

Angeliki Delikari (Thessaloniki, Greece)

THE SERBIAN TRADITION OF GEORGE GLABAS'S *HOMILY TO THE HOLY AND GREAT PARASKEVE* (*Good Friday*)

The *Homily to the Holy and Great Paraskeve* (Good Friday) *Ὁμιλία εἰς τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἁγίαν <καὶ> μεγάλην Παρασκευὴν* of George Glabas is part of a rich body of similar homilies on the Sufferings of Our Lord and the Great Paraskeve (Δεληκάρη 2014)¹. Just to give an example, I would like to point out homilies of similar content by Athanasius of Alexandria (PG 28: 185–250), Cyril of Alexandria (PG 77: 1015–1030), John Chrysostom (PG 50: 811–816), John of Damascus (PG 96: 589–600), Andrew of Crete (PG 97: 1399–1420), etc. (Ιωαννίδης 2019; Ιωσήφ Μοναχού του Βρυεννίου 1768: 66–91; Ρωμανού Μελωδού 2003: 374–391, n. 19 and 392–412, n. 20).

About George Glabas, the author of the homily I wish to discuss, no biographical data are known apart from what the title of the homily says, that is that the author was a deacon and also had the title of the most glorious of philosophers (*ἐνδοξοτάτου τῶν φιλοσόφων*) as well as that of a teacher of the Holy Gospel. George Glabas lived probably in the 14th century, and scholars have tried to identify him with persons with the same name alive during the same period, but so far without a positive result (PLP: 69, 91684 (I. Γλαβάζ Γεώργιος); Kakridis 1988: 145–147).

According to a check of manuscript catalogues the *Homily to the Holy and Great Paraskeve* is conserved, in two manuscripts containing the Greek text of the work and at least five with the Slavic translation. It is worth pointing out that all Slavic manuscripts identified so far represent in all probability one branch of the transmission, as will become evident later.

¹ This article is the precursor of a commented edition (Greek and Slavic text) of the *Homily to the Holy and Great Paraskeve*, prepared in cooperation with my colleague Prof. Tatjana Subotin-Gulobović (University of Belgrade).

The oldest Greek codex is National Library of Greece (EBE) 2717 (ff. 243r–248v) dated to 1396 and imperfect². It contains a triodion (Τριώδιον) and we know that it was written by Michael Mesopotamitis (Nowack 1961; PLP: 212, 17956 (I. Μεσοποταμίτης Μιχαήλ).

The second Greek manuscript known, likewise a triodion (Τριώδιον), belongs to the Holy Monastery of the Great Laura, number I 197.1281 (ff. 373v–381r) (Σπυρίδων Λαυριώτης 1925: 213)³. The manuscript is considerably younger (it is dated to the 17th century) and contains the full text of the homily and one lengthy passage (a little longer than one folio). Research into works of a similar character allows us to identify the passage with an excerpt (Δεληκάρη 2014: 60–63) from the Λόγος Η' /homily of George of Nikomedeia *Eis τὸ εἰστήκεσαν παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (On the verse 'They stood beneath the cross of Our Lord') (9th century) (PG 100: 1457–1490). Clearly the copyist believed, wrongly, that this section related to the homily of George Glabas, which in the codex from the Great Laura follows the homily of George of Nikomedeia.

As regards the Slavic manuscripts, I have identified five, but I have only dealt with three so far: Dečani 88 (ca. 1360–1370) (ff. 125r–140r)⁴, Nikoljac 49 (ca. 1556) (ff. 139r–150r)⁵, Hilandar 457 (ca. 1370–1385) (ff. 26v–41v)⁶.

Since my research on the homily of George Glabas is still at an early stage, I have so far only examined the two known Greek manuscripts and three Serbian codices (Dečani 88, Nikoljac 49, and Hilandar 457).

The description of Dečani 88 and the investigation of several topics connected with it are found in the PhD thesis of Ioannis Kakridis "Codex 88 des Klosters Dečani und seine griechischen Vorlagen. Ein Kapitel der serbisch-byzantinischen Literaturbeziehungen im 14. Jahrhundert" (Kakridis 1988). This Codex is a sbornik in Serbian Church Slavonic according the orthographical rules of the so-called Ras school and contains treatises against the Latins and the Barlaamites. In the final section, there are two homilies on Good Friday. Folios 13–28, 30–69, and 71–156 form the older part of this manuscript (dated to 1360–1370) (Kakridis 1988: 8), and it is here that we find the two homilies mentioned above. The homily by George Glabas is on ff. 125r–140r and that by George of Nikomedeia on ff. 140v–156r.

