

*Stefan Harkov*

## AN ENIGMATIC HYMN FOR SAINT PETKA–PARASKEVA: THE CANON AND ITS INTERPRETATION IN THE THEMATIC REPLACEMENT OF CHANTS

**Abstract:** In MS Lavra E–10 / Z–58 from the 17<sup>th</sup> c. there is a sticheron *Ѓдесную Снаса предста дево* in plagal second mode (sixth mode) for the service in honour of St. Petka-Paraskeva (14 October). Such a hymn cannot be found in other manuscripts or printed editions in the service for St Petka. This chant is a unique hymnographical artefact which is a good example of the literary atmosphere of the early Balkan revival and of an ancient liturgical chant practice – the thematic replacement of chants.

**Keywords:** chant, musical manuscript, sticheron, thematic replacement, menaion.

I came upon an interesting fact while working on the chants from the service in honour of St. Petka-Paraskeva of Epivat on 14 October.<sup>1</sup> In one of the musical manuscripts with notated chants for St. Petka<sup>2</sup> there is a sticheron *Ѓдесную Снаса предста дево* in plagal second mode (sixth mode) which cannot be found in other notated manuscripts in this service. The manuscript is Lavra E–10 (Z–58), dating from the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century<sup>3</sup> – one of a few Slavonic notated manuscripts, kept in the library of

---

<sup>1</sup> In this article Feast Days of the Saints are presented according to the Orthodox Byzantine liturgical calendar. There are several Saints known as Paraskeva (Παρασκευή). The first is St. Paraskeva of Rome, God-bearing Martyr. She lived during the 1<sup>st</sup>–2<sup>nd</sup> centuries and is honoured on 26 July. The second is St. Paraskeva of Iconium, Great Martyr, who lived during the 3<sup>rd</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> centuries and is honoured on 28 October. The third is St. Petka–Paraskeva of Epivat, God-bearing Mother, who lived during the second half of the 10<sup>th</sup> century and is honoured on 14 October. She was born in Epivat (today Selimpasa) in Thrace, some 50 kilometres west of Constantinople (Istanbul). She is called “of Epivat”, but also “the New”, “the Young”, “of Tarnovo” (“Bulgarian”), “of Belgrade” (“Serbian”) and “of Jassy”, according to the places where her holy relics have rested for a considerable period of time. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, another, fourth Saint was discovered with the name Paraskeva, in the Arkhangelsk region in Russia, and is honoured on 3 June – a Saint still unknown to the Balkan countries. On this subject v. E. Kaluzniacki, “Zur älteren Paraskevaliteratur der Griechen, Slaven, und Rimänen”, *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch–Historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 141/8 (1899), 1899, 1–93; Архиеп. В. Сергий, *Полный месяцесловъ Востока*, 1–2, Владимир 1901; Й. Иванов, *Български старини из Македония*, София 1931, 424–425; K. Onasch, “Paraskeva–Studien”, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 6 (1978), 121–141; *Dix mille Saints. Dictionnaire hagiographique, rédigé par les Bénédictins de Ramsgate*, Brepols 1991.

<sup>2</sup> MS Lavra E–10 (Z–58), ff. 92v–95r.

<sup>3</sup> In the catalogue of M. Matejić and D. Bogadanović, *Slavic Codices of the Great Lavra Monastery. A Description*, Balkanica II, Inventaires et Catalogues, Sofia 1989, 563–570, this manuscript dates back to the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In the catalogue of P. Matejić and H.

the oldest monastery, and the first in the hierarchy of the Holy Mount Athos, Saint Athanasius, called The Great Lavra.

Danica Petrović<sup>4</sup> and Svetlana Kujumdžieva<sup>5</sup> point to this interesting fact in the service of St. Petka from manuscript Lavra E–10. Danica Petrović writes: “Занимљиво је да се стихире у част св. Петке (преподобне Параскеве, 14. октобар) налазе у рукопису из Лавре, а нема их у хиландарским рукописима”.<sup>6</sup> Svetlana Kujumdžieva adds that stichera from this service, written in the Lavra manuscript cannot be found in other services for St. Petka, published in later printed menaia without notation.<sup>7</sup> Where did this notated chant in the manuscript Lavra E–10 come from? The answer to this question led us in an unexpected direction.

