

D

*Death, Illness,
Body and Soul in Written
and Visual Culture in
Byzantium and Late
Medieval Balkans*

Edited by Vlada Stanković

Edition *Humans and Society in Times of Crisis*

*Death, Illness, Body and Soul
in Written and Visual Culture in Byzantium
and Late Medieval Balkans*
Edited by Vlada Stanković
Belgrade 2021

Publisher

University of Belgrade – Faculty of Philosophy
Čika Ljubina 18–20, Beograd 11000, Srbija
www.f.bg.ac.rs

For the publisher

Prof. Dr. Miomir Despotović
Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy

Referees

Ivan Biliarsky,
Institute of Historical Research,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia
Nina Gagova,
Institute for Literature,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia
Elissaveta Moussakova,
National Academy of Arts, Sofia
Alexandar Nikolov,
University of Sofia “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Sofia
Bisserka Penkova,
Institute of Art Studies,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia
Radivoj Radić,
University of Belgrade – Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade
Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova,
Institute for Bulgarian Language,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia

Cover art and design by

Ivana Zoranović

Set by

Dosije studio, Belgrade

Printed by

JP Službeni glasnik

Print run

200

ISBN 978-86-6427-190-5

This collection of papers was created as part of the scientific research project
Humans and Society in Times of Crisis, which was financed
by the University of Belgrade – Faculty of Philosophy.

CONTENTS

Part one

UNDERSTANDING DEATH AND AFTERLIFE, BYZANTIUM AND SERBIA

- 9 | *Vlada Stanković*
Introduction to the volume
Death in Byzantium. Reflecting on the Byzantine Concept
of Death and Its Place in the Mentality and Identity
of the Byzantines
- 39 | *Jelena Erdeljan*
On Death and Dying in Medieval Serbia.
Written Sources and Visual Culture
- 53 | *Tatjana Subotin-Golubović*
Two Collections of Paraklesis in the Context of Their Time
of Creation (First Half – Middle of the 15th Century)

Part two

DEATH, ILLNESS, BODY AND SOUL: TESTIMONIES

- 69 | *Vlada Stanković*
“There is No Living Man Who Will Not See Death”.
A Case Study on Byzantine Thoughts about Life, Death, and
Afterlife: Testaments of Symbatios Pakourianos and His Widow,
the Nun Maria
- 77 | *Dragoljub Marjanović*
Illness – God’s *Oikonomia* as Displayed in Four Homilies of
Gregory Palamas and the Hymnographic Triptych by
Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos
- 91 | *Ljubica Vinulović*
Poems and Votive Gifts of the Nun Jefimija
as an Expression of Human Tragedy

- 113 | *Jakov Đorđević*
Lessening the Dread of the Hour of Death:
Introductory Miniatures in the Two Late Medieval Slavic Psalters
- 131 | *Nikola Piperski*
The Origin of the Iconography of the Miraculous Return of
Sight to Stefan Dečanski by St. Nicholas of Myra

Tatjana Subotin-Golubović*

TWO COLLECTIONS OF PARAKLESIS IN THE CONTEXT OF THEIR TIME OF CREATION (First Half – Middle of the 15th Century)

Abstract: Two collections of paraklesis were produced in Serbian scriptoria during the first half of the 15th century. The paraklesis is a short service that is not tied to a certain date but is used at times of need when an individual or a society is praying for help from the divine forces. This text analyses two manuscripts from the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church; the first belongs to the collection of Radoslav Grujić (3-I-3) and was created in the first years of the 15th century. The second manuscript belongs to the basic collection of manuscripts of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church (no. 34), and is dated to the middle of the same century, produced in Smederevo. This text considers the reasons for the formation of two such collections and their purpose and function.

Key words: Paraklesis, collection, 15th century, Jefimija, Radič, Županjevac, Stefan Domestik, Smederevo

The second half of the 14th century witnessed a change in the general situation in the Balkans. The breakup of the Serbian state that took place after the death of emperor Stefan Uroš V (d. 1371), the last ruler of the Nemanide dynasty, was the turning point that impacted not only the political scene in Serbian lands, but resulted also in a changed experience in all walks of life. Moreover, that same year saw the first large scale clash between the Serbs and their new enemy – the Turks who appeared in the Balkans. These crucial events proved that a time of unrest had begun, a time of uncertainty and fear before the coming changes which were

* Tatjana Subotin-Golubović is professor of Old Church Slavonic and Medieval Slavic Literature at the Department of History, University of Belgrade – Faculty of Philosophy. tsubotin@f.bg.ac.rs

bringing along unforeseeable perils. The year 7000 (1492) was approaching and, according to an apocryphal prophecy of Solomon, the end of the world was expected. Fear of the unknown *other century* that was to follow this dramatic event left deep imprints on the perceptions of the educated people of the era. Changes in the political and social life also influenced the spiritual life of the Serbian people. However paradoxical it may seem, in the last three decades of the 14th and the first half of the 15th century Serbian literary production did not stagnate nor disappear, quite the contrary, this was a time of production of works of the highest artistic merit.

