University "St. Kliment Ohridski"
Faculty of Education



TEACHER

International Journal of Education

ISSN 1857-8888

vol. 26
November 2023

University "St. Kliment Ohridski" – Bitola
Faculty of Education – Bitola

TEACHER
International Journal of Education

Vol. 26
Bitola, November, 2023

Publisher
Faculty of Education − Bitola

Executive and Editor-in-chief
Ljupco Kevereski, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia

Editorial Team
Ljupco Kevereski, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, ljupco.kevereski@uklo.edu.mk (Editor in-chief)
Jove Dimitrija Talevski, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, jove.talevski@uklo.edu.mk
Dance Sivakova-Neshkovski, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, dance.sivakova@uklo.edu.mk
Violeta Janusheva, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, violeta.januseva@uklo.edu.mk
Jasminka Kochoska, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, jasminka.kochoska@uklo.edu.mk
Josif Petrovski, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, josif.petrovski@uklo.edu.mk

Editorial Board
Grozdanka Gojkov, Higher Professional School for Education of Teachers „Mihailo Palov“ Serbia, g_gojkov@mts.rs
Marjan Blažič, PhD, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Novo Mesto, Slovenia, marjan.blazic@uni-nm.si
Ante Kolak, PhD, University of Zagreb, Croatia, akolak@ffzg.unizg.hr
Svetlana Kurtesh, PhD, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Madeira, Portugal
Danimir Mandić, PhD, University of Belgrade, Serbia,danimir.mandic@uf.bg.ac.rs
Danijela Kostadinović, PhD, University of Nish, Serbia, danijela.kostadinovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs
Jasmina Starc, PhD, University of Novo Mesto, Slovenia, jasmina.starc@uni-nm.si
Mojca Jurishevich, PhD, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, mojca.jurisevic@pef.uni-lj.si
Anton Ilica, PhD, University „Aurel Vlaicu“, Romania, ilica_anton@yahoo.com
Eva Szórádová, PhD, Pedagogical faculty, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Slovakia, eszoradova@ukf.sk
Lazar Stoshić, PhD, University UNION Nikola Tesla, Serbia, lazarstosic@yahoo.com
Alla Belousova, PhD, Don State Technical University, Russia, belousovaak@gmail.com
Irina Abakumova, PhD, Don State Technical University, Russia, abakira@mail.ru
Tom Jovanovski, PhD, USA
Zlatko Zhoglev, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, zlatko.zhoglev@uklo.edu.mk
Valentina Gulevska, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, valentina.gulevska@uklo.edu.mk
Biljana Gramatkovski, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, biljana.gramatkovski@uklo.edu.mk
Milena Pejchinovska-Stojkovikj, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia, milena.pejcinovska@uklo.edu.mk
Nikoleta Momčilović, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Serbia, nikoleta.momcilovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Namita Subiotto, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia,
namita.subiotto@ff.uni-lj.si

English Language Editor
Stela Bosilkovska, MA, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia,
stela.bosilkovska@uklo.edu.mk

Technical Editor
Josif Petrovski, PhD, University St. Kliment Ohridski, Republic of North Macedonia,
josif.petrovski@uklo.edu.mk

CIP - Cataloging in Publication,
National and University Library "St. Kliment Ohridski" – Skopje.

TEACHER: Journal of the Faculty of Education – Bitola /
[Editorial Board Acad. Grozdanka Gojkov ...] Year XXI, No. 2 (2023) -.
- Bitola: Faculty of Education, 2023 -. - 29 cm., 65 p.

Unspecified

ISSN 1857- 8888 (online)

University “St. Kliment Ohridski“ – Bitola, North Macedonia
Faculty of Education – Bitola, North Macedonia

Address:
Faculty of Education
ul “Vasko Karangelevski“, b. b.
7000 Bitola, North Macedonia
Tel/Fax. ++ 389 47 253 652; 203 385

With the opinion of the Ministry of Culture no. 07-2699/2 from 15.04.1998, for the journal “Teacher” is paid preferential tax rate. In accordance with Article 20, paragraph 8 of the VAT Law (Official Gazette 44/99), for the journal “Teacher” is paid a tax of 5%.