² I would like to thank Prof. Sofia Kotzambasi (Thessaloniki) for providing me with copies of the manuscript in the National Library of Greece.

³ I would like to thank Father Nikodemos from the Monastery of St. Paul on Mount Athos for his help with acquiring a microfilm of the Laura manuscript.

⁴ I would like to thank Prof. Dragiša Bojović (Niš) for a copy of the Codex Dečani 88.

⁵ I would like to thank Prof. Tatjana Subotin-Golubović (Belgrade) for the microfilm of the Codex Nikoljac 49.

⁶ I would like to point out that Dečani 88 had been in the Hilandar Monastery, and we do not know exactly when it entered the library of the Dečani Monastery (Kakridis 1988: 8,18–19).

The date of the Hilandar 457 manuscript is approximately the same (ca. 1370–1385) as that of Dečani 88. It is also a sbornik in Serbian Church Slavonic in the Ras orthography. In its first part, we read sermons, homilies of Fathers of the Church (for example, John of Damascus's sermon on the Nativity of the Holy Theotokos, a sermon of John Chrysostom on the Baptism of Our Lord, Glabas's *Homily on Good Friday*, and others). The second part of the manuscript contains the *Dioptra of Philippos Monotropos* with a prologue by Michael Psellos (Богдановић 1978: 175). However, the folios containing the text by George Glabas present a problem. According to the description of the manuscript in Bogdanović's catalogue, the text of Glabas's homily is on ff. 26v–43r (Богдановић 1978: 175). This is not correct, because ff. 30r–38v and 42r–42v contain passages from the homily of George of Nikomedeia and f. 43r the end of John of Damascus's *Sermon on the Nativity of the Holy Theotokos*, a fact not noted in the description of the manuscript. I must point out that f. 26v contains the end of George of Nikomedeia's homily, and Glabas's homily begins on the same folio. This means that in the codex itself the homily by George of Nikomedeia came first and the homily by Glabas followed. The disturbance of the sequence was very likely caused by a faulty assemblage of the codex.

The identical sequence, namely first the homily of George of Nikomedeia and then the homily of George Glabas, is confirmed by the codex Hilandar 651 (Kakridis 1988: 148), as well as the Greek manuscript in the Great Laura I 197, although in the manuscripts Dečani 88 and Nikoljac 49 the Homily of Glabas is followed by the homily of George of Nikomedeia.

The Codex Nikoljac 49 (also a sbornik) is younger, dated to about 1556 (Kakridis 1988: 149). Apart from the two homilies mentioned above, it contains works of Demetrios Kantakouzenos, Maximos Holobolos, David Disypatos, the Patriarch Euthymios of Tarnovo, and Konstantin Kostenečki. It also preserves a chapter of the *Dogmatic of John of Damascus* in Slavic translation.

For our investigation, the codex Dečani 88 is especially important, not only because it is the oldest witness of the manuscripts containing the Slavic translation, but even more so because its watermark allows us to date it between 1360–1365, i.e. very close chronologically to the time when the homily was written (it is believed that this was around the middle of the 14th century) (Kakridis 1988: 8). Moreover, it is clear that the translation in the codex Dečani 88 was based on a manuscript of the homily older than the two known Greek manuscripts that are preserved, and furthermore this text in the codex Dečani 88 could perhaps be the first Serbian translation of Glabas's homily.

I will add only a few remarks highlighting the importance of this Serbian tradition of the homily.

The three Slavic manuscripts I have studied have many errors in common (*errores coniunctivi*), and this makes it likely that they probably derive from the same source. I will mention a few characteristic instances. For the Greek text, I

cite from the manuscript Laura I 197. For the Slavic text, I quote from the codex Dečani 88.

In the Greek text (cf. Laura I 197, f. 373v) we read: ἡ πανάχραντος αὐτοῦ μήτηρ παρίστασο θρηνοῦσα, ὀδυρομένη, κοπτομένη, δακρῦουσα, while in the Slavic text the word κοπτομένη is missing (cf. Dečani 88, f. 125r: прѣвнѣста егѡ маѣ прѣдстоиаше плачуѡци рѣдаѡци, салзѣци).

In all three Slavic manuscripts the following part of a sentence ὅτε ὄν τρέμει τὰ χερουβὶμ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνόμων ἐτύπτετο found in the Greek text (cf. Laura I 197, f. 373v) is omitted.

