

Société des études byzantines et slaves,
St. Pétersbourg

SCRINIUM

5



Revue de patrologie, d'hagiographie critique
et d'histoire ecclésiastique

Symbola Caelestis

Le symbolisme liturgique et paraliturgique
dans le monde chrétien

Edited by

Andrei Orlov

Basil Lourié

A X I Ō M A

gorgias press

Symbola Caelestis

Le symbolisme liturgique et paraliturgique dans
le monde chrétien

Edited by

Andrei Orlov

Basil Lourié



gorgias press

2009

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Table des matières.....	vii
Préface.....	x
Liste des abréviations.....	xi

Édition critique

Andrei S. SLUTSKIJ.

Early Slavonic Versions of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts	3
Preface	3
Introduction	4
Manuscripts of the Old Russian Recension	12
Manuscripts of the Studite Recension	13
I. Vespers	14
1. Structure of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in the Manuscripts of the Old Russian Recension	14
2. Text of Vespers of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in the Manuscripts of the Old Russian Recension	21
3. Manuscripts of the Studite Tradition	25
II. The Great Entrance	35
1. Liturgy of the Catechumens	35
2. Prayers of the Great Entrance	36
3. Dialogue of the Clergy	42
III. Communion	45
1. Preparation for Communion	45
2. Communion of the Clergy	47
3. The Ending of the Service	50
Appendix. Critical Edition of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in the Old Russian Recension	54

Articles

- Andrei A. ORLOV. Eschatological Yom Kippur
in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*: Part I. The Scapegoat Ritual.....79
- Silviu N. BUNTA. "Your Own of Your Own":
Jewish Adam Speculations and Christian Liturgy
in the Slavonic and Romanian *Life of Adam and Eve*112
- Bogdan G. BUCUR. "The Mountain of the Lord": Sinai, Zion, and Eden
in Byzantine Hymnographic Exegesis129
- Jack CUSTER. Inspired Word and Spiritual Worship:
How Byzantine Hymnography Interprets Sacred Scripture.....173
- Stéphane VERHELST. Les prières de l'ambon
de la Liturgie de saint Jacques199
- Dmitrij F. BUMAZHNOV. Das Charisma in der christlichen Gnosis
und im frühen ägyptischen Mönchtum.224
- Sung-Hyun NAM. L'Usage du Terme « notre père (ΠΑΤΕΡ) »
dans la littérature pachômienne.....238
- Dragoş A. GIULEA. The Heavenly Fire Working the Earth of the Heart:
Origen, Antony, Pseudo-Macarius,
and the Internalization of the Image of Divine Fire252
- Nestor KAVVADAS. Theology of Language and Liturgical Prayer
in Isaac of Nineveh.....273
- Leena Mari PELTOMAA. Role of the Virgin Mary
at the Siege of Constantinople in 626.....284
- Tatiana BORISOVA. To the Problem of the Reconstruction
of the Early Stages of the History
of the Church Slavonic Translation of the Akathistos Hymn.....300
- Tatiana A. SÉNINA (moniale Kassia). Remarques
sur le canon des défunts écrit par S. Cassia de Constantinople317

Youhanna Nessim YOUSSEF. The psalis for the consecration of the church (revisited).....	323
--	-----

Notes

Constanta COSTEA. Earlier Versions of Patriarch Germanus' <i>Homily on the Cross and the Icons</i>	341
Vladimir A. LIVŠIĆ. Sogdian "Ancient Letters" (II, IV, V).....	344
Basil LOURIÉ. <i>Courts of Solomon, A Jewish Collection</i>	353
Basil LOURIÉ. Slavonic Texts of Hard Fate: the <i>Prophecy of Solomon</i> and Some Others	364
Tatiana A. SÉNINA (moniale Kassia). Un saint fouette un autre : Théoktistos le logothète et Euthyme de Sardes	391
Youhanna Nessim YOUSSEF. Two Notes on the Coptic Theotokias	394

Bibliographie

Michel Stavrou, Nicéphore Blemmydès, <i>Ceuvres théologiques.</i> <i>Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes. Tome 1 (B. Lourié)</i>	429
Tedros Abreha, <i>Il Gädl di Abuna Demyanos santo eritreo (XIV/XV sec.).</i> <i>Edizione del testo etiopico e traduzione italiana (A. Bausi)</i>	429
Nouvelles publications de l'Institut de la littérature russe (Maison de Pouchkine) sur la littérature ancienne de la Russie (B. Lourié).....	436
Les publications récentes dans la série ΣΜΑΡΑΓΔΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΛΙΑΣ	444
Deux livres sur l'autocéphalie russe	447
Bibliographie du R. P. Michel van Esbroeck, s.j. <i>Addenda</i>	448

Discussion

- Т. Л. Вилкул. По поводу рецензии П. В. Лукина
«Деконструкция деконструкции»
[T. L. VILKOUL, À propos de la recension de P. V. Loukine
«Déconstruction de la déconstruction»].....451
- П. В. Лукин. Нужно ли нам «новаторство»?
(Об ответе Т. Л. Вилкула)
[P. V. LOUKINE, Avons-nous besoin de l'esprit novateur?]495

PRÉFACE

La liturgie, c'est pour les liturgistes. Oui, il est vrai, mais ce n'est pas la vérité toute entière. L'intérêt scientifique des matières liturgiques ne se limite pas à l'histoire de la liturgie au sens strict. Il y a d'autres domaines où la compréhension de la liturgie est vitale même dans ses détails techniques. Tout d'abord, ce sont les visions mystiques du Temple céleste. Les apocalypses juives et chrétiennes aussi bien que l'expérience de la vie monastique du christianisme médiéval ouvrent des scènes de services dans le Temple céleste, devant le Trône de Dieu, dans l'entourage des anges et des esprits des justes. Parfois c'est uniquement l'analyse des données liturgiques qui serait capable de fournir la clef aux chiffres symboliques des textes mystiques anciens. D'ailleurs, la liturgie est toujours unie avec les traditions hagiographiques et artistiques. De temps en temps, des textes hymnographiques sauraient jeter de la lumière sur les faits historiques.

Telles sont, en bref, les idées sous-jacentes à l'approche interdisciplinaire qui a produit le recueil présent. Il contient des publications liturgiques *sensu stricto* aussi bien que des études dans les domaines où l'on fait usage du symbolisme liturgique.

Dieu voulant, ce ne sera que le début d'une file de publications où les liens entre la liturgie historique « pure » et ce que l'on peut nommer « la liturgie historique appliquée » seront de plus en plus étroits.

Andrei Orlov
Basile Lourié

LISTE DES ABBRÉVIATIONS

BB	<i>Византийский временник</i>
ПСРЛ	Полное собрание русских летописей
ТОДРА	<i>Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы</i>
XB	<i>Христианский Восток</i>
BBGG	<i>Bollettino dela Badia Greca di Grottaferrata</i>
BHG	F. HALKIN, <i>Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca</i> , vol. I–III (Bruxelles, 1957) (<i>Subsidia Hagiographica</i> , 8a)
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BSA	<i>Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie</i>
BSAC	<i>Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte</i>
BSac	<i>Biblica Sacra</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
ConBOT	Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series
CPG	M. GEERARD, <i>Clavis Patrum Graecorum</i> (Turnhout: Brepols) I (1973), II (1974), III (1979), IV (1980), Supplementum (1998) (<i>Corpus Christianorum</i>)
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
GOTR	<i>Greek Orthodox Theological Review</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSS	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LIDDELL—SCOTT	H. G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT (revised by H. S. JONES and R. MCKENZIE), <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> (Oxford, 1968)
NT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
OC	<i>Oriens Christianus</i>
OCP	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
PO	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i>

PG	J. P. MIGNE (acc.), <i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca</i> , vol. 1–161 (Parisiis, 1857–1866)
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLSP	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SC	Sources Chrésiennes
Scr	<i>Scrinium</i>
	T. 2 (2006) — A. MOURAVIEV, B. LOURIE (eds.), <i>Universum Hagiographicum. Mémorial R. P. Michel van Esbroeck, s.j. (1934–2003)</i>
	T. 3 (2007) — B. LOURIE, A. ORLOV (eds.), <i>The Theophaneia School: Jewish Roots of Eastern Christian Mysticism</i>
	T. 4 (2008) — V. BARANOV, B. LOURIE (eds.), <i>Patrologia Pacifica. Selected papers presented to the Western Pacific Rim Patristics Society 3rd Annual Conference (Nagoya, Japan, September 29 – October 1, 2006) and other patristic studies</i>
SH	Subsidia Hagiographica
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SP	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
SVTQ	<i>St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly</i>
TCS	Text-Critical Studies
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (http://www.tlg.uci.edu/)
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
UBL	Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>

Édition critique

Andrei S. Sluts kij
St Petersburg

EARLY SLAVONIC VERSIONS OF THE LITURGY OF THE PRESANCTIFIED GIFTS

PREFACE

The Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts has a special place in the rite of the Orthodox Church. Presently, this service of great beauty is performed only during Great Lent and Holy Week. The Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts has many features of the Lenten service, but it contains a number of specific features that are not found in other offices, customary for Orthodox liturgical practices. The origin of these liturgical elements, specific only for the service of the Presanctified Gifts, has been the subject of numerous scholarly works. Nevertheless, many issues of historical Liturgics and liturgical theology, associated with the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, do not yet have generally accepted solutions. The main sources for studying the history of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts are the Greek versions contained in the old Byzantine *Euchologia*. Along with the Greek *Euchologia*, the oldest Slavonic versions of this Liturgy represent important historical materials for studying the initial stages of the service of the Presanctified Gifts. The earliest surviving Slavonic service books are considerably younger than the oldest Greek *Euchologia*. However, due to the conservativeness of the Slavic tradition, these service books have preserved an archaic form of some of the liturgical elements that constitute the office of the Liturgy.

This publication is devoted to a historical and liturgical analysis of the oldest Slavonic versions of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. Twenty three manuscripts of the service books of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries, which are the earliest Slavonic sources preserving the text of the Liturgy, are identified and studied in detail. These manuscripts contain the office of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts that follows the oldest rules, regulating Slavonic divine services in the initial period of their history. In describing the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, we focused on liturgical elements that were preserved in the medieval Slavic texts but have been lost in modern liturgical use. The Slavonic service books, containing the ordinance of the Lit-

urgy of the Presanctified Gifts in its early recensions, constitute not only evidence of the formation of liturgical traditions in Slavic countries, but also an important additional source for the study of the origin and development of the Byzantine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. Some of the Slavic manuscripts, while preserving the same type of description of the office of the Liturgy as the oldest Greek sources, describe the key elements of the ordinance in more detail compared to the early Greek *Euchologia*. This primarily applies to seventeen manuscripts of the Old Russian recension of the Presanctified Liturgy. Therefore, along with an analysis of the ordinance, this study contains a critical text edition of the Old Russian recension on the basis of all manuscripts of the text.

INTRODUCTION

The time when the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts appeared among Byzantine divine services, remains unknown. The earliest references to the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts date back to the beginning of seventh century. The *Chronicon Paschale*, supposedly composed in the 630s, says: "... this year, under Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople, starting in the first week of Lent of the fourth Indiction (year 615), they began to sing after 'Let my prayer arise' during the transfer of the Presanctified Gifts to the Holy Table from the *skeuophylakion*, after the priest says, 'According to the gift of Your Christ,' the people immediately start 'Now the Powers of Heaven invisibly with us do serve. Lo, the King of Glory enters. Lo, the mystical sacrifice is up borne, fulfilled. Let us draw near in faith and fear to become the communicants of eternal life. Alleluia.'"¹

The most important sources for the reconstruction of the history of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts are the handwritten Greek *Euchologia*. The ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts is contained in the oldest known *Barberini Euchologion 336* (8th C.),² and the prayers contained in the *Barberini 336* constitute the main part of the modern ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. Both the *Barberini 336* and other old Greek manuscripts, the *Sinai Euchologion 958* (9th C.) and 959 (11th C.), *Sevastyanovskij Euchologion* (10th C.),³ and the *Euchologion of Porfirij Uspenskij* (9th–10th C.),⁴ mention the Vespers

(1) PG 92, 989.

(2) The edition is: S. PARENTI, E. VELKOVSKA, *L'eucologio Barberini gr. 336* (Roma, ¹1995 [Roma, ²2000]).

(3) Ms. Russian State Library *Greek 474*.

(4) Ms. National Library of Russia *Greek 226*.

which initiate the service of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, but the texts of the prayers for the Vespers are missing. The description of the Vespers consists of a brief instruction on the readings,⁵ singing “Let my prayer arise...,” “Lord have mercy”. Then the *Barberini 336* has a Prayer for the Catechumens: “God, our God, creator and maker of all things...,” the Prayer for those preparing for the holy Enlightenment, “Manifest your countenance, Master...,” the first Prayer of the faithful, “O God, who are great and to be praised...,” the second Prayer of the faithful, “Holy Master, supremely good...,” the Prayer after setting the Holy Gifts on the Holy Table, “O God of ineffable and unseen mysteries...,” the Prayer after Communion, “We thank you, God the Savior of all things...,” the Prayer behind the ambo, “Master almighty, who fashioned creation with wisdom...” All these prayers from the manuscripts of the eighth century are present in the modern ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in the same order. At the same time, the *Barberini 336*, just as the other oldest *Euchologia*, is almost silent on the actions of the clergy that accompany the prayers. The oldest *Euchologia* practically lack instructions concerning the service, whereas modern *Euchologia* and service books cite them in corresponding rubrics. Along with the manuscripts that contain a set of prayers, entirely corresponding to the modern ordinance of the Liturgy, there are some manuscripts among the oldest *Euchologia*, that have prayers in their ordinances of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts that currently have fallen out of use. (One of the earliest sources of this type is the Ms. *Paris. gr. 391* of the Paris National Library dated to the 11th C.).⁶

In 1955 Moraitis made a critical edition of the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts on the basis of many Greek manuscripts of the eighth–sixteenth centuries.⁷ These *Euchologia* have differences not only in the texts of the prayers of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, but also in the composition of the ordinances of the Liturgy. The subsequent publications, devoted to the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, focused on its initial part, the Vespers, that play a key role in the problem of the origin of the service. In particular, researchers attempted to explain the fact that Psalm 140 occurs twice in the Vespers. Jane-

(5) The “readings” here mean the instruction by the bishops during Great Lent: Н. Д. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Литургия Преждеосвященных Даров, Богословские труды* 15 (1976) 155.

(6) Δ. ΜΩΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Ἡ λειτουργία τῶν προηγουμένων* (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1955) 61.

(7) *Ibid.*

ras argued that the Vespers of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts has a Constantinopolitan origin and are the result of a combination of the Sabbaitic monastic Vespers containing Psalm 140 and “Φῶς ἱλαρόν...” (“*O gentle Light ...*”) with the ancient cathedral Constantinopolitan rite of lighting the lamps, containing “Φῶς Χριστοῦ...” (“*The Light of Christ...*”) and “Κατευθυνθήτω...” (“*Let my prayer arise...*”).⁸ A different view on the origin of the elements of the Vespers was proposed by Engberding who believed that “*Let my prayer arise...*” was a *Prokeimennon* after the second Old Testament reading, and “*The Light of Christ...*” was related to the preparation of the Catechumens for Baptism.⁹ The article of Winkler, who identified an ancient Antiochean core¹⁰ in the ordinance of the Vespers, had significant impact on the views about the origin of the Vespers in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. Winkler concluded that the Vespers of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts is the combination of the monastic Sabbaitic Vespers (up to “*O gentle Light...*”), the Antiochean system of Old Testament readings during Lent, and the ancient Antiochean Vespers, in which the repeated rite of light (“*The Light of Christ...*”) and Psalm 140 (“*Let my prayer arise...*”) originated. The study of Arranz¹¹ was focused on evidence concerning the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in the Byzantine *Euchologia* and *Typica* from the oldest manuscript, and the dissertation of Alexopoulos¹² summarized the state of current research on the history of the Byzantine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts.

