

**Резюмета на английски език на публикациите, представени
от доц. д-р Явор Милтенов,
Секция за история на българския език,
Институт за български език, БАН,
за участие в конкурса за заемане на академичната длъжност
„професор“,
обявен в „Държавен вестник“, брой 93 от 22.XI.2022 г.**

Монография:

Слова от колекцията Златоструй с неизвестен гръцки източник. София: Авалон, 2021, 250 с. (ISBN: 978-954-9704-40-2). (Homilies from the Chrysorrhoeas Collection With Unidentified Greek Original)

The study is devoted to ten works included in the Zlatostruy collection translated by the commission of Tsar Simeon (893–927), for which (unlike the other over 150 texts from the collection) no corresponding Greek text has been found so far.

The introduction to the monograph presents the complex history of Zlatostruy and its distribution in medieval literature. Special attention is paid to the sources for compiling the collection, consisting primarily of translated homilies by the most famous Byzantine writer, John Chrysostom.

Then, in ten separate sections, the texts that are the subject of research are examined. For each of them, one and the same methodological approach was applied, aiming at a complex and comprehensive study: a significant number of copies were searched and compared, versions of the texts and secondary editorial changes in them were identified, a linguistic analysis was carried out, and an edition with a critical apparatus was elaborated.

In the process of work, it appeared that most of the ten works can be claimed to be original Old Bulgarian works, not translations. This is a significant contribution to the history of Bulgarian literature and culture from the time of the Golden Age, since we actually have very few untranslated texts written by medieval Bulgarian authors that have reached us.

Moreover, the careful analysis of the stylistic and linguistic characteristics of the works studied leads to the conclusion that a significant part of them were created by

Kliment of Ohrid or his followers, and one is a reworking of a sermon attributed to the Old Bulgarian writer monk (chernorizets) Petar. Most of these texts are explored and published for the first time in the present monograph.

The conclusion is actually devoted to collecting in one place the evidence on which the identification of Kliment of Ohrid as an author is based. In most of the cases it is certain characteristic themes and stylistic features in the content of the texts that support such an assumption. In this way, the results of the research consist not only in the discovery, reconstruction of the texts and publication of new works by old Bulgarian authors, but the complex approach also allows reaching new information about the daily life and spiritual needs of the Bulgarian society shortly after the Conversion, about the style and language of the Bulgarian writers from this time, shows new directions for understanding the cultural processes during the Bulgarian Golden Age.

Статии и доклади, публикувани в научни издания, реферирани и индексирани в световноизвестни бази данни с научна информация:

A Note on the Adoption of the Byzantine Models in Medieval Bulgaria (9th-10th c.): The Case of the Chrysorrhoeas Collection. – *Studia Ceranea*, 7, 2017, 161–168. (ISSN: 2084–140X, e-ISSN: 2449-8378) **Без JCR или SJR – индексирани в WoS или Scopus (Web of Science)** [Линк](#)

In the first quarter of the 10 c. the first Slavic collection of homilies of John Chrysostom was compiled. It was called Zlatostruy, which means Chrysorrhoeas or Golden Stream. In previous studies the Zlatostruy was noted mostly for its Preface, whereby the Bulgarian Tsar Symeon (893-927) is named initiator of the gathering the initial Corpus Chrysostomicum and author of its name.

The importance of the Zlatostruy collection is supported not only by the Preface, which may be considered of more or less ideological value. It is substantiated by means of a comprehensive text-critical and comparative analysis that endeavors to reconstruct the history of the collection and reveal further detail about the textual history of the homilies from the Byzantine originals to the later Slavic copies.

In the present study, the focus is shifted to those features that actually characterize the flourishing of the Bulgarian literary tradition in the 10th century and the successful

assimilation of Byzantine literary models - state support, the approach of translators, and the compilation of anthologies.

