

A SLAVONIC TRANSLATION OF THE EUCHARISTIC DIATAXIS
OF PHILOTHEOS KOKKINOS FROM A LOST MANUSCRIPT
(ATHOS AGIOU PAVLOU 149)

Michael Zheltov

The library of the hagioritic monastery of St. Paul (Ἱερὰ μονὴ Ἀγίου Παύλου) was once famous for its Slavonic collection, one of the most interesting on the Holy Mountain. Tragically, this collection was destroyed by a fire in 1902. Some of the manuscripts from this collection happened to have been sold by the monks or given as a gift to this or that visitor,¹ or transferred to other hagioritic monasteries. But most of the Slavonic manuscript treasures formerly belonging to the monastery were completely lost. Scholars are left to depend on a few short descriptions by 19th-century travellers to Mount Athos: Bishop Porphyry Uspensky,² Archimandrites Antonin Kapustin³ and Leonid Kavelin,⁴ Viktor Grigorovich.⁵

This is why a list from dossier No. 138 from the archive of Alexey Dmitrievsky († 1929), kept at the Russian National Library in Saint-Petersburg (archive fund No. 253), looks so promising. There is mentioned a number of Slavonic manuscripts from the monastery of St.

¹ As, for example, the amazing Bulgarian 14th-century Tetraevangelion of Ivan Alexander (see: L. Zhivkova, *Tetraevangelion of Tzar Ivan Alexandăr* [original title in Bulgarian: Живкова Л. *Четвероевангелието на цар Иван Александър*], Sofia 1980), currently British Library MS Add. 39627, given to Robert Curzon as an abbot's present.

² Bishop Porphyry Uspensky, *First Trip to the Athonite Monasteries and Scetes*, part 1: 2 [original title in Russian: Порфирий (Успенский), еп. *Первое путешествие в афонские монастыри и скиты архимандрита, ныне епископа, Порфирия Успенского в 1845 году. Часть I-я, отделение второе*], Kiev 1877.

³ Archimandrite Antonin Kapustin, *The Notes of a Pilgrim to the Holy Mountain* [original title in Russian: Антонин (Капустин), архим. *Заметки поклонника Святой Горы*], Kiev 1864.

⁴ Archimandrite Leonid Kavelin, «Serbian-Slavonic Manuscript Collections on the Holy Mountain Athos» [original title in Russian: Леонид (Кавелин), архим. «Славяно-сербские книгохранилища на Св. Афонской горе»], in: *Чтения в Императорском обществе Истории и Древностей Российских*, 1 (Moscow 1875), 1-80 [fifth pagination].

⁵ V. Grigorovich, *A Description of a Travel to European Turkey* [original title in Russian: Григорович В. И. *Очерк путешествия по европейской Турции*], Moscow 1877.

Paul. The list was published by Miguel Arranz,⁶ who has also briefly studied another dossier from Dmitrievsky's archive, the huge No. 137, consisting of many copies from various Greek and Slavonic manuscripts (actually, an unedited continuation of Dmitrievsky's famous «Описание литургических рукописей...»), and concluded: «Une première vision nous a laissé l'impression qu'il s'agit des mêmes documents indiqués dans l'index... qui se trouve dans le dossier n. 138».⁷ In reality, though, it turned out that the cited conclusion is incorrect — actual contents of No. 137 differ considerably from the list given in No. 138. In particular, one finds here excerpts from just two Slavonic manuscripts from the collection of the monastery of St. Paul. The present article is an edition of the first of them, written out from a 15th-c. *Sluzhebник* (Leitourgikon), *Athos Agiou Pavlou 149*.

This copy of *Athos Agiou Pavlou 149* was acquired by Dmitrievsky in 1887, during his second trip to Mount Athos. He himself characterizes the manuscript as «very interesting and important in a scholarly sense».⁸ Yet, the copy Dmitrievsky acquired is by no means representing the complete manuscript. It comprises only the first part of a Slavonic translation of Διάταξις τῆς θείας λειτουργίας of St. Philotheos Kokkinos, Patriarch of Constantinople († 1377/78), and ends just before the initial ephonesis of the Divine Liturgy (i. e., «Blessed is the Kingdom...»).

The first scholar to study the eucharistic Diataxis of Philotheos thoroughly was Nikolay Krasnoseltsev,⁹ who began with editing in 1885 a Greek liturgical diataxis from *Vatican Gr. 1213* (16 c.) and a Slavonic translation of the Diataxis of Philotheos from *Vatican Slav. 14* (turn of the 14-15th c.), together with some remarks.¹⁰ In 1889 Krasnoseltsev published a number of Byzantine eucharistic Diataxeis, including the first critical edition of the Philothean Diataxis, according

⁶ M. Arranz, «Les archives de Dmitrievsky dans la bibliothèque d'Etat de Leningrad», *ОСР* 40 (1974), 61-83, here 80-82.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁸ A. Dmitrievsky, *A Trip to the East and Its Scholarly Results* [original title in Russian: *Дмитриевский А. Путешествие по Востоку и его научные результаты: отчет о заграничной командировке в 1887–88 году, с приложениями*], Kiev 1890, 48.

⁹ The text of the Philothean Diataxis together with some others had been already edited by Jacques Goar, but this was not a study in the proper sense.