In the Greek text (cf. Laura I 197, f. 375r) we read: ἐκείνη πολλοῦ χρυσίου τὸ μῦρον ἠλλάξατο. The words τὸ μῦρον are again missing from all three Slavic manuscripts (cf. Dečani 88, f. 128v: ѡнѧ мнѡгѧ златѧ нзмѣнѧ).

In the Greek text we read (cf. Laura I 197, f. 375r): τῷ δεινῷ τῆς φιλοχρηματίας καὶ χαλεπῷ ἔρωτι, while in the Slavic text the two words καὶ χαλεπῷ are missing (cf. 88, f. 129r: въ злом любуемѣннѧ желани).

Or, in the Greek text (Laura I 197, f. 375r) we read: πρὸς τὰ κατάκρημα τοῦ σκότους καὶ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἐχώρησας. The Slavic text omits the translation of καὶ τῆς αἰσχύνης (cf. Dečani 88, f. 129r: къ пропастѧ тѣмѧ прѣдѣ).

The Slavic text omits the translation of κρείττον ἢ κατ' εὐχὴν (cf. Dečani 88, f. 129v: ѡнѧ ѡ глѣбнѣннѧ злѣ, ѡперѣнѣннѧ се въ рою въ зндѣ), found in the Greek manuscripts (cf. Laura I 197, f. 375v): ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ τῶν κακῶν περωθεῖσα τῇ πίστει, κρείττον ἢ κατ' εὐχὴν ἀνέβη.

One last example for such conjunctive errors: In the Greek text (cf. Laura I 197, f. 377r) we read: οὐδένα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐποίησασθε λόγον. In the Slavic manuscripts, the text is slightly different (cf. Dečani 88, f. 131v, lines 19–20): ннѣднѡ поповѣннѣ нстннѣ створѣсте. The Greek text could have been: οὐδεμίαν φροντίδα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐποιήσασθε.

There are quite a number of cases in which the Slavic text of the three manuscripts follows the text of EBE 2717. The comparison of the text of the translation with the Greek original confirms readings and helps with the establishment of some passages in the Greek text. Here are some examples.

In EBE 2717, f. 243v we read οἱ φίλοι πεφεύγασιν, οἱ δῆμιοι παρεστήκασιν. This phrase is absent in the Laura manuscript. Exactly the same passage is found in the Slavic text (cf. Dečani 88, f. 126r): любнѣннѧ вѣжашѣ, мѡγѣнтѣннѣ прѣдсташѣ.

In EBE 2717, f. 244r there are some words and phrases which are missing in the Laura codex, but we can find them in the Slavic text.

For instance EBE 2717, 244r: οὐ παρήσαν ἔτοιμα εἰσδέξασθαι τὰ δεσμοκτήρια. The infinitive εἰσδέξασθαι is missing from the Laura manuscript, f. 376r, but in a way present in the Slavic text (cf. Dečani 88, f. 131r): нѣ вѣхѡγ лн гѡтѡвѣ тѣмннѣце въ вѣспрнѣтнѣ.