The journal has no commercial nature.

Table of contents

BRITISH ENGLISH VERSUS AMERICAN ENGLISH PREFERENCE BY UNIVERSITY STUDENTS OF EFL 6
Ana Koceva, Dafina Kostadinova, Tanya Tabutova

INVESTIGATING L2-L1 TRANSFER AMONG BILINGUAL STUDENTS IN THE REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA 11
Stojanoska Marija, Shalevska Elena, Talevska Marija

AI LANGUAGE MODELS, STANDARDIZED TESTS, AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: A CHAT (GPT) 17
Elena Shalevska

EXPLORING EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS: INTEGRATING CHILDREN'S LITERATURE IN THE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM 26
Dushko Talevski, Elena Shalevska

JUXTAPOSITION OF THE SOUND SYSTEMS OF THE ENGLISH AND MACEDONIAN AND THE POSSIBILITIES FOR INTERFERENCE 31
Stela Bosilkovska, Violeta Janusheva

THE IMPERATIVE FOR OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY IN CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES – A LITERATURE REVIEW 41
Denis Arsovski, Tanja Jovanovska, Viktorija Prodanovska-Stojchevska, Izabela Filov, Domnika Rajchanovska, Angelka Jankulovska, Daniela Petkovska

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE TEACHER IN ENCOURAGING CREATIVITY AMONG THE GIFTED STUDENTS IN PRIMARY EDUCATION 46
Vesna Stojanovska

PANNONIC LEGENDS – ATTRIBUTION 49
Anita Angelevska

COMPARISON OF SPEAKERS LIZ TRUSS AND BORIS JOHNSON 53
Sofija Trampevska, Biljana Gramatkovski

USING STEM EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS 62
Josif Petrovski

University "St. Kliment Ohridski" – Bitola
Faculty of Education – Bitola

eISSN: 1857- 8888
UDK: 27-36:929Св.Кирил
27-36:929Св.Методиј
821.163.3'04
DOI: 10.20544/teacher.26.08

PANNONIC LEGENDS – ATTRIBUTION

Anita Angelevska
aaangelska@gmail.com

Abstract

The question of the attribution of the colloquially named Pannonian legends, i.e., the hagiography of St. Cyril and the hagiography of St. Methodius, is very important from two aspects. It is essential for the attribution of Saint Clement's work, and on the other hand, these two hagiographies represent written documents that provide the closest data on the Moravian mission, i.e., on the Cyril Methodius issue, one of the most significant points on which Slavic philology rests. The fact that the Moravian mission is a testimony to the formation of the new strong European civilization – the Slavic one – is undoubtedly important.

Key words: Pannonian legends, attribution, St. Clement, Moravian mission, Slavic civilization.

The authorship of Pannonian legends is one of the significant questions regarding the attribution of Saint Clement's work. One millennium, one century and six decades since the beginning of the Moravian mission, are a benchmark that testifies to the formation of a strong European civilization – the Slavic one.

The Cyril-Methodius question is the most important question of the Slavic philology. Vatroslav Jagich correctly locates that the successes in the study of the Cyril Methodius question are a benchmark of the achievements in the entire Slavic science. The Pannonian legends represent the first Slavic literary hagiographic texts and are the basic sources for the work of Saints Cyril and Methodius. The hagiographies were discovered by A. V. Gorski in 1843, Shafarikj in collaboration with Pogodin published them in 1851. For a long time in science, the hagiographies were named as Pannonian legends, but today that name is already treated as an anachronism. The most accurate, however, is the naming of these two texts as: Hagiography St. Cyril and Hagiography of St. Methodius. We also come across the term spacious hagiographies. One of the most complex issues in Slavic science is the attribution - connecting the work (the text) with its author, i.e., confirming the authorship. According to the fact, that a large part of the texts in medieval literature are anonymous, these two texts are undated and non-localized. There are mainly two benchmarks regarding the authorship of the two hagiographies: The first refers to the complete unity of the hagiographies and authorship (one authorship), the second locates a lack of dependence between the hagiographies, but a common ideological focus and different authors - multiple authorship - many authorship. The question of the authorship of the two hagiographies of St. Cyril and Methodius has long been the subject of scientific research and to this day remains unanswered and is a real challenge for further research. The next scientist who seriously deals with attribution is V. P. Vasilev. He gives a critical and sublimated review of the previous research on the two hagiographies, with time (approximate) and locational determinants of their creation, emphasizing the fact that the language of the two works is a strong confirmation of their early creation. Vasilev approaches the question of the attribution of the hagiographies through the application of statistical formal-quantitative and glottometric methods. The conclusions from the glottometric observations show the following textual connections: Due to the fact that the hagiographies are of the same genre, the results do not allow asserting with great certainty that, it is a matter of different authorship. The results speak of the closeness of all indicators, which cannot be explained only by the uniformity of the genre. It is possible that the authors of the Praise of St. Cyril and the Hagiography St. Methodius coincide. The glottometric analysis rejects the