The oldest handwritten Slavonic service books represent very valuable historical evidence, substantially supplementing the materials of the oldest Greek *Euchologia*. The text of the Liturgy of the Presanctified

(8) S. JANERAS, La partie de la liturgie byzantine des Présanctifiés, *OCP* 30 (1964) 193–222.

(9) H. ENGBERDING, Zur Geschichte der Liturgie der Vorgeewihten Gaben, *Ostkirchliche Studien* 13 (1964) 310–314.

(10) G. WINKLER, Der geschichtliche Hintergrund der Präsanctifikatenvesper, *Oriens Christianus* 56 (1972) 184–206.

(11) M. ARRANZ, La Liturgie des Présanctifiés de l’ancien Euchologe byzantin, *OCP* 47 (1981) 332–388.

(12) S. ALEXOPOULOS, *The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite: a comparative analysis of its origins, evolution, and structural components* (Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame, Indiana, 2004). Published as S. ALEXOPOULOS, *The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite: A Comparative Analysis of its Origins, Evolution, and Structural Components* (Leuven: Peeters, 2008) (Liturgia Condenda, 21).

Gifts is present in most of the Slavonic service books of the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries that are listed in the catalogs of modern manuscript collections. Despite the fact that the service books of the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries were compiled significantly later than the oldest known Greek *Euchologia*, some Slavonic manuscripts contain information that sheds light on the earliest stages of development of the Byzantine service of the Presanctified Gifts. These sources primarily include the manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy of the Old Russian recension, represented by seventeen manuscripts¹³ (see below p. 12).

A distinctive feature of the Old Russian recension is, primarily, the description of the initial part of the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. Like the earliest Greek *Euchologia*, the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension of the Liturgy do not contain any initial exclamations, they have no indication of the “beginning according to the custom,” and also do not provide the text of the prayers for the Vespers, which are at the beginning of the service of the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts; the description of the service starts with the moment of the Entrance with the censer. The structure of the text of the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy is of the same kind as the structure in the Greek *Euchologia* of the eighth–eleventh centuries which contain the text of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts at the early stage of its development.¹⁴ However, the Slavonic service books substantially supplement Greek materials, because, as a rule, they contain more detailed liturgical instructions (rubrics) than corresponding Greek manuscripts. Thus, the Slavonic manuscripts of the Old Russian recension that transmit the

(13) We should note that in: А. С. СЛУЦКИЙ, Чинопоследование вечерни литургии Преждеосвященных Даров в славянских служебниках XII–XIV вв., in: *Славяне и их соседи*. Вып. 6 (Москва, 1996), and in: Т. И. АФАНАСЬЕВА, А. С. СЛУЦКИЙ, Чинопоследование литургии Преждеосвященных Даров в двух древнейших болгарских служебниках, *Palaeobulgarica* (1999) № 3, 88–98, the texts of the Old Russian recension are called “the first” (the initial) Slavonic recension. Only twelve manuscripts are identified in the first study, and only fifteen manuscripts — in the second study. The term “Old Russian recension” was introduced in the article: Т. И. АФАНАСЬЕВА, К истории текста Литургии Преждеосвященных Даров в славянской рукописной традиции XIII – первой половине XIV в., *Опыты по источникововедению. Древнерусская книжность* 4 (2001) 34–46.

(14) The periodization of Greek sources was introduced by Moraitis, who identified three stages of development in the Greek handwritten text of the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts: ΜΟΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η Λειτουργία...*, 53–77.

specific features of the liturgical tradition of the Russian Church in the pre-Mongolian period, also constitute a very valuable source for studying the history of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts that reflects a rite of parish worship in Byzantium prior to the catastrophic events of 1204.

The texts of the Old Russian recension have an important feature: these sources belong to the body of liturgical books of the Studite tradition. Various recensions of the rules belonging to the Studite type and their corresponding liturgical service books defined the liturgical tradition of the Russian Church from the end of the 11th until the middle of the 14th century.¹⁵ In the second half of the fourteenth century the active spreading of the Jerusalem rule,¹⁶ by this time almost universally accepted in the Orthodox East, started in Russia. Since the fifteenth century, the Jerusalem rule and its related body of liturgical books have become the main regulators of divine service in the Russian Orthodox Church.¹⁷ Thus, the liturgical texts belonging to the Studite tradition, retain the earlier order of service and hold the most interest for historical and liturgical studies.

In addition to the seventeen manuscripts of the Old Russian recension of the service of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, the Studite tradition is manifested in the ordinance of the Liturgy contained in six service books of the late thirteenth–mid. fourteenth centuries, which are not related to the Old Russian recension. These six manuscripts, as opposed to the service books of the Old Russian recension, contain an initial exclamation (“*Blessed is the kingdom...*”)¹⁸ and the Prayers for the Lighting of the Lamps. As in the case of the Old Russian recension, the feature that allows us to connect the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts with the texts of the Studite tradition, is the indica-

(15) А. М. ПЕНТКОВСКИЙ, *Типикон Алексея Студита в Византии и на Руси* (Москва, 2001) 195.

(16) И. Д. МАНСВЕТОВ, *Церковный устав (Типик), его образование и судьба в Греческой и Русской Церкви* (Москва, 2001) 269–271. ПЕНТКОВСКИЙ, *Типикон Алексея Студита...*, 216–217.

(17) On the liturgical reforms in the Russian Orthodox Church related to the acceptance of the Jerusalem rule, see: А. М. ПЕНТКОВСКИЙ, *Литургические реформы в истории Русской церкви и их характерные особенности*, *Журнал Московской патриархии* (2001) № 3, 72–80.

(18) Only the service book III a 32 from the Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti does not have the initial exclamation in the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, but this is due to the missing pages of the manuscript which contained the beginning of the ordinance.

tion of performing the Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week, immediately preceding Great Lent. (The Jerusalem rule prescribes the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts be performed during Great Lent and the first three days of Holy Week.) Hereafter, the term “manuscripts of the Studite tradition,” will normally designate these six manuscripts, listed below on page 13.

The main subject of this study are twenty-three Slavonic manuscripts of the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts dating to the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries that belong to the liturgical tradition preceding the spread of the Jerusalem rule. The liturgical reform in Russia in the fourteenth century, associated, primarily, with Metropolitan Alexey (1354–1378) and Metropolitan Cyprian (1390–1406),¹⁹ resulted in a general replacement of texts belonging to the Studite tradition with texts of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts with nearly uniform ordinance structure, containing significantly fewer important differences with relation to modern liturgical practices than the earlier manuscripts.

Further development in the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in Russia led to significant discrepancies between the practices of the Russian Orthodox Church and Greek Orthodox Church. According to the opinion reflected in the text of the Russian service book, the chalice contains wine that is not transformed into the Blood of Christ. This theological notion has led to ceremonial differences in Russian and Greek liturgical practices. A detailed historical and theological analysis of the problem about the chalice, which is the main theological question relating to the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts (see below p. 47) can be found in a fundamental work by Karabinov.²⁰ Further discussion of this theological issue in the articles of Uspensky²¹ and Vanyukov²² entirely follows the study of Karabinov.

The manuscript tradition of the Slavonic Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts until recently did not attract the special attention of researchers. Among many historical and liturgical studies by prominent

(19) ПЕНТКОВСКИЙ, *Литургические реформы...*, 74.

(20) И. КАРАБИНОВ, *Святая чаша на литургии Преждеосвященных Даров*, *Христианское чтение* (1915) VI, 737–753; VII–VIII, 953–964.

(21) УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Литургия Преждеосвященных Даров...* Н. Д. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Коллизия двух богословий в исправлении русских богослужебных книг в XVII в.*, *Богословские труды* (1975) № 13, 148–171.

(22) С. ВАНЮКОВ, *Чин Литургии Преждеосвященных Даров (Исследование печатных изданий)*, *Богословский сборник* 8 (2001) 269–294.

Russian liturgical scholars in the late nineteenth — early twentieth century, besides the work of Karabinov, only the article by Muretov²³ was specifically devoted to the history of the Slavonic Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. This article traced the differences between the description of the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in some Medieval Greek and Slavonic manuscripts and the modern ordinance of this service. Some aspects of the service of the Presanctified Liturgy as it is described in the Slavonic service books, were studied in the work of Lisitsin, devoted to the study of the oldest liturgical rules that prescribed the order of divine services in the Russian Church in the initial period of its history.²⁴

A systematic study of medieval Slavic manuscripts of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts was begun in the late twentieth century in the works of Slutskij,²⁵ and Afanasieva.²⁶ The article of Vanyukov contains a collation of texts of the Presanctified Liturgy from old-printed Russian service books and modern editions.²⁷ The work by Afanasieva is dedicated to linguistic and textological analysis of Slavic manuscripts containing the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, and takes into account the manuscripts corresponding both to the rules of the Studite type, and to the Jerusalem rule.²⁸

This study is limited to the manuscripts belonging to the liturgical tradition prior to the dissemination of the Jerusalem rule. This tradition records the texts of the ordinance at early evolutionary stages of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. These texts are a valuable source for studying the history of the initial period of both Slavonic and Byzantine divine services. This study examines specific features of the liturgical rite as reflected in the above mentioned sources and focuses on the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension. Along with an analysis

(23) С. МУРЕТОВ, Особенности литургии Преждеосвященных Даров в древних греческих и славянских памятниках, *Московские церковные ведомости* (1896) № 10–12.

(24) М. ЛИСИЦИН, *Первоначальный славяно-русский типикон (историко-археологическое исследование)* (Санкт-Петербург, 1911).

(25) СЛУЦКИЙ, Чинопоследование вечерни литургии...

(26) АФАНАСЬЕВА, СЛУЦКИЙ, Чинопоследование литургии..., АФАНАСЬЕВА, К истории текста Литургии...

(27) ВАНЮКОВ, Чин Литургии Преждеосвященных Даров...

(28) Т. И. АФАНАСЬЕВА, *Славянская литургия Преждеосвященных Даров XII–XV вв.: текстология и язык* (Санкт-Петербург, 2004).

of the ordinance of this, apparently, oldest²⁹ surviving Slavonic version of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, Appendix provides a critical edition of the Old Russian recension on the basis of all seventeen manuscripts.³⁰ The initial part of the service, the Vespers, is studied in most detail in the following analysis of the structure of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, which is contained in the first part of this study. The Slavonic manuscripts of the Old Russian recension describe the Vespers significantly better than the Greek manuscripts related to the corresponding stage of evolution of the ordinance of the Liturgy.³¹ At the same time, the descriptions of the Vespers in the manuscripts of this recension show significant differences. Therefore, the text of all manuscripts of the Vespers is reproduced in full in the critical edition of the Old Russian recension in Appendix.

In addition to the Vespers, the key elements for the historical and liturgical analysis of the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts are the ordinance of the Great Entrance, and the description of the actions of clergy associated with Communion. The second and the

(29) Apparently, the text of the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts from the West Bulgarian service book *Khlud. 117* seems to be close to the protograph, see: Т. И. АФАНАСЬЕВА, *Литургия Преждеосвященных Даров в славянской рукописной традиции XII–XIV вв. (лингво-текстологический анализ)* (Автореферат диссертации, СПбГУ, 2000) 20. The service book *Khlud. 117* was written during the reign of King Stefan Uroš II Milutin (1282–1321) and was used many times in historical and liturgical studies: МУРЕТОВ, *Особенности литургии Преждеосвященных Даров...*, № 11, p. 142, 144; № 12, p. 158; АФАНАСЬЕВА, СЛУЦКИЙ, *Чинопоследование литургии...* However, scholars paid insufficient attention to this service book which is extremely interesting in many respects, being one of the few testimonies of the liturgical traditions of parish service in Western Bulgaria in the thirteenth century (on the *Khlud. 117*, see: Б. Н. ФЛОРЕА, А. А. ТУРИЛОВ, С. А. ИВАНОВ, *Судьбы кирилло-мефодиевской традиции после Кирилла и Мефодия* (Санкт-Петербург, 2000) 134; *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в России, странах СНГ и Балтии. XIV век. Вып. 1* (Москва, 2002) 656–661).

(30) The text of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts from the service book *Sol. 1016/1125* was chosen as the main text.

(31) Liturgical rubrics in the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension are notably one of the few surviving descriptions of the order for the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week, and supply evidence from the manuscripts of the *Typikon* of the Great Church — the Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople: J. МАТЕОС, *Le Typikon de la Grande Église, ms. Saint-croix n 40, X^e siècle* (Roma, 1963) (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 166) 6–8; А. А. ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Древнейшие патриаршие Типиконы* (Киев, 1907) 327–330.

third parts of this study are dedicated to these elements of the ordinance of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts.

The list of seventeen Slavonic manuscripts of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts which form the subject of this study, is cited below. The refinement of the dating of manuscripts in this list primarily follows the recent fundamental work by Zheltov, who investigated the manuscript tradition of the Slavonic Liturgy of John Chrysostom.³²

Manuscripts of the Old Russian Recension

1. *Syn.* 604, State Museum of History, early 13th C.,³³ SK 11–13 № 167.³⁴
2. *Sof.* 519, National Library of Russia, early 13th C., SK 11–13 №313.
3. *Sof.* 518, National Library of Russia, late 13th – early 14th C.,³⁵ SK 11–13 № 312.
4. *YaMZ* 15472, Yaroslavl Reserve-Museum, 1328–1336,³⁶ PS № 469.
5. *Sol.* 1016/1125, National Library of Russia, mid. 14th – 15th C.,³⁷ SK 11–13 № 310.
6. *O.p.* I.5, National Library of Russia, first half – mid. 14th C.,³⁸ PS № 1087.
7. *Sof.* 521, National Library of Russia, second half of the 14th C.,³⁹ PS № 1237.

(32) М. ЖЕЛТОВ, Чин Божественной литургии в древнейших (XI–XIV вв.) славянских Службениках, *Богословские труды* 41 (2007) 272–359.

(33) The dating is clarified on the basis of: О. С. ПОПОВА, Миниатюры Хутынского Службеника раннего XIII в., in: *Древнерусское искусство: Русь. Византия. Балканы. XIII в.* (Санкт-Петербург, 1997) 274–289.

(34) For each manuscript we give the reference number, name of collection, date and, whenever possible, the number according to the catalogue SK for the 11th–13th C. (*Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в СССР. XI–XIII вв.* (Москва, 1984) or (in case of absence in the SK) according to the PS (*Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописей, XI–XIV веков, хранящихся в СССР*, in: *Археографический ежегодник за 1965 г.* (Москва, 1966) 177–309).

(35) The dating is clarified by Turilov (see: ЖЕЛТОВ, Чин Божественной литургии..., 281).

(36) The dating is clarified by Turilov (see: *Ibid.*, 282).

(37) The dating is clarified by Turilov (see: *Ibid.*).

(38) The dating is clarified by Turilov (see: *Ibid.*, 284).

(39) Possibly the turn of the 14th–15th C. The dating is clarified by Turilov (see: *Ibid.*, 282).