¹⁰ N. Krasnoseltsev, *Information on Some Liturgical Manuscripts of the Vatican Library...* [original title in Russian: *Красносельцев Н. Ф. Сведения о некоторых литургических рукописях Ватиканской библиотеки с замечаниями о составе и особенностях богослужебных чинов последований, в них содержащихся, и с приложениями*], Kazan' 1885, 127-39, 171-94.

to Greek manuscripts *Athos Pantel. 421* (1545 AD), *Athos Pantel. 435* (2nd half of the 16 c.), *Athos Vatop. 133* (744) (14 c.) and a Slavonic manuscript, *Moscow Synodal Library* [now: ГИМ. Сун.] 601 (end of 14 c.), and an extensive commentary.¹¹ In 1895 Krasnoseltsev reported that he managed to find the initial redaction of the Philothean Diataxis, which is antecedent to the one he published earlier. He then started editing the first pages of this initial redaction, according to *Athos Pantel. 770 (49)* (14 c.). Unfortunately, this work remained unfinished.¹² But the text prepared by Krasnoseltsev was finally published in 1912 by Dmitrievsky, Krasnoseltsev's former student, together with some other important texts.¹³ In 1935 the Diataxis from *Athos Pantel. 770 (49)* was published once again, this time by Panagiotês Trempelas, who seems to have been unaware of the works by Krasnoseltsev and Dmitrievsky.¹⁴ I would note here that *Athos Pantel. 770 (49)* must not be a unique manuscript to contain the initial redaction of the Diataxis. For example, in a manuscript of 1545 AD from the hagiortitic monastery Esphigmenou, edited by Polychrony Syrku,¹⁵ we find a combined eucharistic *ordo*, where prayers of the Divine Liturgy are inserted into the text of the Philothean Diataxis itself, and the text of the Diataxis here clearly follows its initial redaction.¹⁶ After the pioneering works of Krasnoseltsev and other Russian pre-revolutionary scholars, there have been no special studies on the

¹¹ N. Krasnoseltsev, *Materials for a History of the Rite of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* [original title in Russian: Красносельцев Н. Ф. *Материалы для истории чинопоследования литургии св. Иоанна Златоустого*], Kazan' 1889.

¹² N. Krasnoseltsev, «Materials for a History of the Rite of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, Part 2» [original title in Russian: Красносельцев Н. Ф. «Материалы для истории чинопоследования литургии св. Иоанна Златоустого». Вып. 2], in: *Православный собеседник*, 1 (Kazan', 1895 [1896]), 1-8 [separate pagination].

¹³ A. Dmitrievsky, «Review of M. Orlov's Book 'The Liturgy of St. Basil'» [original title in Russian: Дмитриевский А. А. «Отзыв о сочинении М. И. Орлова «Литургия св. Василия Великого»»], in: *Сборник отчетов и премий о наградах, присуждаемых Императорской Академией Наук: Отчеты за 1909 г.*, Saint-Petersburg 1912, 176-347; here: 309-45.

¹⁴ P. Trempelas, *Three Liturgies According to the Athens Codices* [original title in Greek: Τρεμπέλας Π. *Αἱ τρεῖς λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*], Athens 1935, here: 1-16.

¹⁵ P. Syrku, *Liturgical Works of Patriarch Euthymios of Tyrnovo*, 2 [original title in Russian: Сырку П. А. *Литургические труды патриарха Евфимия Тырновского* (= *К истории исправления книг в Болгарии в XIV в.* Т. 1): Выпуск 2], Saint-Petersburg 1890, here: lxiv-lxxix, 149-75.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 149-72.

Greek text of the eucharistic Diataxis of Philotheos, though it was discussed to various extents in a number of scholarly works.¹⁷

The first study of a Slavonic translation of the eucharistic Diataxis of Philotheos belongs to Ivan Mansvetov, who dedicated a part of his book on the liturgical works of St. Cyprian, Metropolitan of all Rus' († 1406), to his translation of the Diataxis.¹⁸ Mansvetov's work was used by Church historian Eugene Golubinsky, who brought the study a little bit further.¹⁹ The first scholarly publications of Slavonic translations of the Diataxis and more profound studies of them are contained in the aforementioned works of Krasnoseltsev, Syrku and Dmitrievsky, as well as those of Sergey Muretov.²⁰ More recent publications in the field are those of Radu Constantinescu,²¹ Alexey Pentkovsky,²² Tatyana Afanasyeva,²³ and Svetlana Panova.²⁴

¹⁷ For example, A. Jacob, *Histoire du formulaire grec de la liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louvain, 1968), 441-6; R. Constantinescu, «Euthyme de Tarnovo et la reforme liturgique au XIV^e siècle», *Etudes balkaniques* 3 and 4 (1986), 62-78 and 53-80; R. Taft, «Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite», *DOP* 42 (1988), 179-94, here: 192-4; A. Rentel, «The Origins of the 14th century Patriarchal Liturgical Diataxis of Dimitrios Gemistos», *OCP* 71 (2005), 363-85; here: 368-70; idem, «New Finds in the Liturgical Diataxis Tradition» (a paper presented at the SOL 2008 conference in Rome, to be published in: Basilius J. Groen and Steven Hawkes Teeple (eds.), *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship: Acts of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy*, Rome, 17 – 21 September 2008 [Eastern Christian Studies, Vol. 10], Leuven 2009).

¹⁸ I. Mansvetov, *Metropolitan Cyprian in His Liturgical Activity* [original title in Russian: Мансветов И. Митрополит Киприан в его литургической деятельности: историко-литургическое исследование], Moscow 1882, 9-38, v-vii.

¹⁹ E. Golubinsky, *The History of the Russian Church* [original title in Russian: Голубинский Е. История Русской Церкви], vol. II: 2 (2nd edition: Moscow 1911), 406-9.

²⁰ S. Muretov, *A Historical Survey of the Prothesis Rite up to the «Diataxis» of Constantinopolitan Patriarch Philotheos* [original title in Russian: Муретов С. Д. Исторический обзор чинопоследования проскомидии до «Устава литургии» Константинопольского Патриарха Филофея: Опыт историко-литургического исследования], Moscow 1895; idem., «Materials for a History of the Rite of the Liturgy in Ancient South-Slavonic Monuments of XIV-XVII cc.» [original title in Russian: Муретов С. Д., прот. «Материалы для истории литургии в древних юго-славянских памятниках XIV-XVII вв.»], *Чтения в Императорском обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 254: 3 (1915), 53-68.

²¹ Constantinescu, *op. cit.* It must be noted that this publication should be used with caution, because a number of manuscripts cited here is provided with substantially incorrect datings, etc.

²² A. Pentkovsky, «A Case from the History of Liturgical Reforms in the Russian Church in the 3rd Quarter of the XIVth century: Liturgical Works of Saint Alexy, Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus'» [original title in Russian: Пентковский А. М. «Из истории литургических преобразований в Русской Церкви в третьей четверти XIV столетия: литургические труды святителя Алексия, митрополита Киевского и всея Руси»], *Символ* 29 (1993), 225-31.

All these scholars pointed out that there were different early Slavonic translations of the Philothean Diataxis. Pentkovsky made it quite clear that the first of them was accomplished by some Athonite Serbian monks, the second one — by St. Euthymius, Patriarch of Tyrnovo († 1402), and there was also a Russian translation (or translations). Afanasyeva refined some of Pentkovsky's hypotheses and concluded that there were only three different 14th- century Slavonic translations of the Diataxis: an anonymous one which she called the Athonite, and translations of Patriarch Euthymius and Metropolitan Cyprian. However, Afanasyeva's argumentation was rather brief, and she evidently lacked a sufficient knowledge of the original Greek tradition. For example, she states that «three Greek manuscripts of the Diataxis of Philotheos are known»,²⁵ while their number is significantly greater.²⁶ Nonetheless, a profound philological study presented by Panova has proven Afanasyeva's insights to be correct. Panova convincingly demonstrated that the three translations differ in vocabulary and translation techniques. Moreover, as Afanasyeva had already shown, the Athonite translation has a specific feature: while those of Euthymius and Cyprian initially formed a separate section in *Sluzhebnyki*, the Athonite translation is combined with the text of the Divine Liturgy²⁷ (the text of the latter in this case always accords to a translation, also designated as Athonite). The Athonite translation of the Diataxis is

²³ Т. Afanasyeva, «South-Slavonic Translations of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom in the XI–XV cc. Sluzhebnyki from Russian Libraries» [original title in Russian: Афанасьева Т. «Южнославянские переводы литургии Иоанна Златоуста в Службениках XI–XV вв. из российских библиотек»], in: *Многokратните преводи в Южнославянското средновековие*, Sofia 2006, 253–66; eadem, «Concerning the Question of Redactions of the Slavonic Translation of the Diataxis of Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos» [original title in Russian: Афанасьева Т. И. «К вопросу о редакциях славянского перевода диатак-сиса патриарха Филофея Коккина»], *Древняя Русь* 29 (2007), 10–2.

²⁴ She published in 2007–2008 a series of articles on Slavonic translations of the Diataxis of Philotheos, ending up in a Ph.D. thesis entitled: *The Diataxis of Philotheos Kokkinos in the Slavonic Manuscript Tradition of the 14–15 cc.: A Linguistic-Textological Analysis* [original title in Russian: Панова С. И. *Диатак-сис патриарха Филофея Коккина в славянской книжной традиции XIV–XV вв.: лингвотекстологическое исследование*], defended at the Moscow State University in 2009, which will be published soon.

²⁵ Afanasyeva, «South-Slavonic Translations...», 255, footnote 8.

²⁶ Already in the publications of Krasnoseltzev and Syrku there are mentioned more than three Greek manuscripts of this Diataxis; in the Manuscript Listings for the Authored Works of the Palaeologan Period (R. Sinkewicz, W. M. Hayes, eds.: Toronto 1989) more than thirty manuscripts are listed, and anybody who has worked with the Greek manuscript *Euchologia* would expect that this number is not even a rough estimate.

²⁷ In the course of time, though, the Cyprian's rendition was also combined with the prayers of the Divine Liturgy itself.

mostly witnessed by Serbian manuscripts, or Bulgarian and Russian copies of Serbian manuscripts.

The Athonite translation of the Diataxis also gives a number of variant readings when describing some rites and citing certain euchological formulas, which differ substantially from that Greek redaction of the Diataxis, which is witnessed by *Athos Vatop. 133 (744)* etc. Panova has noticed some of these (for example, a specific order of commemoration of Saints during the Prothesis) and concluded that while they are not found in the Greek text, they should therefore mirror the liturgical practice of the Slavs at the time when the translation was made. But this is incorrect. In fact, the liturgical peculiarities of the Athonite translation correspond perfectly well with the initial Greek redaction of the Philothean Diataxis, attested in *Athos Pantel. 770 (49)*. In their turn, Euthymius' and Cyprian's renditions conform not to the initial, but to the revised Greek redaction of the Diataxis. The Athonite translation was, therefore, made from a text not identical to the source of two other Slavonic versions of the Diataxis.

Returning to the excerpt from *Athos Agiou Pavlou 149*, we must say that it contains specifically the Athonite translation of the Diataxis of Philotheos. The first part of it (up to the initial ecphonesis of the Divine Liturgy) was edited first by Muretov,²⁸ and then by Constantinescu.²⁹ The reasons for a separation of the first part of the Diataxis from its remaining text in the manuscripts and, subsequently, in the editions, is clear. As was already noted, in the Athonite translation the Diataxis is combined with the text of the Divine Liturgy. It thus gets lost in it, so only the first part of the Diataxis remains independent.³⁰ The same occurred with the excerpt from *Athos Agiou Pavlou 149*: it ends, as was already mentioned above, just before the initial ecphonesis of the Divine Liturgy, while the Divine Liturgy itself (including the remaining text of the Diataxis) was not copied by Dmitrievsky's copyist.

In this preparatory part of the Divine Liturgy, which comprises the entrance rites, the vesture of a deacon and a priest, and the rite of Prothesis, the initial redaction of the Diataxis of Philotheos – and, therefore, the Athonite Slavonic translation of it – differs from the later re-

²⁸ Muretov, "Materials...", 64-8.

²⁹ Constantinescu, *op. cit.*, vol. 4, 66-80.