LITERATURE

- Kakridis 1988 K a k r i d i s, I. *Codex 88 des Klosters Dečani und seine griechischen Vorlagen. Ein Kapitel der serbisch-byzantinischen Literaturbeziehungen im 14. Jahrhundert* (= Slavistische Beiträge, 233). München, 1988.
- Nowack 1961 N o w a c k, G. *Le Cod. Athènes, Bibl. Nat. 2717 et l'origine du Synodicon d'une église suffragante de la Métropole d'Athènes*. – *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 19 (Mélanges Raymond Janin), 1961, p. 227–238.
- PG M i g n e, J.-P. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca*. 161 vols. Paris, 1857–1866.
- PLP *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*. Wien, 1976–1996.
- Богдановић 1978 Б о г д а н о в и ћ, Д. *Каталог ћирилских рукописа манастира Хиландара* (Д. Медаковић. *Старе штампане књиге манастира Хиландара*). Београд, 1978 [Bogdanović, D. *Katalog ćirilskih rukopisa manastira Hilandara* (D. Medaković. *Stare štampane knjige manastira Hilandara*). Beograd 1978].
- Δεληκάρη 2014 Δ ε λ η κ ά ρ η, Α. *Γεωργίου Γλαβά, διακόνου και διδασκάλου του Ευαγγελίου, Όμιλία εις τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἁγίαν <καί> μεγάλην Παρασκευήν. Η ελληνική αθωνική παράδοση της Ομιλίας και η παλαιοσλαβική μετάφρασή της*. – In: Η' Διεθνές Επιστημονικό Συνέδριο “Άγιον Όρος και Λογιοσύνη”. Πρακτικά Συνεδρίου, Θεσσαλονίκη, 22–24 Νοεμβρίου 2013. Thessaloniki, 2014, p. 53–65 [Delēkarē, A. *Geōrgiōy Glaba, diakonoy kai didaskaloy toy Eyangelioy, Omilia eis ta kata tēn agian <kai> megalēn Paraskeyēn. Ē ellēnikē athōnikē paradosē tēs Omilias kai ē palaioslabikē metafrasē tēs*. – In: 8 Diethnes Epistēmoniko Synedrio “Agion Oros kai Logiosynē”. Praktika Synedrioy, Thessalonikē, 22–24 Noembrioy 2013].
- Ιωαννίδης 2019 Ι ω α ν ν ί δ η ς, Φ. *Το πάθος του Χριστού και ο θρήνος της Θεοτόκου στη βυζαντινή παράδοση*. – In: Φ. Ιωαννίδης. Πτυχές της Ορθόδοξης Δυτικής Εμπειρίας, Θεολογία-Γραμματεία-Πνευματικότητα. Θεσσαλονίκη, 2019, σ. 636–656 [Iōannidēs, F. *To pathos toy Christoy kai o thrēnos tēs Theotokoy stē byzantinē paradosē*. – In: F. Iōannidēs, *Ptyches tēs Orthodoxēs Dytikēs Empeirias, Theologia-Grammateia-Pneumatikotēta*. Thessalonikē, 2019, p. 636–656].
- Ιωσήφ Μοναχού του Βρυνενίου 1768 Ι ω σ ή φ Μ ο ν α χ ο ύ τ ο υ Β ρ υ ν ε ν ί ο υ τ α Ε υ ρ ε θ έ ν τ α. *Τόμος Β' αζιώσει του Υψηλοτάτου και ευσεβεστάτου πρώην ηγεμόνος Μολδοβλαχίας κυρίου κυρίου Γρηγορίου Αλεξάνδρου Γκίκα Βοεβόδα δι' επιμελείας Ευγενίου Βουλγάρεως*

- ἤδη το πρώτον τύποις εκδοθέντα. Εν Λειψία της Σαξονίας, 1768 [Iōsēf Monachoy toy Bryenniōy ta Eyrethenta. Tomos 2 axiōsei toy Ypsēlotatoy kai eysebestatoy prōēn ēgemonos Moldoblachias kyrioy kyrioy Grēgoriōy Alexandroy Gkika Boeboda di' epimeleias Eygeniōy Boylgareōs ēdē to prōton typois ekdothenta. En Leipsia tēs Saxonias, 1768].
- Ρωμανού Μελωδού 2003 *Ρωμανού Μελωδού Ὕμνοι. Απόδοση στα Νέα Ελληνικά Αρχιμανδρίτης Αναίας Κουστένης*. Αθήνα, 2003 [Rōmanoy Melōdoy Ὕμνοι. Apodosē sta Nea Ellēnika Archimandritēs Ananias Koystenēs. Athēna, 2003].
- Σπυρίδων Λαυριώτης 1925 *Σπυρίδων Λαυριώτης, Κατάλογος των κωδίκων της Μεγίστης Λαύρας (τη εν Αγίῳ Ὁρει)* (= Αγιορειτική Βιβλιοθήκη. Τ. Β' and Γ'). Paris, 1925 [Spyridōn Layriōtēs, Katalogos tōn kōdikōn tēs Megistēs Layras (tē en Agiō Orei) (= Agioreitikē Bibliothēkē. Τ. 2 and 3). Paris, 1925].

THE SERBIAN TRADITION OF GEORGE GLABAS'S *HOMILY TO THE HOLY AND GREAT PARASKEVE* (*Good Friday*)

(Summary)

The manuscript tradition of George Glabas's work (mid-14th century), *Homily to the Holy and Great Paraskeve*, is of particular interest. The homily is known to us not only from the Greek original text but also from its Old Slavic translation (which is transmitted by perhaps more than five manuscripts in a Serbian version). The Greek text is preserved in two manuscripts. The comparison of the text of the Slavic translation with the Greek original confirms readings and helps with the establishment of some passages in the Greek text.

Keywords: George Glabas; Homily to the Holy and Great Paraskeve; Hilandar Monastery; Dečani Monastery; Nikoljac Monastery.

*Angeliki Delikari,
School of History and Archaeology –
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki*