in works of authors such as Simeon Metaphrastes, 10th century, and Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, 14th century²⁴. 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 *Глѡужба свѣго причещенїа*, *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 15th century:

1. *МЛѢТВА ИЖЕ ГЛѢТЬ АРХИЕРЕН ЗА ГРѢХЫ ВОЛНІЕ И НЕВОЛНІЕ И ВЪСАКОУ КЛЕТВОУ И ЗАКЛИНАНІЕ* (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 *МЛѢТВА ГЛѢМЕЛА ѿ АРХІЕРЕА ИЛИ ІЕРЕА ВЪСАКОМЪ ХОТЕЩОМЪ ПРИЧЕСТИТИ СЕ БЖІТВНЫ ТРИНЬ, ПРАЩАЕ ЕМОУ ВЪСА ВОЛНАА И НЕВОЛНАА СЪГРѢШЕНІА И ВЪСАКО ПРОКЛЕТІЕ И КЛЕТВОУ* (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

²³ R. КАТИЧИЋ, *Σχήματα Γορυεία и одной staroslavenskoj ispovednoj molitvi*, Slo 6–8, 1957, p. 237–238.

²⁴ SYMEONIS METAPHRASTAE, *Precationes*, [in:] PG, vol. CXIV, Paris 1857, col. 221; NICEPHORI CALLISTI XANTHOPULI, *Precatio confessoria*, [in:] PG, vol. CXLVII, Paris 1865, col. 591–600; А.И. АЛМАЗОВ, *Тайная исповедь...*, vol. II, p. 299–302.

²⁵ R. КАТИЧИЋ, *Σχήματα Γορυεία...*, 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 prayer²⁶. 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 Trebnik²⁷.

2. The second example, already familiar to scholars as soon as the 19th century, is *Молитва прѣсвѣщеннаго архієпископа Константина града курь Михаила рекомааго Ясхалона*, which also appears under the title *Раздрѣшеніе прѣсвѣщеннаго архієпѣпа константина града Михаила рекомааго Ясхалона мѣтва исповѣданію*²⁸. 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 reconstructed²⁹. 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 Aschalonus 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 Balkans³⁰. We also find it in the printed Prayer Book from Targovište, 1545, after *Чинъ бѣываемъи на всѣбщеніе масляно оумръштимъ иннокимъ*

²⁶ А.И. Алмазов, *Тайная исповедь...*, vol. II, p. 225.

²⁷ Е. НЕМИРОВСКИЙ, *Славянские издания кирилловского (церковнославянского) шрифта 1491–2000. Инвентарь сохранившихся экземпляров и указатель литературы*, vol. I, (1491–1550), Москва 2009, p. 142.

²⁸ А.И. Алмазов, *Тайная исповедь...*, vol. II, p. 269–271; vol. III, *Приложения*, p. 77. This is precisely under the title of Раздрѣшеніе, Absolution, and referring to курь Михаила Ясхалона 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.

²⁹ *Молитвеник Ђурђа Црнојевића 1495/96. Факсимилно издање*, ed. К. Мано-Зиси, Подгорица–Цетине 1993; Вл. Мошин, *Још о реконструкцији Црнојевићева Требника 1495 године*, Биб 3–4, 1964, p. 199–204.

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 БЕЛЦЕМЬ³¹. 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 Unction*³². 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 *Chalon*³⁴. 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: ПРЪКЛЮБОДЪВАНІЕ (μοιχεία), БЛЖДЪ (порнеія), МЖЖЕЛОЖІЕ (άρρενοκοιτία), КРЪВОМЪСІЕ (αίμομιξία), СКОТЛОЖІЕ (κτηνοβατία), РЖКОВЛЖДІЕ (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.

³¹ I. BIANU, N. HODOȘ, *Bibliografia Românească Veche. 1508–1830*, vol. I, (1508–1716), București 1903, p. 23–29.

³² Л. МАКАРИЈОСКА, Б. ПАВЛЕСКА-ГЕОРГИЕВСКА, *Лексиката на средновековните...*, p. 102.

³³ А.И. АЛМАЗОВ, *Тайная исповедь...*, vol. II, p. 269.

³⁴ P.P. PANAITESCU, *Manuscrisele slave din Biblioteca Academiei RPR*, vol. II, București 2006, p. 328, according to 15th century Missal № 496, f. 51v.