eISSN: 1857- 8888
UDK: 27-36:929Св.Кирил
27-36:929Св.Методиј
821.163.3'04
DOI: 10.20544/teacher.26.08

co-authorship of Clement's Praise of St. Cyril with the hagiography of this saint. Clement's authorship is most certain for the hagiography of St. Methodius. When comparing the hagiography of St.

Methodius with the word of praise for Saint Cyril, a significant stylistic and morphological identity is established. There is another scientific study by Penev about the Extensive hagiographies of St. Cyril and Methodius, in which the methods of mathematical statistics are skillfully used, and this procedure has been valorized and recognized by other more recent researchers. In the text of the hagiography of St. Cyril there is only one clear indication of who wrote this monument: the message that Constantine's writings against the Jews "were translated by our teacher and archbishop Methodius" (ZK, X). From there, the conclusion is easily accessible, that the author of the St. Cyril hagiography was a student of St. Methodius, and at the same time an experienced writer, the main master of Old Slavic literature. If we take into account these facts, it is clear why the majority of Slavists, starting with V. M. Undolski and P. Shafarich, attribute the authorship of the hagiography of St. Cyril to St. Clement Ohridski, one of the closest, most gifted and best students of St. Cyril and Methodius. In addition to this, we add the argument that even in the Byzantine period of their activity, St. Clement belonged to the closest circle of St. Cyril and Methodius: according to his hagiography, he accompanied Methodius from his youth and directly participated in his exploits and his works. Of all their students and followers, we consider the most important fact that St. Clement is profiled as a great medieval writer and creator, which refers to the possibility that, his teacher St. Methodius, could have given precisely to St. Clement such a responsible task as writing the hagiography of his deceased brother. We consider it of great importance that the medieval tradition does not argue about Saint Clement's authorship of the Praise of Cyril - obviously one of the first monuments associated with the official cult of St. Cyril, which developed in Moravia. Finally, in support of this attribution, P. A. Lavrov and V. Vondrak, also state stylistic parallels between the works of St. Clement and the hagiography of St. Cyril.

We should mention that several arguments have been noted against the attribution of the hagiography of St. Cyril by St. Kliment Ohridski. It is stated, the fact that in the list of works of St. Clement, located in the XXII and XXVI chapters of his hagiography, the hagiography of St. Cyril is missing. However, this can also be elaborated and analyzed, due to the fact that even in this part there is no precise data of the attested works of St. Clement. The situation with lyrics and hymnography is slightly better in that respect, but yet it is still a strong challenge for further research. Scholars have also detected some factual inconsistencies between the Hagiography of Saint Cyril and the Praise of Saint Cyril. To this should be added the considerations about the different level of literary skill with which the hagiography of St. Cyril and the authentic writings of St. Clement were written. And here again we can argue about the views of Lavrov and his supporters, because there is no doubt about the virtuoso style of the talented medieval orator and writer St. Clement, and St. Methodius is mainly known to have concentrated on translation work, without any transcript of his possible integral author's text being discovered so far. Determining the mutual relations between the hagiography of St. Cyril, the hagiography of St. Methodius and the Italian legend gives Lavrov a slight advantage. The comparison of these texts, showed that during the compilation of the hagiography of St. Methodius, the original version of the hagiography of St. Cyril was subjected to a certain editorial intervention. It is possible, therefore, that the words of "our teacher Methodius" are an insertion of the editor of the hagiography of St. Cyril – the author of the hagiography of St. Methodius, who really belonged to the order of Methodius' disciples. At the same time, Methodius' "Address to the Judges" in Klots' verbatim manuscript, creates new difficulties in the way of such attribution, because the style of this address does not match the style of St. Cyril's hagiography. And Romankova, perhaps states the arguments most systematically in favor of St. Clement in relation to the attribution of the hagiography of Cyril and the hagiography of Methodius. The content of both hagiographies and the broad picture presented in them of the era and the apostolic activity of St. Cyril, testify in favor of a contemporary author, from among their first disciples – St. Clement. The presence of mutual complementation of both hagiographies.

University "St. Kliment Ohridski" – Bitola
Faculty of Education – Bitola

eISSN: 1857- 8888
UDK: 27-36:929Св.Кирил
27-36:929Св.Методиј
821.163.3'04
DOI: 10.20544/teacher.26.08

Compositionally, both hagiographies resemble each other. The language and style of the hagiographies refers to the language and style of Saint Clement's works. The biographer uses documentary sources, works of his teachers, personal observations and testimonies, describes details of life and activity. The author is more inclined to Byzantium and the Patriarchate of Constantinople than to Rome. According to the medieval tradition, the biographer is also the author of the words of

praise, and St. Clement has words of praise for Cyril and Methodius. The hagiographies are the source for the words of praise for St. Cyril and Methodius. Traces of the Glagolitic script can be found in the Cyrillic transcriptions of the hagiographies. Derzhavin, Bogdanov, Kodov, however, point to the possibility of co-authorship, St. Clement and his teacher St. Methodius wrote together the hagiography of St. Cyril. Romankova, using a formal-quantitative method, contrasting the hagiography of St. Cyril with the attested words of praise of St. Clement - the words of praise for Cyril, the eulogy for 40 martyrs, the words of praise (eulogy) for Demetrius of Thessalonica and the eulogy for Michael and Gabriel, however, there are arguments that do not support Saint Clement's authorship of Cyril's hagiography, and they even shake the thesis of co-authorship with Methodius. Regarding the authorship of the hagiography of Methodius, there are no definite indications in the text about the time of its writing, but the analysis of the characteristics of its narrative for some facts known from other sources already allowed A. V. Gorski to claim that the hagiography of Methodius was written in the time immediately after his death. In addition to the presence of different authorship of the hagiography of St. Cyril and the hagiography of St. Methodius is also the thorough analysis of the structure and orientation of the text, carried out by the contemporary Czechoslovak researcher V. Vavrzhink. His research makes it possible to accurately determine not only the time, but also the purpose of the creation of the text. Although the hagiography of St. Methodius, as well as the hagiography of St. Cyril, formally follows the pattern of the hagiographies developed in Byzantine hagiography, in fact this monument deviates even further than the hagiography of St. Cyril from the typical examples of this genre, although it still contains a large number of motifs characteristic of monuments of this type (for example, the description of the burial of Methodius).

The latest research also brings to light the knowledge that the hagiography of St. Methodius was written in the eastern regions of Bulgaria in Preslav. Josip Bratulikj supports the opinion that the hagiography of St. Methodius was created immediately after his death, before the persecutions of the disciples from Moravia. The clarification of the term "ante luuem" is closely related to the question of authorship. If we take into account that St. Clement Ohridski wrote the hagiography until 888, because after that year he was sent to be a teacher in the district of Kutmichevica. R. Nachtigal, Dr. Kostic, Fr. Grivec, D. Petkanova and others believe that the author of the hagiography of St. Methodius is Presbyter Constantine. There are other hypotheses in science. P.I. Shafarik believes that the author could also be Gorazd. Golubinski believes that the author is a Moravian, Lavrov also believes that both hagiographies of St. Cyril and of St. Methodius come from a Moravian environment, and Gitzel - that their author is Greek. R. Ugrinova-Skalovska, Lj.Basotova, believe that the author of the hagiographies could be St. Clement Ohridski, and Ratomir Grozdanoski has a similar opinion of St. Clement's authorship. He claims that the hagiographies of St. Cyril and St. Methodius were written by St. Clement Ohridski, their closest and most prolific student.