Три пласта на лексикално редактиране в Зографското евангелие. *Slověne* = Словѣне. *International Journal of Slavic Studies*, 8, 2019, ISSN:2304-0785, 12-24. SJR (Scopus):0.1 **Q4 (Scopus)** [Линк](#) (Three Layers of Lexical Editing in Codex Zographensis)

The article aims to examine Cyrillic and Glagolitic glosses in the OCS Codex Zographensis, inserted by the scribe himself. These notes in the margins are among the earliest examples of editorial work in a Slavonic written monument ever, hence they are an important evidence about the way the lexical editing in the 9th – 10th century was applied and about its essence. The study on the glosses was put in the context of previous research on 1) the lexical variants with which the text of Codex Zographensis is opposed to that of Codex Marianus, Assemanianus and Liber Sabbae, and 2) the lexical alterations which in scholarly literature are treated as East Bulgarian. The analysis leads to the conclusion that the Cyrillic alphabet was copyist's usual, daily writing routine might have been in Cyrillic, and that his intention was to replace or explain certain foreign, non-Slavic words. Most synonyms and interpretations he offers are not influenced by the tradition and are probably due to his own initiative, which typologically corresponds to already established processes of lexical editing in 10th century Bulgaria.

Щрихи от историята на българския Златен век: преводната литература в контекста на духовното присъединяване към византийската общност. *Български език и литература*, 61, 4, 2019, ISSN:0323-9519, 407-418 **Без JCR или SJR – индексирани в WoS или Scopus (Web of Science)** [Линк](#) (Outlines of the History of the Bulgarian Golden Age: Translated Literature in the Context of the Spiritual Integration to the Byzantine Commonwealth)

Bulgarian Golden Age is, on the one hand, a time of territorial expansion and significant presence on the political map of Europe; on the other hand, it is the period of the first major peaks in Slavic literature, and, probably, in arts and architecture.

At its core, the Golden Age is joining the spirituality and mentality of the Byzantine world and adoption of the achievements of its centuries-old philosophical tradition.

The Byzantine models in literature were borrowed by using two co-existing principles: copying and adaptation. The former might be observed in most of the works intended for non-liturgical individual or monastic reading, which were translated in full. The latter is found in miscellanies compiled from partial translations and excerpts, or in Old Bulgarian translations that were abridged, edited, or reworked. The article aims at examining the most important examples of such adaptation and its features, pointing out the role of the aristocracy and the ruler himself in guiding these processes.

Статии и доклади, публикувани в нереферирани списания с научно рецензиране или публикувани в редактирани колективни томове:

Хилендарските свидетели на *Златоструй* и тяхното значение за реконструиране на протосбирката. – В: Юбилеен сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф. Уйлям Федер. [In honorem 2. Филология и текстология]. Шумен, 2014, 222-232. (ISBN 978-619-00-0096-9) (Hilandar Witnesses of Chrysorrhoeas (Zlatostruy) Collection and Their Importance for the Reconstruction of the Initial Corpus)

Two Slavonic collections of Chrysostomian homilies, both known as Zlatostruy (Chrysorrhoeas), were arranged in Bulgaria in the 10th century. It is assumed that the longer one (comprising 138 entries) and the shorter one (81 entries) are independent witnesses of a lost original corpus of texts – a Chrysorrhoeas protocollection, emerged during the reign of King Symeon (893–927).

Despite that a) the Chrysostomian corpus was constituted in Preslav at the beginning of the 10th c., and b) the two main versions emerged from it in the 10th c. too, there are very few South Slavic manuscripts containing the successors of the original collection. The reconstruction of the history of collection(s) and, respectively, of the texts, faces, unsurprisingly, the usual obstacle – a tradition, interrupted for centuries and developed in different environment than the original one: the longer and the shorter collections are represented by Russian copies, almost all of which dating from 15th c. on.

Luckily, there are also three 14th c. Serbian manuscripts, written at the Hilandar monastery on Mount Athos, which, for the above mentioned reasons, are of great

importance. The article aims at studying the transformations, dissemination and structure of the Chrysorrhoeas collections on the base of the features of these witnesses.