The chronological framework defined by the title of this text witnessed the production of two collections of *paraklesis* that are a reflection of the time of their creation and the inner spiritual life of the educated men. However, before we proceed with the presentation of the two mentioned collections, we need to say a few words about the *paraklesis* as a specific form of hymnographic compilation. Over the last couple of years, researchers have focused their attention on a subject that had previously been poorly investigated – namely on the *paraklesis* as a specific type of service of limited function, as well as on the collections containing them. (Убипарип & Тријић, 2010; Убипарип & Тријић, 2015; Суботин–Голубовић, 2018.) The *paraklesis* is a particular type of service dedicated to a saint which, as opposed to services found in the *menaion*, is not tied to a particular date but is sung when the need arises (Трифунковић, 1990², pp. 155–156). It is already the Slavic name, *moleban*, that reflects precisely the Greek term associated with this sort of service – *παράκλησις*. In the Serbian medieval written sources we come across both names – *moleban* and *paraklesis*. The *paraklesis* is a prayer addressing a selected saint who is believed to have the power to answer the prayers of the petitioner. This service can be sung either in or outside the church, at any given time of the day and throughout the year, depending on the circumstances and when the need arises. The *moleban* belongs firstly to the domain of private devotion and by its intercession the petitioner can seek protection in times of natural disasters, earthquakes, hunger, external enemy attacks or civil strife – in times of such terrifying events which are beyond the control of any individual. The only thing to be done is for that individual to address the higher powers in hope of receiving shelter from the coming peril. *Parakleses* are composed in honor of those saints who are believed to be able to offer help and protection in times of the above mentioned unfortuitous events. The origins of this service are not entirely clear. The first to draw scholarly attention to their specific use was our colleague from Bulgaria, Stefan Kožuharov, who associated their appearance in the Slavic world with the literary circle of patriarch Euthymios of Trnovo and

his followers, and proposed hesychasm as the crucial force behind their spiritual orientation (Кожухаров, 1974). He managed to identify two Bulgarian parakleses devoted to the venerable Paraskeve, one the work of monk Makarios and the other of an anonymous hymnographer (Кожухаров, 1974, p. 293). Philoteos Kokkinos, patriarch of Constantinople (1353–1354/5 and 1364–1376), reformer of liturgical practice and prolific author, composed a number of canons which included a petitioning tone typical of parakleses. The hymnographic works of Philoteos which include a tone of personal prayer could have served as a model for later authors of Slavonic parakleses. Slavonic translations of hymnographic compositions of the Constantinopolitan patriarch Philoteos Kokkinos appeared quite early on, at practically the same time. There is ground to assume that these translations were produced in Chilandar itself. In the Chilandar manuscript № 342 (1364/1374) we find *Supplicatory Canon to Jesus Christ and the Mother of God* (against drought), while manuscript № 378 (older part of a manuscript from the first quarter of the 14th century) from the same collection – *Supplicatory Canon to Jesus Christ* and two prayers (1. against drought, strong winds and barbarian attacks; 2. in the case of a terrible and sudden death) (Богдановић, 1978, pp. 139–140, 149; Суботин–Голубовић, 2004, pp. 247–272.). Elements of petitioning address are to be found in the earliest works of the Serbian hymnographer, Teodosije; Đorđe Sp. Radojičić already noted them in the *Joint Canon to Sts. Simeon and Sava* (of the fourth mode) (Радочић, 1956, pp. 137–155.). That indicates that the appearance of parakleses as we know them from written sources of the 14th – 15th centuries had their predecessors in some sort of preparatory period that saw the composition of texts which heralded the creation and the line of development of this type of short services that were independent of the general liturgical calendar.

The structure of the *paraklesis* is stable; it opens with Psalm 142 followed by a troparion and a litany. The canon is the central part of the service and a kondakion and an oikos are then added after the sixth ode. After the canon there are three sticheira, and the entire service ends with a sticherion of *слава и ниња* (*δόξα καί νύνη*). The parakleses that are a part of the two collections we are discussing in this text include full evangelical readings (and not just the indications) which thus provide them with a completeness and a certain self-sustainability. The anonymous authors of the parakleses were obviously well informed of the cults of the saints, their *vitae* and their miracles. Existing texts taken from certain hymnographic collections, mostly menaia and oktoechos (for parakleses dedicated to the Virgin) are inserted into these services. Naturally, this does not preclude the possibility that in certain cases and for special purposes entirely new and original texts are composed for parakleses dedicated to a given saint.

Although a series of different parakleses are to be found mostly in euchologia,¹ psalters with commentaries and horologia, two collections with a larger number of parakleses dedicated to different types of saints were put together in the first half of the 15th century. Both manuscripts are kept today at the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Belgrade. The older manuscript belongs to the collection of Radoslav Grujić and carries the signature 3-I-3; judging by the watermarks on the paper, it was copied around 1395/1405. The history of this book is interesting. According to an inscription, it was acquired by the monk Samuilo in region of Sirinić near Prizren and brought to the monastery of Devič (Пузовић, 2015, p. 107). After 1936, the manuscript was moved from the monastery to Belgrade by Radoslav Grujić for the purpose of its study. During World War II the book was in Belgrade and after the war, as part of the group of manuscripts collected by Grujić, it became a part of the collection of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church. Unfortunately, there is no inscription to indicate the place of production of this manuscript but its contents could, in our opinion, be useful in the process of determining the place of its making. Relying on the method of attribution, Lucija Cernić has identified its scribe as Radič who was undoubtedly employed at the Lazarević court office. So far, we know that Radič was the scribe who wrote the charter issued on August 1st, 1398 by princess Milica (the nun Eugenia) to the monastery of Chilandar (kept today at the Laura of St. Athanasios on Athos), as well as two books – the already mentioned collection of parakleses and a Pentecostarion from 1408. The Pentecostarion was written for despot Stefan Lazarević² (Цернић, 1981, p. 358.). Radič's activity as a scribe is tied to Županjevac in the region of Levač where, at precisely the time of his activities there, princess Milica and her court had resided. Archaeological excavations carried out in the village of Županjevac have uncovered the ruins of a medieval fortification and a monastery³ (Рашковић & Грковић, 2014, p. 329).

In view of these facts, we believe that the creation of the collection of Parakleses from the Grujić collection should be associated with the princess Milica, Jefimija and their close circle of which scribe Radič was a

1 Thus in Chilandar manuscript no. 378, an euchologion from the 15th century, there are parakleses dedicated to St. Nicholas, the holy prophet Elijah, megalomartyr George, Christ, the asomatoi (Бордановић, 1978, p. 149).

2 The manuscript is kept in the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg (F I 583).

3 It is assumed that princess Milica resided in Županjevac during the course of construction of her endowment – the monastery of Ljubostinja, which is also located in the region of Levač. The same region is also the site of the monastery of Kalenić, raised by protovestiaris Bogdan. This speaks of the high level of involvement of the nobility close to the ruling house of Lazarević in the area in question.

member. Indicative in this vein are the very contents of the manuscript in question. The first of a series of its parakleses is dedicated to the venerable Sava and Symeon, and Teodosije's *Joint Canon to Sts. Simeon and Sava* (of the fourth mode) was used in the process of its making (Мошин, 1962, p. 220; Убипарип & Тријић, 2010, pp. 49–50). A brief instruction regarding the occasions of its singing is inserted into the paraklesis text: (р. 6) аште ли хоштеши пѣти параклис(ь) градоу . рекше с(вѣ)тон ѡбнтѣли . въ нѣиже живеши . ѡт напастн приключъши се еи . (р. ба) ѡште молиш се и ѡ еже съхранити се с(вѣ)тон ѡбнтѣлн сен, и всакомоу градоу и странѣ . ѡт гл(а)да, гоубнтельства . троуса . потопа, огнѣа . ѡще молиш се и ѡ еже съхранити се с(вѣ)тон ѡбнтѣлн сен, и всакомоу градоу и странѣ . ѡ гл(а)да, гоубнтел'ства . троуса . потопа, огнѣа мѣа . и нашьствнѣа иноплемѣн'никъ . и междоусобныѣ рати . и ѡ еже м(н)л(о)стивоу . и кроткоу, и тнхоу . и бл(а)гопрѣмѣн'ноу быти . бл(а)гомоу и члов(ѣ)колюбецоу б(ог)оу ѡ грѣсѣхъ нашихъ . ѡвратити ѡ нас(ь) належащаго праведнааго его прѣщенѣа . и помилувати нас(ь) (...).⁴

The following paraklesis is dedicated to the holy megalomartyr Georgios. There we find the full text of Psalm 50; canon of the second mode (б(о)ж(ь)ствною вѣроу и любовноу призывающе те) is taken from the minaion service for April 23rd (May 6th). The paraklesis of Saint Demetrios includes a canon of the fourth mode (inc. б(о)ж(ь)ствнымъ моу'чениа вѣн'цем(ь)), the lection from Luke follows the sixth ode. The same *katabasis* is repeated in each ode of the canon (сп(а)си ѡ вѣдъ рабы своѣ страсотрѣп'те . тако вси съ б(о)го)мъ к' тебѣ прибегаемъ тако къ топлому застоупникоу и скоромоу помощ'никоу.).

A special place among those parakleses is assigned to that dedicated to the Forty Holy Martyr of Sebastea. The reasons behind the composition of a paraklesis dedicated to these saints should perhaps be sought in the lines of Jefimija's *Encomium of Holy Prince Lazar* (Грковић, 1993, p. 93). Addressing Lazar, Jefimija beseeches him to pray to God for his people together with the assembly of holy martyrs:

Gather the assembly of your resopendents in dialogue,
the holy martyrs,
and with them all pray to God,
who has exalted you in celebration:
inform Georgios, move Demetrios,
convince the Theodores, take Merkurios and Prokopios,
and leave not behind the forty martyrs of Sebastea,
and in their martyrdom (in Asia Minor)
your beloved children are at war,
prince Stefan and Vuk (...).⁵

4 We pointed out the cases of attack of external enemies and civil strife because they were aspects of everyday life at that time.

5 Larrington, 1995, p. 251.

Regardless of the fact that Jefimija's text belongs to the genre of *encomium* by nature and literary characteristics, the choice of saints Lazar addresses is indicative – they all belong to the category of holy warriors and it is quite clear that Jefimija chose them not only to underline Lazar's warrior image, but also to show that he is addressing those among the saints who belong to the same rank as he does. At the same time this is an allusion to all those warriors who died alongside Lazar, thus pointing out the fact that they had all died as martyrs of the True Faith, just as all the listed holy warriors had died for their faith in the first centuries of Christianity, suffering cruel persecution. The mention of Lazar's sons, Stefan and Vuk, who at that time, in 1402, were in Asia Minor and their association with Roman soldiers who were martyred for their faith in times of persecution of Christians in the days of emperor Licinius, alludes to the predicament of Lazar's sons who were forced to make war on the side of an infidel ruler. It is thus fully understandable why the collection of parakleses include one dedicated to the holy martyrs of Sebastea. It is a reflection of the actual historical circumstances and its composition was by no means an act of chance but a result of deep contemplation. Although there can be no outright claims, it does appear that the author of this paraklesis followed the line of Jefimija's thinking and this would possibly make it yet another argument in favor of the idea that the entire collection was conceptualized among members of princess Milica's circle and with the assistance of her close associate and cousin Jefimija.

The next paraklesis is dedicated to Saint Nicholas based on canon of the second mode which is sung on Thursdays (from the Octoechos) (inc. *всегда в(о)ж(ь)ственому прѣстолю прѣдстою николае ...*).⁶ In hagiographic sources and hymnographic material Saint Nicholas appears as a universal protector and aide in any trouble which makes him a fit companion of those who offer selfless help to the afflicted and the grieving (Anrich, 1913; Суботин–Голубовић, 2013; Атанасова, 2015.). The choice of canon for this paraklesis is also understandable – canons from the Octoechos are paralytic in nature and thus better suited for the paraklesis than canons from menaion services to Saint Nicholas.

As somewhat of a surprise, next we find a paraklesis to the venerable fathers Onouphrios and Peter the Athonite, celebrated in menaia on June 12th.⁷ Although they are two different saints, in this paraklesis they are

6 In medieval times there were several versions of the oktoichos. In one of them, present in the Serbian manuscript tradition, Thursday was a day dedicated to Saint Nicholas of Myra: Йовчева, 2007, 51.

7 Onouphrios lived in ascesis in the desert of Upper Egypt in the 5th century. Peter the Athonite was a professional soldier. He was taken captive by the Arabs and spent a long time in captivity in the city of Amara on the Euphrates. Having regained his freedom, he reached Athos where he lived as a hermit. He died there in 734.

celebrated in a joint i.e. combined canon of the fourth mode. The odes of the canon that served for the making of this paraklesis are made up of troparia taken from the separate canons to Onouphrios and Peter. This approach lies at the basis of the composition of the combined canon which, by typological standards, was present already in the archaic Serbian *menaia* of the 13th century. At the time of creation of the paraklesis dedicated to the two hermits, the above mentioned compositional approach had long been abandoned. However, the author was obviously well informed of the archaic tradition and used it as a model to accommodate his needs. Thus, for example, the first ode comprises of two troparia dedicated to Onouphrios and one to Peter;⁸ the fourth ode – two troparia for Onouphrios and one for Peter; the fifth – one troparion for Onouphrios and two for Peter, etc. Although the lives of the two saints developed along somewhat different paths, both ended their lives as hermits. In this case also Peter was chosen very knowingly – as a soldier who retreated from this world after many challenging temptations. In this case, Peter and Onouphrios are representatives of the ranks of the holy anachoretēs. The composition of this paraklesis could have been shaped under the influence of someone who had a deep spiritual and personal connection with Athos. Once again, we have Jefimija in mind, whose father and infant son were buried in Chilandar (Трифуновић 1983; Шпадијер 2014, pp. 119–124).

The paraklesis dedicated to the venerable Mary of Egypt is the greatest surprise of the collection.⁹ It is, at least at this moment, the only known paraklesis dedicated to this saint to be found in the Serbian literary tradition. The paraklesis is based on the canon of the fourth mode from the *menaion* service. Should we adhere to the assumption that the creation of the entire manuscript is related to the circle of people close to princess Milica, it is highly possible that Mary of Egypt, a harlot who became a recluse, was selected by the patron(s) of this collection of parakleses (Milica and/or Jefimija) who probably believed that women who bore such a great sacrifice in their day should also find some sort of mention. It may sound unusual, but Mary of Egypt was a model of a woman who rose to saintliness by the sheer strength of her asceticism (Шпадијер, 1992, p. 177). According to tradition, a great number of noble women whose husbands had died alongside Lazar also took their monastic vows in Županjevac, together with Milica, and thus forged a sisterhood of a kind, the members of which were united in the tragedy that befell them.

The paraklesis dedicated to the holy hieromartyr Eleutherios (celebrated on December 15th) is based on the canon of the first mode from

8 The manuscript is damaged and is missing a leaf in this spot, the canon continues only with the fourth ode.

9 Mary of Egypt is celebrated on April 1st.

the menaion service. The choice of Eleutherios also carries a strong message of martyrdom for the faith. Eleutherios was born in Rome and display such an intensity in professing the faith that he was ordained as bishop of Illyricum with a see in Valona at a tender age of twenty. He was martyred around the year 120 AD in Rome, in the days of emperor Hadrian.

The contents of this collection of parakleses is rounded off with *Supplicatory Canon to emperor and despot* and the acronym indicates the name of its author – Jefrem.¹⁰ Jefrem's canon was reworked so that a number of troparia speak of the despot – instead of the emperor. Vladimir Mošin was the first to identify the text and he pointed out that it was a later adaptation of Jefrem's composition (Мошин, 1962, pp. 219–234.). Biljana Jovanović-Stipčević is of the opinion that it was Radić himself who adapted Jefrem's canon (Јовановић–Стипчевић, 1980, p. 24.). We should point out that *Supplicatory paraklesis to despot Stefan* is the only text in this collection which includes two canons – Jefrem's and the canon of the Virgin from the Octoechos (eighth mode). Whatsmore, it is the only one dedicated to a living man and ruler – despot Stefan. This detail goes to underline our opinion that the entire manuscript was conceptualized among members of the circle around princess Milica, and probably with her own personal contribution. Previous research has already, somewhat shily, stated that despot Stefan could have been the patron of this collection (Убипарип & Тријић, 2015, p. 85). However, it appears to us that it is precisely the presence of Jefrem's adapted canon that stands in opposition to such an assumption – the despot would hardly have personally required that the canon be adapted and then added to the manuscript.

The other, younger collection of parakleses was copied in 1456 and is kept today in the basic collection of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, catalogued under the no. 34. It was already Dimitrije Bogdanović who noted that this manuscript, along with manuscript no. 50 from the same collection, comprises a single codicological unit (Богдановић, 1982, p. 91). Insight into the structures of the two manuscripts shows that this is a *Psalter with commentaries*; the collection of parakleses is actually part of the second half of the manuscript (Убипарип & Тријић, 2015, p. 71). We also know the name of the scribe – Stefan Domestik.¹¹ It was he who, most probably, conceptualized this collection of parakleses. Before it reached the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, this manuscript was kept in the monastery of Krušedol and had, most probably, once been a part of

10 The monk Jefrem composed the *Канон за цара* in the days of emperor Uroš V (r. 1355–1371).

11 The attribute Domestik by the name of the scribe proves that he was a member of the higher clergy and the chaplain of the church of the Annunciation in Smedrevo, the see of the metropolitan. Apart from being educated in music, Stefan was also a good and experienced scribe, as attested by the manuscripts he copied (Цернић, 1968, pp. 61–83.).

the library of Serbian despots, transferred after the fall of Smederevo to their newly founded monastery.¹²

Following the death of despot Stefan and the returning of his capital, Belgrade, to the Hungarians in 1427, it was necessary to secure a new center for the Serbian state. The construction of Smederevo, the capital of the Despotate, began in 1428 at the place where the River Jezava flows into the Danube. The opening words of the study on Smederevo written by the archaeologist Marko Popović render a precise image of the epoch: „This renowned fortification represented the last and the best example of Serbian military architecture. It was constructed in a desperate, but unsuccessful, attempt to preserve the state in the face of Turkish invasion“ (Поповић, 2013, p. 5). The Turks managed to take the city already in 1439 because it was still not prepared to defend itself. In accordance with the peace treaty of 1444, they returned it to despot Đurađ. The Turks attacked again in 1454 but the city managed to defend itself. Finally, on June 20th, 1459, Smederevo surrendered to the Turks. In the first thirty years of its existence, the city survived a number of dramatic moments, and uncertainty and fear marked the everyday life of its inhabitants. One event left a particular imprint on the life of Smederevo in the final years prior to its fall. Following a series of difficulties that had befallen the city, despot Đurađ managed to find a way to secure a new holy protector for his capital. He succeeded in acquiring the relics of the holy apostle Luke and paid an exorbitant sum of 30,000 ducats for them.

Luke's relics were expected to provide protection and deliverance in the face of imminent danger and their translation was seen as a ray of hope that miracles were indeed possible. A new feast was established in honor of this event – January 12th was celebrated as the day of the translation of the relics of St. Luke to Smederevo and their deposition in the church of the Annunciation, the see of the metropolitan. The confirmed date of the translation, January 12th, 1453, indicates the *terminus ante quem* for the construction and consecration of the church. An entire corpus of prose and hymnographic texts has been created in honor of this event. The *adventus* of the relics to Smederevo is described in two prose texts¹³ (Rugarac, 1868, pp. 178–186; Павловић, 1882, pp. 70–100; СубОТИН–ГОЛУБОВИЋ, 2000, pp. 167–178). A special service was composed in honor of the new-

12 The old signature of this manuscript was Krušedol Ђ V 1 (Петковић, 1914, p. 48.). Krušedol monastery was founded by bishop Maksim Branković between 1509 and 1516. He was the grandson of despot Đurađ Branković. He was christened Đorđe and was born in 1461. After the Ottoman conquest of Belgrade the see of the metropolitan of Belgrade was moved to Krušedol and bishop Maksim was at its head.

13 Rugarac published the text which is found in manuscript no. 165 of the Patriarchal Library. Pavlović published a somewhat different version found in slave 46 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.

ly established feast of the translation of the relics of the apostle Luke to Smederevo, as well as two parakleses¹⁴ (Суботин-Голубовић, 1998, pp. 133–157; Суботин-Голубовић, 2011, pp. 99–116). The acquisition of such a powerful protector certainly contributed to a certain sense of security but it did not quiet down the omnipresent dread of the inhabitants of Smederevo. In view of the more recent approaches to the study of the effect of the presence of holy relics on the status of a given church or the broader community, we could consider the possibility that the intended purpose of the translation of such highly revered relics was to transform the newly founded city into a new sacred space that would grant protection to all who resided in it. Alexei Lidov has discussed this phenomenon and his words could also apply to this Serbian case in point: „It has been understood that the most significant aspect of relics and miraculous icons was the role they played in the creation of particular sacred spaces. In many cases relics and venerable icons were established as a core, a kind of pivot in the forming of a concrete spatial environment.“ (Lidov, 2007, pp. 135–136.)

Judging by the water marks, the Smederevo collection of parakleses was created around the year 1456, three years after the adventus of the relics of St. Luke to the city and three years before its final fall into Turkish hands. It opens with the Akathistos to the Holy Virgin (Friday vespers of the fifth week of Lent), and continues with a series of parakleses dedicated to Christ, the *asomatoi* powers, John the Forerunner, holy apostles Peter and Paul, prophet Elijah, protomartyr Stephen, megalomartyr Georgios, megalomartyr Demetrios, John Chrysostomos, Saint Nicholas, Saints Symeon and Sava, Saint Ephraim the Syriac. The final paraklesis of the collection is dedicated to the apostle Luke, an original composition of an anonymous Serbian hymnographer with a canon of the eighth mode. The first and last compositions of this collection of parakleses are key to understanding the nature of this manuscript. The Virgin was the protectress of Constantinople. The Akathistos hymn, sung in her honor in the fifth week of Lent, is ascribed to patriarch Sergios and related to a historical event. In 626 the Avars laid siege to Constantinople and then suddenly gave up on this undertaking. This miraculous event is explained as a result of the intervention of the Virgin who protected her city. The collection ends with a *Paraklesis to the apostle Luke* who became the protector of the newly founded city of Smederevo. We are inclined to interpret this as an indication that Luke had the power to protect his city in the same manner, just as the Virgin Mary had done with Constantinople almost 800 years earlier. The creation of this paraklesis goes to show that the Despotate was living the final days of its existence in full awareness of its imminent fate. The

14 The service was part of manuscript no. 165 of the Patriarchal Library in Belgrade. The paraklesis is part of the collection of paraklesis, manuscript no. 34 of the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church.

dark and gloomy tones of the canon of this paraklesis best confirm this assumption. We cite here only a couple of examples in order to corroborate this idea. The fundamental themes of the canon are illnesses (spiritual and corporeal) that have befallen men, fear of sins committed and repentance. We must also keep in mind the fact that St. Luke was a man of medicine, a doctor. Thus, *слава* (δόξα) in the first ode of the canon includes the following lines: (...) “therefore, I address the casket of your relics, oh apostle, help me – your servant who is on the path to be destroyed“. The first troparion of the third ode of the canon: “The darkness of my life makes dark my unhappy soul, and the night of my actions makes my heart dark“ (...). The second troparion of the fourth ode: “Heal the boils on my soul, oh apostle, and the bitter wounds of my body make whole“ (...). *Слава* (δόξα) in the ninth ode: “Raise the horn of those from our state who pray with faith, and destroy the barbarian attacks, Lord, and save this invincible city and your people, us who have our own apostle who prays for us.“ Examples such as these go to illustrate the actual state of despondence and hopelessness in the city and among the people close to despot Đurađ.

The choice of saints with parakleses devoted to them and presented in this collection is partly identical with that found in the first collection discussed in this text. Christ, Saint Nicholas, megalomartyrs Georgios and Demetrios appear in both manuscripts. However, just as there were certain surprising contents in the first collection, so, too, there are some surprising elements in the one produced in Smederevo. First – a paraklesis to John Chrysostomos who is considered to be a poet of repentance. The other unexpected saint is Ephraim the Syriac. Dragiša Bojović has already considered the significance of Ephraim’s literary opus in the context of repentance and the approaching end of days. In his works, Ephraim the Syriac speaks of repentance, the Last Judgement, the soul, death and the transience of life (Bojović, 2004). Serbian manuscripts with a number of Ephraim’s texts speak in favor of his popularity in monastic circles. It is, thus, not surprising that the author of this collection included a paraklesis dedicated to this saint. It was, perhaps, the deep piety of despot Đurađ that influenced the inclusion of John Chrysostomos and Ephraim the Syriac in the Smederevo collection.

In our opinion, the reasons behind the making of the collections of parakleses discussed above, as well as their functional value, indicate that they were a product of the time of their creation and a unique phenomenon, having firstly in mind their contents and use. It is obvious that both collections were put together to answer the needs of a close circle of people and it is, therefore, not surprising that there aren’t any other manuscripts of the same specific contents. Both were conceptualized in court circles, one of princess Milica and the other of despot Đurađ Branković. After the final fall of the Despotate and the loss of state independence, there was simply no need for them any more.

Bibliography

- Anrich, G. (1913). *Hagios Nikolaos. Der heilige Nikolaos in der griechischen Kirche. Band I. Die Texte*. Teubner.
- Атанасова, Д. (2015). *Рейџорика на истѳорично. Дејание на Св.Никола в јужнославијски контекстѳ*. Фондација Литературен вестник.
- Богдановић, Д. (1978). *Катѳолоѳ ћирилских рукојиса манастира Хиландара*. САНУ.
- Богдановић, Д. (1982). *Инвенѳтар ћирилских рукојиса у Југославији (XI-XVII века)*. САНУ.
- Бојовић, Д. (2004). *Српска есхаѳолошка књижевностѳ. Оѳледи и стѳудије*. Центар за црквене студије.
- Витић, З. (2020). *Светѳи Петѳар Аѳѳонски у визанѳијској и јужнословенској ѳрадицији*. Чигоја штампа.
- Кожухаров, С. (1974). Търновската книжовна школа и развитието на химничната поезия и старата българска литература. In П. Русев, Г. Данчев & Екатерина Сарафова (Eds.), *Търновска книжовна школа 1371–1971: международен симѳозиум Велико Търново, 11–14 окѳтомври 1971* (pp. 277–309). Българската академия на науките.
- Јовановић–Стипчевић, Б. (1980). *Рукојиси ресавској круја 1392–1427. Катѳолоѳ изложбе у манастиру Ресави*. Народна библиотека Србије.
- Јовчева, М. (2007). Древнеславијски октоих: реконструкција его состава и структуры. In H. Rothe & D. Christians (Eds.), *Liturgische Hymnen nach byzantinoschen Ritus bei den Slaven in ältester Zeit* (pp. 50–73). Brill.
- Larrington, C. (1995). *Women and Writing in Medieval Europe. A Sourcebook*. Routledge.
- Lidov, A. (2007). The Creator of Sacred Space as a Phenomenon of Byzantine Culture. In M. Bacci (Ed.), *L'artista a Bisanzio e nel mondo cristiano-orientale*. Pisa 2007 (pp. 135–171). Scuola Normale Superiore.
- Мошин, А. (1962). Молебствије о деспоту Стефану Лазаревићу. *Прилози за књижевностѳ, језик, истѳорију и фолклор*, 28, (3–4). 219–234.
- Павловић, И. (1886). О Св. Луци и преношењу његовог тела. *Гласник СУД*, 51, 70–100.
- Петковић, С. (1914). *Ојис рукојиса манастира Крушедола*. Монашко удружење православне српске Митрополије Карловачке.
- Поповић, М. (2013). *Смедеревски ѳрад*. Републички завод за заштиту споменика културе.
- Пузовић, Љ. (2015). Покушај реконструкције рукописне збирке манастира Девича. *Прилози за књижевностѳ, језик, истѳорију и фолклор*, 82, 93–109.
- Радојичић, Ћ. Сп. (1956). Теодосијев Канон општи Симеону Немањи и Сави (глас 4). *Прилози за књижевностѳ, језик, истѳорију и фолклор*, 21, (1–4), 137–155.
- Рашковић, Д. & Грковић, М. (2014). Археолошка истраживања налазишта „Град“ у Жупањевцу, у Левчу. In С. Мишић (Ed.), *Власѳи и моћ: власѳела Моравске Србије од 1365. до 1402. јодине: ѳемајски зборник радова са међународној научној скуја одржаној од 20. до 22. сепѳтем-*