Literary works of St. Clement are part of the literary tradition of the Macedonian and other old Slavic, Russian, Bulgarian, Serbian and Romanian literatures. Manuscripts of transcripts from the works of St. Clement are found in all the places touched by the life of the Slavs "from the Arctic Ocean to Mount Athos and the Sinai Peninsula in the south and from the Ural Mountains to the Adriatic Sea in the west" (Clement Ohridski, 1970, p. 6). St. Clement Ohridski, as one of the greatest creators, the founder of the Old Macedonian and Slavic literature, together with John the Exarch, Crnorizets Hrabar, Patriarch Euthymius and Gregorij Tsamblak, contribute to its spread throughout the Christian Orthodox world. Rightly, the sources confirm that St. Clement is the most popular and present writer in the entire Christian Orthodox literature.

The claim that both works are the work of one author (Vasilev, 229, p. 240) has not withstood modern scientific verification. The analysis of the texts, carried out through the methods of modern

eISSN: 1857- 8888
UDK: 27-36:929Св.Кирил
27-36:929Св.Методиј
821.163.3'04
DOI: 10.20544/teacher.26.08

linguistics as well as the analysis of the compositional structure and logic, show that it cannot be a question of authorship by one person. That claim has been accepted by the contemporary "Slavic" science and an authorial "division" of the hagiographies has been proposed: the extensive hagiography of Cyril is attributed to St. Clement, and the hagiography of Methodius by Constantine Presbyter. However, the claim remains as final that the question of the authorship of these two hagiographies has not been definitively resolved (Petkanova, 1986, p. 113). With some certainty it can only be claimed that St. Clement is the author of The words of praise (eulogy) for St. Cyril, and

Constantine at the service for St. Methodius. But all these are just basics, which can be enough to establish a hypothesis, but it should be clear that there is no solid evidence. From there, objectivity dictates that the extensive hagiographies of St. Cyril and Methodius should be considered as anonymous works, whose authors should of sought among the disciples of the Thessaloniki brothers, is Romankova's claim, which is acceptable to Stanchev and Popov. Romankova, applying formal-quantitative methods of analysis and comparison with the attested-reliable works of St. Clement, comes to the following realization: "The data from the formal-quantitative analysis do not allow the extensive hagiography of Constantine to be attributed to St. Clement Ohridski. Instead of being so marked, more similarities show a certain connection between Constantine's extensive hagiography and Clement's work. From there, it seems possible that we can join Professor Georgieva's opinion that the hagiographies were created by a collective author, in the center of which was St. Clement Ohridski" (Romankova, 1985, p. 13).

The question related to the authorship of the hagiography of St. Cyril and the hagiography of St. Methodius still remains open. Newer findings confirm the hypothesis that the author of the hagiography is probably St. Clement Ohridski with the participation of other students of the educators. But from here it can be seen that all the mentioned works make up the so-called Cyril and Methodius cycle that can only be associated with one author (St. Clement Ohridski). The linguistic, glottometric analysis, the application of the mathematical and formally quantitative method necessarily points to the need to revise the traditional thesis about Clement's authorship of both hagiographies. It is very logical to suspect that the application of statistical methods can magically solve the question of the authorship of the hagiographies. This question still remains unanswered, primarily due to the lack of critical editions of both hagiographies. We can finally summarize that the attribution of St. Cyril and Methodius's hagiographies or colloquially of the Pannonian legends is a very complex question, which remains a real challenge for researchers. It requires an interdisciplinary, but strictly scientific, even experimental approach, exclusively based on facts. The corpus of attested words of Saint Clement should be significantly used. They allow the establishment of formal signs of the writer's authorial style, so research should continue with other works of Saint Clement.

References

Vasilev. V. Clement Ohridski and the authorship of the "Pannonian Legends". (1969). *Bulgarian language, 19*(3). Климент Охридски. Събрани съчинения. т. I. София, 1970.

Петканова, Д. (1986). Старобългарска литература. Ч. 1 (IX-XII век). София.

Романкова, Н. (1985). Формально-количественые методы и проблемы атрибуций наративных источников по истории южных славън IX – XIV вв. Автореферат дисертации. Москва.