³⁰ Moreover, our fragment of the Diataxis absorbs the initial parts of the text of the Divine Liturgy itself – the prayer of the Prothesis etc., – and even the old heading of the eucharistic formulary (see in the edited Slavonic text below: this heading is inserted into the section on incensation).

dactions in three points: 1) it cites the prayers of the deacon's vesture, but omits those of the priest; 2) it opens the commemorations of the third prosphora with a mention of the Life-giving Cross and the angelic powers; 3) it welcomes the deacon to commemorate those he wants to right after the priest, instructing him to extract particles from prosphoras as had the priest.

The reasons for the omission of the priestly vesting prayers are unclear. Actually, many of the manuscripts of the Athonite translation of the Diataxis contain them, but the number of the manuscripts without them is considerable (including the one I am discussing here, *Athos Agiou Pavlou 149*). These prayers are also omitted in the Greek *Athos Pantel. 770 (49)*, so it is more probable that they were not cited in the original text (if *Athos Pantel. 770 (49)* is not *the* original text), and in the manuscripts which have them they are a later addition, made for convenience. The presence of only the deaconal vesting prayers in the original text of the Diataxis could mean that Philotheos Kokkinos composed his Diataxis while being a deacon – or at a request of some deacon.

The commemorations of the third prosphora in current Slavonic practice open with the name of St. John the Baptist. In current Greek practice – with the names of Michael and Gabriel together with the angelic powers. This issue has been a subject of theological reflection in several publications.³¹ One of the central questions concerning this is the following: What is the sense of commemorating the angels during the Prothesis if the sacrifice of Golgotha and, therefore, of the Eucharist was offered not for them but for the human race? I am not going to criticize nor praise any of the positions. The revised redaction of the Philothean Diataxis according to *Athos Vatop. 133 (744)* etc. supports the Slavonic practice and opens the commemorations with the name of St. John the Baptist. It is the initial redaction of the Diataxis where the angelic powers are commemorated, and not only they, but even the Holy and Life-giving Cross!³² It seems that at first Philotheos had simply followed the common practice, which is also de-

³¹ The most extensive of these publications is a whole monograph dedicated to this question alone: S. Muretov, *Concerning the Question of Commemoration of Angelic Powers During the Prothesis Rite* [original title in Russian: Муретов С. Д. *О поминовении Бесплотных сил на проskomидии*], Moscow 1897.

³² According to Mansvetov, this was due to an influence of the deaconal petition from the rite of λυτή in the all-night vigil on the rite of Prothesis (Muretov, *Concerning the Question...*, 97-114).

scribed in the earlier anonymous Diataxis («Hermêneia»),³³ but later decided to refine it. Yet the peculiarity from the initial redaction remained in some Greek manuscripts and had already passed to the Athonite Slavonic translation of the Diataxis.

The most interesting feature of the description of the Prothesis in the initial redaction of the Philothean Diataxis is a permission given to the deacon to extract his own particles from the prosphoras. It is a clear remnant of the archaic practice when the deacon performed the whole rite of the Prothesis himself, save the final Prothesis Prayer.³⁴ This practice began to change in the beginning of the 12th century,³⁵ and what we find in the initial redaction of the Philothean Diataxis is just an echo of it. Further on even this remnant was extinguished completely in both Greek and Slavonic practices. In the middle of the 17th century Arsenij Suxanov, a hieromonk and a famous Russian traveler to the Greek and Arabic Orthodox East, is very surprised to learn that «in all the Greek printed Euchologia as well as old Slavonic [*Sluzheb-niki*]» a deacon is allowed to extract his own particles from a prosphora, and witnesses that this practice is not in use among the Greeks anymore.³⁶

The excerpt from *Athos Agiou Pavlou 149* I am editing here comprises folia 178^r–179^v of dossier No. 137 from Dmitrievsky's archive.

³³ Editions: Mansvetov, *Metropolitan Cyprian...*, i-v; Krasnoseltsev, *Materials for a History...*, 6-16; S. Muretov, *A Supplement for the Materials of the History of the Rite of the Liturgy* [original title in Russian: Муретов С. Д. К материалам для истории чино-последования Литургии], Sergiev Posad 1895, 17-24.

³⁴ See: Mansvetov, *Metropolitan Cyprian...*, 137-41; Muretov, *A Historical Survey...*, 233-6; M. Mandalà, *La protesi della liturgia nel rito bizantino-greco*, Grottaferrata 1935, 73-96.

³⁵ See: M. Bernatsky, M. Zheltov, «Questions and Answers of Elias, Metropolitan of Crete: A Testimony of the Byzantine Liturgical Practice in the Beginning of the 12th Century» [original title in Russian: Бернацкий М. М., Желтов М., диак. «Вопросоответы митр. Илии Критского: свидетельство об особенностях совершения Божественной литургии в нач. XII века»], in: Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского Гуманитарного Университета, I: Богословие, философия 14, Moscow 2005, 23-53.

³⁶ «*Proskinitarij*» of Arsenij Suxanov (ed. N. Ivanovsky) [original title in Russian: «*Просквинитарий*» Арсения Суханова / Под ред. Н. И. Ивановского]. (Saint-Petersburg, 1889; Православный Палестинский сборник, Т. 21 = Vol. 7, Fasc. 3), 291. The most recent study of the «*Proskinitarij*» belongs to Sr. Vassa (Larin): V. Larin, *The Hierarchal Divine Liturgy in Arsenij Suxanov's Proskinitarij: Text, Translation, and Analysis of the Entrance Rites* (OCA, in print). Taking the opportunity, I am giving many thanks to Sr. Vassa for her help with improving the English language of this article.

It is not written in Dmitrievsky's handwriting.³⁷ The entire excerpt contains only one brief remark written by Dmitrievsky himself. He wrote it on a margin of the first page of the excerpt; it is marked with a small letter «x»; the same letter indicates the place in the text that is relevant to this remark. The excerpt contains the first part of the Athonite Slavonic translation of the Διάταξις τῆς θείας λειτουργίας of Philotheos Kokkinos. The text of the manuscript is collated with that from another manuscript, *Athos Agiou Pavlou 148*. This latter codex also perished thereafter in a fire. The variant readings from *Athos Agiou Pavlou 148* are presented in the form of footnotes at the end of each page of the excerpt and are written by the same hand that copied the main manuscript. The copyist used the civil Russian script, but was careful in preserving the manuscript text in every detail, including specific Old Slavonic letters and various diacritical marks. The system of using the diacritics in the manuscript differs significantly from the later Slavonic printed editions of liturgical books, and is consistent with the diacritical system of the Serbian manuscripts of the late 13th – 16th centuries, thoroughly studied by Vyacheslav Zagrebin.³⁸

I give the text as it is, making just a few small corrections.³⁹ I keep both systems of pagination: the numbering of folia from dossier No. 137 (these numbers are given in square brackets in bold script and are right-aligned), and the original numbering of the folia of *Athos Agiou Pavlou 149* (it was kept by the copyist; I give it as he did – in the round brackets in the text). The text is divided into lines exactly as in dossier No. 137 and not according to the original division in the

³⁷ As well as many of the other excerpts from dossier No. 137. It seems that enormous volumes of Dmitrievsky's *Oniscanie...* are in fact collections of excerpts, ordered by Dmitrievsky himself, but actually prepared by anonymous copyists.

³⁸ V. Zagrebin, «The Prosodic Diacritical Marks in the Medieval Serbian Manuscripts...» [original title in Russian: Загребин В. М. «Просодические надстрочные знаки в средневековых сербских рукописях: периодизация их употребления, форма и функции, генезис»], in: Idem, *Исследования памятников южнославянской и древнерусской письменности*, Moscow; Saint-Petersburg 2006, 27-100.

³⁹ **Fol. 178^r**: in line 7 of the Slavonic text I give нѣрѣквѣнцѣ instead of нѣрѣквѣнцѣ; in line 21 – вѣрѣху вѣобращенїѣ instead of вѣрѣхуth обрѣженїѣ; in lines 24-25 – зѣколѣнїѣ instead of зѣкалѣнїѣ; **fol. 178^v**: in line 26 of the Slavonic text I give ꙗѣ instead of ꙗѣ; **fol. 179^r**: in lines 10-11 of the Slavonic text I give вѣѣнїѣ instead of нѣѣнїѣ; in line 20 – тѣ instead of тѣ; **fol. 179^v**: in line 9 of the Slavonic text I give тѣмо instead of тѣме; three times I also inserted a letter, these instances are marked by square brackets in the text. Square brackets are also used when I add something to the Russian notes of Dmitrievsky or of the copyist. I am very grateful to Roman Krivko who read the Slavonic text and gave a number of important advises.

manuscript, nor according to the sense of the text. For the sake of convenience, I provide the English titles for the sections of the Diataxis; they are given in italics and are right-aligned. The footnotes made by the copyist are given in the end of each page of dossier No. 137.

THE EDITION

- Изъ сербскаго служебника XV^{то} в. N° 149 библиотеки
Св. Павла. [F. 178^r]
- (л. 1) Тѣ прѣходѣнтъ къ іерейо¹⁾ дѣакѣ дръже въ дѣсноѣ роуцѣ
стѣхѣръ, съ ѡрѣрьемъ. ѿ поклѣннѣвъ ѣму глѣвоу, глѣ блѣвн блѣкѣ
стѣхѣ съ ѡрѣремъ дѣако²⁾. блѣвнѣ бѣ нашѣ вѣсегдѣ нѣнѣ
н прѣно. тѣ. ѡходѣнтъ ѡсѣбѣ дѣакѣ въ ѣднѣноу стрѣну свѣтнѣнѣ-
5 ца ѿ блѣвнѣтъ въ стѣхѣръ мѣлѣсе сѣце³⁾. вѣзрѣдовѣсе дѣша
моѣ ѡ гнѣ. цѣловавѣ же ѡрѣрь^{х)} полѣгаѣтъ на лѣвемъ
рѣмѣ. нарѣквнѣнѣ налѣгаѣтъ на роуцѣ. на дѣсноѣ глѣ
дѣвнѣнѣца твѣо гнѣ прослѣвнѣсе въ крѣ(л. 1 об.)постн дѣ-
снаѣ роука твѣо⁴⁾ сѣкѣроу⁵⁾. на лѣвѣнѣ же: роуцѣ твѣнѣ
10 сѣтворнѣста мѣ н сѣздѣаста мѣ: пнѣ. зѣ. тѣ шѣ⁶⁾ сѣннѣнкѣ, ѿ
вѣнѣвѣтъ вѣдоу ѿ ѡмнѣвѣтъ роуцѣ. тако же ѿ дѣакѣнѣ.
таже шѣ въ проскомнѣдѣю нарѣжаѣтъ сѣдѣ. сѣдѣ ѡуѣвѣ.
блѣдѣцѣ полѣгаѣтъ на лѣвѣнѣ стрѣнѣ. ѣашѣ же на дѣ-
сноѣ, ѿ дрѣоуѣга съ нѣмнѣ. тѣ прѣшѣшѣ ѣрѣю твѣорнѣта
15 вѣкоупѣ поклѣннѣ, гѣ, прѣ проскѣмнѣднѣ. кѣжѣ глѣ. бѣ ѡцѣ-
(л. 2)стн мѣ грѣшнаѣдѣ. тѣ. ѿ сѣоупнѣ нѣ ѣсн ѡ клѣтѣвѣ закѣнѣнѣ.
ѣтнѣнѣ сн крѣвѣю, на крѣтѣ прѣгвѣждѣсе. н кѣпѣмъ прѣбѣдѣсе
вѣсѣмрѣтѣ нѣстѣоуѣнѣ ѣсн ѣлѣкѣ спѣсе нашѣ слава тѣвѣ. ~ глѣѣтъ
іерей⁷⁾ блѣвнѣ бѣ нашѣ вѣсегдѣ нѣнѣ.
20 Прѣскѣмнѣ. прѣмѣлѣ іерей⁸⁾ прѣсѣфѣоуѣ въ дѣсноуѣ
же сѣдѣ кѣпѣ. ѿ знѣмѣвнѣѣтъ ѿ нѣмѣ гѣ. вѣрѣхоу вѣвѣрѣжѣнѣ прѣ-
сѣфѣорнѣдѣ глѣ нѣсѣвѣмъ глѣсѣ⁹⁾. вѣспѣмнѣнѣнѣ гѣ бѣ н спѣдѣ на-
шѣо іѣ хѣ гѣ. ѿ блѣ вѣдрѣоужѣѣтъ кѣпѣ ѡдѣсноуѣ (л. 2 об.)
стрѣноуѣ вѣѡвѣрѣжѣнѣ. ѿ рѣже глѣѣтъ. Іѣко ѡвѣе на зѣ-
25 колѣнѣ вѣсе. на лѣвѣнѣ. Іѣко ѣгѣнѣцѣ прѣѣмо стрѣгоуѣоуѣ
ѣго вѣзгѣснѣ, тако нѣ ѡвѣрѣжаѣтъ ѡуѣстѣ своѣ. на гѣрнѣнѣ
стрѣнѣ знѣмѣнѣ глѣ. Вѣ смѣрѣвнѣнѣ соуѣ ѣго вѣзѣтѣсе.
на ѣѣтѣрѣтѣнѣ стрѣнѣ¹⁰⁾ Рѣдѣ же ѣгѣ кѣтѣ нѣспѣвѣстѣ. дѣакѣ
же на кѣмѣ рѣзѣннѣ глѣѣтъ Гоуѣ помѣннѣсе. дрѣжѣнѣ ѡрѣрь въ

*Vesture of
the Deacon**Beginning
of the
Prothesis
rite**The Ist
Prophora:**Cutting out
of the
Lamb*

30 деснѣици своенѣ, постѣ глѣ дѣакѣ възмѣнѣ вѣко. ѿеренѣ же вѣлѣжнѣвѣ
кѣпѣиѣ ѿ рѣверѣ дѣснѣиѣ стрѣниѣ просфѣрѣиѣ ѿ възмаѣ стѣиѣ хлѣвѣвѣ

Служ[ебникъ] библ. Св. Павла № 148: ¹⁾ кѣ сѣенникѣ; ²⁾ сѣенникѣ
же; ³⁾ такоже н сѣенникѣ; ⁴⁾ гнѣ; ⁵⁾ врагѣиѣ н множествомѣ славы твоеѣ
сѣтрѣльѣ иенѣ сѣпостатѣиѣ; ⁶⁾ Таже шѣ вѣ проскомндѣю. н омѣисѣ
нареждаѣ сѣенна. Стоѣ оубо блюдѣе, полагаѣтъ на лѣвѣиѣ стрѣнѣ.
Уашоу же, на деснонѣ. н дрѣугаѣ сѣ нмнѣ. Сѣенникѣ же прѣѣ епѣтрахнѣлѣ,
бѣвѣиѣ н цѣлуѣ иегѣ, глѣ. бѣвенѣ бѣ излѣвѣиѣ блѣтъ. Н възмѣ поѣасѣ н
бѣвѣиѣ иегѣ н глѣѣтъ. бѣвенѣ бѣ прѣпоѣасѣнѣ ме снѣлоу. нарѣоуѣвѣнѣе же
налагѣ на рѣкѣиѣ, глѣѣтъ прѣвѣдѣенѣсанное. Таже прѣѣмѣ фелѣнѣ,
бѣвѣиѣ иегѣ, глѣѣтъ одѣвѣиѣсе нмѣ. Сѣенникѣиѣ твоѣиѣ гнѣ оѣвѣкоуѣсе вѣ
прѣвѣдоуѣ. Таже прншѣшоу сѣенникѣиѣ ѿ оѣмѣившѣсе. тѣорѣтъ вѣкоуѣпѣ
поклѣнѣнѣиѣ гѣ прѣвѣ проскомндѣиѣ; ⁷⁾ сѣенникѣ; ⁸⁾ сѣенникѣ. вѣ лѣвѣюуѣ оубо
роуѣкоуѣ прѣсфѣоруѣ, вѣ десноуѣ же, стѣиѣ кѣпѣиѣ; ⁹⁾ ннѣсѣвѣмѣ глѣсѣ — нѣтъ;
¹⁰⁾ на долнѣе же.

^{*)} [In Dmitrievsky's hand:] о дѣакѣ не упоминаѣтъ при обла-
ченѣиѣ вѣ ркп. № 94, а посѣму и всѣ дѣѣствѣиѣиѣ относяѣиѣя кѣ нему
исключѣны.

глѣ (л. 3) сѣцѣ. ѿко възѣмѣиѣтсе ѿ възмѣиѣ жнѣвѣтъ иегѣ. ѿ по-
лѣжнѣтъ иегѣ възнѣкѣ вѣ стѣемѣ блѣдѣ. рѣкѣшоу дѣакѣноу ¹⁾ жрѣ-
тѣоу сѣтѣорѣиѣ стѣиѣ вѣко: ѿ рѣвѣ кѣрѣтѣоѣбрѣжно глѣ. Жрѣтсе
дѣгнѣцѣ бѣжнѣ, възѣмѣиѣнѣ грѣхѣиѣ мѣроу. за мѣрѣскѣиѣ жнѣвѣтъ
5 н сѣпѣиѣ. ѿ ѣбрѣиѣще дрѣоуѣгоу стрѣноу гѣрѣ, таже нмѣтъ
кѣрѣтъ тѣѣюуѣ аѣце иѣ топѣлѣ ѿ пѣрнѣтсе. тогда възнѣко да
положнѣтъ. за ѣже не сѣтѣорѣнтн ѿ нздѣола мокрѣ-
тн. бѣднѣ же иегѣ ѿ дѣсноуѣ стрѣноу стѣиѣиѣ кѣпѣемѣ (л. 3 об.)
глѣ. ѣднѣнѣ ѿ вѣоннѣ кѣпѣемѣ рѣверѣ иегѣ прѣбѣдѣ. ѿ дѣѣ
10 нздѣдѣ крѣвѣ ѿ вѣда, ѿ вѣдѣвѣиѣнѣ сѣвѣтѣлѣствоѣ. нстѣннѣно иѣ
сѣвѣтѣлѣство иегѣ. дѣакѣиѣ же вѣлѣнѣвѣѣтъ вѣ стѣоуѣ уѣшоу ѿ внѣ-
на, ѿ вѣдоуѣ вѣкоуѣпѣ. ѿ рѣкѣ прѣвѣжѣ кѣ иерѣю. бѣвѣиѣнѣ вѣко
ѿ прѣѣмѣ ѿ снѣхѣ бѣвѣвѣиѣ. иерѣиѣ же прѣѣмѣ вѣ роуѣцѣ
ѣторѣуѣ просфѣоруѣ глѣ. Вѣ ѣтѣ ѿ вѣ пѣмѣтъ прѣвѣбѣвѣнѣ-
15 ѿвѣнѣ вѣдѣе нѣше бѣце, н прѣнѣвѣдѣиѣнѣ мѣрѣиѣ ѣѣже мѣтѣвѣамѣ
н прѣнѣмнѣ гнѣ жрѣтѣоуѣ сѣю вѣ прѣвѣнѣиѣнѣ твоѣиѣ жрѣтѣвѣнѣиѣкѣ:
(л. 4) възмѣ ѣѣстѣ стѣиѣмѣ кѣпѣемѣ полагаѣѣтъ ѿ лѣвѣоуѣ
стѣоуѣ хлѣвѣа, на трѣтѣѣ ²⁾ глѣѣтъ. Снѣлоу ѣтѣнаагѣ, н жнѣво-
тѣорѣщѣаагѣ кѣрѣта. ѣтѣнѣиѣ бѣспѣлѣтнѣиѣ снѣлѣ нѣнѣнѣхѣ. ѣтѣнаагѣ

[F. 178^v]
*Sacrificing
the Lamb*

*Prepara-
tion of the
Chalice*

*The 2nd
Prospora:
Commem-
oration of
the Mother
of God*

*The 3rd
Prospora:
Commem-
oration of
the Saints*

- 20 н славнаагò прѣрка прѣче крѣпа іѡанна. Стѣн сла-
внѣн ѣ всѣхвалѣнѣн апла. Нже въ стхѣ ѡцѣ нашѣн іерархъ
васнліа вѣлнкаагò. грїгорїа бгослова. іоанна зладустаагò.
афанасїа н крїпа. ннколн. нже въ мурѣ. савзы сръбска-
аго (л. 4 об.) н всѣ стѣн іерархъ. Стго апла н прѣвомучннка,
25 а̀рхідаіакона стѣфа. Стзѣн вѣлнкомнн гѣвгїа, днмїтрїа,
ѳеѡрѣ н всѣ стзѣн. ³⁾ прѣвннѣн н бгонѡсннѣн ѡцѣ нашѣн, а̀нѳо-
нїа, ѐнѳїмїа, савзы, ѡноуфрїа • а̀фанасїа а̀ѳонскаагò.
сѣмбона сръбскаагò, всѣ прѣвннхѣ ѡцѣ нашѣн⁴⁾. Стѣн вѣ-
србрннѣн н ѡдтворѣцѣ квзѣн н дамїана, пннтелѣнїмона
30 н всѣ всрбрнннкъ. Стхѣ н правѣдннѣн бгѡѡцѣ іѡакїма
н анна н стго ѣмоу же ѐ днѣ н всѣ (л. 5) стхѣ, нхже мѣамн
посѣтн на бѣ :- Н тако вѣзѣм ѣестѣ полагаѣетѣ на тоѣже
странѣ лѣвон. долоу же н прѡуеє полагаѣетѣ порѣдоу.
тѣ вѣзѣм н дрѡугу прѡсфурѣ глїѣ • ѡ всѣко епїкпствѣ прѣ-
35 вославнѣ, ѡ епїкпѣ нашѣмѣ імѣ • ѡ ѡтнѣ прѣзвѣтѣрствѣ, ѣже

*The 4th
Prophora:
Commem-
oration of
the Living*

¹⁾ даіакону. Пожрн вѣко. н рѣжетѣ его; ²⁾ на трѣтїен прѡсфорѣ; ³⁾ стѣхѣ
мнннкъ; ⁴⁾ ѡцѣ нашѣн — нѣтъ.

- ѡ хѣ слоужбѣ. ѡ всѣмѣ іерейскоу ѡнну. благоутннѣн н бгѡхрѣнн-
мнѣн црн нашѣн. ѡ рабѣ бжїемѣ нмѣ нгоумѣне н ѡ брѣтїаха
нашѣн, сзслоужбѣннцѣ • прѣсвѣтѣрѣ даіаконѣ н всѣн (л. 5 об.)
братн нашн, нхже прнзѡвѣ въ твоє прнѡвѣщенїе, за твоє
5 блгосрѣдїе всѣлгѣнн вѣкѡ. тѣ глїѣ. нхже нмѣтъ по [н]мѣннн
жнвнѣн: н тако вѣзѣмѣтъ ѣестѣ на дрѡугон прѡсфурѣ н глїѣтъ.
ѡ блжѣннѣн пѣмѣтн, н ѡстаѣлїе[н]н грѣховѣ блжѣнннн ктї-
торѣ стѣн ѡвѣтѣлн сѣн. тѣ помннѣетѣ постаѣлѣшаго
а̀рхїереа • н нннн нхже нмѣтъ по [н]мѣннн оу̀сѣпшнѣ, н на
10 конѣ глїѣтъ, снцѣ ѡ всѣ нже въ надѣжн вскрѣсѣнїа, н жнзны вѣ
ѡнїе, н твоєгò прнѡвѣщенїа (л. 6) оу̀сѣпшнѣ н прѣвославннѣн
ѡцѣ н брѣтн нашн ѡлѣѡлюбѣе гн н вѣзѣмѣтъ ѣестѣ. даіакон
же прїѣмѣѣ прѡсфурѣ, н стѡє копїе глїѣ снцѣ • Помѣннн
гн н моє недѡннствѡ по мнѡжѣству цїѣдрѡтѣ твоѣн, н прѡ-
15 стн мн всѣко прѣгрѣшенїе, вѡлнѡе же н неволнѡе. тѣ по-
мннѣѣ н тѣ. нхже помннѣетѣ жнвнѣн. на дрѡугон прѡсфурѣ