³⁵ А.И. АЛМАЗОВ, *Тайная исповедь...*, vol. II, p. 196, 267.

³⁶ Fr. VAN DE PAVERD, *The Kanonarium by John, Monk and Deacon and Didascalia Patrum*, Rome 2006, p. 77–93.

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: *златолюбвѣць, славолюбвѣць, сребролюбвѣць; грьдѣнини и смѣхочѣтворѣць; самогадѣць* ‘who eats apart from the fraternity’³⁷, *скорогадѣць* ‘who is gluttonous and eats quickly’; *братроненавистѣтникъ, клеветѣтникъ, лжкаводобѣтътникъ* ‘who deceives for material benefit’, *подъхубѣтникъ* ‘a flatterer, servile person’, *прѣклетѣвѣтникъ* ‘a person who curses, utters false oaths and curses’, *самохотѣтникъ* ‘a reclusive, selfish person’, *тъщеславѣтникъ* ‘vain, proud person’, *хуѣльникъ* ‘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 *вѣсь-* and *прѣ-*, such as *вѣсьсвѣщенъ, вѣсьщедръ, прѣблагъ, прѣпросвѣщенъ, прѣчистъ*, refer to spiritual advisors and clergymen who perform the sacramental rites and grant absolution, while the sinner is qualified as *вѣсьсквернъ* ‘entirely foul, vile, lowly, impure’, *вѣсьслоуга диаволоу* ‘a servant of the Devil in all things’, *вѣсьокаанъ* ‘entirely abject’, *трѣокаанъ* ‘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 всѣ дни и по всѣ ноци и по всѣ часы; от юности до старости, многожды многыхъ, тысяща тысящами, тмы тьмами, нажвѣ и въ смѣ*, and others³⁸. From the Vladislav the Grammarian’s copy: *вѣськъмь моиѣ ѿтѣво и дшею, еше и тѣломь; ѿ прѣваго възраста*

³⁷ Л. МАКАРИЈСКА, Б. ПАВЛЕСКА-ГЕОРГИЕВСКА, *Лексиката на средновековните...*, p. 130, translated as “greedy, selfish”.

³⁸ E. KOSCHMIEDER, *Grammatischer Prosareim...*, p. 335–356.

моѣго; єдинъ вѣдѣ въсѣхъ зѣмльнѣхъ стъгрѣши люто; не вѣ днѣ и не вѣ нощѣ
 нижѣ пакы чась, въ нже не ѡврѣтохъ се грѣхоу работае; зѣмля и нѣбо и сѣнце
 и мѣцѣ и звѣзды и море и рѣкы и вѣсны възвѣпѣю на мѣ; тысоуше тысоушамы
 крати себе проклѣнахъ, въ ѣже прѣстѣти ми ѡ лоукавы дѣлы мой, и пакы по
 въсѣ часы прѣстоупникъ клѣтвѣ ѡврѣтахъ се. Stylistic opposition helps to skill-
 fully weave verbal rhetoric, as не тѣкмо нѣ и. Contrasting symbolic opposi-
 tions point out that sin turns man from the Grace of baptism to the lows of evil:
 храмъ бжїи — вртѣпъ нечїстѣ и сквѣрнѣнъ развоиникѣ. Among the expressive
 devices of the Confession is found a paraphrase of the famous Old Testament
 biblical simile оумножише се паче власъ главы моѣе везаконїа моѣ 'my sins have
 multiplied more than the hairs of my head' (as in Ps 39: 13, αὶ 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 Unction 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 Grammatrion'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 Grammatrion 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

³⁹ *Septuagint*, Greek-English Old Testament, <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/septuagint/default.asp> [12 XII 2022].

⁴⁰ Г. ДАНЧЕВ, *Владислав Граматик...*, p. 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 nomocanons. The model of *ponovlenie* was not commonly spread on the Balkan⁴¹, 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 Christians⁴².

The text under study demonstrates the active *manifestation of the ability of inner self-preservation*⁴³ 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 ѿ, ѡ, and ѣ, nor the ligatures.