Особености на рецепцията на византийското книжовно наследство в старобългарската преводна литература от IX-X в. – В: 145 години Българско книжовно дружество. Приложение към сп. Български език, София, 2014, 173-188. (ISSN 0005-4283) (Some Features of Byzantine Literary Heritage Reception in Old Bulgarian Literature from IX-X c.)

The aim of the article is to reconstruct and analyze the purposefully introduced principles, which with the commissioner's will and patronage of the ruler, have become the driving force of the flourishing in the field of literature and a successful way of assimilating the cultural achievements of Byzantium. The composition of translated and compiled anthologies is the main and perhaps the most important line in this direction. These are collections that seek to present the essence of theological thought through specially selected excerpts, serve for individual reading and are intended for an enlightened elite. The presence of textually authenticated independent collections selectively using the same arrays, the partial translations and the fragmentation of complete translations, the interweaving of all these features in a system of mutual relationships that produces anthologies and that is inextricably bound to the capital and the ruler - these are the parameters that fix the processes common to some collections, but also clearly characteristic of literature as a whole: the main driving force of Symeon's project is the preliminary work of collecting the achievements of Byzantine written culture, followed by various types of adaptation, transformation and fragmentation.

Общите пасажии между колекцията *Златоструй* и *Княжеския Изборник*. – Старобългарска литература, 49-50, 2014, 28-45. (ISSN 0204-868X) (Common Passages between Zlatostruy and the Knyazhiy Izbornik)

Zlatostruy and the so-called Knyazhiy (or Knyazheskiy) Izbornik are among the most interesting and most important Old Bulgarian anthologies. The former was a collection of more than 120 Chrysostomian homilies that became a source for miscellanies of stable content (known as "redactions of Zlatostruy") and strongly influenced the Lenten homiliaries and other early florilegia. The latter is a compilation from compilations, as

William Veder defined it, which means a selection from various previously made and subsequently revised Slavonic translations from Greek.

Both Zlatostruy and the Knyazhiy Izbornik have much in common: time and place of origin, a connection with the Bulgarian royal court in their early history, similarities in terms of structure and in the way the sources were adapted. Last, but not least there are textual coincidences between them. The article deals with juxtaposition of the common passages. Their analysis leads to conclusion that collections under consideration do not depend on one another, but transmit a larger protocollection, which contained translations, excerpts and gnomai.

Научните приноси на професор Франсис Томсън в светлината на методологическите проблеми пред палеославистиката. – Старобългарска литература, 52, 2015, 11–23. (ISSN 0204-868X)

The article analyzes the reasons why Slavic medieval studies for decades in the middle of the 20th century remained a closed system, written and read mainly in Slavic languages. The second part examines some of Francis Thomson's contributions to overcoming the shortcomings of the previous methodology of self-isolation. They generally consist in the application of an approach forgotten by the Slavists - the linking of translations with the originals, of Slavic studies with Byzantine studies - which can lead to a qualitatively new stage in scholarship.

The return of Greek in publications, the different way in which medieval Slavic translations have been published in the last 25 years, the central place of textual criticism in Slavic studies, the compilation of catalogs of texts - these are only some of the main features of the change in methodology, of which Thomson was a forerunner. And in some sense an ideologue, as many of those who carried it out were influenced by his articles as a model, as an approach, as a way of thinking.

Бележки върху историята и състава на ръкопис № 1039 от Народната Библиотека „Св. Св. Кирил и Методий“. – В: Агиославика. Проблеми и подходи в изследването на Станиславовия чети-миней. Съст. Д. Атанасова. София, 2016, 61–77. (ISBN 978-954-07-3920-5) (Ms. 1039 from the National Library “Sts. Cyril and Methodius” in Sofia – Notes on Its History and Content)

The article examines the codicological and textological features of ms. 1039 of the National Library in Sofia with special attention to the history of the texts in the manuscript, its protograph and alleged archetype. In addition to the individual characteristics of ms. 1039, its context is considered as well – miscellanies that preserve similar content are analyzed in regard to their origin and their textual grouping. Copying of these codices seems to be a result of deliberate dissemination of menaia sets intended for major Serbian monastic centers in mid-14th century. The source (i.e. their common protograph) probably came from Mount Athos.

A partial linguistic analysis reveals inhomogeneity in the content of ms. 1039 and related miscellanies, for the entries differ in terms of lexical features (Preslav, neutral, and mixed). The conclusion from these initial observations is, that ms. 1039 does not reflect one hypothetical most ancient Preslav archetype, allegedly created (as is logical to assume) en bloc by retransmission of a certain Byzantine volume or set. It seems the Slavonic pre-Metafrastic hagiographic corpus as we know it from these manuscripts, has already experienced some changes and development, which means it is several generations away from the archetype (if such existed at all).

Notes on Scribal Errors in the Earliest Slavic Manuscripts. The Oldest Linguistic Attestations and Texts in the Slavic Languages, Holzhausen, 2018, ISBN:978-3-903207-21-9, 167-175.

This paper presents a preliminary survey of some types of scribal errors in the earliest Slavic manuscripts. The data analysed include omissions, additions, or substitutions of letters, which lead to a loss of or change in meaning. Why do such errors appear? What do they tell us about the training of the scribes or about the way they transcribed their texts? Here are some possible answers to these questions: 1) Although most 10th-11th century codices were presumably written in a multilingual environment (Sinai, Athos), it seems that scribes did not have a great deal of experience with spoken/written Greek; 2) Some of the errors under consideration seem to have resulted from transcribing character by character or syllable by syllable; 3) Most of the graphic errors and deviations are due to the text having been perceived by sight or ear by certain scribes, however, one frequent reason for their occurrence is the failure (or the lack of an attempt) to understand the meaning of the text; 4) Some of the Sinai manuscripts show evidence that the copyists frequently interrupted their work and failed to begin

transcribing from the same place when they returned to it, failing to read prior text and not knowing the text by heart (Psalms for example). Some of these men of letters were likely still apprentices, and were thus prone to careless errors simply because these were among the first manuscripts they had to copy.

The Five Ws of the Old Church Slavonic Codex Zographensis: Recent Studies, Future Tasks. Digital and Analytical Approaches to the Written Heritage. Proceedings of the Conference E' Manuscript 2018, Sofia: Gutenberg, 2019, ISBN:978-619-176-155-5, 169-187.

Ever since the famous Glagolitic-Old Church Slavonic Codex Zographensis was discovered some 175 years ago, its features have been subject to comprehensive research. Naturally, they have also become a major source for the reconstruction of the Old Church Slavonic grammar and for the research of various aspects of the Slavonic written culture in the 9th – 11th c. However, the critical question remains, whether the accumulation of this large amount of scholarly literature leads to answers to the five classical questions to be posed to any such historical source: who - what - when - where - why? The present article intends to gather the information available in one place and to critically revisit the different opinions. The focus is on studies conducted over the last thirty years which offer new approaches and new answers. The following issues are considered: the assumptions about the original content of the manuscript, the influence of the Cyrillic alphabet on the habits of the copyist, the inclusion of an inexperienced second scribe, similarities with the decoration of other Glagolitic manuscripts, notes on the liturgical use of the Tetraevangelium, hypotheses about the origin of the codex based on linguistic and orthographic features, among others.

To conclude, recent studies have shown that even a well-studied monument such as the Codex Zographensis can be subjected to further research which may reveal new facts. On the one hand, some aspects and features of the manuscript are still left unstudied or insufficiently studied. On the other hand, the scholarly methods still need elaboration and refinement both of their concepts and the foundational principles for classification of the earliest monuments based on a complex and multidisciplinary approach which would surely unearth further important details of the Slavic written culture of the 10th - 11th c.

Три непроучени славянски Златоустови антологии в съпоставка със сборника Златоструй. Sapere aude. Сборник в чест на проф. Искра Христова-Шомова, София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2019, ISBN:978-954-07-4890-0, 390-403. (Three Yet Unstudied Slavic Chrysostomian Anthologies as Compared to the Chrysorroas Collection)

The original Old Bulgarian proto-collection of Chrysostomian homilies has not been preserved in its entirety in any manuscript source. It is reconstructed through complementary or corroborating data drawn from homiletical anthologies and collections of mixed content that use it. The most important for text critical reconstruction are several collections, called by slavists “redactions of Zlatostruy”.

There are, however, other Slavic collections of selected Chrysostom’s works, which are related to Zlatostruy but are either only mentioned in passing in the scholarly literature, or remain completely unstudied. The article offers some preliminary data on the composition and partial observations on the text-critical evidence of three such manuscripts. They contain various selections from the Zlatostruy, as well as works that have not been assigned to the Tsar-Simeon collection until now. As concerns the text type, some works resemble the versions presented in shorter Zlatostruy, and others – to the longer collection. The observations made are of great importance for the reconstruction of the history of each text and for preliminary assumptions regarding the compilation of various South and East Slavic compilations, which directly or indirectly go back to the archetypal Old Bulgarian corpus.

Съвпадащи лексикални решения в преписи на Осмокнижието и на Тълковните пророчески книги. – В: *Sub specie aeternitatis*. Сборник научных статей к 60-летию Вадима Борисовича Крысько. Москва, 2021, ISBN 978-5-91172-215-9, 403–415. (Common Lexical Features in Slavic Medieval Witnesses of Octateuch and Prophets with Commentary).

The article examines lexemes from medieval Slavic copies of the Octateuch and the *Catena in prophetas*, which have the value of a marker, an individualizing mark, a differentiating and grouping feature. They testify not only to a similar time and place of processing of the examined Old Testament books (which is clear from the use of proto-Bulgarianisms and typical synonyms), but also contain information about the style laid down in their Preslav photographs. The coincidences with the text of the homilies of

Gregory the Theologian are particularly impressive - their comparative study should continue with the thought that they may be the result of the work of the same circle of translators.

In conclusion, it is argued that the compilation of a collection of biblical prophetic books in Preslav was part of a wider program of translation or editing of the Old Testament texts. The examined material reinforces the feeling that the Old Testament books may have been worked on at the same time - it seems that, if not all, then a significant part of the matching vocabulary was introduced into the texts in their Preslav period.

Свидетелства за прехода глаголица – кирилица през X–XIII век. – В: Шестовуѣж нѣнѣ по слѣдоу оучителю. Сборник в чест на проф. д.ф.н. Анна-Мария Тотоманова. София, 2021, ISBN: 978-954-075-222-8, 35–49. (Evidence of the Transition from Glagolitic to Cyrillic in the 10th-13th c.)

The questions regarding the use of the Glagolitic alphabet after the arrival of the Cyril-Methodian students in Bulgaria, the invention of the Cyrillic alphabet and its imposition in the following decades, the geographical and chronological scope and stages of this change, have been repeatedly discussed in scholarship. The article aims to return to a complex examination of the sources that can serve to establish the Glagolitic-Cyrillic transition in the 10th-13th centuries.

The first part examines the coexistence of Glagolitic and Cyrillic in the 9th–11th centuries. The imposition of Cyrillic as the main script in the Bulgarian regions in the 10th century is well attested by epigraphic monuments with a precise date, however, several entirely Glagolitic or Cyrillic-Glagolitic inscriptions from the 10th century are also known. This is not exactly the case of literary sources – Glagolitic manuscripts and fragments make up more than half of their total number. The influence of the Cyrillic alphabet on the scribes of some Glagolitic monuments is especially emphasized, certifying that they mastered both writing systems. From the analysis, it becomes clear that the mentioned sources come to us from an era with a predominance of the Cyrillic alphabet. The critical review of the sources continues with examples of Glagolitic notes in Cyrillic manuscripts left by scribes or readers in the 10th–11th centuries. Further, the

article offers comprehensive data on texts that had a (now lost) Glagolitic original and transmission. The conclusion from the examination of all the evidence is that in the lands of the rulers Boris, Simeon, Peter and Samuil, Glagolitic and Cyrillic coexisted for a long period of time, and the assessment of the predominance of one or the other in certain regions is a matter of subjective research point of view.

In the second part, "Echoes from the Glagolitic tradition in the 12th-13th centuries, examples from the 14th and 15th centuries", the aim is to document the chronology of the transmission of knowledge about the older alphabet, its use, etc. Evidence such as larger Glagolitic insertions in Cyrillic manuscripts, single Glagolitic letters, manifestations of digraphia in paratexts are revisited. On the basis of these data, it can be argued that the knowledge of the Glagolitic alphabet marked a gradual regression in time, but until the middle-end of the 14th century, there was clearly a need for literate people who could read in Glagolitic. Thus, a picture emerges of an unexpectedly long life of the Glagolitic tradition in the education and practice of scribes. As for the geographical distribution of the sources from the 12th–15th centuries, they were written primarily in the Western Bulgarian and Macedonian regions, sometimes to modern Kosovo, Bosnia. The traces of knowledge of the Glagolitic language of Athos, which date from the late 13th to the middle of the 14th century, are examined in detail.

О трех лингвистических критериях локализации древнейших славянских рукописей – критический обзор. – В: Труды Института русского языка. Лингвистическое источниковедение. № 1, 2021, ISSN 2311–150X, 233–245. (On Three Linguistic Criteria for Localization of the Earliest Slavic Manuscripts: a Critical Review)

The article aims at analysis of some of the linguistic features of the earliest Slavic manuscripts, which in scholarly tradition are considered not only as means for grouping some of these written monuments, but also as evidence of the region they originate from.

Since the time of A. Leskin, V. Vondrak, V. N. Shchepkin and others, the main criterion for the classification of the most ancient South Slavic manuscripts is the presence or absence of examples of the change of the reduced ѣ into o. The article examines linguistic data from the *Zographensis* Gospel, which, however, contradict the traditional positions in science and call into question the validity of this criterion as a locating mark

in relation to the *Zographensis* Gospel, and hence also in relation to all other manuscripts from the 10th–11th centuries.

Another phonetic feature used to locate some of the oldest monuments is the interchange of ж and оу. This feature is considered to be one of the distinguishing features of, for example, the *Marianus* Gospel, pointing to a Serbian influence. Modern research, however, shows that the change ж>оу is not a feature of the modern Serbian language only, but is present in a very wide area in Serbia, Dalmatia, Western Bulgaria and North Macedonia.

Examples of replacing ж with о are also attested in some of the oldest manuscripts. The study argues that the phenomenon is attested in many more manuscripts than those mentioned in the literature and can be considered the most uncertain localization mark of those mentioned.

On the basis of a critical review of studies carried out to date and after taking into consideration some lesser known and lesser used data, it is concluded that examples of changes of ъ into о, ж into оу and ж into о have different values, but none of them is indisputable and may be recognized as a decisive argument for localization.

За някои редки думи в „маргиналните“ писмени свидетелства от X–XI в. – В: Доклади от Международната годишна конференция на Института за български език „Проф. Любомир Андрейчин“ (София, 2022 година). София, 2022, 291–297. (ISSN: 2683-118X) (On Some Rare Words in “Marginal” Written Evidence from the 10th-11th c.)

The article aims at examining several rare words, attested in a) notes left by the copyists of Old Bulgarian manuscripts from the 10th-11th c., and b) in inscriptions from the same period. In some cases a new interpretation of the analyzed material is performed, and in other such is offered for the first time.

The analysis includes the words вѣри 'let?', from the Cyrillic-Glagolitic inscription on f. 94r in the *Asemanianus* Gospel, нежитѣ (a disease characterized by inflammation in the head, migraine) from lead amulets against this disease, срѣдопостие 'mid-Lent' from a note in the lower margin of f. 76v in the *Asemanianus* Gospel, соукаѣти 'defecate' from inscription No. 3 from the monastery near the village of Ravna, прѣхѣтъ 'coin of small

value' from the glosses left by the scribe of the *Zographensis* Gospel in the margins of the manuscript.

The observations supplement the lexicographic manuals and contain little-known facts about the monuments in which these hapaxes and rare words occur.

Вмъкнатите глаголически листове в Зографското евангелие. – Българска реч, 27, № 2, 2021, 107–120. (ISSN: 1310-733X)

As it is well known, the five classical questions to be posed to any subject of research are: who - what - when - where - why. After conducting research on the possible answers of these questions as regards the famous Codex Zographensis main part, author turns now his attention to the three Glagolitic quaternions inserted in the original manuscript in order to replace lost folia. The article intends to gather the information available in one place and to revisit the history of these quaternions in the light of the practices and habits of medieval scribes. The characteristics of the upper and lower text of the palimpsest leaves are considered in sequence. All possible characteristics are taken into account - codicological, linguistic and orthographic, related to graphics, decoration, etc. The inserted folia, as it becomes clear, are an important source for tracing the coexistence of Glagolitic and Cyrillic, and also for fixing a number of phonetic processes, which, as the epigraphic monuments also show, began already in the Old Bulgarian period (dropping of jer vowels, leveling of their voicing, consolidation of consonants, leveling of front and back sonants, etc.). All the manuscripts that have come down to us from the earliest period, that disparate group that we now call the "canon" of "classical monuments," are the product of the fringes of literary culture. The Zographensis Gospel shows how the book moves over the centuries further and further away from the center (i.e. from the normed, from the elegant, from the representative) and precisely because of this it brings us more and richer data about the development of the language, written culture, education, scribal practice in the Old Bulgarian cultural space.

Студии, публикувани в научни издания, реферирани и индексирани в световноизвестни бази данни с научна информация:

Проблеми и перспективи пред проучването на „класическите“ старобългарски паметници. Старобългарска литература, 59-60, 2019, ISSN:0204-868X, 153-198 **Без JCR или SJR – индексирани в WoS или Scopus (Scopus) [Линк](#)**

The study aims to address selected key issues concerning the characteristics and classification of the oldest Slavic manuscripts: what are the reasons for defining them as a corpus and canon, what new approaches could be used to retrieve previously unknown information from them, is it possible to objectively group them according to reliable criteria, to establish their relative chronology, provenance and the scribal practices that reproduced them. Scholars presume definitive answers to most of these questions, but the picture is actually much more complicated.

The study offers a critical reassessment of the arguments underpinning shared assumptions in the field and the conventions on which our knowledge relies. In separate sections, the following issues are considered: "Why and how do we single them out?" Examining the earliest manuscripts as corpus and canon', 'What else can be explored about the earliest manuscripts? More accessible sources and new technologies", "When were they created? Known and unknown about the relative chronology of the earliest manuscripts", "Where did they originate? The reference points for relative localization of the oldest manuscripts', 'Does the evidence match? The earliest literary monuments and the earliest epigraphy', 'Is grouping or chronological sequence possible? Various attempts to classify the earliest manuscripts", "Who were their creators and how did they work? The earliest manuscripts as a source for written culture in a 'technological' aspect". As a result of these studies on the data from the manuscript sources, it becomes possible to rethink some of the solutions established in scholarship, which tend to fill the sketchy data with interpretations and thus to turn them from meager fragments into history.

The study proposes new approaches to exploring features which have received little attention so far, but which could expand and enrich our understanding of the particular manuscripts and of medieval Slavic written culture more broadly.

Преславските лексикални маркери. 1. Опит за въведение. Palaeobulgarica, 2020, ISSN:0204-4021, 54-79. SJR (Scopus):0.1 **Q4 (Web of Science) [Линк](#)** (The Preslav Lexical Markers. 1. An Attempt for an Introduction)

The article deals with methodological problems concerning the identification and study of the lexicon, that is characteristic of the translated and original literary works created in East Bulgaria from the late 9th till the last quarter of the 10th centuries. Issues related to some inaccurate and unclear claims are discussed, as well as those concerning our knowledge of translation techniques, the synonymous variation, and the implementation of the so-called "Preslav redaction". An attempt is made to clarify the criteria according to which certain lexemes could be considered of differentiating value ("markers"). The purpose of the present study is to serve as a guide for extracting a reliable corpus of linguistic evidence, for classifying the lexical markers and for possibly grouping the texts from which they are extracted.

The work is organized, almost literally, through a sequential examination of each of the three words that make up the term *Preslav lexical markers*. Why is the lexical layer specific to a certain group of Old Bulgarian monuments called *Preslav* and what does this mean? Why and how exactly is *lexical* data brought to the fore as decisive argument? Which vocabulary can reliably be defined as specific, to what extent, and what exactly does it *mark*? At first glance, these are questions with clear answers, but in fact they involve many conventions, important details, ideas established as rules and a broad, often overlooked, context. In addition, the lack of sufficient number of synchronous historical, literary and linguistic data from the IX-X centuries leads to the impossibility of applying a method that always and in every case gives a certain positive or negative result.

Despite all the reservations and limitations discussed (none of which should be overlooked), two main characteristics of the subject of study should be brought to the fore: it is a vocabulary that matches, and it is a vocabulary that disappears. Preslav lexical markers are found through linguistic analysis – comparing texts and noting the common and different between them. The lexical coincidences have attributive value only when they are valid for a certain circle of Old Bulgarian works and when they are purposefully removed in later copies of these works or are categorically avoided by the authors and translators who worked in the following centuries. The gradual (or sudden) disappearance of this type of lexicon guarantees the researcher that there is a chronological boundary which he can rely on to place the text he is studying among the works bearing the marks of the entire "radiation" of a cultural tradition from Preslav.

Студии, публикувани в неререферирани списания с научно рецензиране или публикувани в редактирани колективни томове:

За книжовните връзки между Атон и Синай. – В: Манастирски библиотеки в южнославянските земи и Русия през XIV–XVI век. Доклади от международната научна конференция 26–28 април 2021 г. Отг. ред. М. Скарпа, Е. В. Белякова, Т. В. Пентковска. [Кирило-Методиевски студии, 23]. София, ISSN 0205-2253, 2022, 93–116. (On the Literary Connections between Mount Athos and Sinai)

The collection of Slavonic manuscripts, kept (once and today) in the library of the Sinai Monastery of St. Catherine, is emblematic in many ways: firstly, because it contains a large part of the Glagolitic manuscripts that have reached our modern times, secondly, because of the evidence of collaborative team work by scribes in the monastery from different linguo-geographical areas working on the same codex or codices, and thirdly, because of the numerous notes by pilgrims in the manuscripts. It is also extremely interesting to explore the history of each manuscript in the context of the collection itself.

The study is devoted to evidence about manuscripts written elsewhere and found in the library of the Sinai Monastery, with the emphasis being mostly on the manuscripts of Athonite origin. The overview includes more than fifteen manuscripts that came from the Balkans to Sinai, and is based on the information in notes of scribes, translators, donators, readers. Normally, such notes contain a mentioning where the manuscript was created or where it resided, or it is stated that it was gifted to the Sinai Monastery.

It turns out that, unlike most other monastery collections we know about, the formation of the Sinai monastery library as we know it today was very strongly influenced by donated books and copies of such. Sending a book to the Sinai monastery has long been seen as an offering for the forgiveness of sins. Because of this, donators choose within their means specimens of the highest possible quality. The role of the Athonite literary tradition in this process was undoubtedly very important, and especially in the second half of the 14th century – decisive. In the study, special attention is paid to several such specimens and some little-known or unknown facts about these and other particular manuscripts are discussed.