[F. 179^r]

*The 5th
prophora:
Com-
memoration
of the Dead*

*The Two
Deaconal
Prophoras:
Com-
memoration
of the Deacon
himself,
the Living*

- оу́спши́ӣ. та́коже по́лагаєть ѱестн ѿ до́лнїе стра́нн стго
 хлѣ́ба, ꙗ́коже і́ерен̄. вѣ́змь мѣ́тлыцу съвѣ́раєть њже въ стѣ́мь
 блю́дѣ (л. 6 об.) ѿ њже до́лу по́ стїи хлѣ́ ꙗ́коже лежатн ¹⁾
- 20 въ ствѣ́рженїӣ. њ не прїкóсноутнсе њмь у́тò. та́. вѣ́змь кá-
 днѣ́ннцѣ съ фї́мїанѡ̄ њ глїєть къ і́ерею • бѣ́вн вѣ́кѡ̄. та́
 го́у помл̄нмсе і́ерен̄ м̄ ка́днлоӯ.
 Бѣ́твнла слóӯжба њже въ стѣ́х ѡ́ца̄ на́шего, і́ѡ̄
 злоу́стаа̄. мѣ́тва̄ на̄ ка́днлѡ̄.
- 25 ка́днло тн прїно́снмь хѣ́ бѣ́ на́шь въ вѣ́ннѡ блгоу́ха́нїа
 ѣ́же прїемъ въ прѣ́внїӣ њ мї́сльнїӣ своѡ̄ жртьвннкъ съспóслзї
 на̄ бѣ́гть (л. 7) прѣ́стго твоєгò дѣ́ха. дї́акѡ̄. го́у помл̄нмсе.
 і́ерен̄²⁾ покáдн̄ звѣ́зды́цу. по́лагає на̄ стѣ́мь хлѣ́бомь глїє̄ •
 њ прїшї́шїӣ звѣ́зда, стѣ́ врѣ́хӯ њдѣ́же въ ѡ́трѡ́че дї́акѡ̄.
- 30 го́у помл̄нмсе. і́ерен̄³⁾ покáдн̄тѣ прѣ́вїӣ покрѡ́вѣ̄ њ покрѡ́-
 ваєть стїӣ хлѣ́бь глїє̄. гѣ́ вы́щрнсе, њ въ блгоу́спїе ѡ́блѣ́чесе (...
 — весь [Пс])
 (л. 7 об.) дї́акѡ̄. го́у по́. покрѡ́вї вѣ́ко. і́ерен̄⁴⁾ покáдн̄ ѣ́тòрїӣ
 покрѡ́вїцѣ • покрѣ́ває стго́ю у́ашоӯ глїє̄ • покрѡ́вї нѣ́са до́ро-
 дѣ́тѣ твоа̄ хѣ́ њ хвѣ́лн твоєє њсплѣ́ннсе землїа̄. дї́акѡ̄.
- 35 го́у помл̄н̄. покрѡ́вї вѣ́кò. і́ерен̄ покáдн̄ (л. 8) трѣ́тїӣ покрѡ́вїцѣ.
 њже і́є дї́ерѣ. покрѡ́ваєть ѡ́боа̄ глїє̄ • покрѡ́вї нѣ́са кро́во̄
 крѡ́лоӯ твоєю. ѡ́жензї ѿ на̄ вса́кого вра́га н соу́поста̄-

and the Dead

Arranging
the extracted
Particles on
the DiscsThe Incense
PrayerThe Rite of
Covering the
Gifts

¹⁾ ꙗ́коже лежатн въ съблюденїӣ н оу́вѣ́рженїӣ н не испадноутн у́тò. та́же вѣ́змь каднѣ́ннцоӯ н фї́мїамъ вѣ́ло́жнвъ въ ню, гааголеть къ і́ерею • бѣ́вн вѣ́ко каднло. та́ го́у помолнмсе; ²⁾ сцѣ́нннкъ; ³⁾ сцѣ́нннкъ; ⁴⁾ сцѣ́нннкъ.

та. оу́мнрн на́шоӯ жн́знь гн̄. помл̄оун̄ на̄ н мѡ́рь своѡ̄.
 стїӣ дї́ше на́ше. ꙗ́ко блгъ њ чл̄колю́бїцѣ. та́. свѣ́завшїа
 ѡ́ба рѣ́цѣ своѡ̄ њ поклòнїшасе съ гóвѣ́нїе. глїє́та. бѣ́нъ бѣ́, њже
 снїцѣ њзвòлнвїӣ вѣ́сєгда ннїа̄ њ п̄рно.

[F. 179^v]

A bow

- 5 м̄ ѿ прѣ́ложенн стнмн дѣ́рмн :~
 гн̄ бѣ́ на́шь њже нвѣ́нїӣ хлѣ́бь пнцѣ́ӯ всѣ́мъ мѡ́рь
 гл̄ на́шего (л. 8 об.) і́ѡ̄ хл̄. послáвїӣ спса̄ (... вся [МОЛИТВА])
 посѣ́. покáдн̄тѣ сѣ́ і́ерен̄ прѣ́ло́женїе (л. 9) њ твòрнть
 ѡ́поӯ та́мо. њ та́ко вѣ́змь дї́аконъ ка́днлѣ́ннцоӯ. њ кá-

The Prayer
of the
ProthesisApolysis and
Incensation

