Dr. Tatiana Borisova
Associate Professor
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
Institute for Mediterranean Studies (IMS FORTH)

Additional Troparia in the Great Canon of Repentance by Andrew of Crete in the Church Slavonic Tradition

The present study discusses the history of the Church Slavonic translation of the Great Canon of Repentance - one of the most important and definitely the most popular hymn by St. Andrew of Crete (Ἀνδρέας ὁ Κρήτης, Ἱεροσολυμίτης)[1]. The name "Great" (Μέγας), which was given to this canon later when it was included into the church service, probably refers to its volume[2]. Being amongst the longest canons ever composed, the Great Canon consists of 250 strophes - *troparia*, divided into 9 songs - *odes* (including the second ode, which is usually not included in canons). The text introduces 11 themes - *Irmos* (the second and the third ode have two *irmos*).

Seeing as this canon has no acrostic, it is no wonder that in early manuscripts and editions, it showcases significant divergence in terms of its structure, specifically in terms of the composition and strophe order in each ode. This divergence in Greek tradition also influenced the early (up to the 15th century) Slavonic tradition, where translations and further corrections were realized with the use of different Greek sources. Therefore, the Slavonic manuscripts of the 12th – 15th century containing the Great Canon reflect different Greek traditions in regard to the

---

[1] For further information about the Great Canon and its author see Θ. Δετοράκης, Βυζαντινή φιλολογία: Τα πρόσωπα και τα κείμενα. Τόμος Β'. Ηράκλειο, 2003, 293 – 307. Π. Β. Πάσχος. «Ο Μέγας Κανών του Αγίου Ανδρέου Κρήτης. Μικρή εισαγωγή στην κατανυκτική ποίησή του», Ριζάρειος Εκκλησιαστική Παιδεία. Τόμος 4, Αθήνα, 1988, 315 – 326.

[2] Θ. Δετοράκης, Βυζαντινή φιλολογία, 295.

structure of the text. The variations occurring could be divided into three main categories:

1. Omission of specific strophes, which can occur both consciously and unconsciously (due to mistakes of the scribes) throughout the history of both the Greek and the Church Slavonic manuscript texts, as well as during their translation.

2. Change of the location of a strophe within a specific ode. Apart from the first stanza - the *Irmos* - as well as the final two - *To the Holy Trinity* and *Theotokion* - the other troparia could be moved, which was a common phenomenon in the history of the hymn.

3. Interpolation of specific strophes which do not reflect the authentic Greek text of the hymn as it is saved in manuscripts and editions[3].

The variations belonging to the first two categories were studied in our earlier research[4]. The goal of this paper is to study the variations of the third category in the troparia that were found in the Church Slavonic manuscripts of the 12th – 15th century and do not correspond to the authentic text of the Greek hymn. These variations were less common compared to the other categories; however, they present important evidence in regard to the classification of the manuscripts and the reconstruction of the history of the text. In fact, the addition of one more stanza to the initial text could not have possibly happened by mistake and it presupposes conscious work over the text. For most of them, the possibility that they were part of the initial text written by St. Andrew of Crete, which happened to be later excluded from most Greek traditions

---

[3] See e.g. G.P. Migne, Patrologiae Cursus Graecae, Paris, 1860, Volume 92, 1330 – 1384.

[4] See, as an example, T. Borisova, «Old Church Slavonic Translation of the Great Canon of Repentance by St. Andrew of Crete: the Earliest Stages of History», Cyrillomethodianum, XIX, 2014, 53 – 66. Τ. Μπορίσοβα, «Ο Μέγας Κανών του Ανδρέου Κρήτης και η μετάγγισή του στον κόσμο των Σλάβων: αρχικά στάδια της ιστορίας του παλαιοσλαβικού κειμένου», Σλάβοι και ελληνικός κόσμος: Πρακτικά Α΄ Επιστημονικής Ημερίδας Τμήματος Σλαβικών Σπουδών, Αθήνα, 2014, 73 – 88. Τ. Борисова, Текстология церковнославянских переводов византийских гимнографических текстов по спискам Триоди постной XII – XV веков, Новосибирск, 2016, 75 – 132.

and was only saved in the Slavonic translation, could also not be neglected. In both cases, these troparia deserve careful textological and linguistic analysis in order to determine their origin, as well as the time, place, and reasons of their possible interpolation in the text of the hymn along with their subsequent history in the manuscripts.

More specifically, after the study of 35 Church Slavonic manuscripts of the Lent Triodion containing the text of the Great Canon dating from the 12th up to the 15th century and representing the South Slavonic (Old Bulgarian and Old Serbian) and East Slavonic (Old Russian) traditions, we found 21 manuscripts containing additional troparia, which we divided into 3 groups described in detail below.

Group 1.
This group consists of the following 6 manuscripts:

1. Triodion and Pentecostarion (*Shafarikovski)*, Bulgarian, 12th –13th cent., Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), code F.п.I.74 (hereinafter referred to as *Shafar.)[5]*.

2. Triodion and Pentecostarion, Serbian, first half of the 13th cent., Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), code F.п.I. 68 (hereinafter referred to as *Serb.*).

3. Triodion and Pentecostarion, Serbian, 14th cent., National Library of Serbia (Belgrade), code 644 (hereinafter referred to as *NLS 644).*

4. Triodion and Pentecostarion, Serbian, 1328, National Library of Serbia (Belgrade), code 645 (hereinafter referred to as *NLS 645).*

5. Triodion and Pentecostarion (*Triodion of Moses Kianin)*, Russian, 12th – 13th cent., Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (Moscow), collection 381, № 137 (hereinafter referred to as *Kian.).*

---

[5] For the manuscript description see *Л. Макаријоска, Э. Црвенковска, Шафариков Триод. Лингвистичка анализа.* Скопје, 2012.

6.   Triodion and Pentecostarion *(Orbelski)*, Bulgarian, 13th cent., Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), code F.п.I.102 (hereinafter referred to as *Orbel*.)[6].

These manuscripts represent the earliest stages of the Slavonic written tradition and probably date back to the first Church Slavonic translations of the Greek hymnography[7]. The Greek sources according to which this translation was performed differ significantly from the ones contemporary Greek tradition is based on. In addition to other differences, three troparia at the end of the last ninth ode were found right before the last strophes *To the Holy Trinity* and *Theotokion.* It is quite certain that these three troparia, unidentified so far in the Greek tradition and referred to hereinafter as *9.1app – 9.2app – 9.3app,* originate from one initial Slavonic protograph. The reason behind this assumption is that they are complete and saved in full with small variations due to mistakes of the scribes in all the above-mentioned manuscripts, which represent different Slavonic regions and *izvod*, with the exception of two manuscripts *Serb.* and *Orbel.,* where *9.2app* strophe is omitted. Though thematically, melodically, and stylistically they are similar to the authentic text of the hymn, supplying the text with the final pray to God's mercy, it has not been proven so far that they were part of the Greek hymn translated by Slavs and that they were not added to the Slavonic text by translators. It should be noted that this specific version of the Slavonic liturgical books hypothetically attributed to the disciples of Cyril and Methodius, specifically to Constantine of Preslav, contains a large original part written by the same author[8].

The text of these additional troparia with the variations of the manuscripts under research is included below. The basic text was taken

---

[6] Э. Црвенковска, *Л.* Макаријоска, Орбелски Триод. Сер.: Стари текстови. Т. Х. Скопје, 2010, 240 – 250.

[7] See, for example, Г. Попов, Триодни произведения на Константин Преславски, София, 1985, 71 – 73. M. Momina, Triodion und Pentekostarion nach slavischen Handschriften des 11 – 14 Jahrhunderts. Vol. 1. Ser.: Patristica Slavica. München, 2004, 131 – 133. Т. Борисова, Текстология церковнославянских переводов, 199 – 208.

[8] Г. Попов, Триодни произведения, 33 – 61.

from *Kian.*, the variations described under it do not include the regular phonetic of graphic variants of the local Slavonic traditions *(izvod).*

9.1app

шюма пецьнааго полацааго ѡгнꙗ скрьжътъ ꙁоѵбомъ тьма кромѣшьнааго чрьвь не оѵсъіпаꙗ страшить дш҃ю мою тѣмь поцади мꙗ бе҃ творьче мои соѵдии съвѣдꙑи срдьчьнаꙗ

пецьнааго : пецьнаго и *Shafar.*] полацааго : пълаюцаго *Serb.* : ѡпалѣжцего *Shafar.*] скрьжътъ ꙁоѵбомъ : скрьжьта ꙁѫбьна *Serb.* = *Orbel.* : скрьжьта ꙁоѵбнаго *NLS 644* = *NLS 645* : и скрьжьта ꙁоѵбьна *Shafar.*] тьма : тьмꙑ *Shafar.* : тьмѫ *Orbel.*] кромѣшьнааго : кромѣшьна *Serb.*: кромѣшьнꙑж *Shafar.* : кромѣшьнаꙗ *Orbel.* = *NLS 644* = *NLS 645*] чрьвь : чрьви *NLS 644*: и чрьвиа *Shafar.*] оѵсъіпаꙗ : оѵсъіпаема *Shafar.*] страшить : оѵстрашае *Serb.* = *NLS 644*: оѵстрашажть *Shafar.* = *Orbel.*] дш҃ю мою : дш҃е *Serb.*: ми дш҃ж *Shafar.* = *Orbel.* : дш҃ж *NLS 644* = *NLS 645*] съвѣдꙑи срдьчьнаꙗ : om. *Orbel.*

9.2app (omitted in *Serb.* and *Obel.)*

крѣпость моꙗ и хваление тꙑ еси вл҃дко и надежж си къ тебе възлагаю вѣрж ми недвижимоѵ съхрани до коньца еже съгрѣшихъ тебѣ прѣже времене сжда остави ꙗко мл҃срдъ

хваление : похвалление *Shafar.* = *NLS 644* = *NLS 645*] вл҃дко : вл҃дко мои *Shafar.* : om. *NLS 644* = *NLS 645*] тебѣ : къ тебѣ *NLS 644* = *NLS 645*] сжда : и сжда *Shafar.* : om. *NLS 644* = *NLS 645*] остави : ѡстави и помл҃оѵи *NLS 644* = *NLS 645*

9.3.app

съꙁдавꙑи чл҃ка и давъ емоѵ дꙑхание животьное и раю сътвори жителꙗ двьри ми отъврьꙁи едемьскꙑꙗ блаже да дрѣва животьнаго въсприимъ вѣчно поклоню сꙗ црь҃ствию ти

дꙑхание : om. *Orbel.*] раю : раю *Shafar.* = *Serb.* = *NLS 644* = *NLS 645* = *Orbel.*] блаже : бж҃е *Orbel.*: абие же *Shafar.*] дрѣва животьнаго : дрѣво животьное *Serb.* = *NLS 644* = *NLS 645*] вѣчно : вѣрно *Orbel.*] ти : твоемоѵ *NLS 644* = *NLS 645* : ти вл҃дко *Shafar.*: ти х҃е сп҃се *Orbel.*

Group 2

This group consists of 14 South Slavonic and East Slavonic manuscripts representing the same version originating from the Athonite book correction, which, according to the inscription found and published by G. Popov[9], was carried out at the end of the 13th cent. by *Starets Josef*, a monk at the Mount Athos monastery of Great Lavra. The text of the Triodion that resulted from this correction replaced the old versions of said liturgical book, first in the South Slavonic and later in the East Slavonic region, becoming acknowledged as the "true version"[10]. Typical examples of manuscripts belonging to this version from different regions are analyzed below, specifically:

1.   Lent Triodion, Bulgarian, 14th cent., St. Catherine's monastery (Mount Sinai) manuscript collection, code Slavonic 23 (hereinafter referred to as *Sin. 23*).

2.   Lent Triodion, Serbian, 15th cent., Sts. Cyril and Methodius National Library (Sofia), code 1158 (hereinafter referred to as *CMNL 1158).*

3.   Lent Triodion, Serbian, 1359, St. Panteleimon monastery (Mount Athos) manuscript collection, code 29 (hereinafter referred to as *Pant.29)[11]*.

4.   Lent Triodion, Serbian, 1390, Hilandar monastery (Mount Athos) manuscript collection, code 255.

5.   Lent Triodion, Serbian, 1360, Hilandar monastery (Mount Athos) manuscript collection, code 256.

---

[9] Г. Попов, «Среднебългарският светогорски превод на Триода от първата половина на 14 век», Преводите през 14 столетие на Балканите. Доклади от международната конференция. София, 26 – 28 юни 2003 г., София, 2004, 173 – 184.

[10] Г. Попов, Среднебългарският светогорски превод, 174.

[11] А.-Э. Тахиаос. Славянские рукописи Свято-Пантелеимонова монастыря (Руссик) на горе Афон. Санкт-Петербург, 2012, 80 – 81. Ермолай (Чежия). Каталог рукописей, печатных книг и архивных материалов русского Свято-Пантелеимонова монастыря на Афоне. Афон, 2013, 36. The author would like to thank the monks of St. Panteleimon monastery (Mount Athos) and the librarian father Yermolay (Chezhia) for the copy of the manuscript.

6.   Lent Triodion, Bulgarian, 1350, Hilandar monastery (Mount Athos) manuscript collection, code 259.

7.   Lent Triodion, Serbian, beginning of 15ᵗʰ cent., Hilandar monastery (Mount Athos) manuscript collection, code 261[12].

8.   Lent Triodion, Russian, 15ᵗʰ cent., Russian State Library (Moscow), code 385 (hereinafter referred to as *RSL 385)*.

9.   Lent Triodion, Russian, 15ᵗʰ cent., Russian State Library (Moscow), code 386.

10.   Lent Triodion, Russian, 15ᵗʰ cent., Russian State Library (Moscow), code 1169.

11.   Lent Triodion, Russian, 15ᵗʰ cent., Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), M. Pogodin's manuscript collection, code 42.

12.   Lent Triodion, Russian, end of 15ᵗʰ cent., Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), code Q.I.1319.

13.   Lent Triodion, Russian, 15ᵗʰ cent., Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), code Q.I.99.

14.   Lent Triodion, Bulgarian, 1466, Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), code F.I.125 (hereinafter referred to as *F.I.125)*.

All the above manuscripts contain 5 additional troparia in the text of the Great Canon, which were borrowed from the Canon for the Sunday of the Last Judgment by Theodore the Studite (incipit *Τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν φρικτήν*), which is also included in the Lent Triodion[13]. It should be noted that this canon was composed by Theodore the Studite who was inspired by the Great Canon, and thus display a thematic and melodic similarity with the latter, being composed over the same *irmos.* The other similarities include some troparia of the Great Canon being

---

[12] The author would like to thank the monks of Hilandar monastery (Mount Athos, Greece), the Hilandar Research Library, and the Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies at the Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio, USA) for the copies of the five Lent Triodia (code 255, 256, 259, 261, 262) from the Hilandar manuscript collection.

[13] See also Т. Борисова, «Афонская редакция церковнославянского перевода Великого покаянного канона св. Андрея Критского в славянской литургической традиции», Афон и славянский мир. Сборник 3. Материалы Третьей международной конференции, посвященной 1000-летрию присутствия русских на Святой Горе. Киев, 21 – 23 мая 2015 г., Афон, 2016, 247 – 257.

"re-used" by Theodore the Studite, e.g. the last strophe of the first ode Μὴ εἰσέλθῃς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν κρίσει (не вниди со мною в соудъ).

The large number of manuscripts in this group made it impossible for us to present the variants between all of them, and we therefore confined ourselves to the most representative manuscripts, specifically *CMNL 1158, Pant.29, RSL 385, F.I.125*, which illustrate different (Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian) traditions and showcase a greater divergence from the initial version, which we assume to be the one saved in the above-mentioned *Sin. 23*. The variations described do not include the regular phonetic or graphic variants of local Slavonic traditions *(izvod)*.

1.1app (Δεῦρο λάβε μοι ψυχή)

грѧди пріими дше моа самъіи час и днь кгда бъ ꙗвѣ приидетъ и рꙑидаи и плачи сѧ ѡбрѣсти сѧ чиста въ часъ испꙑтаніа

въ часъ : въ днь *CMNL 1158*

1.2app (Ἐξιστᾷ με καὶ φοβεῖ)

оужасает мѧ и страшитъ ѡгнь ѡнъ гееньскъіи чрѣвъ горкъіи скрежетъ зѫбомъ нѫ ѡслаби ми и пощѧди и стоꙗнію мѧ хе избранъіхъ твоихъ причьти

и пощѧди : пощади *Pant.29= RSL 385*] стоꙗнію : стоꙗніа *CMNL 1158*

6.1.app (Ἆρον τὸ σόν)

възми свое да не слъішѫ гꙇи ѡсилаемъ ѿ тебе ни еже иди въ ѡгнь проклѧтъіи нѫ благаго гласа праведнъіхъ

ѡсилаемъ : ѡсъімемь *RSL 385*] нѫ : на *RSL 385*

8.1.app (Πᾶσαν πνοὴν νίκα προσκέκλησαι)

въсѣко дъіханіе егда призовеши разъсѫди ти хе въкѫпѣ вели страх тогда велиа нѫжда въсѣмъ оужасающимсѧ непостоꙗнна сѫдища твоего

въсѣко : всѧкои *RSL 385*] вели : веліи *Pant.29= RSL 385* : великъіи *CMNL 1158=F.I.125*] непостоꙗнна : непостоꙗннаго *CMNL 1158=F.I.125= Pant.29= RSL 385*

8.2.app (Κύριε, ἀκούσομαί σου φωνῆς)

въсѣхъ сѫдіи бе︦ мои и г︦и да вслъишѫ твои глас тогда бл︦говтишенъ виждѫ твои свѣтъ великъіи оу︦зрѫ ѡбитѣли твоѫ и славѫ твоѫ радоуѫсѧ в вѣкъ

и г︦и : г︦и *RSL 385* : мои си *CMNL 1158*] свѣтъ : гласъ *F.I.125*] ѡбитѣли твоѫ : твоихъ ѡбитѣли *F.I.125*] в вѣкъ : въ вѣкъі *CMNL 1158*= *F.I.125*= *Pant.29.*

One can easily see that the differences between the manuscripts are insignificant and surely appeared within the course of their Church Slavonic history due to mistakes of the scribes or small conscious corrections. We can thus state with confidence that these troparia originate from one Slavonic protograph.

As far as the origin of said protograph is concerned, three possibilities should be examined. Firstly, this appendix of 5 troparia from another canon could originate from some unknown until now Greek tradition which happened to be the initial Greek text the correction by monk Joseph was based on. Secondly, these troparia could have been added to the text by monk Joseph himself in the process of correcting the Slavonic text. Finally, the troparia could have been added to the Church Slavonic text of the hymn later by an unknown Slavic scholar.

In order to find out which one of these hypotheses is more plausible, we should compare the texts of these additional troparia with the same troparia which form part of the Canon for the Sunday of the Last Judgment in the same manuscript - *Sin. 23* (see Table 1).

Table 1. Comparison of the troparia texts from the Canon for the Sunday of the Last Judgment by Theodore the Studite, repeated in the Athonite version of the Great Canon (in the manuscript *Sin. 23).* The most significant diversions are underlined.

Greek origin	Canon for the Sunday of the Last Judgment by Theodore the Studite	Great Canon by Andrew of Crete
Ode 1		
Δεῦρο λάβε μοι ψυχή, αὐτὴν τὴν ὥραν καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν, ὅτε ὁ Θεὸς ἐμφανῶς ἐπιστῇ καὶ θρήνησον, κλαῦσον, εὑρε θῆναι καθαρά, ἐν ὥρᾳ τῆς ἐτάσεως.	грѧдꙑ прїими дше моа т҃ꙑи час и д҃нь кегда б҃ъ ꙗвѣ прїидеть и рꙑдаи въпїа ѡбрѣсти сѧ чиста въ час испꙑтанїа	грѧди прїими дше моа самꙑи час и д҃нь кегда б҃ъ ꙗвѣ приидетъ и рꙑдаи и плачи сѧ ѡбрѣсти сѧ чиста въ часъ испꙑтанїа
Ἐξιστᾷ με καὶ φοβεῖ, τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον τῆς γεέννης, σκώληξ ὁ πικρός, τῶν ὀδόντων βρυγμός, ἀλλ' ἄνες μοι ἄφες, καὶ τῇ στάσει με Χριστέ, τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου σύνταξον.	оу̑дивлѣетꙁ мѧ и страшитꙁ мѧ негасимꙑи и геенꙁскꙑи чрꙗвь горькꙑи скрежеть з҃бомь нж ѡслаби ми пощади и стоанїю мѧ х҃е иꙁбраннꙑхъ съчини	оу̑жасает мѧ и страшитъ ѡгнь ѡнꙁ гееньскꙑи чрꙗвъ горкꙑи скрежетъ з҃бомъ нж ѡслаби ми и пощади и стоꙗнїю мѧ х҃е иꙁбранꙑхъ твоихъ причьти
Ode 6		
Ἆρον τὸ σόν, μὴ ἀκούσω Κύριε, ἀποπεμπόμενος ἐκ	въꙁми свое да не слꙑшж г҃и ѿсилаемъ ѿ тебе ни	въꙁми свое да не слꙑшж г҃и ѿсилаемъ ѿ тебе ни

σοῦ· μηδὲ τό, Πορεύου, εἰς πῦρ κατηραμένον· ἀλλὰ τῆς εὐκταίας φωνῆς τῆς τῶν Δικαίων	поиде въ ѡгнь проклѧтъі нꙁ кроткаго гласа праведникъ	еже иди въ ѡгнь проклѧтъіи нꙁ благаго гласа праведнъіхъ
Ode 8		
Πᾶσαν πνοὴν νίκα προσκέκλησαι, τοῦ διακρῖναι Χριστέ, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό· μέγας ὁ φόβος τότε, μεγάλη ἡ ἀνάγκη, μόνων βοηθούντων, τῶν πράξεων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας	въсѣко дъіханіе егда призовеши разꙑсꙗдіти хе̃ въкоупѣ великъ страхъ тогда велїа бѣда ѥдінѣмъ помагаꙗщемъ дѣаніемъ вь вѣкъі	въсѣко дъіханіе егда призовеши разꙑсꙗди ти хе̃ въкꙋпѣ вели страх тогда велиа нꙗжда въсѣмъ оужасаꙗщимсꙗ непостоꙗнна сꙗдища твоего
Πάντων Κριτὰ Θεέ μου καὶ Κύριε, ἀκούσομαί σου φωνῆς, τότε εὐκτικῆς, ἴδω σου φῶς τὸ μέγα, ἀθρήσω τὰς σκηνάς σου, βλέψω σου τὴν δόξαν, γηθόμενος εἰς τούς αἰῶνας.	въсѣхъ сꙗдіи бе̃ мои г̃и да оуслъішꙗ твои гласъ тогда кроткъіи да вижджꙗ твои свѣть великъіи да въселꙗсꙗ въ кровъі твоꙗ да пож твоꙗ славꙗ радоуꙗсꙗ въ вѣкъі	въсѣхъ сꙗдіи бе̃ мои и г̃и да услъішꙗ твои глас тогда бл̃говтишенъ вижджꙗ твои свѣтъ великъіи оузрꙗ ѡбитѣли твоꙗ и славꙗ твоꙗ радоуꙗсꙗ в вѣкъ

One can easily see from the comparison presented in Table 1, that there are significant differences between the texts of the same troparia included in two different canons. This divergence (see e.g. variants възпіꙗ / плачи сꙗ for κλαῦσον, оудивлѣетъ / оужасаетъ for ἐξιστᾷ, съчини / причьти for σύνταξον, кроткаго / благаго for εὐκταίας, кроткъіи/ бл̃говтишенъ for εὐκτικῆς, кровъі / ѡбитѣли for τὰς σκηνάς) could not have occurred after

the text was translated into Church Slavonic, and has definitely originated from different translations of the Greek text. Moreover, some variants (troparia 8.1app and 8.2app in particular) testify that these differences existed in the Greek original texts of the troparia. It should be highlighted that in some cases, specifically in the translation of the Greek ἀνάγκη as ноүжда in Slavonic instead of бѣда, as well as in the translation of the end of the strophe Πάντων Κριτὰ… (*8.2app*), the text of the Great Canon corresponds more accurately to the authentic Greek text compared to the one in the Canon for the Sunday of the Last Judgment. All this evidence led us to believe that these additional troparia were included in the Greek text of the Great Canon, which was used by monk Joseph for his corrections. This hypothesis agrees with the spirit of the Athonite book correction, the main goal of which was to have the Slavonic liturgical tradition be in accordance with the Greek one.

It should also be noted that these additional troparia, found in all the manuscripts of the Athonite version, disappear from the text of the Great Canon in subsequent versions where the text of the hymn was corrected according to other Greek sources[14], namely the Russian manuscript *RSL 25*[15] and the Bulgarian manuscript *F.n.I.55*[16].

Group 3

This "group" consists only of one manuscript, namely that of the Lent Triodion, Serbian, mid-15th cent., Hilandar monastery (Mount Athos) manuscript collection, code 262 (hereinafter referred to as *Hil. 262)*. In general, the text of the hymn in this manuscript follows the Athonite version, with mostly the same composition and the same order of strophes, including the additional strophes from the Canon by Theodore the Studite (1.1app, 1.2app, 6.1app, 8.1app, 8.2app). However, it has two unidentified in Greek tradition additional troparia. The first

---

[14] See Т. Борисова, Текстология церковнославянских переводов, 169 – 198.
[15] Lent Triodion, Russian, 14th cent., Russian State Library (Moscow), code 25.
[16] Lent Triodion, Bulgarian, 15th cent., Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), code F.п.I.55.

one is placed at the end of ode 1, immediately before the stanza *To the St. Mary of Egypt¹⁷*, *To the Holy Trinity* and *Theotokion*, and after the *1.1app* and *1.2app* additional troparia by Theodore the Studite and the strophe Μὴ εἰσέλθης μετ᾿ ἐμοῦ ἐν κρίσει (да не вьнидеши со мнюю вь соудь) – the last stanza of the ode of the initial text of the Great Canon, omitted in all other manuscripts of the Athonite version. This additional unidentified troparion, the full text of which is presented below (*1.3 app*), melodically follows the pattern of the *irmos* of the ode and has textual similarities with the stanza before it (да не вьнидеши со мнюю вь соудь - егда вь соудь вьнидеши) as well as with the other strophes of the ode from the initial text (по нѣ на коньца спси ме - прѣжде конца ослаби ми).

1.3 app

како ти сьтрьплю гнѣвь хе мои егда вь соудь вьнидеши котораа же словеса обрѣщоу тамо не сьдѣлавь ни вьзьмь твою волю спсе тѣм же прѣжде конца ослаби ми

Another unidentified additional troparion is found in the second part of ode 7, between the troparia Ἐκλείσθη σοι οὐρανός (затворисе тебѣ нбо) and Προσπίπτω σοι καὶ προσάγω σοι (припадаю ти и приношоу ти), which follow one another in the Athonite version. In *Hil.262*, however, another two troparia are inserted between them: the final stanza of the same ode of the authentic Greek text, missing from all the other manuscripts of the Athonite version Ἐξέλιπον αἱ ἡμέραι μου (изчезоуше днїе мои), and right before it the unidentified in the Greek tradition troparion, the full text of which can be found below (7.1app). Note that this is a unique case in the Slavonic tradition where the additional troparion is placed not at the end, but in the middle of the ode.

7.1app

илїа ꙗко вьзалка низвѣже їезавель обрѣте масльнⸯыи чбаньц и блсвлꙗаше се гресть моукы дше еꙗже и ты да сподобила себи испльнꙗющи топлѣ заповѣды бжїе

---

¹⁷ These troparia in the Church Slavonic tradition were inserted at the end of each ode in the Athonite correction.

This troparion is not only melodically similar to the other strophes of the ode, but in reference to the facts regarding the history of the Bible as described in the First Book of Kings (17: 12 – 16), it corresponds thematically with the other troparia, describing the facts of the same period of the history of the Bible and referring to the same Bible books. It also follows the same poetical pattern: it moves from the description of miracles and acts of faith of the holy men in the Bible to the effort of the soul to be like them (see e.g. the end of the stanzas from the same ode Τοῦ Μανασσῆ ἐπεσώρευσας: д҃ше... нь того тъı покаанїю ревноующи топлѣ стежи оумиленїе, Ἐκλείσθη σοι οὐρανός: д҃ше... нь сарефѳѣнзини оуподобисе и прѣпитаи прр҃чю д҃шоу).

Therefore, some additional strophes not included in the Greek text of church and scientific editions of the Great Canon of Repentance by Andrew of Crete, but saved in the Slavonic tradition, were found in these 3 groups, which amount a total of 21 Church Slavonic manuscripts among the 35 under research, dating from the 12th up to the 15th century. These 10 troparia are either unidentified so far in the Greek tradition (5 troparia), or were taken from another hymn – the Canon for the Sunday of the Last Judgment by Theodore the Studite (another 5 troparia). Although so far it has not been definitively proven whether these interpolations were realized by Greek or Slavic scholars, the textological evidence speaks in favor of their Greek origin. The thematic, melodic, and poetic characteristics of the additional strophes prove that they were either composed for this specific text by Andrew of Crete or by an unknown successor, or that they were taken from a text with the same thematic and melodic pattern. More evidence regarding the origin of these troparia, as well as the textological history of the Great Canon in general, could be discovered through a careful analysis of the Greek manuscripts.

About the author

Dr. Tatiana Borisova was born in Novosibirsk, Russia. She studied Philology at the Faculty of Humanities of the Novosibirsk State University, and, in 1998, she received her first PhD in Russian Language from the same university. She continued her studies at the Department of Philology of the University of Crete, receiving her second PhD in Byzantine Philology in 2007. Her scientific interests include the study of the Church Slavonic language and literature, and the Greek - Slavic cultural relations. She has published books, papers and articles on various aspects of Paleoslavistics, as well as on teaching Russian as a foreign language. Since 2008 she teaches at the Faculty of Russian Language and Literature and Slavic Studies of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, and since 2019 she works as a Post-doctorate Researcher in the Institute for Mediterranean Studies (IMS FORTH).