Though this chant cannot be found in the notated Slavonic manuscripts of this service, it appears in one of the first neumed South Slavonic printed collections in Church Slavonic: the *Минейник* from A.D. 1869,<sup>8</sup> but in a different role. We find it in the service for St. Natalia of Nicomedia (Αγία Κυριακή, Santa Domenica) on 7 July. There are six chants, all included in a group dedicated to women martyrs. Angel Ioannov (Ангел Иоанов), the publisher and compiler of the *Минейник*, explains this in a special note: “Понеже има Храмове изъ Болгарія на тія три Великомученицы Свят[ые] жен[ы] нужда Есть да имъ напишимъ Славы те. На Иулія 7-й, Святая Күрїакія, която называютъ въ Родопа планина, Свят.

Thomas, *Catalog. Manuscripts on Microform of the Hilandar Research Library (The Ohio State University)*, 1, Columbus 1992, 144, the manuscript dates from the last decade of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Svetlana Kujumdžieva quotes Stefan Kozuharov’s opinion regarding this manuscript: he (orally) opined in the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, during a discussion concerning this manuscript, that it is later in date – at the earliest from the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, judging only by linguistic data. Cf. С. Куюмджиева, *С. Българска музика в Хиландар*, София 2008, 63.

<sup>4</sup> Д. Петровић, “Музички рукопис манастира Лавре (E–10/ Z–58) из XVII века”, in: *Проучавање средњовековних јужнословенских рукописа*, Београд 1995, 345–358.

<sup>5</sup> С. Куюмджиева, *op. cit.*, 62–66.

<sup>6</sup> Д. Петровић, *op. cit.*, 348. It is not mentioned in the article which are the chants in question, but obviously they are *Преподобная мати Параскеве* in plagal second mode (sixth mode) and *Џдесную Спаса предста дево* in plagal second mode (sixth mode). The other two chants in the service on 14 October from the same manuscript, *Ты слезными излияни* in the first mode and *отечество и отродство* in the second mode, can be found in musical manuscripts from Hilandar, for example MS Hilandar 312 and MS Hilandar 581.

<sup>7</sup> С. Куюмджиева, *op. cit.*, 64. The quotation concerns the sticheron-doxasticon for Litiya *отечество и отродство* in the Second Mode, but also apply to *Џдесную Спаса предста дево* in the plagal second mode (sixth mode).

<sup>8</sup> *Минейник, който съдържава на двадесеттех минеи и празничните стихире, тропари и кондаци, с няколко слави и на осмтех гласове подобията. Сочини ся на славянски език по новата метода на църковното пение от Ангела Иоанова, севлиеца. В Константинополе, напечатана ся в типографията на В.[естник] “Македония”, 1869.*

Неделя, която торжественно празнують родопците. Както и на 17-й Иулія, Свят. Маріна: и на [5-й ] Маія Святая Ирина”.<sup>9</sup>

The stichera in the 1869 collection, following this explanation, are as follows:

<i>Гдесную Спаса предста дева</i>	Doxa after psalms 140-141	sixth mode
<i>Іако на камени тверде</i>	Doxa for Artoklasia	first mode
<i>Въ града Бога нашегѡ</i>	Doxa Aposticha	second mode
<i>Жениха твоего Христа</i>	Apolytikion	fourth mode
<i>Во гласе радованія</i>	Sticheron after psalm 50	second mode
<i>Всякъ языкъ</i>	Doxa Ainoi (Lauds)	eighth mode

In the same collection we also find a note, which points to a connection with the above mentioned chants. On page 90, after two chants for St. Catherine of Alexandria on 24 November, is written: “Аще ли есть храмъ, ищи следующие іулія 7”.

The notes of the publisher from 1869 are very important because they reveal an interesting peculiarity in the structure of the Sticheraion. On the date 7 July there are stichera-doxasticon which are not only for St. Natalia of Nicomedia, honoured on this day, but also for three other women martyrs – St. Marina of Antioch, St. Irene of Magedon and St. Catherine of Alexandria, whose memory is honoured on other days. The text of both notes shows that the performance of this group of stichera had been intended for special occasions – in celebratory services on the saint’s day. At the same time it does not become clear where these stichera come from and why they are preferred for the celebratory services in honour of the four women-saints, or, most importantly, how these six stichera are connected at the same time with St. Natalia, St. Marina, St. Irene and St. Catherine, given that there are special notated chants in the Sticheraia, dating back to the Middle Ages, for two of them (St. Marina and St. Catherine) while there are none for the other two.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, 203–204.

<sup>10</sup> The data concerning the content of the notated sticheraia dating back to the Middle Ages are according to А. Атанасов, *Византийски музикални ръкописи в България. Репертоар I, Средновизантийски Стихирап XII–XIV в.*, София 2003.



composed of specially marked and thematically grouped stichera for the services in honour of Apostles, Martyrs, Hierarchs and God-bearing Fathers. One of these thematic groups is marked as *εἰς αγίας μάρτυρας*, and includes chants for holy women martyrs. The group consists of three notated chants:

<i>Ἐν πόλει τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν</i>	second mode
<i>Ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Σωτήρος</i>	plagal second mode
<i>Ὅτε τω πάθει σου, Κύριε</i>	second mode

The first two chants were already mentioned above – they are from the services in honour of St. Marina and St. Euphemia respectively. The third chant is for commemoration of the Holy 40 Women Martyrs at Heraclea in Thrace on 1 September. What is important here is that we again come upon the sticheron *Ὡδесную Спаса предста дево* (*Ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Σωτήρος*) in plagal second mode (sixth mode) which provoked this investigation. The information from codex Vat. gr. 1562 clearly shows that the chants from the services for St. Euphemia and St. Marina had a significance exceeding their particular liturgical usage on 16 September, 11 July and 17 July. These chants had been significant for all the services around the year devoted to holy women martyrs in the name of Christian faith. This ancient Byzantine tradition had made its way into the Slavonic liturgical cycle and had been followed by the compilers of manuscript Lavra E–10 (Z–58) from the end of 17<sup>th</sup> century, and the *Минеѣник* from A.D. 1869.

The above-mentioned tells us about a specific liturgical practice reflected by the General Menaia without notation and by single musical manuscripts written in neumes. A certain chant, initially written in honour of a certain Saint, a chant with established traditions in the respective service (services), is subsequently used in services in honour of other saints by using the so called General Menaion by the strict observance of the principle of thematic correspondence. This was illustrated with the above-mentioned examples of the holy women martyrs.

What is characteristic about the previously-described specific liturgical musical practice of thematic replacement? Bearing in mind the above examples, the texts remained almost the same, though of course the name of the saint had been changed. On the other hand the musical content of the chants had been greatly changed. In fact, only the mode (with some of his formulas) remained as a basic element, but as a whole the practice of thematic replacement led to a re-composing of the melody. Thus the practice of thematic replacement of chants turns out to be similar as an idea, but in reality opposed to two connected types of Orthodox chanting: according to

the automelon (model), and according to the prosomoion (podoben). In all these cases, the idea is to enrich the music of the church services with necessary and suitable chants. With automelon/prosomion chanting, this idea was achieved by adapting different texts to an identical model melody; in doing so, the melody became partially altered according to the specifics of the new text. In thematic replacement, things are the other way round: a new melody had been composed to a relatively similar text, as in idiomelon singing, but after that this chant gained a new life in a different place (that is, a different service). This clearly defines the chanting practices. Automelon/prosomion singing is an relatively simpler practice, mostly intended for daily liturgical singing. Thematic replacement is, comparatively, a more elaborate practice, mostly intended for feasts. Of course, all that is mentioned here are preliminary observations, based on a small number of musical examples<sup>12</sup> in the research of this interesting phenomenon in Orthodox liturgy.

Finally let us return to manuscript Lavra E–10 (Z–58). Why, after all, is the sticheron-doxasticon *Одесную Спаса предста дево* not found in other services for St. Petka–Paraskeva? The principle of thematic replacement explained above had strict rules, strict canons, and according to them, one chant could be used only among the same thematic group in the General Menaion. The doxasticon *Одесную Спаса*, as mentioned above, was included in the thematic group of chants in honour of holy women martyrs. This is reflected in the General Menaion, where the chant is included in the content of two common services – for a woman martyr and a God-bearing woman martyr.<sup>13</sup> Such martyrs who suffered for the faith are Great Martyr Euphemia of Chalcedon, Great Martyr Marina of Antioch, Great Martyr Catherine of Alexandria, Great Martyr Natalia of Nicomedia and Martyr Irene of Magedon. The life of St. Petka–Paraskeva is different. She had led a holy life pleasing to God<sup>14</sup> and after her death her holy relics performed miracles, but she had not been put to torture and had not been killed for her Christian faith. This is the reason why she had been canonized as a God-bearing Mother, not as a Martyr. In the common service for a God-

---

<sup>12</sup> The following notated manuscripts and printed editions have been consulted in this study: MS Sofia, Centre Dujčev 299, 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 17<sup>th</sup> c.; MS Sofia, National Library Gr. 60, A.D. 1706; MS Sofia, ЕНAI 814, A.D. 1720; MS Sofia, ЕНAI 1158, 18<sup>th</sup> c.; MS Plovdiv, National Library 144, 18<sup>th</sup> c.; MS Plovdiv, National Library 286, A.D. 1794; MS Sofia, Centre Dujčev 180, A.D. 1808; *Συντομον Δοξασάριον*, Εν τῷ Βουκουρεστίου, 1820; *Δοξασάριον*, Εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει 1841.

<sup>13</sup> According to: *Минея Общая*, Москва 2002.

<sup>14</sup> Regarding the *vita* of St. Petka–Paraskeva of Epivat and the other saints mentioned in this article, v. the titles in Note 1, cf. *Жития Святыхъ на русскомъ языке, изложенныя по руководство четырёхъ-минеи св. Димитрія Ростовского*, Москва 1904; *Жития на светиците*, София 1991.

bearing saint from the General Menaion, we do not find the doxasticon *Ωδесную Спаса*. This is logical – the text clearly speaks of a martyr (καὶ Μάρτυς – и Мученица) and about blood from suffering (καὶ τῷ αἵματι τῆς ἀθλήσεως – и кровію страданія). All this explains the absence of this sticheron-doxasticon from the services for St. Petka–Paraskeva in other manuscripts and printed editions with or without notation, and its presence in the same service from the Lavra manuscript seems at least strange.

Today we can only speculate as to how and why the sticheron *Ωδесную Спаса предста дево* in the plagal second mode (sixth mode) was included in the service in honour of St. Petka–Paraskeva on 14 October in codex Lavra E–10 (Z–58). One possible explanation is connected with the time of the writing of the manuscript. The beginning of the Balkan Revival after the middle of 17<sup>th</sup> century was a time of powerful intellectual renovation, which spread throughout the Balkan Orthodox peoples. The revival also affected liturgical practice. The major centre for these changes became Mount Athos, always a hospitable land for the greatest talents of the Orthodox world. At that time Athos was not only a guardian of traditions but also an active generator of ideas. Thus the writer of the manuscript could have been influenced by the intellectual and liturgical reforms typical of the time, and could have decided to allow himself the liberty of interpreting the canons freely and of expressing what now we would describe as a creative initiative. Probably being very impressed by the sticheron *Ωдесную Спаса*, he decided to use it in the service in honour of St. Petka, despite the fact that according to the General Menaion it is of a different thematic group, a different General Menaion. Probably he wanted to make the service on 14 October more interesting by adding chants<sup>15</sup> and to achieve a greater effect in the celebration of one of the most respected Saints of the Balkan Orthodox peoples. In order to achieve his goal he had to change the text and he had to alter the lines referring to the martyr suffering for her faith. He allowed himself freedom even to change the meaning at places:

---

<sup>15</sup> We have to admit that this service lacks chants even now. There is a text in the Typikon of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church that says: “14 October – St. Petka (God-bearing Mother Paraskeva of Epivat). The service is Polyeleos rank according to the menaion. If it happens to be Sunday, the order is as follows: At the midnight service: after the triple canon – stichera for Lity of the God-bearing saint (there are none in the menaion, but when a new service is compiled it will be placed there)”. In: *Типик или църковен устав за извършване еднообразно и чинно обществено богослужение в енорийските храмове на Българската православна църква*, София 1959, 55–56.

<b>MS LAVRA E–10 (Z–58), the end of 17<sup>th</sup> c. 16<sup>th</sup></b>	<b>МИНЕЙНИК, AD. 1869<sup>17</sup></b>
<i>одесную спаса предста дева</i>	<i>ᾨδесную Спаса предста дева</i>
<i>преподобная параскевіе</i>	<i>и страстоносица и Мученица Неделя</i>
<i>одеянна добротою пощєня</i>	<i>одеянна добродетельми обедными</i>
<i>и преукрашена малом чистоти слезнага</i>	<i>и преукрашена Елеемъ чистоти</i>
<i>ко миро приносящимъ</i>	<i>и кровію страданія</i>
<i>(и вопію?)щихъ Хрїсту</i>	<i>и вопіюци къ нему</i>
<i>въ радости свеца держащи</i>	<i>радостно свецу держащи</i>
<i>благоухане мира твоего</i>	<i>въ воню Благоуханія твоего</i>
<i>тебе Хрїсте Боже</i>	<i>текохъ Хрїсте Боже</i>
<i>іако оуязвихся твоего любовію (азъ?)</i>	<i>іако оуязвена твоею любовію азъ</i>
<i>не отлучи мене</i>	<i>не ωтлучи мене</i>
<i>чертога твоего женише небесня</i>	<i>женише Небесный</i>
<i>тому молитвами (посли?) нас</i>	<i>тоя молитвами послѣ намъ</i>
<i>въсєсилне спаси милостию твоею</i>	<i>всєсилне спасє милости твоя</i>
<b>МИНІЯ МЕСЯЦЪ СЕПТЕМВРІЙ<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>Μηναιου του σεπτεμβριου<sup>19</sup></b>
<i>Одесную Спаса предста дева</i>	<i>Ἐκ δεξιων του Σωτηρος, παρεστη η̄ παρθενος</i>
<i>и страсотѣртица и мученица Евфїміа,</i>	<i>καὶ αθληφόρος και Μάρτυς,</i>
<i>одеяна добродетельми непобеждѣна,</i>	<i>περιβεβλημένη ταις το αητητον</i>
<i>и преукрашена елеемъ чистотѣ,</i>	<i>και πεποικιλμένη ελαίω της αγνείας,</i>
<i>и кровію страданія,</i>	<i>και το αιματι της αθλήσεως</i>
<i>и вопіюци къ нему,</i>	<i>καὶ βοῶσα πρὸς αὐτὸν</i>
<i>радостно свецу держащи:</i>	<i>εν αγαλλιασει, την λαμπαδα κατεχουσα.</i>
<i>въ воню мура твоего текохъ,</i>	<i>Εἰς οσμην μυρου σου εδραμον,</i>
<i>Хрїстѣ Боже</i>	<i>Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός,</i>
<i>іако оуязвихся твоею любовію азъ,</i>	<i>ὅτι τέτρομαι τῆς σῆς αγάπης ἐγώ,</i>
<i>не ωтлучи мене</i>	<i>μὴ χωρίσης με</i>
<i>женише небесный,</i>	<i>νυμφιε επουρανιε.</i>
<i>тоя молитвами низпослѣ намъ</i>	<i>Αυτης ταις ικεσίας καταπεμπον ημιν</i>
<i>Всєсілне спасє, милости твоя.</i>	<i>παντοδυναμε Σωτηρ τα ελεη σου.</i>

<sup>16</sup> The text is according to: С. Куюмджиева, *Българска музика в Хилендар*, София 2008, 131. The words and parts of words placed within brackets with a question mark are missing in the text.

<sup>17</sup> *Минейник*, 204–205.

<sup>18</sup> *Миния мєсяць Сєптємврїй*. Кїєвъ, Въ тїпографїи кїєво-печѣрской лавры, аоѿг (1893) гѣда; репринт: Москва, Московский Сретенский Монастырь, издательство “Правило веры”, 1997, 326–327.

<sup>19</sup> *Μηναιου τοῦ σεπτεμβριου*, ἐν Ἀθῆναις, 1993, 205–206.



In summary, the writer of manuscript Lavra E–10 dared and was able to adapt the sticheron to the service in honour of a God-bearing Mother – St. Petka–Paraskeva, but to do so he clearly had to work outside the framework of the canon.<sup>20</sup> Such liberty had not obviously been entirely acceptable even in these times of considerable change, and his example was not followed in other later manuscripts. Nevertheless, due to the creative activity of the writer of manuscript Lavra E–10 (Z–58) we are able to witness a single, unique hymnographic artefact which is a good example of the literary atmosphere of the early Balkan revival, and of an ancient liturgical chant practice – the thematic replacement of chants.

#### LIST OF REFERENCES – ЛИСТА РЕФЕРЕНЦИ

- Архиеп. Владимирский Сергей, *Полный месяцеслов Востока*, Т. 1–2, Владимир 1901.
- Атанасов Асен, *Византийски музикални ръкописи в България. Репертоар. I. Средновизантийски Стихирар XII–XIV в.*, София 2003.
- Dix mille Saint, Dictionnaire hagiographique, rédigé par les Bénédictins de Ramsgate*, Brepols 1991.
- Δοξασταριον*, Εν Κωνσταντινούπολει 1841.
- Иванов Йордан, *Български старини из Македония*, София 1931.
- Kaluzniacki E., “Zur älteren Paraskevalitteratur der Griechen, Slaven, und Rimänen”, *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 141/ 8 (1899), 1–93.
- Куюмджиева Светлана, “Бележки и коментари за някои ранни химнографски ръкописи от Ватикана”, in: *Богослужебните книги – познати и непознати*, София 2008, 43–154.
- Куюмджиева Светлана, *Българска музика в Хилендар*, София 2008.
- Matejić Mateja and Bogdanović Dimitrije, *Slavic Codices of the Great Lavra Monastery. A Description*, Balkanica II, Inventaires et Catalogues, CIBAL, Sofia 1989.
- Matejić Predrag and Thomas Hannah, *Catalog. Manuscripts on Microform of the Hilandar Research Library (The Ohio State University)*, vol. 1, Columbus 1992.
- Миня Общя*, Издателский Совет Русской Православной Церкви, Москва 2002.

<sup>20</sup> There are many examples in the hymnographical literature of the fact that in the menaion a chant for one saint is adapted to suit another, but as a rule this should happen within the same thematic group.

*Минејник, којто содржава на дваесеттех минеи и празничните стихури, тропари и кондаци, с неколку слави и на осмтех гласове подобјата. Сочини се на славјански език по новата метода на црковното пение от Ангела Иоанова, севлиеца, В Константинополе, напечатана се в типографијата на В.[естник] “Македонија”, 1869.*

*Миния месецъ Септемврїи. Кїевъ, Въ тѹпографїи Кїево-Печѣрской лавры, аочг (1893) гѹда. Репринт: Московский Сретенский Монастырь, издательство “Правило веры”, Москва 1997.*

*Μηναιον του σεπτεμβριου, εν Αθηνας 1993.*

Onasch K., “Paraskeva-Studien”, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 6 (1978), 121–141.

Петровић Даница, “Музички рукопис манастира Лавре (E–10 / Z–58) из XVII века”, in: *Проучавање средњовековних јужнословенских рукописа*, Београд 1995, 345–358.

*Σύντομον Δοξασταριον, Εν τω Βουκουρεστιν 1820.*

*Типик или църковен устав за извършване еднообразно и чинно обществено богослужение в енорийските храмове на Българската православна църква, Синодално издателство, София 1959.*

*Жития Святыхъ на рускомъ языке, изложенныя по руководство четьхъ-минеи св. Димитрія Ростовского, Москва 1904.*

*Жития на светиите, София 1991.*

### ***Cited manuscripts***

- Lavra E–10 (Z–58), ff. 92v–95r.  
 Plovdiv, National Library 144, 18<sup>th</sup> c.  
 Plovdiv, National Library 286, A.D. 1794.  
 Sofia, Centre Dujčev 180, A.D. 1808.  
 Sofia, Centre Dujčev 299, 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 17<sup>th</sup> c.  
 Sofia, ЕНAI 814, A.D. 1720.  
 Sofia, ЕНAI 1158, 18<sup>th</sup> c.  
 Sofia, National Library Gr. 60, A.D. 1706.

Стефан Харков

ЗАГОНЕТНА ХИМНА ЗА СВ. ПЕТКУ–ПАРАСКЕВУ:  
КАНОН И ЊЕГОВЕ ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЈЕ  
У ТЕМАТскоЈ ЗАМЕНИ НАПЕВА  
(Резиме)

У једном од музичких рукописа са нотираним напевима за Св. Петку–Параскеву (рукопис Lavra E–10 / Z–58 с краја XVII века) налази се стихира *Ωδесную Спаса предста дево*, у другом плагалном гласу, која не постоји у другим нотираним рукописима са службом ове светитељке. Реч је о измењеној верзији стихире *Ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Σωτήρος* која је саставни део службе у част Св. Јефимије, која се прославља 11. јула и 16. септембра. У раду се полази од питања из ког разлога поменута стихира – докастикон (са припевом „Слава“) *Ωδесную Спаса предста дево* није део других служби у част Св. Петке–Параскеве? Принцип тематске замене напева подразумева стриктна правила и законитости. Основно је правило да се напев не може користити изван једне тематске групе у оквиру општег минеја. Стихира *Ωδесную Спаса* јесте саставни део тематске групе химни у част светих жена мученица. То се запажа у општем минеју, у коме ова химна управо представља две службе посвећене мученици и преподобној. Мисли се на свете великомученице: Јефимију из Халкидона, Марину из Антиохије, Катарину из Александрије, Наталију из Никомедије и Ирину из Магедона. Живот Св. Петке–Параскеве био је другачији. Она је водила свети живот благоугодан Богу да би након смрти њене свете мошти постале чудотворне, што значи да није била мучена нити убијена због своје хришћанске вере. Из тог разлога Св. Петка–Параскева је канонизирана као преподобна, а не као мученица. У служби посвећеној преподобној из општег минеја не проналазимо докастикон *Ωδесную Спаса*. То је сасвим логично будући да текст јасно упућује на мученицу (μάρτυς / мученица), као и на крв проливену кроз патње (καὶ τὸ αἷματι τῆς ἀθλήσεως/и крвию страданія). Самим тим, јасно је због чега у другим нотираним и ненотираним рукописима и штампаним издањима, на припев „слава Оцу и Сину и Светоме Духу“ нема стихире у служби Св. Петке–Параскеве. Не може се, међутим, са сигурношћу установити зашто је она увршћена у ту исту службу у рукопису Lavra E–10 (Z–58).

Можемо, међутим, да претпоставимо како је и због чега у датом рукопису стихира *Ωδесную Спаса предста дево* нашла своје место у служби у част Св. Петке–Параскеве, која се прославља 14. октобра. Једно од могућих објашњења је у вези са временом настанка рукописа.

Наиме, период балканског препорода, након прве половине XVII века, представљао је време изразитог интелектуалног узмаха који је захватио готово све православне балканске народе. Он се одразио и на литургијску праксу. Средиште промена била је света планина Атос где су се традиционално окупљали најумнији појединци из православног света. У то време Атос није представљао само место очувања традиције, већ се наметнуо и као место рађања нових идеја. Стога је могуће да је писац рукописа подстакнут интелектуалним и литургијским реформама, типичним за тај период, одлучио да на слободнији начин протумачи каноне и оствари, оно што бисмо ми данас назвали, креативан појав. Вероватно је, бивајући импресиониран стихиром *Одесную Спаса*, одлучио да је употреби у служби св. Петке, упркос чињеници да према општем мишљењу она припада другој тематској групи. Претпостављамо да је намера била да се служба одржана 14. октобра учини интересантнијом додавањем напева како би се постигао одговарајући утисак приликом обележавања прославе једне од најцењенијих светитељки пореклом из балканских народа. Из тог разлога морао је да буде промењен текст, као и да се избаци стихови у којима се говори о страдању због вере. Понегде је, штавише, промењен сам текст.

Напоследку, закључујемо да је писац рукописа Lavra E–10 прилагодио стихиру служби у част преподобне мати Св. Петке–Параскеве искорачујући из оквира канона. Оваква врста слободе чини се да није била прихватљива чак ни у датом периоду што се закључује на основу увида у касније рукописе у којима не проналазимо сличне поступке. Ипак, захваљујући креативности писца рукописа Lavra E–10 (Z–58) имамо могућност да сагледамо јединствен химнографски подухват који је последица преовлађујуће климе у раној фази балканског препорода, као и оживљавања старе литургијске праксе – тематске замене напева.

UDC 783.25:271-535.7

811.163.1-141(093.3)

DOI: 10.2298/MUZ1111063H