ИСПОВѢДАНІЕ СЪБЛѠ ПОЛЪСНО, ХОТЕЩОМОУ СЪБОЕ МАСЛО СЪБЫТИ ВЪСАКОМОУ ХРІСТІА-
НИНОУ, ЧРЪНЦОУ И БѢЛЦОУ ПРѢЖДЕ ПОМАЗАНІА ГЛАВѢ, СТАВЪ ПОСРѢДѢ, СЕДМЫ СЩЕН-
НИКЪ. И НАЧВНѢТЬ СЪ ОУМИЛІЕНІЕМЪ И СЪ СТРАХОМЪ БЖІЕМЪ ВЪКОУПѢ И СЪ СЛЪЗЪМИ
ИСПОВѢДАЕ СЕ ГЛАТИ СІЦЕ:~

⁴¹ М. КОРОГОДИНА, *Исповедь в России в XIV–XIX вв. Исследование и тексты*, Санкт Петербург 2006, р. 22; ИДЕМ, *Исповедные тексты в Сербии и на Руси (по рукописным материалам, хранящимся на территории России, ЦСту 1, 2004, р. 131–136.*

⁴² М. ШНИТЕР, *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.

Бжтвенїи ѡци и вѣкы мой, вѣсѣщєннїи и прѣпросвѣщєннїи, слоугы прѣчїстѣи и животворєцїи гѣ бѣ и спаса нашего и҃ѣ хѣ тайнѣ. Ѣже азъ вѣсѣскверннѣи и ѡмрачєннѣи, и вѣсѣслоугѣ лоукавому дїаволоу выхѣ въ хотѣнїе. призвѣвшоу ми вѣсь помолити вѣсѣцєдраго и прѣвѣлѣгаго бѣ нашѣ, о̄ избавлєнїи вєсчїслнѣи и лютїихъ мой съгрѣшенїи. въ помазанїе моеѣ ѡкааннѣе главы. паче же вѣсь сє поврѣзаю прѣ стѣми ѡбразы вашими моле сє и призыває и мїла сє дѣкє. хѣѡпѣвнаа мїрдїа ваша стѣа ѡверѣзѣте, и вѣлюбивѣе ваше слоухы. и моѣ морскѣе глѣ исповѣданїа вѣноушитє. прѣвое исповѣданїе мойхъ съдѣанєи, великїи и вєсчїслнѣи. вѣсѣхъ прѣвѣзвыдохъ вєзоумнѣи съгрѣшенїемъ и нечїстотоу. вѣсѣмъ моимъ иѣтѣѡ и дшєю, ещє и тѣломъ трѣѡкааннѣи азъ вѣлагаго ми и прѣвѣлѣгаго вѣкы моего и бѣ вєзаконно прогнѣвахъ. іако ни єдинъ ѡ вѣка съгрѣшїи. нѣ іако вѣласть їмоуше ѡ вєзмѣрнѣе влѣти бжтїе, понїже оучєнїци єгѡ єстє, раздрѣшите, даръ тѣ їмоуше ѡ стѣго дхѣ, мноу исповѣданнѣе грѣхы. дадїте ми прѣщєнїе и ѡставлєнїе ѡкааннѣоу, Ѣже хѣщоу вѣзвѣстїти вашєи стѣни, лютїи вѣ истїноу и непростєннѣи мой вєзаконєи. и сїхъ стѣи мїлѣвѣ. сщєннїчєскоу сїѡ книгоу и помазанїе, вѣ вѣщєнїе вѣвшаго ѡ вѣ мѣсла. обѣтїте сквернѣаго и нечїстагѣ, и непотрѣбнаго гѣоу и вѣмъ и оучєнїкѣмъ и равѣмъ єгѡ. и вѣспрїимѣте мє ѡ храмїны тѣго оудѣливша сє. и тѣжда сътворша сє тѣго оучєстца, за вєзбѣожное моѣ съдѣанїе. нїна бѡ прѣк прѣчїстѣими вашими ѡбразы прѣстѣоу, іако на стрѣшнѣмъ и нелицємѣрнѣмъ соудїиши хѣ бѣ нашего. сїа вѣбѣщѣоу тѣоу єдиноу, їже и тайнаа ѡ сѣца испїтоуѣ ѡкааннѣе ми нечїстѣи дшє оѣбогыє моѣ. Сїє показѣти вѣмъ хѣщоу, ѡ чѣстнїи ѡци съ смѣренїемъ и слѣзѣми мнѣогыми и съкроушенноу дшєю. азъ ѡкааннѣи ѡ прѣваго вѣзрѣста моего самъ сєбє вєзоумнїи рѣстлїхъ. и сквернѣе и нечїстѣе плѣти моеѣ ѡдеждѣоу ѡсквернїхъ. и како храмъ бжтїи стѣимъ крѣщєнїемъ выхъ, и сътворихъ сє врѣтопъ нечїстѣи и сквернѣнъ развоиннїкѣѡ, нїна стѣи мой вѣкы и ѡци, вѣсѣ глади не їмамъ за нѣкыи здє равѣно прѣстѣоещїи намъ, да не каѣ наоучїтель воудѣоу їмъ вєзаконїю великоу. и їны на тѣ рѣжєгоу. и вѣмѣстѣо ѡзлѣблєнїа понєсоутѣ оумилєнїе. єдинъ вѣ паче вѣсѣхъ зємльнѣи съгрѣшїи люто. нѣ прѣмѣлѣчу и съкрѣю. прочѣа же злѣа исповѣдаю, и вѣпїю дрѣзновєннѣо оучєнїци и сщєнїци гнїи. не вѣ днѣ и не вѣ нѣщѣ нїже пакы чѣсѣ, вѣ нже не ѡверѣтохъ сє грѣхѣоу равѣотає. а соудѣ вжїа и чѣса съмрѣтнагѣ николиже на оумъ не прїєхъ. ѡ юнаго ми вѣзрѣста даже и до нїна оугѣдїе тѣлєсноє съврѣшаю. когдѣ прѣкѣводѣанїе. ѡвогдѣ влоудѣ. їногдѣ моужєлѣжїе и крѣвомѣсїе. нѣкогдѣ скѣтолѣжїе. роуковлоудїе мнѣѡгажїи мнѣѡго, и вѣсѣакыє поганїе стрѣ азъ непотрѣбнѣи съдѣахъ. не тѣкѣно ѡтрѣчищє рѣстлїхъ, нѣ и дрѣгаа силнѣишаа. не тѣкѣно моѣ дшѣ ѡсквернїи, нѣ и сїхъ стѣими злѣбѣми дїаволоу прѣдѣахъ. и мнѣѡѣкѣ їныхъ дшє ѡ бѣ ѡтоуждї наоучєнїемъ моимъ лоукавѣи, кѣ грѣхѣоу прїводєщє їхъ. по вѣсєгдѣ на дѣланїе злѣбное и волю дїаволоу потыкає їхъ. нїже дшѣгоуѣбїа непростѣннѣи выхъ. и ещє вѣлхѣвѣанїа и чарѣдѣанїа и дрѣоугѣаа кѣ сїмъ вєзмѣстнѣа мнѣѡгаа оуѣвы мнѣ съдѣває, повѣжєнїю вѣсѣакомоу ѡдѣахъ сє ѡкааннѣи азъ. ѡкааннѣе и грѣшнѣи вѣ вѣсѣкѣ члѣвѣкѣ. оумнѣожїше сє паче вѣлѣсѣ главы моеѣ вєзаконїа моѣ. вѣзвїнѣноути

помирачѣннѣи ѿчи мой на нѣса не смѣю, ѿ стоудныѣ и проклѣты дѣль мой. коа оубо ѿ злоба, юже азъ не сътвори и не творюу паче и доселѣ днѣ. коѣ ѿ злое же азъ не въобразихъ. и на въсакъ чае же въобразажоу въ ѿкаанноую мою дшѣ. коемоу безаконію и оскврненію и нечистотѣ не быхъ азъ оудникъ и наоучитель. и како мооу покаати се ѿ мой дѣль нечистіи, и ѿ иныхъ ихже наоучихъ равно дѣлають и тѣи покаанію и исповѣданію несъмыслешоу ми, еже съдѣахъ азъ лоукавыи. не тѣкмо съ члѣскымъ итвомъ тоужаа боу сътворихъ. нѣ и съ скотоу азъ оуниаи, клеветникъ. азъ лѣжныи съхранитель. азъ хоульникъ и прѣклѣтовникъ. грьдыни и смѣхоутворецъ и дѣлатель. послихливъ пѣаница, блонникъ. чрѣвоу работае. мнѣго съна трѣвоуе, мръзкъ ненавистникъ. сребролюбъць златолюбъць. и мѣнѣа мнѣга любе, іакѣ никто же ѿ члѣк: славолубъць тыщеславникъ, хоульникъ, лоукавъ. братоненавистникъ, похыбникъ. самохотникъ, гнѣбливъ. скорыи злодѣи, и посоупленъ. скорогадыць самогадыць. тать, хыщникъ, неправедникъ. лоукаводобытникъ. нѣ на въсе ли страсти хошоу глаати, иже ѿбладаютъ ми ѿкаанною дшѣю и тѣломъ. ѿ моа безаконіа. ѿ моа съдѣаніа лоукаваа, твореннаа мнооу лоукавыимъ и поганимъ. и помышлагоу оутѣа ли се днѣ онооу и ноци, въ нѣ же съдѣа зла и лоукаваа моа дѣла. нѣ въдѣ извѣстно, и сіа ме хоте обличити. и исповѣде на ме безаконіа моа, иже нѣа не хощешоу ми глаю боу и вашои стѣсти. не оумлѣчитъ во тогда ни днѣ ни ноць, ниже пакы часъ. въпѣ съ агглатѣ егѣ на ме скврннаго. и гдѣ оукрѣтити се илѣ оубѣгнути и мамъ, земля и нѣо и слнце и мѣцъ и звѣзды и море и рѣкы и вѣзныѣ възпыію на ме. и сѣго ради въемъ вѣгодарованныи ваимъ ѿ ба даръ вѣзати и рѣшити вины члѣскыихъ съгрѣшеней. еже во свѣжете на земли, и на нѣсехъ свѣзано ѿ. и еже разрѣшите на земли, разрѣшено ѿ и на нѣсехъ. и призва ваше вѣолювѣе ѿ чѣстнѣи ѿци, іакѣ да мѣрдаго и прѣвѣлаго ба помолите ѿ мнѣ окаанно. и дасте ми разрѣшеніе и прощеніе моимъ грѣхомъ. мнѣго во можеть млтва праведнаго. въсѣго бо себѣ непотрѣбна сътворихъ боу и члѣкомъ. въсакъ оудѣ оскврннихъ и растлѣи и истѣшихъ. и быхъ дѣлатель въ вѣсемъ діавлоу. и вѣщше ихже изглахъ съдѣахъ, непотрѣбныи и нечистіи и въсѣѿкаанныи азъ. ниже прѣстахъ когда не дѣлае безаконное дѣло съ тоуждѣими женами инооезычныими. и съ моужьскыи дѣтѣми. оубѣдающе въ срѣци моѣмъ лоукаваа исплетѣнѣа. непотрѣбнаа и мръскаа съвлажнѣнѣа. тѣло же смрадное моѣ, оукрашаю въсею сіаюю моѣю и пишею и тоукомъ. и вонями самовонныи въсакыи и мнѣгыи смѣшеныи ароматы. да сіце привлѣкоу въ тлѣнѣе дшѣ тоуждыихъ. нѣ иже и страха бжѣа никѣлиже прѣ ѿчима моима поставихъ. да въспомѣноу соудѣища бжѣа, и възданіа съдѣаныхъ мой. тысоуше тысоуцами крѣти себѣ проклѣнахъ, въ еже прѣстѣти ми ѿ лоукавы дѣль мой, и пакы по въсе часы прѣстоупникъ клѣтвѣ върѣтахъ се. и егѣже зрѣхъ творѣща млтѣнию. постъ и вѣдѣнѣе, то ѣлико по силѣ моѣи ѿвраща ѿ пѣти права, и моѣи поганости оучахъ и привлѣча ѿсоуждае и нѣхъ, а самъ ѿсоужденъ ѣсмъ. въ вѣсемъ повѣнъ вѣсѣомъ быхъ, и съ въсакымъ тыщаніемъ самъ себѣ оудалихъ ѿ ба. тѣмѣже гѣсподіе и вѣкы и слоужителіе ба вѣшнаго, оуцѣдрите ме смѣреннаго и оуниаго. іакѣже хсѣ блонницѣ оноу и развѣбника прѣе

мáлaгo рaдн̄ ѡпoвѣдáнїа. сн̄цѣ и вѣ хвѣпѣбнїцн̄ и мѣнѣ прїїмáтѣ и прoстїтѣ. и прївѣдѣтѣ вѣ ѡтрадoу, ѡ нн̄е же ѡзвѣдохъ безoумнїи. и дáроуїтѣ мнѣ прoщѣнїѣ и ѡстáвлѣнїѣ грѣхoвмъ н̄х же ѡпoвѣдáхъ. и спoбїтѣ мѣ стѣмн̄и вáшн̄мн̄ мл̄твáмн̄ сѣгo прѣстѣгo мáслá помáзáнїю. и помoлїтѣ вѣсѣблáгo и незлѣблївáгo бá и гá нáшeгo їѣ хá дá вѣспрїїмѣтѣ ѡ тoплoтѣ сїѣ покáанїѣ мoѣ прїнoсїмoѣ. и спoбїтѣ мѣ прїчѣстнїкá вѣтн̄и стѣхъ єгo и прѣчїстѣхъ и стрáшн̄хъ и бескрѣвн̄хъ тáинн̄хъ. дá и áзъ дрoззвoвѣннo стѣ вáмн̄и вѣспoю и прoслáвлю ѡмѣ ѡцá и снá и стѣгo дхá. нн̄тá и пр̄но и вѣ вѣкн̄и вѣкoвмъ áмн̄н̄хъ.

тáже прїїдѣтѣ поклонїм сѣ цр̄ю нáшeмoу бoу. Г. и ѡсл̄шн̄ гн̄ прáвд̄ш̄ мю: и тáкo по сѣмъ, прo. и ап̄лы. и єв̄лїа, сь мл̄твáмн̄и. по рѣдоу:~

Bibliography

- ALMAZOV A.I., *Tajna ja ispoved' v pravoslavnoj vostočnoj cerkvi. Opyt vnešnej istorii*, vol. II, *Specialnye ustavy*, vol. III, *Priloženija*, Odessa 1894.
- ARRANC M., *Istoričeskie zametki o činoposledovanijah tainstv po rukopisjam Grečeskogo Evhologija*, Leningrad 1979.
- BIANU I., HODOȘ N., *Bibliografia Românească Veche. 1508–1830*, vol. I, (1508–1716), București 1903.
- CHRISTOVA B., *Bălgarskata knižnina i kultura prez XV vek*, [in:] *Bălgarskijat petnadeseti vek. Sbornik s dokladi za bălgarska obšta i kulturna istorija prez XV vek*, ed. B. CHRISTOVA, A. MINČEVA, B. RAJKOV, Kl. IVANOVA, Sofija 1993, p. 117–123.
- CHRISTOVA B., *Opis na rākopisite na Vladislav Gramatik*, Veliko Tārnovo 1996.
- CHRISTOVA B., *Vladislav Gramatik i rilskijat knižoven centār*, [in:] *Rilski manastir. Jubileen vestnik. Specialno izdanie, posveteno na naučnata sesija "Rilskijat manastir v istorijata i kulturata na bălgarskija narod"*, Sofija 1981.
- CIBRANSKA M., *Za edin molitven tekst avtograf na Vladislav Gramatik*, "Български език" / "Bălgarski ezik" 5, 1997–1998, p. 58–63.
- DANČEV G., *Osobenosti na pripiskite i beležkite v sbornicite na Vladislav Gramatik – izvor na svedenija za negovite kulturni interesi i za kulturata u nas prez XV stoletie*, [in:] *Bălgarskijat petnadeseti vek. Sbornik s dokladi za bălgarska obšta i kulturna istorija prez XV vek*, ed. B. CHRISTOVA, A. MINČEVA, B. RAJKOV, Kl. IVANOVA, Sofija 1993, p. 181–187.
- DANČEV G., *Vladislav Gramatik. Knižovnik i pisatel*, Sofija 1969.
- GOŠEV I., *Stari zapisi i nadpisi*, "Годишник на Софийския университет. Богословски факултет" / "Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet. Bogoslovski fakultet" 4.1, 1927, p. 336–378.
- GRKOVIĆ-MEJĐOR J., *Spisi Dimitrija Kantakuzina i Vladislava Gramatika*, Beograd 1993.
- IORGA N., *Byzance après Byzance*, Bucarest 1935.
- KATIČIĆ R., *Σχήματα Γορυγεία u jednoj staroslavenskoj ispovednoj molitvi*, "Slovo" 6–8, 1957, p. 236–245.
- KOROGODINA M., *Ispoved' v Rosii v XI–XIX vv. Issledovanie i teksty*, Sankt Peterburg 2006.
- KOROGODINA M., *Ispovednye teksty v Serbii i na Rus (po rukopisnym materialam, chranjaščimsja na territorii Rossii)*, "Црквене студије" / "Crkvene studije" 1, 2004, p. 131–136.

- KOROGODINA M., *Problemy isučeniya russkikh srednevekovykh tekstov kak istoričeskogo istočnika*, [in:] *Russkij istoričeskij sbornik*, vol. II, ed. V.M. LAVROV, Moskva 2010, p. 110–120.
- KOSCHMIEDER E., *Grammatischer Prosareim in Kirchenslavischen Beichtgebeten*, “Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 44, 1951, p. 334–342, <https://doi.org/10.1515/bz-1951-1243>
- MAKARIJOSKA L., PAVLESKA-GEORGIEVSKA B., *Leksikata na srednevekovnite molitvenici*, Skopje 2021.
- Molitvenik Đurđa Crnojevića 1495/96. Faksimilno izdanje*, ed. K. MANO-ZISI, Podgorica–Cetine 1993.
- MOŠIN VI., *Još o rekonstrukciji Crnojeviheva Trebnika 1495 godine*, “Библиотекар” / “Bibliotekar” 3–4, 1964, p. 199–204.
- NAHTIGAL R., *Euchologium Sinaiticum. Starocerkvenoslovanski glagolski spomenik*, vol. II, *Tekst s komentarjem*, Ljubljana 1942.
- NEMIROVSKIJ E., *Slavjanske izdanija kirillovskogo (cerkovnoslavjanskogo) šrifta 1491–2000. Inventar sohranivšichsja eksempljarov i ukazatel' literatury*, vol. I, (1491–1550), Moskva 2009.
- NICEPHORI CALLISTI XANTHOPULI, *Precatio confessoria*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, vol. CXLVII, ed. J.-P. MIGNÉ, Paris 1865, col. 591–600.
- PANAITESCU P.P., *Manuscrisele slave din Biblioteca Academiei RPR*, vol. II, București 2006.
- POP-ATANASOV G., MILOVSKA D., *Novi listovi od Premčanskiot trebnik (pergamenten kniževen spomenik od XIII vek)*, “Кирилметодиевистика” / “Kirilometodievistika” 1, 2003, p. 135–186.
- Praznichen miney na Božidar Vukovič Podgoričanin ot 1538*, ed. M. POLMIROVA, Podgorica–Sofija 2021.
- RAYKOV B., KODOV Ch., CHRISTOVA B., *Slavjanski rakopisi v Rilskija manastir*, vol. I, Sofija 1986.
- Septuagint*, Greek-English Old Testament, <http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/septuagint/default.asp> [12 XII 2022].
- SIMIĆ Pr., *Trebnik srpske redakcije XIII v.*, “Зборник историје књижевности” / “Zbornik istorije književnosti” 10, 1976, p. 53–87.
- SNITTER M., *Molitva i magija*, Sofija 2001.
- SPROSTRANOV E., *Opis na rākopisite v bibliotekata na Rilskija manastir*, Sofija 1902.
- STANKOVA R., *Starobālgarskoto knižovno nasledstvo v srābski prepisi ot XIII i načaloto na XIV v.*, “Електронно списание LiterNet” / “Elektronno spisanie LiterNet”, 02 I 2004, № 1.50, <https://litenet.bg/publish4/rtrifonova/stb.htm> [12 I 2023].
- SYMEONIS METAPHRASTAE, *Precationes*, [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, vol. CXIV, ed. J.-P. MIGNÉ, Paris 1857, col. 219–224.
- ТКАЧЕНКО А.А., *Eleosvjašenie*, [in:] *Pravoslavnaja Ėnciklopedija*, vol. XVIII, Moskva 2008, p. 325–337.
- ТУРИЛОВ А., *Vladislav Gramatik*, [in:] *Pravoslavnaja ėnciklopedija*, vol. IX, Moskva 2005, p. 99–101.
- VAN DE PAVERD Fr., *The Kanonarion by John, Monk and Deacon and Didascalia Patrum*, Rome 2006.

Mariyana Tsibranska

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Institute for Bulgarian Studies
Schipchenski prohod 52, bl 17
1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
m.tsibranska@gmail.com