- бра 2013. *Њодине у Крушевцу, Великом Шилеџовцу и Варварину* (pp. 319–342). Народна библиотека.
- Грковић, М. (1993). (Ed.) *Сѣиси о Косову: монахиња Јефимија, кнез Лазар, кнеџиња Милица, Вук Бранковић, неџознаџи раванички монаси, Давид, Јелена Балишић, Анџоније Рафаил Еџакџић, Десџоџи Сџефан Лазаревић, најсџарији срџски заџиси о Косову*. Српска књижевна задруга.
- Ruvarac, I. (1868). О прџеносу тџела св. Луке у Smederevo. *Rad JAZU*, 5, 178–186.
- Спремић, М. (1994). *Десџоџи Ђурађ Бранковић и њеџово доба*. Српска књижевна задруга.
- Суботин–Голубовић, Т. (1998). Смедеревска служба преноси моштију светог апостола Луке. In М. Пантић (Ed.), *Српска књижевносџи у доба Десџоџиовине, Дани срџскоџ духовноџ ѓреображења V* (pp. 133–157). Народна библиотека «Ресавска школа».
- Суботин–Голубовић. (2000). Свети апостол Лука – последњи заштитник српске Деспотовине. In Д. Ајдачић (Ed.), *Чудо у словенским кулџурама* (pp. 167–178). Научно друштво за словенске уметности и културе
- Суботин–Голубовић, Т. (2004). Химнографски састави Филотеја Кокина у хиландарским рукописима. *Хиландарски зборник*, 11, 247–272.
- Суботин–Голубовић, Т. (2011). Параклис светом Луки. In М. Спремић (Ed.), *Пад Срџске десџоџиовине 1459. ѓодине: зборник раџова са научноџ скуџа, одржаноџ 12–14. новембра 2009. ѓодине* (pp. 99–116). САНУ, Одељење историџских наука.
- Суботин–Голубовић, Т. Децембарске службе св. Николи у српским минеџима старијег периода. In J. Reinhart (Ed.), *Hagiographia Slavica. Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. Linguistische Reihe. Sonderband 82* (pp. 245–263). Gesellschaft zur Förderung slawistischer Studien.
- Суботин–Голубовић, Т. (2018). Молебен – краткај служба особого састава в сербскоџ књижности XIV–XV вв. *Fontes Slavicae Orthodoxae*, 2, 105–112.
- Трифуновић, Ђ. (Ed.). (1983). *Монахиња Јефимија: књижевни раџови*. Багдала.
- Трифуновић, Ђ. (1990²). *Азбучник срџских средњовековних књижевних ѓоџмова*. Нолит.
- Убипарип, М. & Триџић, В. (2010). Непознати параклис Светоме Симеону и светитељу Сави. *Прилози за књижевносџи, језик, исџорију и фолклор*, 76, 49–79.
- Убипарип, М. & Триџић, В. (2015). Зборници параклиса у српскословенскоџ традицији. *Археџграфски ѓрилози*, 37, 69–105.
- Цернић, Л. (1968). Рукопис Стефана Доместика. *Библиџекар*, 20,(1–2), 61–83.
- Цернић, Л. (1981). О атрибуцији средњовековних српских ћирилских рукописа. In Д. Богдановић (Ed.), *Међународни научни скуп Текстологија средњовековних јужнословенских књижевности*, 14–16. новембра 1977 (pp. 335–360). САНУ.
- Шпаџијер, И. (1992). Житије Марије Египћанке у рановизантиџском књижевном контексту. *Књижевна исџорија*, 24, (87), 177–192.
- Шпаџијер, И. (2014). *Свеџџџорска башџина: манасџир Хиландар и сџара српска књижевносџи*. Чигџа штампа.

Татјана Суботин-Голубовић*

ДВА ЗБОРНИКА ПАРАКЛИСА У КОНТЕКСТУ ВРЕМЕНА СВОГА НАСТАНКА (ПРВА ПОЛОВИНА - СРЕДИНА 15 ВЕКА)

Апстракт: Током прве половине века настала су два зборника параклиса. Параклис је кратка служба која се не везује за одређени датум, већ се служи према потреби, у време када појединац или заједница траже помоћ и заштиту од вишњих сила. У раду су анализирана два рукописа из Музеја СПЦ; први припада Грујићевој збирци (3-I-3) и настао је у првим годинама XV stoleћа. Други рукопис припада основној збирци рукописа Музеја СПЦ (бр. 34), датиран је у средину истога stoleћа, а преписан је у Смедереву. Анализа садржаја ових зборника показала је да представљају одраз свог времена и пружају слику унутрашњег духовног живота образованог човека. Рукопис из Грујићеве збирке преписан је, судећи по воденим знацима хартије, око 1395/1405. године. Овај зборник параклиса састављен је несумњиво при двору кнегиње Милице у Жупањевцу, чему у прилог говори чињеница да га је исписао Радич, писар дворске канцеларије. У одабиру светих којима су састављени параклиси овог зборника учествовала је Јефимија, за шта су у раду понуђени докази. Други, млађи зборник параклиса преписан је 1456. године у Смедереву, последњој српској престоници. Рукопис је настао за потребе Благовештењске цркве при којој се тада налазило седиште митрополије. На исписивању, а чини се и састављању овог зборника параклиса, радио је познати писар тога времена Стефан Доместик. Узимајући у обзир избор светаца којима су параклиси ушли у састав овог рукописа, претпостављамо да је одређену улогу приликом његовог настанка имао деспот Ђурађ Бранковић. Настанак ова два рукописа представља јединствену појаву у српској средини прве половине XV века, везану за највише кругове друштвене и политичке кругове свога времена.

Кључне речи: Параклис, зборник, XV век, Јефимија, Радич, Жупањевац, Стефан Доместик, Смедерево

* Татјана Суботин-Голубовић је редовна професорка Старословенског језика и Средњовековне словенске књижевности на Одељењу за историју Универзитета у Београду – Филозофског факултета. tsubotin@f.bg.ac.rs