8. *Syn.* 892, State Museum of History, second half of the 14th C., PS № 1232.
9. *Rum.* 399, Russian State Library, second half of the 14th C., PS № 751.
10. *Rogozh. kladb.* 566, Russian State Library, 14th C., PS № 866.
11. *O.p.* I.4, National Library of Russia, 14th C., PS № 1086.
12. *Sof.* 526, National Library of Russia, 14th C., PS № 1239.
13. *Slav.* 1, N.Y. Public Library, second half – third quarter of the 14th C.⁴⁰
14. *Syn.* 598, State Museum of History, late 14th C., PS №868.
15. *Syn. typ.* 40, Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts, 14 – early 15th C., PS № 1481.
16. *Sof.* 525, National Library of Russia, late 14th – early 15th C.,⁴¹ SK 11–13 № 314.
17. *Syn. typ.* 43, Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts, 15th C.⁴²

Manuscripts of the Studite Recension

1. *Khlud.* 117, State Museum of History, 13th C.⁴³
2. *Q.p.* I.68, National Library of Russia, second half of the 13th C., SK № 397.
3. *Q.p.* I.67, National Library of Russia, ca. 1316,⁴⁴ SK № 479.
4. *Uvar.* 46, State Museum of History, first half (early) 14th C.⁴⁵
5. III a 32, Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, first half of the 14th C.⁴⁶
6. *Uvar.* 574, State Museum of History, mid. 14th C.⁴⁷

(40) The dating is clarified on the basis of Э. С. Смирнова, *Русский лицевой Служебник в Нью-Йорке, Хризограф* 2 (2005) 54–73.

(41) The dating is clarified on the basis of SK 14: *Сводный каталог славяно-русских рукописных книг, хранящихся в России, странах СНГ и Балтии. XIV век. Вып. 1* (Москва, 2002) 579.

(42) The dating is clarified by Turilov (see: Желтов, *Чин Божественной литургии...*, 284).

(43) SK 14, p. 591.

(44) The dating is clarified on the basis of SK 14, p. 591.

(45) The dating is clarified by Turilov (see: Слущкий, *Чинопоследование вечерни литургии...*, 131).

(46) V. Mošin, *Cirilski rukopisi JAZU*, t. 1 (Zagreb, 1952).

(47) The dating is clarified by Turilov (see: Слущкий, *Чинопоследование вечерни литургии...*, 131).

I. VESPERS

1. *Structure of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in the Manuscripts of the Old Russian Recension*

We should mention the main elements in the description of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy, which appear in the service books of the Old Russian recension. Typically, the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy starts with the Vespereal Entrance with the censer: the regular “prayer of the Entrance” in the Vespers, “*At evening, at morning and at midday we praise...*,” and singing of the Hymn, “*O gentle Light ...*” Then the ordinance mentions the *Prokeimena*, the *Paroemias* (readings from the Old Testament), as well as instructions on liturgical actions which occur only during the Vespereal part of the Presanctified Liturgy: “the rite of Light” — the exclamation of the clergyman who is holding the light, “*The Light of Christ shines for all,*” and a particular singing of “*Let my prayer arise...*,” and “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” consisting of the verses of Psalms 140 and 130, accordingly.

According to the description of the ordinance of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy, all service books of the Old Russian recension can be divided into four groups, each containing four manuscripts. Group 1 consists of service books *Syn.* 604, *Sof.* 518, *Sof.* 519, *Sol.* 1016/1125; group 2 consists of manuscripts *Sof.* 525, *Sof.* 526, *Rum.* 399, *Sin typ.* 40; group 3 consists of manuscripts *Sof.* 521, *Syn.* 892, *YaMZ* 15472, *Rogozh. kladb.* 566; and group 4 consists of manuscripts *O.p.* I.4, *O.p.* I.5, *Syn. typ.* 43, *Syn.* 598, and the service book *Slav.* 1.

First of all we will consider the structure of the ordinance for the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy from the manuscripts of the latter group. The service books from the fourth group include the manuscripts with the most detailed description of the Vespers. Moreover, only the manuscripts of this group contain the structure of the Vespereal part of the Presanctified Liturgy twice: first for Cheese-fare Week that precedes Great Lent, and then for Lent itself.

According to the Jerusalem rule, which has regulated the divine service of the Russian Orthodox Church from the late fourteenth century until now, the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts is served only during Great Lent and Holy Week; Wednesday of the first week of Lent is the first day for performing the Liturgy. However, Slavonic liturgical texts of the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries preserve evidence of serving the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts also during Cheese-fare Week. Besides the service books, instructions to serve the Presanctified

Liturgy during this week, can be found in the Slavonic *Typica*, *Triodia*, and the *Books of Paroemias*,⁴⁸ but the service books belonging to the fourth group describe the order of the Vespertal part of the Presanctified Liturgy for Cheese-fare Week in greatest detail.

The custom of performing the Presanctified Liturgy on Wednesday and Friday of Cheese-fare Week is reflected not only in the texts of the Studite type, but also in the manuscripts, which describe the office of the cathedral church (the Great Church or the Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople). All three known manuscripts of the *Typikon* of the Great Church⁴⁹ mention serving the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week, yet some parts of the liturgical rite are described in these manuscripts in different ways. Therefore, the brief description of the ordinance for the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week from the Slavonic sources serves as valuable historical evidence supplementing the Greek sources. The order of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy for the period of Cheese-fare week from the manuscripts of the fourth group is schematically presented in Table 1. Here and below in the Tables, the sign “+” denotes the existence of a certain element in the manuscript, and the sign “-” denotes the absence of such an element.

(48) The instructions concerning the performance of the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare week can be found, for example, in the Slavonic *Typica* Syn. 330 (fol. 6), Syn. 333 (fol. 95), Syn. 905 (fol. 158v) from the State Museum of History, in the *Triodion* Pog. 40 (fol. 21v) from the National Library of Russia, in the books of *Paroemias* O.p. I.13 (fol. 24v, fol. 27) from the National Library of Russia, Syn. typ. 49 (fol. 13v), Syn. typ. 51 (fol. 19v) from the Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts. The history of performing the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts on Wednesday and Friday of Cheese-fare week in Rus' was discussed in detail in the study: ЛИСИЦИН, *Первоначальный славяно-русский типикон...*, 56–69. We should note that besides the *Typica* of the Studite type, the *Typikon* of the Great Church also instructs serving the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts on Wednesday and Friday of Cheese-fare week (concerning the regulations of the *Typikon* of the Great Church for Cheese-fare week, see below, p. 24).

(49) Jerusalem manuscript (10–11 C.): МАТЕОС, *Le Typikon de la Grande Église...*, 6–8; Patmos manuscript (9–10 C.): А. А. ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся в библиотеках Православного Востока*, т. 1: *Τυπικά* (Киев, 1895) 111–112, Dresden manuscript: ЛИСИЦИН, *Первоначальный славяно-русский типикон...*, 61–63.

Table 1.
The Structure of the Vespers in the Old Russian Recension

	Syn. 98	O.p. I.4	O.p. I.5	Syn. typ. 43	Slav. 1
Prayer of the Entrance	+	+	+	+	+
"O gentle Light ..."	+	+	+	+	+
Prokeimenon	+	–	+	+	+
Paroemia	+	+	+	+	+
"Let Israel hope in the Lord..."	+	+	+	+	+

First of all, we should note the lack of "the rite of light," and the exclamation, "*The Light of Christ enlightens all*" in the service books that belong to the fourth group.⁵⁰ According to the evidence contained in the manuscripts of the fourth group, the singing of "*Let my prayer arise...*" at the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week was replaced by the singing of "*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*" Similarly, the absence of the exclamation, "*The Light of Christ...*" may indicate a conjoint emergence of "*Let my prayer arise...*" and "*The Light of Christ...*" in the service of the Presanctified Liturgy, which is consistent with the view of Winkler on Constantinopolitan borrowing of elements from the Antiochean Vespers.⁵¹ However, we should also note that the exclamation "*The Light of Christ...*" on Wednesday of Cheese-fare week is mentioned in the Dresden manuscript of the *Typikon* of the Great Church,⁵² moreover, according to the description of this Wednesday service, the exclamation "*The Light of Christ...*" is

(50) The Bulgarian Codex Pogodinskaya Triodion (Ms Pog. 40, fol 21v from the National Library of Russia, first half of the 14th C.) also contains an indication on the absence of the exclamation "The Light of Christ..." during Cheese-fare week: "а въ ѿѣдѣ. да сѧ исправитѣ мѧтѣ. да ѹпѣа нѣзѣ на гѣ ѿнынѣ. свѣтъ хѣвъ. не глѣнь. ни в ѿдѣ" The same indication is contained in the earlier Byzantine texts, for example, in the entry at the service on Wednesday of Cheese-fare week from the *Evergetis Typikon* (Ms of the *Typikon* of the Most-Holy Theotokos the Benefactor (Evergetis) Monastery): ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Описание литургических рукописей...*, т. 1, 508: "τὸ ἀναγνώσματα, τὸ δὲ Φῶς Χριστοῦ οὐ λέγομεν, οὔτε σήμερον, οὔτε τῇ παρασκευῇ".

(51) WINKLER, *Der geschichtliche Hintergrund...*, 205.

(52) ЛИСИЦИН, *Первоначальный славяно-русский типикон...*, 62: "Ἰστέον, ὅτι τῇ δὲ καὶ τῇ παρασκευῇ λέγεται τὸ Φῶς Χριστοῦ φαίνει πᾶσιν, τῶν διακόνων ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰ στίχου τοῦ προκειμένου κατεχομένων εἰς τὰς βασιλικὰς πύλας καὶ λαμβανόντῃ τὰ μανουάλια."

made after the first verse of the *Prokeimenon*.⁵³ (The Jerusalem and the Patmos manuscripts of the *Typikon* of the Great Church do not contain an indication of the exclamation “*The Light of Christ...*” in the service of Cheese-fare week.⁵⁴)

During Great Lent the manuscripts belonging to the fourth group prescribe the order of the Vespers that can be summarized in the following Table:

Table 2.

	<i>Syn.</i> 598	<i>O.p.</i> I.4	<i>O.p.</i> I.5	<i>Syn.</i> <i>typ.</i> 43	<i>Slav.</i> 1
Prayer of the Entrance	–	+	+	–	+
“ <i>O gentle Light ...</i> ”	–	–	+	+	+
Prokeimenon	+	+	+	+	+
Paroemia	+	+	+	+	+
Prokeimenon	+	–	+	+	–
“ <i>The Light of Christ ...</i> ”	+	+	+	+	+
Paroemia	+	+	+	+	+
“ <i>Let my prayer arise ...</i> ”	+	+	+	+	+

The structure of the Vespers from Table 2 coincides with the modern order of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in the part that starts with the Entrance and ends with singing “*Let my prayer arise...*”

As opposed to the fourth group of manuscripts, the rest of the service books of the Old Russian recension describe the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in lesser detail. The first group consists of the earliest manuscripts of the thirteenth century. The manuscripts of the first group do not contain instructions on what actions are performed

(53) For the Wednesday of Cheese-fare Week, the Dresden *Typikon* indicates that the *Prokeimenon* “*Save me, O God, by thy name...*” with two verses “*Hear my prayer, O God...*” and “*Behold, God is my helper...*” should be performed on Wednesday of Cheese-fare Week (Лисицын, *Первоначальный славяно-русский типикон...*, 62). The Jerusalem and the Patmos manuscripts of the *Typikon* of the Great Church prescribe performing the same *Prokeimenon* on Wednesday of Cheese-fare Week but only with the first verse: Матеос, *Le Typikon de la Grande Église...*, 8.

(54) The Jerusalem manuscript and the *Typikon Paris gr.* 1587 (12th C.) mention the exclamation, “*The Light of Christ...*” for March 9, for the service for the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste, in the case when this service falls during the period of Great Lent; the Patmos manuscript does not have the exclamation, “*The Light of Christ ...*” in the service for March 9: Матеос, *Le Typikon de la Grande Église...*, 246.

only during Cheese-fare Week and what actions are performed during Great Lent, but their description of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy has certain liturgical elements that correspond both to the ordinance of the Vespers for Cheese-fare Week and for the ordinance of the Vespers for the period of Great Lent. The manuscripts of the fourteenth century constitute the second and the third group. The second group includes service books with the most concise description of the Vespers, which, notably, do not mention the rite of light as well as singing “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*”, that is, the liturgical elements corresponding to Cheese-fare Week.⁵⁵

The structure of the description for the ordinance of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in the manuscripts of the second group is shown in Table 3.

Table 3.

	<i>Sof.</i> 525	<i>Sof.</i> 526	<i>Syn.</i> <i>typ.</i> 43	<i>Rum.</i> 399
Prayer of the Entrance	+	+	–	+
“ <i>O gentle Light ...</i> ”	+	+	–	+
Prokeimenon	+	–	+	+
Paroemia	+	+	+	+
“ <i>Let Israel hope in the Lord...</i> ”	+	+	+	+

Naturally, if the service book does not mention a certain liturgical action, this does not mean that this action was not performed during the service. Therefore, the comparison of brief rubrics in the service books of the second group with significantly more detailed description of the Vespers in the service books of the fourth group shows a difference not in the liturgical rite, but in the form of recording the rite in a manuscript. The lack of a unified structure for describing Vespers in the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension shows that the rubrics, corresponding to this part of the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy, apparently did not exist in the Greek originals of the Old Slavonic service books belonging to the Old Russian recension, and the scribes supplemented the missing rubrics themselves, with varying degrees of completeness.

(55) Nevertheless, in the manuscripts of this group, as well as other manuscripts of the Old Russian recension, the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy starts with the instruction that this Liturgy should be served starting on Cheese-fare Wednesday.

The order of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy for the manuscripts belonging to the third group, is shown in Table 4.

Table 4.

	<i>Sof.</i> 521	<i>YaMZ</i> 15472	<i>Syn.</i> 892	<i>Rogozh.</i> <i>kladb.</i> 566
Prayer of the Entrance	–	+	–	+
<i>“O gentle Light ...”</i>	–	+	+	+
Prokeimenon	–	+	+	+
Paroemia	+	+	+	+
<i>“The Light of Christ ...”</i>	+	+	+	+
Paroemia	+	+	+	+
<i>“Let Israel hope in the Lord...”</i>	–	+	–	+
<i>“Let my prayer arise ...”</i>	+	+	+	+

We should note that although the service books from the third group, in contrast to the manuscripts from the fourth group, do not have a double description of the ordinance of the Vespers (separately for Great Lent, and for Cheese-fare Week), the manuscripts *YaMZ* 15472 and *Rogozh. kladb.* 566 contain instructions on performing *“Let my prayer arise...”* for the period of Great Lent and *“Let Israel hope in the Lord...”* during Cheese-fare Week (these manuscripts do not have the instruction on the absence of the exclamation, *“The Light of Christ...”* during Cheese-fare Week).

The structure of the ordinance of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in the service books of the first group is shown in Table 5. The sign “*” in the Table marks those parts of the Vespers that are mentioned only in the margins of the manuscript.

Table 5.

	<i>Syn.</i> 604	<i>Sol.</i> 1016/ 1125	<i>Sof.</i> 518	<i>Sof.</i> 519
Prayer of the Entrance	+	+	–	+
<i>“O gentle Light ...”</i>	–	+	+	+
Prokeimenon	+	+	+	+
Paroemia	+	+	+	++
<i>“The Light of Christ ...”</i>	+	–	+	++
Paroemia	+	–	+	++

"Let Israel hope in the Lord..."	+	+	-	-
"Let my prayer arise ..."	-	+	+*	+*

At first sight it might seem that there is a discrepancy between the worship practices of Old Rus' and the practices described by the Byzantine sources: the earliest manuscripts of the thirteenth century reflect a different type of ending of the Vespers that was replaced later, in the fourteenth century, by the ending recorded in later sources. The service books from the first group either omit the instruction on singing "Let my prayer arise..." (Syn. 604) insert it on the margins of the manuscript (Sof. 518, Sof. 519),⁵⁶ or list it together with "Let Israel hope in the Lord..." (Sol. 1016/1125) without mentioning the time of its performance (during Great Lent or during Cheese-fare Week). However, it is likely that this feature does not refer to the ritual but to the method of its recording. It is unlikely that singing "Let my prayer arise..." was absent in the original Russian Church tradition.

Thus, the most interesting evidence of the Slavonic service books is related to the ordinance of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy on Wednesday and Friday of Cheese-fare Week. Byzantine manuscripts that contain information about the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week, firstly, are few in number, and, secondly, their data is not always consistent among various manuscripts. The *Evergetis Typikon* (note 50) and the Dresden manuscripts of the *Typikon* of the Great Church (note 52) answer one of the key questions, that is, whether the "rite of light" was performed at the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week, in a different way. Out of seventeen manuscripts of the Old Russian recension, the most complete and clear liturgical instructions concerning the order of serving the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy are contained in the fourth group of manuscripts. The evidence of these five Slavonic manuscripts of the fourteenth century coincides with the indication of the *Evergetis Typikon* on the lack of the exclamation, "The Light of Christ..." in the service of the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week. Fragmentary liturgical instructions, contained in the re-

(56) We should note that in the manuscript Sof. 519, the instructions on the exclamation, "The Light of Christ..." and singing "Let my prayer arise..." appear on the margins of the manuscript and probably are later additions to the text. ("Let my prayer arise..." in the Ms. Sof. 518, was most likely added by the scribe of the manuscript).

maining twelve manuscripts, do not allow us to recognize any particular pattern.

The disagreement between the rubrics that describe the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy, is one of the main features of the Old Russian recension. On the one hand, the omission of a certain liturgical element in the text of a service book does not necessarily mean the absence of this element in liturgical practice, but, on the other hand, we cannot rule out the possibility that the description of Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in the service books of the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries reflects local liturgical traditions. However, the small number of sources usually does not allow us to draw any conclusions about local liturgical traditions with certainty. Thus, none of the service books from the collection of the Novgorod Cathedral of St. Sophia contains the hymn, “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*,” but this did not lead to the absence of singing “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” in the liturgical practice of Novgorod churches. The singing of this *Prokeimenon* during Cheese-fare Week is indicated in the *Zakharinsky Book of Paroemias* (Ms. O.p. I.13 from the Russian State Library), and on the fol. 73 of the Book, the scribe left a note indicating that this *Book of Paroemias* was written for one of the Novgorod churches.⁵⁷

2. Text of Vespers of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in the Manuscripts of the Old Russian Recension

The ordinance of the Vespers in the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension begins with the instruction on the Vespereal Entrance. Almost all service books of the Old Russian recension contain the instruction on reading the Exit prayer; the service book *Sof.* 519 contains the full text of the Entrance Prayer, “*At evening, at morning and at mid-day we praise...*”, and the manuscripts *Sol.* 1016/1125, *Syn.* 598, *Sof.* 525, *Sof.* 526, *O.p.* I.4, *O.p.* I.5, *Rum.* 398, *Syn. typ.* 43, and *Slav.* 1 contain the opening words. The instructions on the performance of “*O gentle Light...*” are absent only in three manuscripts: *Syn.* 604, *Sof.* 521, and *Syn. typ.* 40 (in the manuscript *Sof.* 521, free space was left for the title and the beginning of the service of the Presanctified Liturgy, but the scribe of the manuscript never filled the space). Seven service books (*Sol.* 1016/1125, *Sof.* 518, *YaMZ* 15472, *Rum.* 398, *Sof.* 526, *O.p.* I.4, and *Syn. typ.* 43) provide the indication of singing “*O gentle Light...*” by

(57) SK, p. 205–206.

the people.⁵⁸ The remaining six manuscripts contain a method for performing the Hymn, “*O gentle Light...*” which is not used in modern practice, when the deacon pronounces the initial words (*Sof.* 519, *O.p.* I.5, *Rogozh. kladb.* 566), and sometimes, perhaps, the whole Hymn (*Sof.* 525, *Syn.* 598, *Syn.* 892, *Slav.* 1).⁵⁹

Other features of the initial part of Vespers in the service books of the Old Russian recension include the indication for pronouncing the verse of blessing made upon entering the altar, in the manuscript *Rum.* 398 (fol. 92v): *ВЛГНО ВХЖЕНЫЕ ХА ИСТИННАГО БА НАШЕГО. ВСЕГДА И НЫ!* (cf. the prayers of the Entrance in the service book *Khlud.* 117 — see below, p. 29). In some Russian service books of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries, this verse is assigned to the Entrance during the Vespers (for example, *Sof.* 518, fol. 2v, *Sof.* 524, fol. 61v) or for the Small Entrance during the Liturgy of John Chrysostom (for example, *Sof.* 523, fol. 18r).

After the Entrance, the service books of the Old Russian recension, according to usual practice, indicate the exclamation of the *Prokeimena* and reading the *Paroemias*. Some manuscripts specify the Biblical material (Genesis for the first reading in the *Sof.* 518, *Sof.* 521, *Syn.* 598, *O.p.* I.4, *O.p.* I.5, and *Slav.* 1, and Proverbs for the second reading in the *Sof.* 521, *O.p.* I.5, and *Slav.* 1) which is also a traditional feature. We should note that in the combination of the Old Testament readings from both the Slavonic Books of *Paroemias* and from the *Triodia* for Cheese-fare Week and the beginning of Great Lent, we did not find deviations from the usual order.⁶⁰

(58) Along with a well established practice of performing the Hymn “*O gentle Light...*” by the singers, in the fourteenth century there existed a tradition, when the text was recited by a reader. This tradition is reflected, for example, in the rubrics for the Presanctified Liturgy in the Serbian manuscripts of the fourteenth century: *Dečani* 119, *Dečani* 121, *Dečani* 122, *Dečani* 123, *Krušdol* Zh IV64, *Hilandar* 316, *Čorovič* J 7.

(59) The method of performing the Hymn by reciting the initial words of “*O gentle Light...*” by the deacon and singing the rest of the Hymn by the choir, in the fourteenth century was used not only at the Presanctified Liturgy but during the regular Vespers. (see, for example, the *Sof.* 523, fol. 51r). This method was used until the seventeenth century, and is indicated in the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy from some of the old-printed service books (see, for example, *Служебник* (Москва, 1623) 190).

(60) *The Book of Paroemias* *O.p.* I.13 from the National Library of Russia, in contrast to regular practice, prescribes reading Isaiah as a reading for Cheese-fare Week. Yet the text of the *Paroemia* is, in fact, the reading from the Book of Joel, traditional for Cheese-fare Week. The *Typika* *Syn.* 330 (fol. 6), *Syn.* 333

The indication about the exclamation “*The Light of Christ...*” is missing in the manuscript *Sol.* 1016/1125, and in all four service books of the second group. The service books of the first group do not provide this indication for the period of Cheese-fare Week. Most of the service books that contain the “rite of light” (*Syn.* 604, *YaMZ* 15472, *Syn.* 892, *Sof.* 521, *O.p.* I.4, *O.p.* I.5, *Rum.* 398) indicate the custom of pronouncing the exclamation “*The Light of Christ...*” not by the priest or the bishop, as it is done now, but by the deacon.⁶¹ This custom goes back to the practice of the Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople⁶² and, despite its wide circulation in the cathedral order of service,⁶³ later it was completely abolished. We should note that although the Codex *O.p.* I.5, indicates that the “rite of light” was most likely performed by the deacon, the manuscript allows for another interpretation: joint performance of the “rite of light” by the deacon and the reader (the deacon goes out with the censer and candles, and the reader exclaims “*The Light of Christ...*”); the practice of pronouncing the exclamation “*The Light of Christ...*” by the reader is known; it is mentioned, for example, in the *Pogodinskaya Triodion* (Ms. National Library of Russia *Pog.* 40, fol. 35): **ЧЪТЪЦЬ РЪЧЕТЪ. СВЪТЪ ХЪВЪ ПРОСВЪЩАЕТЪ ВСА.**

Out of the manuscripts belonging to the Old Russian recension, only *Sof.* 519, *Slav.* 1 and *Syn. typ.* 43 indicate that the exclamation “*The Light of Christ...*” should be made by the priest (from the description of the “rite of light” from the *Sof.* 518 it is not clear, whether the exclamation “*The Light of Christ...*” was performed by the priest or by the deacon). However, the Codex *Sof.* 519 contains a corresponding note

(fol. 95), *Syn.* 905 (fol. 158v) and the *Books of Paroemias Syn. typ.* 49 (fol. 13v), *Syn. typ.* 51 (fol. 19v) prescribe the reading of Prophet Joel for Cheese-fare Week.

(61) On the custom of the exclamation of “*The Light of Christ...*” performed by the deacon, see: ЛИСИЦИН, *Первоначальный славяно-русский типикон...*, 69–72.

(62) The instruction of the exclamation “*The Light of Christ...*” performed by the deacon are contained, for example, in the Dresden manuscript of the *Турикон* of the Great Church (ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Древнейшие патриаршие Типиконы...*, 329) and the description of the Presanctified Liturgy by the Symeon of Thessaloniki (see: PG 155, cols. 656, 657).

(63) Along with Slavonic and Greek texts, Georgian texts also testify to the exclamation of “*The Light of Christ...*” made by the deacon, see: К. С. КЕКЕЛИДЗЕ, *Литургические грузинские памятники в отечественных книгохранилищах* (Тифлис, 1908) 104.

on the margin of the manuscript, and this note may possibly belong to a later time. Apparently, the main reason why the exclamation, “*The Light of Christ ...*” later became pronounced only by the priest, was the absence of the deacon in some parish churches. This assumption is confirmed by the evidence of the manuscript *Syn.* 598, fol. 58v: **ВЫИИДѢ ДѢАКОѢ С КАЛОМЬ • СЪ СВѢЩА • АЩЕ ЛИ НЕ ВЪ • ДѢАКОѢ • ПѢ.**

Only seven manuscripts contain the full text of the exclamation. In the *Sof.* 519, *O.p.* I.4, *Rum.* 398, it is exactly the same as the current exclamation; in the *Syn.* 598, *Syn.* 892, *O.p.* I.5, *Slav.* 1 and *Syn. typ.* 43, in contrast to the modern practice, the pronoun **НЫ** appears at the end of the exclamation.

The Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy ends with the instruction on singing “*Let my prayer arise...*” (Ps. 140) and “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” (Ps. 130). The information about singing “*Let my prayer arise...*” is contained in the *Chronicon Paschale* for the year 615, which is the first surviving evidence concerning serving the Presanctified Liturgy in Constantinople (see p. 4 and note 1), and in the earliest Greek *Euchologia*.⁶⁴ In the modern tradition, “*Let my prayer arise...*” has the form of the Great *Prokeimenon*: it consists of a refrain (Ps. 140,2) and three verses (Ps. 140,1, 3, 4). The same form, according to the Dresden manuscript of the *Typikon* of the Great Church (11th C.), also has “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*”: “*τοῦ ἀρχidiaκόνου ἐκφωνουντος· Σοφία, λέγεται ἀντι τοῦ Κατευθυτήτω, προκείμενον β' μετὰ τοῦ ψαλμοῦ τῷ Δαβίδ, ἦχος πλ. β' Ἐλπιστω Ἰσραήλ. Στίχος α'· Κύριε, οὐκ ὑψώθη ἡ καρδία μου. Στίχος β'· Οὐδὲ ἐπορεύθην ἐν μεγάλοις. Στίχος γ'· Εἰ μὴ ἐπαπεινοφρόνουν*”⁶⁵ (after the archdeacon exclaims “*Wisdom,*” he says instead of “*Let my prayer arise...*” the second *Prokeimenon* from the Psalm of David in Tone 2: “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*,” the first verse “*My heart is not proud, O Lord...*,”⁶⁶ the second verse “*I do not concern myself with great matters...*,”⁶⁷ the third verse “*But I have stilled and quieted my soul...*”⁶⁸). The earlier manuscript of the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia, Ms. Jerusalem 40 (10th C.), mentions only one verse: “*Καὶ πάλιν προκείμενον ἦχος πλ. β' Ἐλπισάτω Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον,*

(64) ΜΩΡΑΙΝΗΣ, *Ἡ λειτουργία...*, 110.

(65) ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Древнейшие патриаршие Типиконы...*, 329–330.

(66) Ps 130, 1.

(67) Ps 130, 1.

(68) Ps 130, 2.

έως τοῦ αἰῶνος Στίχος β'. Εἰ μὴ ἐπαπεινοφρόνουν έως· ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν μου"⁶⁹.

Having mentioned the refrains, "*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*" and "*Let my prayer arise...*" (Ps. 140,2, and Ps. 130,3, respectively), and, in some cases, the first verse (Ps. 140,1 and Ps. 130,1, respectively), the service books of the Old Russian recension, as a rule, do not tell us anything else about these liturgical elements. The exceptions are the manuscript *Rogozh. kladb.* 566, which contains two verses added to "*Let my prayer arise...*," and the *O.p.* I.5 that describes the singing of "*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*"⁷⁰

The manuscript *Sof.* 521, after "*Let my prayer arise...*" mentions потомъ сѣиры на ѣи въѣва — apparently this is a scribal error related to the fact that Psalm 140, 2 was repeated twice during the service of the Presanctified Liturgy, the first time in the beginning of the Vespers, as a part of the "*O Lord, I call to you; come quickly to me...*," that is, as a part of the regular evening Psalms (Ps. 140, 141, 129, 116), and the second time as a refrain in "*Let my prayer arise...*"

3. Manuscripts of the Studite Tradition⁷¹

Along with the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension, there exist other service books of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries that contain instructions on performing the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week, yet the order of the Liturgy, reflected in these manuscripts, corresponds not to the Jerusalem rule but to the earlier liturgical tradition. These manuscripts are represented by service books dated to the end of the thirteenth century: Serbian *Q.p.* I.68 and Bulgarian *Khlud.* 117, as well as manuscripts of the early fourteenth century: Bulgarian *Uvar.* 46 from the State Museum of History, Russian *Q.p.* I.67,

(69) ΜΑΤΕΟΣ, *Le Typikon de la Grande Église...*, 6. The third manuscript of the *Typikon* of the Great Church Patmos 226 (9th C.) does not indicate the method for performing "*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*" (Ibid.).

(70) Several manuscripts of the Studite tradition, which do not belong to the Old Russian recension, contain a fuller description of "*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*" and "*Let my prayer arise...*" (see below, p. 31).

(71) We should mention again that the term "the manuscripts of the Studite tradition," as a rule, is applied to the service books that contain an indication for performing the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week but do not belong to the Old Russian recension.

Serbian *Uvar*. 574, and the *HAZU III a 32*.⁷² This section describes the ordinance of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy on the basis of these six manuscripts. The texts of the Liturgy contained in these Codices, do not belong to a single recension and have substantial differences both in the ordinance composition, and in the texts of the prayers; the name of the ordinance in these manuscripts also differs. In the *Q.p. I.67* and *Uvar*. 46, the Liturgy has a title “вжѣтвна слѣва ст҃го поста • прѣжещѣныхъ”⁷³ (*Q.p. I 67*, fol. 66v), in the *Khlud*. 117 — “литургия ст҃аго поста” (fol. 43), in the *Q.p. I.68* — “вжѣтвнана слоужба • прѣжещѣныхъ • рекше постына” (fol. 47), in the *Uvar*. 574 — “ст҃а и вжѣтвнана литургия ст҃аго и прѣобнаго шѣа нашего ѳеифанна рекше постына” (fol. 102–102v). The beginning of the ordinance in the manuscript *HAZU III a 32* is missing. We should note that besides the *Uvar*. 574, the Presanctified Liturgy is attributed to Epiphanius of Cyprus in several Greek Codices,⁷⁴ in the service book of the fourteenth century *Dečani* 121 and in some Russian manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy of the sixteenth century, for example, the service books *Sof*. 964, *Sof*. 1025, and *Sof*. 1030 from the National Library of Russia.⁷⁵

(72) The beginning of the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy in the manuscript *HAZU III a 32* is missing, but the manuscript has an indirect reference to the ministry of the Liturgy during Cheese-fare week: the presence of singing “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” and the following instruction about singing “*Let my prayer arise...*”: ѿ поѣка чисте ѿ, that is, starting with the first Monday of the Great Lent (similar indication is present in the manuscript *Uvar*. 574).

(73) In the *Uvar*. 76 the word прѣжещѣныхъ is missing.

(74) For example, the *Euchologia Vat. gr.* 1213, Bodleian *Cromwell* 11, *National Library of Athens* № 086, № 802 (see: ΜΩΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η λειτουργία...*, 25).

(75) The normal title for the Slavonic service books of the fifteenth–sixteenth centuries is “*The Divine Service of the Presanctified [Gifts] by Basil the Great ...*” (See, for example, *Mss. Syn.* 606, *Syn.* 602, *Syn.* 618, *Syn.* 612, *Syn.* 267 from the State Museum of History, and *Mss. Sof.* 528, *Sof.* 529, *Sof.* 534, *Sof.* 537, *Sol.* 1018/1127 from the National Library of Russia, *Ms. YaMZ* 15471 from the Yaroslavl Reserve-Museum, etc.). However, the attribution of the Presanctified Liturgy to Gregory Dialogus, which corresponds to the indication of modern service books, already has occurred in Slavonic manuscripts since the middle of the sixteenth century — the Liturgy of “Gregory, the Pope of Rome,” is mentioned in the Acts of the Moscow Council of 1551 (Стоглав, Казань, 1912, p. 43). In connection with the history of the title of the Liturgy, we should mention curious evidence from the Ukrainian manuscript of the sixteenth century from the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences 21.4.13 (Plichin Collection № 13), fol. 70: ұстав вжѣтвнана слоужкы прѣжещѣнына ст҃аго прѣѣна ѡца

The text of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in all six manuscripts begins with the initial exclamation of the Liturgy *"Blessed is the Kingdom ..."*⁷⁶ that is missing in the service books of the Old Russian recension. After that, the *Khud.* 117, *Uvar.* 46 and *Q.p.* I. 67 indicate the reading of the *Trisagion* (the prayer *"Holy God ...," "Most Holy Trinity...," "Our Father..."*), and after that, all manuscripts indicate the reading of Psalm 103. (As opposed to regular practice, the *Khud.* 117 mentions the reading of the Psalm by the deacon and not by the reader).

After the reading of Psalm 103, all six manuscripts list the Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps and, after them, the Great Litany (*"In peace, let us pray to the Lord..."*). Seven Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps are included in the ordinance of the daily Vespers: the priest prays in front of the Royal Gates, making silent Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps during the reading of Psalm 103. The modern ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy in this case indicates the reading of only the last four prayers by a priest. The first three prayers are read at small Litanies that conclude the three Antiphons of the Eighteenth Kathisma, which is read after Psalm 103. The text of the Presanctified Liturgy contains only the first three prayers: *"O Lord, compassionate and merciful..."*, *"Lord, do not rebuke us in your anger..."* and *"Lord our God, remember us, sinners..."*⁷⁷

In contrast to the service books of the Old Russian recension that do not contain the Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps in the text of the Presanctified Liturgy, the rest of the manuscripts of the Studite tradition contain the Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps after the reading of the Vespereal Psalm (Psalm 103), but the number of these prayers varies in different manuscripts. The manuscript *Khud.* 117 contains three prayers, but their traditional order is broken: the first prayer, *"O Lord, compassionate and merciful..."*, and the second prayer, *"Lord,*

нашего свѣта епифанія кипрѣска инїи повѣдїю зложеномъ быти еи акгафанѡ папа римскїи. и
сѣтороцы повѣдаю григорїа папы рїскаго изложение ...

(76) The initial exclamation, *"Blessed is the Kingdom ..."* is also absent in all early Greek manuscripts of the Liturgy (see: ΜΟΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η Λειτουργία...*, 110), which is one of the signs of an earlier origin for the text of the Old Russian recension, compared to the texts of other manuscripts belonging to the Studite tradition.

(77) Чин божественныя литургии Преждеосвященных, in: *Служебник*, ч. 2, 421, Божественная литургия Преждеосвященных, in: *Ibid.*, 432–435.

do not rebuke us in your anger...," are in reverse order.⁷⁸ The service book *Q.p. I.67*, after citing three regular prayers, adds at this place of the text the Prayer, "*At evening, at morning and at midday we praise...,"* which is usually read during the Entrance. The manuscript *Uvar. 574* contains four Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps; the fourth Prayer from the modern ordinance of the Vespers, "*O Lord, who are praised by the holy Powers with never silent hymns...,"* is added to the first three Prayers. Along with four prayers listed in the *Uvar. 574*, the manuscript *Uvar. 46*, similar to the *Q.p. I.67*, contains the Prayer of the Entrance, "*At evening, at morning and at midday we praise...,"*⁷⁹ The ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy from the service book *Q.p. I.68* contains all seven Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps of the Vespers.⁸⁰ In the manuscript *HAZU III a 32*, the beginning of the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy is missing. The first folio belonging to the service of the Presanctified Liturgy (fol. 50r), contains the end of the third Prayer at the Lighting of the Lamps "*Lord our God, remember us, sinners...,"* and the fourth Prayer, "*O Lord, who are praised by the holy Powers with never silent hymns...,"* After the Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps, all six service books contain the Great Litany (the Litany of Peace), which is missing, similar to the Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps, in the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension.

According to the modern order of the service, after the Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps, the Psalter (18th Kathisma) is read. At this time the priest makes preparations of the Gifts for the celebration of the Liturgy: he puts the bread on the paten, pours wine and water into the chalice. Out of all the six manuscripts, only the *Khlud. 117* and the *Uvar. 46* mention the reading of the Kathisma.⁸¹

(78) Some Greek manuscripts have a similar feature, for example, the *Eiletary* of the Patmos library № 709 (1260) (А. А. ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся в библиотеках Православного Востока*, т. 2: Εὐχολόγια (Киев, 1901) 159).

(79) It is possible that the Prayer of the Entrance is indicated in this place of the ordinance for reciting while transferring the Holy Gifts to the Prothesis (cf. further, p. 30).

(80) The indications of the Greek *Euchologia* on the number of the Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps are also very different, see: УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Литургия Преждеосвященных Даров...*, 176.

(81) The Ms. *Khlud. 117* only indicates the reading of the Psalter, without the specific number of the Kathismas; the *Uvar. 46* indicated the 18th Kathisma.

Before the indication on the reading of the Psalms in the manuscript *Khlud.* 117, two short prayers are listed, entitled as the prayer of “въхожденію,” and the prayer of “въходоу.” The first prayer (fol. 44r):

... БЛАГОВЕНОЕ ВЪХОЖЕНІЕ Х҃А ИСТИННАГО Б҃А НШЕГО • ВСЕГДА И ННѢ БѢ БѢ НШЬ
ПОКАЗАД НАМЪ ВЕЛИКИА СІ҃ГНИА ТАИНЫ • ДОВОЛНО ПРИНОСИ ЖР҃ВЪЖХВАЛѢ И ЖР҃ВЪЖ
ПРѢЖЕСВѢЩЕННІИ • В СЛАВЖ И ВЪ ХВАЛЖ ШЦА И СНА И С҃ТАГО ДХ҃А ∴ ...

begins with the verse of blessing, “*Blessed is the entry of Christ our True God...*,” found in other service books of the fourteenth century (see page 22). The end of the prayer in other manuscripts is unknown. The second prayer (fol. 44v):

... ВАГ҃Ы ЧЛѢКОЛЮБЧЕ БѢ • БЛАГОВЫ С҃ТИ ВЪСѢЧЬСКАѢ • ЛІМІТІСА ПРИЛЕЖНО •
СР҃ЦЕМЬ СКОРШЕНОМЬ • И ДХ҃ОМЬ СЪМѢРЕНОМЬ БЛАГОВИ ВЪХ҃О НА • И ВЪХОЖЕНІЕ
Х҃Е БѢ НШЬ • ТАКО ТВОЕ ПРИШЕСТВІЕ И ПОЖІЕ СЪ ЧЛѢВКЫ БЛ҃ГОСЛ҃ВЕН҃Ъ ЕСТЬ ...

appears in some service books of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries both in the ordinance of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy, and in the ordinance of the daily Vespers.⁸² Apparently, these prayers were related to the transfer of the Holy Gifts on the Prothesis from the place where the Gifts were kept after their consecration during the full Liturgy.⁸³

After reading the Eighteenth Kathisma and singing “*Lord, I have cried to you, hear me...*,” in the modern ordinance of the service the Entrance is made, with the priest and the deacon carrying the censer coming out from the altar and reciting the Entrance Prayer, “*At evening, at morning and at midday we praise...*” The procession comes into the altar while the Hymn, “*O gentle light ...*” is performed. The Entrance is described in a

(82) The prayer, “*O Good Lover of Mankind...*” is present, for example, in the Serbian service books *O.p.* I. 1116 (fol. 28v), *O.p.* I. 1117 (fol. 58r), *O.p.* I. 9 (fol. 64v – fol. 65r), *OLDP* Q 110 (fol. 25r) from the National Library of Russia, and in the text of the Presanctified Liturgy in the manuscripts *Q.p.* I.67, *Uvar.* 46 (see below). In the *Hilandar* 316 (fol. 114v), the prayer is cited outside of the ordinance of the Vespers and is entitled “*the prayer of the Vespers, at the Entrance.*”

(83) Currently, in accordance with established practice, the Holy Gifts are kept on the altar table, in a special repository, and during the reading of the 18th Kathisma, they are carried to the Prothesis through the High Place. An old-printed service book prescribe that the Gifts should be kept on the Prothesis (see: ВАНЮКОВ, Чин Литургии Преждеосвященных Даров..., 284–287), but in the manuscripts of the 14th century the location of the Holy Gifts prior to the Liturgy is not specified.

similar way in the manuscript *HAZU III a 32*, in the manuscript *Uvar. 574*, which is close to this service book according to the composition of its ordinance, and in the manuscript *Khlud. 117*. In the latter Codex, only a short rubric (fol. 45r) ... по • прѣмѣжростъ • стѣна слави ... indicates “*O gentle light ...*,” that is, the *Khlud. 117* contains not the first two words of the Hymn “*O gentle light ...*,” but the next two words.⁸⁴ The manuscripts *Q.p. I. 67* and *Q.p. I. 68* do not contain the indication of “*O gentle light ...*” The *Q.p. I. 67* contains the Prayer “*O Good Lover of Mankind...*” as the Entrance Prayer. The manuscript *Uvar. 46*, after the “*Lord, I have cried to you, hear me...*” contains the rubric (fol. 75r) ... въ зѣе • кадилицѣж • и сщїи • по • мѣвѣж • въ хонж • прѣдъ дверми ватарѣ •: ..., and then, immediately after the Prayer “*O Good Lover of Mankind...*,” ... въ хѣ • по • прѣмѣждрѣ • дна тв хѣтъ прѣсвѣтитъ вък •: та прѣ • и паремии... The indication of the exclamation “*The Light of Christ ...*” by the deacon corresponds to the tradition of the Great Church and to the text of the service books belonging to the Old Russian recension (see p. 23 and note 61).

In the *Q.p. I.67* and *Q.p. I.68*, the “rite of light” (exclamation “*The Light of Christ...*”) is not mentioned, but in the *Khlud. 117*, “the rite of light” has the following unusual recension (fol. 45r): ... по • прѣмѣжростъ • стѣна слави •: свѣтъ • хѣвъ • дръжа свѣщѣж • и кадилицѣж • ѣе таи • вѣглови вѣко стѣни свѣтъ • како ти еси прѣсвѣщение... The unique feature of the manuscript *Khlud. 117* is also a lack of indication on reading the *Paroemias*: *Khlud. 117* is the only Slavonic manuscript of the Presanctified Liturgy known to us, that does not provide references to the Old Testament readings.⁸⁵ In the *Q.p. I.67*, and *Q.p. I.68*, the *Paroemias* follow the Entrance, in the *Uvar. 46*, they follow “*The Light of Christ...*” The service books *HAZU III a 32* and *Uvar. 574*, in accordance with modern practice, mention the *Paroemias* two times: before and after “*The Light of Christ ...*” However, this “rite of light” significantly differs from the modern rite. First of all, both service books require performing the exit from the altar with the Gospels (*Uvar. 574*, fol. 119v: ... и по мѣ. вывають. .б. • въ хѣ. съ. свѣщамии. и съ. игуменъ ...).⁸⁶ On Wednesday of Cheese-fare Week, the manuscript

(84) It is possibly related to the performance of the Hymn “*O, gentle Light...*” (see, p. 22, and note 59).

(85) The *Syn. typ. 42* does not contain any indication of the *Paroemias*, but in this manuscript, the whole description of the ordinance of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy is omitted, starting with “*Lord, I have cried to you, hear me...*”

(86) We do not know about other Slavonic manuscripts, which provide an indication on the exit from the altar for the exclamation “*The Light of Christ...*”

also requires the Entrance with the Gospels.⁸⁷ Secondly, before the exclamation, “*The Light of Christ...*,” both manuscripts contain the Prayer of the priest, “*O Master, Lord our God...*,” read during the Small Entrance (with the Gospels) during the Liturgy of John Chrysostom.

In the HAZU III a 32 and *Uvar.* 574, the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy end with the indication for singing “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” for the period of Cheese-fare Week, and “*Let my prayer arise...*” for the period of Great Lent. The service books HAZU III a 32 and *Uvar.* 574 are the only known Slavonic manuscripts, in which “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” follows the Greek manuscript of the *Typikon* of the Hagia Sophia, namely, it is sung according to the rite of the Great *Prokeimenon* with three verses of Psalm 103.⁸⁸

Uvar. 574 (fol. 121r – fol. 121v)

...и по кончанни
парими.
днѣ възглашь

да оу||поваѣтъ
израиль на гѣ
ѿ нѣга и до вѣка.
люде. тоуже.

сѣи гѣ не възнесесе срѣце мое
ни възведостасе ѿчи мон.
люде. да оупова.

сѣи .б. ни ходи въ дивныхъ
ни въ великихъ паче мене.
люде. да оупова.

сѣи .г. аще не смѣрихъсе
нъ възнесохъ на дшѣоу мою.

ѿпнь. да оупов.
люде. тоуже. ...

HAZU III a 32 (fol. 51v. – fol. 52r)

...и по концѣ
парими :
възгѣл днѣ||

да оуѣваѣтъ
изль на гѣ
ѿ нѣга и до вѣка. ::

сѣ гѣ не възнесесе срѣце мое
ни възведостасе ѿчи мѣи ::

сѣ ни ходихъ въ великихъ
ни въ дивныхъ ::

сѣ аще не смѣрихъсе
ни възнесохъсе ::

However, there is evidence for the replacement of “the rite of light” by the exit with the Gospels. In the Triodion of the 13th century (manuscript *F.n.* I.102 from the National Library of Russia), the following instruction about serving the Presanctified Liturgy on Great Friday can be found (fol. 202r): ...и вывѣѣ. въхѣ. съ еѣ. и свѣтъ хѣвъ не ремень...

(87) On the evidence of serving the Presanctified Liturgy during Cheese-fare Week in the manuscript *F.n.* I.102, see: Лисицин, *Первоначальный славяно-русский типикон...*, 59, 73, 74.).

(88) См. Дмитриевский, *Древнейшие патриаршие Типиконы...*, 329–330.

(cf. the Greek text on p. 24). Note that the *HAZU* III a 32 and the *Uvar.* 574 have an indication on exclamation of the verses belonging to this *Prokeimenon* by the deacon, which is not found in other manuscripts, containing “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” In the service book *Uvar.* 46, unlike the *Uvar.* 574 and the *HAZU* III a 32, the verse “*Nor do I concern myself with great matters, or things too wonderful for me...*” (Ps 103,1) is absent. In the *Uvar.* 46, the first verse is “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*,” the second verse is “*God, my heart is not haughty, nor my eyes lofty...*,” the third verse is “*Surely I have stilled and quieted my soul...*” Apparently, the difference in the description of the way to perform “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” in the *Uvar.* 46, compared to the *Uvar.* 574 and *HAZU* III a 32, can be explained not by the negligence of the scribe, but with the current liturgical practice, since the performance of “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” is also described in the *Book of Paroemias O.p.* I.13. We should note that the Slavonic *Typikon* of the thirteenth century *Syn.* 330 indicates a different way of performing the “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” (fol. 6r): ...*да оупъвають изъль на г̃а. с̃ти .а̃. г̃и не възнесеса с̃ще мое. а̃ паче мене...*,⁸⁹ that is, the *Syn.* 330 prescribes performing “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” not in the form of the Great *Prokeimenon* (with three verses), but of the regular *Prokeimena* (with one verse).⁹⁰

In the *Q.p.* I.68 and *Khlud.* 117, the singing of “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” is not mentioned, and in the *Q.p.* I.67 only the first verse “*God, my heart is not haughty, nor my eyes lofty...*,” is mentioned. The performance of “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” in the same form is indicated in the *Books of Paroemia* of the fourteenth century, *Syn. typ.* 49 (fol. 13v), and *Syn. typ.* 51 (fol. 19r) from of the Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts, as well as in the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension *Syn.* 604, *YaMZ* 15472, *O.p.* I.4, *O.p.* I.5,⁹¹ and the *Rogozh. kladb.* 566 (the service books of the Old Russian recension *Syn.* 598

(89) A similar note is contained in the *Typika Syn.* 333 (fol. 95r), and *Syn.* 905 (fol. 158v).

(90) The *Syn.* 330 prescribes performing the Great *Prokeimena* for Easter, the Nativity of the Lord, the Baptism of the Lord and for the Matins of Great Saturday (see the section on Great *Prokeimena* in М. СКАБАЛЛАНОВИЧ, *Толковый типикон*, вып. II (Киев, 1913) 141).

(91) Note that the method of finishing “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*,” that is described in detail in the *O.p.* I.5, is not consistent with an indication of the *Uvar.* 574 on the priest performing the end of this singing.

and *Sol.* 1016/1125, referring to “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*,” do not reveal its contents).

Both the *Codex Q.p. I.67* and the earliest Slavonic service book *Syn.604* have an indication of “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*,” but do not mention “*Let my prayer arise...*” In the other five service books that are considered here, the description of the Vespers ends up with the rubric about “*Let my prayer arise...*” In the service books that contain “*Let Israel hope in the Lord...*” (*Uvar.* 46, *HAZU III a 32*, *Uvar.* 574), there is an indication of singing “*Let my prayer arise...*” starting the first Monday of Great Lent.⁹² The contents of the singing of “*Let my prayer arise...*,” in the service books of the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries, as a rule, are not revealed in detail. The exceptions are the manuscripts *Uvar.* 46, *Uvar.* 574, and *HAZU III a 32*. For example, in the *Uvar.* 574, (fol. 122v–124v), “*Let my prayer arise...*” is described as follows:

... а чистѣ ѿ ѿ поѿел :
 пѿ. възглашь. прѣмоудрость прости вънѣмѣмь миръ всѣмь.
 дѿгѿ || да се исправитъ мѣтва мога тако кадило прѣдъ тобою. въздѣни
 роу моюю жрътва вечернага :
 люде. тѣ
 стѣ гѣ възвахъ тебѣ || оуслыши мѣ гѣ вънми глѣсь молитви мое ѿга
 възову к тебѣ
 лю да се испра:
 с .б. положи съхранѣ оустомь моимь и || дѣври шгражѣни воустнахъ
 моихъ
 люде. да се исправи:
 с .г. не оуклони срѣца моего. въ словеса оукавна нещива||ти вини
 ш грѣсѣхъ.
 да се исп.
 люде. въздѣни роукоу. ...

Both, the *Uvar.* 574 and all other manuscripts that cite “*Let my prayer arise...*” do not contain deviations from the present order of verses. The *HAZU III a 32* and *Uvar.* 574 provide an indication of the exclamation of the verses in “*Let my prayer arise...*” by the deacon; other manuscripts do not specify the method of performing “*Let my prayer arise...*”

(92) According to the modern *Typikon*, the first day of serving the Presanctified Liturgy is Wednesday of the first week of Great Lent. According to the Studite practice, the Presanctified Liturgy was performed all days of Great Lent starting the first Monday (see: Лисицин, *Первоначальный славяно-русский типикон...*, 74–77).

Concluding the description of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in the manuscripts in the Studite tradition, we should present the structure for the ordinance of the Vespers of the Presanctified Liturgy in the form of a Table, where the sign “+” indicates the presence of the liturgical element in the ordinance, the sign “-” indicates the absence of such references, and the sign “0” indicates the lack of relevant pages in the manuscript. Roman numerals designate, respectively, the following manuscripts: I – *Q.p. I.68*, II – *Khlud. 117*, III – *Uvar. 46*, IV – *Q.p. I.67*, V – *Uvar. 574*, VI – *HAZU III a 32*.

Table 6.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
<i>“Blessed is the Kingdom...”</i>	+	+	+	+	+	0
Trisagion	-	+	+	+	-	0
Psalm 103	+	+	+	+	+	0
Prayers at the Lighting of the Lamps	+	+	+	+	+	+
Prayers of the Entrance	-	+	-	-	-	-
Great Litany	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kathisma	-	+	+	-	-	-
<i>“Lord, I have cried to you, hear me...”</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+
Prayer of the Entrance	+	+	+	+	+	+
<i>“O gentle light...”</i>	-	+	-	-	+	+
Paroemia	+	-	-	+	+	+
<i>“The Light of Christ...”</i>	-	+	+	-	+	+
Paroemia	-	-	+	-	+	+
<i>“Let Israel hope in the Lord...”</i>	-	-	+	+	+	+
<i>“Let my prayer arise...”</i>	+	+	+	-	+	+

II. THE GREAT ENTRANCE

1. *Liturgy of the Catechumens*

After the Vespers, the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy is continued with the Litany of Fervent Supplication (“*Let us all say...*”). Then, before the Great Entrance, there follow the prayers and the Litany of the Catechumens, Prayers and Litany for those Preparing for Enlightenment (baptism), two Prayers and the Litany of the Faithful, and the exclamation, “*According to the gift of your Christ...*” These parts of the ordinance are present already in the earliest *Euchologion Barberini* 336 (8th C.).⁹³ The specific feature of the initial part of the Presanctified Liturgy from the service books of the Old Russian recension is the absence of the Prayer and the Litany for those Preparing for Enlightenment in most manuscripts.⁹⁴ The Prayer “*Manifest your countenance, Master...*” and the Litany “*As many as are preparing for Enlightenment...*” are found in only four out of sixteen manuscripts:⁹⁵ *Sol.* 1016/1125, *Sof.* 519, *Syn.* 598, and *YaMZ* 15472.⁹⁶ In some Greek *Euchologia*, the Prayer for those Preparing for Enlightenment is either missing, or bears a different name.⁹⁷ Thus, the *Barberini* 336 contains the text of the prayers of the Presanctified Liturgy on fol. 37r – fol. 43v, and, separately, the Litanies at fol. 260v – fol. 262r. In the series of prayers, the text of “*Manifest your countenance, Master...*” is called the Prayer for those Preparing for Enlightenment (εὐχή εἰς τοὺς πρὸς τὸ ἄγιον θῶπισμα εὐτρεπιζομένους)⁹⁸ and in the *Book for the Deacon* it is called “the First Prayer of the Faithful” (εὐχή πιστῶν α’).⁹⁹ Presumably, such a record in the Greek protograph resulted in the fact that the

(93) PARENTI, VELKOVSKA, *L'eucologio Barberini...*, 42–48, 310–314.

(94) All other Slavonic manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy that date to the thirteenth – fourteenth centuries and do not belong to the Old Russian recension, contain both the Prayer and the Litany for those Preparing for Enlightenment.

(95) Here we speak about 16, and not 17 manuscripts, since part of the pages from the manuscript *O.p.* I.4, that contain the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy, are missing, specifically, the pages on which the Litany and the Prayer for those Preparing for Enlightenment might have been written.

(96) Prayer for those Preparing for Enlightenment is also present in the service book *Syn.* 604, but the corresponding Litany is absent.

(97) ΜΩΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Ἡ λειτουργία...*, 54, 60.

(98) PARENTI, VELKOVSKA, *L'eucologio Barberini...*, 42.

(99) *Ibid.*, p. 312.

service book *Syn.* 604 contains only the Prayer for those Preparing for Enlightenment, and the Litany for those Preparing for Enlightenment is missing. With all that, the Litany of Peace for the Faithful (“*Again and again, in peace let us pray to the Lord...*”) is shown twice in the text of the Liturgy: the first time after the Prayer for those Preparing for Enlightenment, and then, at its usual place after the Prayer for the Faithful.

Another specific feature of the initial part of the Liturgy is the presence of two additional petitions in the initial Litany of the Liturgy of the Catechumens in the manuscripts *Sof.* 525, *Syn. typ.* 40: *ЩЕ МОЛИСА ЗА РАБНИ ІАМРК: ИЩЕ МОЛИМСА ТАЖЕ Ѡ ХЪ КЛИР ∴* (fol. 85r in the *Syn. typ.* 40). The second of these petitions, which is absent in the modern service, is also present in the *Syn.* 598. In addition, after the exclamation “*For you, O God, are merciful...*” that finishes the first Litany, the *Syn. typ.* 40, l. 85 contains a short Litany for the Dead with a regular exclamation *ІАКО ТЫ ІЕСИ ГІИ ПОКОИ І ЖИВОТЬ ∴*.

2. Prayers of the Great Entrance

All service books of the Old Russian recension contain a reference to the singing of the Hymn “*Now the hosts of heaven invisibly worship...*” during the Great Entrance. Most manuscripts provide only the opening words, while the full text is contained only in the *Sof.* 525 and *Syn. typ.* 40. We should note that there exists some archaeological material, containing the text of “*Now the hosts of heaven invisibly worship...*” from the same period as the service books of the Old Russian recension. This is the fragment of old frescoes from two churches, of St. Clement and of the Savior, discovered in the last century during the excavations in Staraya Ladoga.¹⁰⁰ The modern Slavonic text of “*Now the hosts of heaven invisibly worship...*” has a lexical different reading from the Greek text: “*fear—love.*” The manuscripts *Sof.* 525 and *Syn. typ.* 40, following the Greek original, include the reading “*fear,*” as well as the service books *Q.p.* I.68, *Čorovič* 7, and the inscription from Staraya Ladoga.¹⁰¹ However, the reading “*love*” was already quite widespread in the fourteenth

(100) Н. Е. БРАНДЕНБУРГ, *Археологические исследования в Старой Ладоге 1886–1887 гг.* (Санкт-Петербург, 1887).

(101) On the inscription, see: Т. В. РОЖДЕСТВЕНСКАЯ, *Типы эпиграфических текстов в надписях Древней Руси XI–XV вв.* (Новгород, Киев, Ладога, Галич), *Die Slawischen Sprachen* 28 (1991) 122–124; она же, *Богослужбные тексты в церковной эпиграфике древней Руси, Византинороссика* 1 (1995) 303–311.

century service books, for example, in the *O.p.* I.48, *Dečani* 119–123, *Krušedol Zh* IV64.

According to the modern service books, the Great Entrance begins with burning incense at the Holy Gifts. While burning incense, the priest recites Psalm 50.¹⁰² The publisher of the Greek texts Muraitis refers to the Codex of the turn of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries, *Sinai* 971, as the earliest *Euchologion* mentioning the reading of Psalm 50 at the Great Entrance of the Presanctified Liturgy,¹⁰³ but the reference to Psalm 50 can be found in all the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension, which confirms the antiquity of pronouncing this Psalm at the Great Entrance. In the *Euchologia* of the twelfth century from the National Library of Athens № 662 and № 713, there are instructions for not pronouncing the “Cherubim prayer,” that is, the prayer, required for reading during the Great Entrance at the Liturgy of John Chrysostom. However, a number of *Euchologia* contain a contrary indication. In particular, the manuscript of the thirteenth century *Sinai* 982 cites the first words of this prayer “*No one bound by worldly desires and pleasures is worthy...*” during the Great Entrance of the Presanctified Liturgy.¹⁰⁴ A rubric with the same content is present in the service book of the Old Russian recension *Syn.* 598: *мѡ. вѣ ѿвѣ слѣ. никто же достоинъ связавшис* (fol. 61v).¹⁰⁵ The instruction on including the prayer from the Liturgy of John Chrysostom into the ordinance of the Great Entrance during the Presanctified Liturgy corresponds to the general trend of

(102) Чин Божественныя литургии Преждеосвященных Даров во Святую и Великую Четыредесятницу, in: *Служебник*, ч. 2 (Москва, 1991) 425.

(103) ΜΟΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η λειτουργία...*, 75.

(104) *Ibid.*

(105) Slavonic service books of the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries, in addition to “*No one bound by worldly desires and pleasures is worthy...*,” contain the instructions on reading the Prayer “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” (*Khlud.* 117, *Uvar.* 46, *Syn. typ.* 40, *Syn. typ.* 43 and others, see, p. 39), as well as the Prayer “*Master and Lord, who visit us in mercy and compassion...*” (*Q.p.* I.67, see, p. 41). at the Great Entrance. The edition of ΜΟΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η λειτουργία...*, mentions six Greek manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy, that have the Prayer “*Master and Lord, who visit us in mercy and compassion...*” (see, note 116). In the Greek *Euchologia*, the Prayer “*O God, who in mercy and compassion hast looked upon our humility...*” from the Liturgy of Basil the Great can be found in the *Sinai* 971 (13th–14th C.), and the *Philotheos Monastery on Mount Athos* № 177 (1332) — see: ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Описание литургических рукописей...*, т. 2, 250, 270.

introducing liturgical elements from the Liturgy of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great into the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, already noted by Uspensky.¹⁰⁶

The manuscripts *Khlud.* 117 (fol. 48v – fol. 49r) and *Uvar.* 46 (fol. 82v – fol. 83r), and the service books of the Old Russian recension *Syn. typ.* 40 (fol. 88v – fol. 89r) and *Syn. typ.* 43 (fol. 69r – fol. 69v) contain the Prayer at the Great Entrance “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*,” made by the priest. This prayer is not found in other manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy of the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries.¹⁰⁷ We do not know Greek manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy that contain the Prayer “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” However, this Prayer can be found in the Greek texts of the rite of *Tritekti* (τριτέκτη),¹⁰⁸ that has disappeared now, as well as in the texts of the First Hour of the “*asmatiki akolouthia*” (ἁσματικὴ ἀκολουθία), both in Greek and Slavonic sources.¹⁰⁹

In the service book *Syn. typ.* 40, the Prayer “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” is entitled “*мѡ в переносѣ*”. In the *Khlud.* 117, and in the *Uvar.* 46 and *Syn. typ.* 43, the Prayer does not have a title, but the position of “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” in the ordinance of the Liturgy clearly indicates that the Prayer was delivered by the priest at a time close

(106) УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Литургия Преждеосвященных Даров...*, 178.

(107) The Prayer, “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” is present in the Slavonic manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy of the sixteenth century, for example, in the service books *Sof.* 556 (fol. 207r – fol. 207v), *Sol.* 1023 (fol. 121v) from the collection of the National Library of Russia (the presence of the Prayer in the *Sol.* 1023 is mentioned in: А. А. ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Богослужение в русской церкви в XVI веке* (Казань, 1884) 140).

(108) The service of *Tritekti* starts exactly with the Prayer “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*,” which is entitled the Prayer of the first Antiphon in the manuscripts (see, for example, the *Barberini* 336 — PARENTI, VELKOVSKA, *L'euclologio Barberini...*, 87, the *Sinai* 957 — ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Описание литургических рукописей...*, т. 2, 9).

(109) For example, on fol. 70v of the Greek Codex № 213 from the Paris National Library (ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Описание литургических рукописей...*, т. 2, 1003), on fol. 115v.–116r of the Slavonic *Trebnik Syn.* 675 from the State Museum of History, that contains the prayers of the “*asmatike akolouthia*” (for the Slavonic manuscripts, see: Е. П. ДИАКОВСКИЙ, *Чин тритекти* (Киев, 1908) 9).

to the transfer of the Gifts, apparently, during the singing of “*Now the hosts of heaven invisibly worship...*” In the manuscript *Khlud.* 117, before the text of “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*,” it says: “*нӣнѣ сили не̄бниа*”, followed by: “*и поставитъ с̄тиа дари кланѣаса на̄сно и ошоуа.*” In other sources, the reference to the singing of the Hymn “*Now the hosts of heaven invisibly worship...*” also precedes the Prayer “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*”

This is the text of “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” according to the manuscripts *Khlud.* 117 and *Uvar.* 46:¹¹⁰

Khlud. 117 (fol. 48v – fol. 49 r)

бѣ сѣдѣи на хероувиаѣ •
и ѿ серафима славаса •
призри на ни сьмѣрениа •
и не̄до̄инниа рабы твоа •
и въстави • оумь на̄
въ насла̄женне твоа бл̄гости •
истор̄гни ни
ѿ всего помышленниа •
да свѣтомъ твоимъ просвѣщаеми •

и волеж • твоа оправдаеми на все
дѣло благо •
с̄юби въса ни
не̄беному ц̄рствѣ с̄четажсѣа

с̄ь избраньними твоими •
а̄т̄ьвади с̄тиа б̄ца • и всѣ ст̄ихъ
все̄а :

Uvar. 46 (fol. 82v – fol. 83 r)

бѣ сѣдѣи на хероувиаѣ
и ѿ сѣрафиаѣ славиыми
призри на ни смѣрениа рабы си

и въстави оумь нашъ
на словословыи си твои бл̄ти •
истор̄гни же ны ѿ
всего помышленна вражиа
да свѣтомъ твоимъ и просвѣтомъ
просвѣщаеми
волеж • твоа справлѣеми •
с̄юбисѣа

не̄беному твоа̄ ц̄рствю •
с̄четажсѣа
с̄ь избраньними твоими •

тако ты еси б̄гъ н̄шь и т̄е слава
въ̄здемь
ѿцоу и сноу и с̄тмоу д̄хоу :

(110) The text of the prayer, “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” from the *Syn. typ.* 40 and *Syn. typ.* 43 can be found in the Appendix on p. 64. The Greek text of this prayer from the ordinance of the Tritecti is published by A. A. ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ according to the *Sinai 957 (Описание литургических рукописей..., т. 2, 9)*, and PARENTI, VELKOVSKA, *L’eucolegio Barberini..., 87, 88* according to the *Barberini 336* (see also: M. АРРАНЦ, *Как молились Богу древние византийцы: Суточный круг богослужения по древним спискам Византийского Евхология* (Дисс., Ленинград, Ленинградская духовная академия, 1979) 223).

Although the Prayer “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*,” is included in the ancient Cathedral service of Constantinople both in the service of the First Hour, and as the initial prayer of the *Tritekti*, the source of the appearance of the Prayer in the Presanctified Liturgy is undoubtedly the rite of *Tritekti*. This service was a part of the daily circle of the Cathedral service during Great Lent, and was closely associated with the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, which, according to Simeon of Thessaloniki, was never performed without the *Tritekti* in the Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.¹¹¹ The manuscripts of the *Typikon* of the Great Church provide instructions on the performance of the *Tritekti* on Wednesday and Friday of Cheese-fare Week, during Great Lent, Holy Thursday and Holy Friday.¹¹²

The liturgical term “*Tritekti*” was used in the Slavonic liturgical manuscripts to denote the Lenten service of the Third and the Sixth Hour, but we do not know of any Slavonic manuscripts of the *Tritekti* service.¹¹³ Nevertheless, since we do not have evidence on performance of the Slavonic service of *Tritekti*, and the Greek Euchologia contain the Prayer “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” in the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy, the question of whether “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” found its way into the Slavonic manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy from the Greek Liturgy, or was borrowed by the compiler of the Slavonic service directly from the rite of the *Tritekti*, remains unsettled.

The Russian service book *Q.p. I.67* requires reading the Prayer “*бѣ поскѣщи насъ мѣстнию и щедротами...*” at the Great Entrance. In *Q.p. I.67* it bears the title *мѣтва прѣкносоу* (fol. 71r). This prayer is present in the manuscripts of the Liturgy of Apostle James¹¹⁴ and is one of the few liturgical elements recorded by early Slavonic manuscripts that go

(111) On the service of *Tritekti* in Symeon of Thessaloniki, see: *PG* 155, cols. 649–753.

(112) МАТЕОС, *Le Typikon de la Grande Église...*, 4, 72, 78, 292, 293; ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, *Древнейшие патриаршие Типиконы...*, 137, 324. In Great Thursday, after the *Tritekti*, the full Liturgy was performed.

(113) Greek manuscripts, related to the rite of *Tritekti*, are listed in the study of АРРАНЦ, *Как молились Богу древние византийцы...*, 231–238.

(114) В.-Ch. МЕРСИЕР, *La Liturgie de S. Jaques. Edition critique, avec traduction latine* (Paris, 1946) (PO, 26.2) 190–192.

back to this Liturgy.¹¹⁵ The question of the impact of the Liturgy of Apostle James on the Slavonic Liturgy requires a separate study. The greatest interest represent the cases, where for the Slavonic liturgical element from the Liturgy of the Apostle James it is not possible to find a corresponding Greek intermediary, that is, a document prior to the Slavonic manuscripts, that contains the element of the Liturgy of the Apostle James in the same place of the liturgical ordinance as the Slavonic source. However, the Prayer “*бѣ посѣщен насъ мѣстїю и щедротами...*” does not belong to such cases. The intermediaries, through which the Prayer found its way into the *Q.p. I.67*, most certainly were the manuscripts of the Greek Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. Muraitis mentions six *Euchologia* in this connection.¹¹⁶ Three of them (11th century *Paris. gr. 391*, 14th century *Paris. gr. 328*, 14th–15th century *Paris. gr. 324* from the Paris National Library), contain both the Prayer “*Master and Lord, who visit us in mercy and compassion...*” and the Prayer “*O God of ineffable and unseen mysteries...*” that follows the Great Entrance. In the other three *Euchologia*, the Sinai *Euchologion* of the twelfth century *Syn. 973*, *Syn. 971* of the thirteenth–fourteenth century, and the manuscript № 177 from the Philotheus Monastery on Mount Athos, the Prayer “*O God of ineffable and unseen mysteries...*” is absent.

This is the text of the Prayer “*Master and Lord, who visit us in mercy and compassion...*” from the *Q.p. I.67* (fol. 71v – fol. 73r):

мѣтѣа • прѣсносоу • по • тан • ѿ • бѣ посѣщен насъ мѣстїю и щедротами •
 влѣдко гѣи • и || даровавыи дѣрзновение намъ смѣренымъ • и недостойнымъ
 равомъ твоимъ • стати прѣ стѣмъ твоимъ жьртвенникомъ • и приносити
 тебе • словѣсноую сїю и бесквѣрнѣноую жьртвоу • ѡ нашихъ грѣсѣхъ •
 призри на ма непотрѣвнаго раба твоего • и ѡмыи мѡта прѣгрѣшениа • за
 твое мѣрднїе • очисти ми оустне и срѣце • ѡ всакоа сквѣрны и плѣти и дѣха •
 оудовли ма силою стѣго твоего дѣха • и прими слоужвоу сїю • влѣгостына
 ради твоега • приближающагса къ стѣмоу || твоемоу жьртвеннику • влѣговоли
 гѣи благопригѣтнѡмъ быти • приносимымъ ти симъ даромъ • нашими
 роукѡми • смерѣгасѡ за маю немощь • не ѡвѣрзи мене ѡ твоего лица • не

(115) A detailed (but not complete) list of instances, where the elements borrowed from the Jerusalem Liturgy of Apostle James, appear in Slavonic liturgical sources, can be found in: С. МУРЕТОВ, Исторический обзор чинопоследования проскомидии до «Устава Литургии» Константинопольского патриарха Филофея (отдельный оттиск статей из Чтений в обществе любителей духовного просвещения за 1893, 1894 г.) (Москва, 1896) 225–229.

(116) ΜΟΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η λειτουργία...*, 39.

ѡмрази моего недостойнства • нѣ помилоуи мѡ бѣ по велицѣи млѣти твоиѡ •
и прѣзѣри беззаконнѡ мѡта • да нешоууженью пристѡупѡ • прѣдѣтъ лицьмѡ
славы твоѡта • и достѡиннѣ боудѡу • ѡкриленнѡта • единачадѡго снѡа твоѡго •
и не тако корабль грѣхѡу неключимѣ боудѡу • ии гѣи всемогыи • оуслышы
млѣбоу мою • ты || во иси дѣѡта всѡчѣскаѡта о всѣхѣ ѡж и соуцѡта помощи ѡ
тебе просимѣ • всегда и нынѣ и принѣ :

The Prayer “бѣ посѣщенѡ насѣ млѣстнѡ и щедрѡтами...” in the service book *Q.p. 1.67* almost entirely corresponds to the Prayer of the Presanctified Liturgy from the earliest of known Greek sources, the manuscript *Paris. gr. 391*¹¹⁷. The text of this Prayer in the manuscripts of the Liturgy of Apostle James in several places supplements the *Paris. gr. 391*,¹¹⁸ but these additions are not reflected in the *Q.p. 1.67*, which is further evidence of borrowing the Prayer “бѣ посѣщенѡ насѣ млѣстнѡ и щедрѡтами...” not from the Liturgy of Apostle James, but from the Greek Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts.

3. *Dialogue of the Clergy*

In the manuscript *Khud. 117*, the Prayer “*O God, sitting on the Cherubim and Glorified by the Seraphim...*” and the rubric и поставитѣ сѣѡа дари кланѣаса нѡсно и ошоуѡ are followed by the dialogue between the priest and the deacon, which usually finishes the ordinance of the Great Entrance at the Liturgy of John Chrysostom and the Liturgy of Basil the Great. The existence of this dialogue in the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy is the unique feature of the manuscript *Khud. 117*. We do not know about other Slavonic and Greek manuscripts or printed editions that contain the dialogue between the priest and the deacon in the text of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts after the transferring of the Holy Gifts to the Holy Table.

This is the text of the dialogue, along with the dialogue from the Liturgy of Basil the Great from the same manuscript *Khud. 117*:¹¹⁹

(117) ΜΟΡΑΙΠΗΣ, *Η λειτουργία...*, 61, 62.

(118) See: MERCIER, *La Liturgie de S. Jaques...*, 190, 192.

(119) There are substantial differences between the dialogues from the Liturgy of Basil the Great and the Presanctified Liturgy in the *Khud. 117*, however, this is the usual case in the early manuscript tradition. The presence of different forms of dialogue in the formulas of the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great in the same Codex is known both from the Greek (см. R. ТАFT, *The Great Entrance* (Rome, 1975) (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 200) 299) and Slavonic sources (see: А. С. СЛУЦКИЙ, *Диалог священнослужите-*

	Liturgy of Basil the Great (fol. 27r)	Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts (fol. 49r)
	пѡпѣ • глѣ бл҃головитѣ свѣщеннѣ •	гл҃а снѣ • бл҃головитѣ ст҃ии •
3	д҃и҃га • д҃хъ ст҃ѣи наидетъ на тѣ • и сила вишьнаго	д҃и҃га • д҃хъ ст҃ѣи наидѣ на тѣ
6	осѣнитъ тѣ бл҃го • д҃и҃ • помѡни мѡ бл҃го •	
9	пѡпѣ • помѡнетъ на бѣ въ цр҃квѣ ст҃ви си	пѡпѣ • вжди мѡнѣ по гл҃оу тѣбѣмоу с мѡромѣ

In the written sources of the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, the dialogue appears initially in very brief form starting in the tenth century. In more complete form, similar to the dialogue from the *Khud. 117*, it can be found in the *Euchologia*, starting from the twelfth century.¹²⁰ Since the service book *Khud. 117* is dated to the last quarter of the thirteenth century,¹²¹ that is, to the time close to the emergence of the developed forms of the dialogue in the Byzantine sources, the phenomenon of the emergence of the dialogue in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts requires special consideration, since it may be important for the study of the origin of the dialogue as a part of the Liturgy.

The form of the dialogues in the *Khud. 117* substantially differs from the version, contained in the printed sources until recently. In contrast to the dialogues from the *Khud. 117*, the key phrase from the dialogue in the Liturgy of John Chrysostom, contained in the printed service book, “*The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you*” (Lk. 1, 35) is pronounced by the deacon and is addressed to the priest.¹²² However, in the manuscript sources of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries, both variants of the distribution of roles in the dialogue can be found. In order to clarify the specific

лей после Великого Входа в славянских служебниках XIII–XIV веков, *XV 2* (VIII) (2000) 245, 250, 251, manuscript O.p. I.5).

(120) See: СЛУЦКИЙ, Диалог священнослужителей..., 243.

(121) See, note 43.

(122) See: СЛУЦКИЙ, Диалог священнослужителей..., 253.

features of the dialogues in *Khlud. 117* in comparison to the manuscripts that belong to the same period, it is necessary to explore the dialogue from the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great in the Slavonic manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Comparison of the *Khlud. 117* with the manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries shows that the distribution of roles in the dialogue which is recorded in the *Khlud. 117*, coincides with the distribution of roles recorded in most of these sources. However, the dialogues in *Khlud. 117* have some specific features which do not correspond to the text of the dialogue in other manuscripts. First of all, the dialogue in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts from the *Khlud. 117*, lacks the deacon's petition that follows Lk.1, 35 and is contained in all other sources of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (lines 7, 8 of the dialogue from the Liturgy of Basil the Great). Second, in both other dialogues from the manuscript *Khlud. 117*, the traditional response of the priest to this petition from the service books of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, "*Let the Lord remember you...*," is absent.¹²³ Instead, the phrase is cited in the dialogue from the Liturgy of Basil the Great, which does not occur in other service books (lines 10, 11). Thirdly, the phrase, "*May it be to me as you have said...*" (Lk. 1, 38) from the dialogue in the Presanctified Liturgy (lines 10, 11) completes the dialogue in other service books of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and belongs not to the priest, but to the deacon. The only exception is the dialogue in the Liturgy of Basil the Great from the manuscript *O.p. I.5*, where the phrase "*May it be to me as you have said...*" occupies the same place as in the *Khlud. 117*.¹²⁴

Thus, the text of the dialogue from the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts that is contained in the manuscript *Khlud. 117*, is generally consistent with the text of the dialogue from the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great in the Slavonic manuscript tradition of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries. The differences from the most common forms of dialogue in these sources usually also occur in other manuscripts. The most significant feature of the dialogue from the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, as compared to other versions of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, is its more concise form. The abbreviated record of the dialogue in the Presanctified Liturgy can indicate that the dialogue in its oral form was originally present in this

(123) See: Службный, Диалог священнослужителей..., 245.

(124) See *Ibid.*, 251.

Liturgy. Thus, the presence of the dialogue in the *Khlud*. 117 may be a trace of an ancient tradition, but the absence of other evidence relating to the dialogue in the Presanctified Liturgy makes it more plausible that the addition of dialogue to the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts in the *Khlud*. 117 represents a local tradition that did not enjoy widespread occurrence.

III. COMMUNION

1. Preparation for Communion

After the Great Entrance and placing the Gifts on the Holy Table, the preparation for Communion begins. The deacon pronounces the Litany of Supplication, “*Help us, save us, have mercy upon us and keep us, O God...*,” followed by the general Prayer “*Our Father...*,” two silent Prayers of the priest, “*O God, alone good and compassionate...*,” and “*Give heed, Lord Jesus Christ our God...*,” and the exclamation, “*The presanctified Holy Gifts for the holy people of God.*” The presentation of this part of the ordinance in the earliest Slavonic manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy generally coincides with the modern ordinance. As a particular feature of this part of the service in the Old Russian recension, we should note the text which is contained in the service books *Sof*. 521, *Syn*. 892 and *O.p.* I.4. This text describes the exclamation of verse 17 of Psalm 50 before the prayer, “*Give heed, Lord Jesus Christ our God...*”:

Sof. 521 (fol. 44r)

ВЪЗДВИГЪ
 РЪЦИ ГЛѢТЬ ТАИ
 ГИ ОУСТНѢ МОИ
 ѠВЕРЖЕШИ
 ОУСТА МОЯ ВЪЗВ

Syn. 892 (fol. 52r)

ГИ ОУСТНѢ МОИ
 ѠВЕРЖЕШИ ∴

O.p. I.4 (fol. 28v)

И ВЪЗДѢВЪ • ПѠ •
 ГОРѢ РЪЦѢ • РЕЧЕ •
 ГИ ОУСТНѢ МОИ
 ѠВЪ ∴

In modern liturgical practice, Psalm 50, 17 (“*Lord, open my lips, and my mouth shall declare your praise...*”) is pronounced by the priest before the beginning of the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great,¹²⁵ and by the reader in the beginning of the Matins, before reading the Six Psalms.¹²⁶ The instruction of the service books *O.p.* I.4 and *Sof*. 521 on pronouncing this verse: “*ВЪЗДѢВЪ ГОРѢ РЪЦѢ*” corresponds

(125) *Служебник*, ч. 1 (Москва, 1991) 94.

(126) *Часослов* (Москва, 1980) 43.

to the way the modern priests do it before the Liturgy of John Chrysostom or Basil the Great.¹²⁷

In the manuscripts of the Studite tradition that do not belong to the Old Russian recension, Psalm 50, 17 in this place of the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy is also mentioned in the manuscript *Khlud*. 117 (fol. 51v): *Г҃И ЧС҃ТЪН҃КѢ МОИ ѠВЕРЬЗЕШИ Ч҃СТА МОѢ ВЪЗВѢСТАТЬ ХВАЛУ ТВѢА ∷ .* The evidence of the service book *Khlud*. 117 is important, because it shows how widespread the reciting of Psalm 50, 17 before the Prayer “Give heed, Lord Jesus Christ our God...,” was in the Slavonic Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts: Psalm 50, 17 occurs not only in Russian manuscripts of the fourteenth century, but also in a manuscript of the late thirteenth century from Western Bulgaria (see note 29).

The Greek *Euchologia* that were used for the critical edition of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, do not mention Psalm 50, 17 in this place of the ordinance.¹²⁸ However, the Prayer “Give heed, Lord Jesus Christ our God...,” occurs in the Liturgy of Basil the Great, of John Chrysostom, and of the Presanctified Gifts. Moreover, in all Liturgies it is located in the same place of the ordinance, before the exclamation “The holy Gifts for the holy people of God” (“The presanctified Holy Gifts for the holy people of God” in the case of the Presanctified Liturgy). Verse 17 of Psalm 50 is mentioned in some early Slavonic manuscripts of the full Liturgy, for example, in the ordinance of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom from the service book *Sof*. 518.¹²⁹ Therefore, the most likely source of Psalm 50, 17 in the Slavonic Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts were the Slavonic Liturgies of Basil the Great and John Chrysostom. The widespread usage of the custom to pronounce Psalm 50, 17 before the Prayer “Give heed, Lord Jesus Christ our God...,” points to the early appearance of this rite in the Slavonic Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts.

The Prayer “Give heed, Lord Jesus Christ our God...” is called the Prayer of the Anaphora, because in the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, this prayer is pronounced before the priest lifts up the Holy Bread above the paten with the exclamation “The holy Gifts for the holy people of God.” In the earliest *Euchologia*, the Prayer “Give

(127) А. И. ГЕОРГИЕВСКИЙ, *Чинопоследование Божественной Литургии* (Киев, 2000) 88, 89.

(128) ΜΟΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η λειτουργία...*, 62, 76.

(129) See fol. 35r: *Г҃И ЧС҃ТЪН҃КѢ МОИ ѠВЕРЬЗЕШИ Ч҃СТА МОЈА ВЪЗВЕСТАТЬ ХВАЛУ ТВОЮ.*

heed, Lord Jesus Christ our God..." is absent from the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. It appears the first time in the Greek manuscripts of the eleventh century.¹³⁰ The Prayer "*Give heed, Lord Jesus Christ our God...*" is also absent in one of the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension — the service book *Syn.* 598. All manuscripts contain the exclamation "*The presanctified Holy Gifts for the holy people of God*" ("*The holy Gifts for the holy people of God*" in the *Syn.* 604).

2. Communion of the Clergy

The Communion of the clergy starts after the exclamation, "*The presanctified Holy Gifts for the holy people of God.*" The Communion is preceded by one of the most important liturgical rites of the Presanctified Liturgy: the blessing of the chalice by immersing the Sacred Host into it.

The modern practice of placing the Holy Body into the chalice, and pouring warm water in silence ("*ничтоже глагола*"¹³¹), as well as prohibiting the clergy from drinking from the holy chalice immediately after partaking of the Body of Christ, and the prohibition of Communion for infants in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts,¹³² is based on the notion that at the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, the chalice contains wine that was not transformed into the Blood of Christ: "*Ибо аще и священно есть вложеніем частицы вино, но не пресъщественно въ кровь бжеественную, понеже над нимъ словеса священіа не чтошася здѣ, такъ вывѣстъ въ литургахъ васіліа великаго и іоанна золотоустаго.*"¹³³ This view is articulated in the service book, in the chapter, "*Statement on certain corrections in the service of the Presanctified Liturgy,*" first introduced into the service books at the time of Patriarch Ioakim, in 1676, by Euthymius, the corrector from the Chudov Monastery, on the basis of an article of the *Trebnik* (Kiev, 1646) of Peter (Mogila), the Metropolitan

(130) In the edition of ΜΩΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η λειτουργία...*, 62, the Euchologion Paris. gr. 391 of the 11th century, that was mentioned above several times, and manuscripts from the National Library of Athens № 713, the Byzantine Museum of Athens № 5, and *Sinai* 973 of the twelfth century were mentioned as the earliest containing the prayer, "*Give heed, Lord Jesus Christ our God...*"

(131) Изъявление о неких исправлениях в служении Преждеосвященныхъ литургии, in: *Служебник...*, ч. 2, 428.

(132) С. В. Булгаков, *Настольная книга священно-церковнослужителя* (Москва, 1993) Т. 2, 289.

(133) Изъявление о неких исправлениях в служении Преждеосвященныхъ литургии..., 430.

of Kiev.¹³⁴ An equivalent of this article neither exists in the Greek *Hieratikon* nor in the service books published prior to 1676.¹³⁵ In the old-printed liturgical books (the service books of 1623 and 1646, and the *Typikon* of 1641), in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, it is required to immerse the Holy Body into the chalice (the rite of the Commixture) and to add warm water into the chalice (the rite of Zeon) according to the Liturgy of John Chrysostom.¹³⁶ Handwritten service books also indicate the correspondence of the rites of preparing the Holy Gifts for Communion at the Presanctified Liturgy and the practices used at the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great.

The earliest Slavonic manuscripts of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts often do not describe how the clergy prepares for Communion, and as a rule, the manuscripts contain a brief instruction on Communion “according to the custom.” This statement is contained in the service books of the Old Russian recension *Syn.* 604, *Sof.* 518, *Sof.* 519, *YaMZ* 15472, *Syn.* 598, *Syn. typ.* 40, and *Rum.* 398. Other manuscripts of the Old Russian recension, *Sol.* 1016/1125, *O.p.* I.4, *O.p.* I.5, and *Syn. typ.* 43 (as well as the service book *Khlud.* 117) indicate that the priest should pronounce the liturgical formula “The fullness of the Holy Spirit” at the immersion of the Holy Body into the chalice — the words that the priest says when he puts the Holy Body into the chalice according to the modern ordinance of the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great.¹³⁷ In this form, the rite of the Commixture is recorded in most of the Slavonic manuscripts of the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great from the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries.

Two service books of the Old Russian recension, *Sof.* 526 and *Rogozh. kladb.* 566, provide a different liturgical formula for the rite of the Commixture at the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, “Mixing the Holy Body and Blood...,” that goes back to the Liturgy of Apostle James.¹³⁸ The *Sof.* 526 (fol. 63v) provides the instruction: ...пѡ. ѿ стѣго члѣкѡ влѡганѣ

(134) ВАНЮКОВ, Чин Литургии Преждеосвященных Даров..., 273. All discussion of the Chalice in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts follows the article of Karabinov, see note 20.

(135) ВАНЮКОВ, Чин Литургии Преждеосвященных Даров..., 272.

(136) *Ibid.*, 276, 277.

(137) *Служебник*, ч. 1 (Москва, 1991) 159.

(138) F. E. BRIGHTMAN, *Liturgies Eastern and Western. I: Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford, 1896) 62; MERCIER, *La Liturgie de S. Jaques...*, 228.

в потырь глѣдъ ∷ сѣмѣшеніе стѣго тѣла и крове хѣ ба... and the *Rogozh. kladb.* 566 (fol. 31r) provides the instruction: ...взѣмъ поупъ дастъ стѣа хлѣба. | влаганѣ в потѣи глѣдъ сѣмѣшеніе стѣго тѣк ...

The manuscript of the Old Russian recension *Slav. 1*, as well as the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts from the service book *Q.p. I.67* (fol. 75v) contain both formulas, the “*Mixing the Holy Body and Blood...*,” and “*The fullness of the Holy Spirit*” ...и влаганѣтъ тѣло в чашю глѣдъ ∷ сѣмѣшеніе стѣго тѣла и чѣтѣныа крове гѣ нашего іса хѣ ∷ всегда и ны прѣ ∷ исполненіе стѣа дѣа аминѣ ∷ ...; the *Slav. 1* (fol. 83r – fol. 83v) contains the phrase: ...и вземъ часть ѿ стѣго тѣла ∷ прекрѣцаа чѣ ∷ глѣтъ ∷ сѣмѣшеніе чѣтѣаго тѣла и крове гѣ нашего ісх ∷ дѣа ∷ исполни очѣ чашю сию ∷ по ∷ исполненіе стѣго дѣа ∷ ам ∷ ... The phrase “*Mixing the Holy Body and Blood...*” is also present in the ordinance of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom in the manuscripts *Slav. 1*, *Q.p. I.67*, and in some other service books of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries.¹³⁹

The service book *Rogozh. kladb.* 566 is the only one from the manuscripts, belonging to the Old Russian recension, that mentions the rite of Zeon along with the rite of Commixture (fol. 31r): ...дѣаѣ. вливаѣ оукрѣо. рѣ исполни ѿчѣ чѣ...¹⁴⁰ In the manuscripts belonging to the Studite tradition, the rite of Zeon is mentioned in the manuscript *HAZU III a 32* and *Uvar. 574*. After the exclamation, “*The presanctified Holy Gifts for the holy people of God*” and the instruction on singing “*One is Holy...*,” these manuscripts contain the following text:

(139) The study of the rite of Commixture in the Slavonic manuscripts of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries can be found in: А. С. СЛУЦКИЙ, Византийские литургические чины «Соединения Даров» и «Теплоты». Ранние славянские версии, *ВВ* 65 (90) (2006) 126–145. A special attention in this article is paid to the Syro-Palestine formula, “*Mixing the Holy Body and Blood...*,” that can be found, in addition to the Slavonic manuscripts of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom, in those Greek manuscripts of this Liturgy, that originated in Southern Italy. Various forms of the rite of Commixture in the earliest Slavonic manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries, correspond to the forms of the rite of Commixture in the contemporaneous Slavonic manuscripts of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom (it is directly stated in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts from the service book *Uvar.46* (fol. 86r): ... тѣа ∷ лони хлѣвъ ∷ съ указаниемъ ∷ тако же ѣ въ ѿнове слоужбѣ...).

(140) The rites of Commixture and of Zeon in the manuscript *Rogozh. kladb.* 566 are discussed in the article of СЛУЦКИЙ, Византийские литургические чины «Соединения Даров»..., mentioned above.

Uvar. 574 (fol. 160r–fol. 160v)

ДѢЛА. ГЛѢТЬ. ПОПОУ. ИСПЛНИ ВЛКО.
 ПОПЬ. ВЪЗЪМЬ ІДИНОУ ЧЕСТЬ. ѠТЬ
 СТЪИХЪ ДАРОВЪ.
 ВЪЛАГАЕ ВЪ ЧАШОУ ГЛѢ.
 ОСПЛНЕНІЕ СТГО ДХА АМИНЬ.
 ДИПКО. ВЪЛКВАНЕ ОУКРОПЬ. БЛВИ
 ВЛКО ОУКРОПЬ.
 ППЬ. ТОПЛОТА СТА ДХА АМИНЬ:

HAZU III a 32 (fol. 59v)

И ВЪЗЪМЬ. ППЬ. Ѡ СТГО ХЛКВА
 ІДИНОУ ЧЕСТЬ.
 ВЪЛАГАЕТЬ ВЪ ЧАШОУ ГЛѢ.
 ИСПЛНЕНІЕ СТГО ДХА ∴ ДѢЛА. АМИНЬ
 ДѢЛА. ВЛКВИ ВЛКО ОУКРОПЬ ∴
 ППЬ ГЛѢ. ТОПЛОТА СТГО ДХА ∴ ДѢЛА.
 АМИНЬ ∴

The phrase “*The warmth of the Holy Spirit*” does not correspond to the modern custom of adding warm water to the chalice “*in silence*,” while serving the Presanctified Liturgy. However, this phrase also differs from the modern liturgical formula *теплота въкры исполнь дха стго*.¹⁴¹ The study of Slutsky,¹⁴² along with the results of the examination of the rite of Commixture, also contains the description of the rite of Zeon in the earliest Slavonic manuscripts, containing the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great. According to the manuscript tradition, the phrase, “*The warmth of the Holy Spirit*,” in the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries is the usual formula for the blessing of Warm Water in the Slavonic Liturgy. Thus, as opposed to the modern tradition, the manuscripts of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries that contain the earliest Slavonic versions of the Presanctified Liturgy, use formulas from the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great not only for the rite of Commixture, but also for the rite of Zeon.

3. *The Ending of the Service*

The most detailed description of the ending of the Communion in all manuscripts of the Old Russian recension, is contained in the *O.p.* I.4 on fol. 29v:

...ПѢВЦИ • КИ • ПОЮТЬ ВЪКУСИТЕ И ВИДИТЕ ТА • ПОКАДИ • СТЫНА ДАРЫ ∴
 ГЛА СИЦЕ Ѡ ТАИ • ВЪЗНЕСИСА НА НБСА БѢ • ПО • ВЪЗГЛА • ВСЪГЛА И НЫНѢ • И
 ПРИСН ∴ ПѢВЦИ • ХВАЛИИ ТЯ ХѢ БѢ НАШЪ ГЛКО СПОДОБИИ НЫ ЕСИ • ПРИЧАСТИТИСЯ
 СТЛЬ ТѢЛѢ ТВОЕМЪ • И ЧЪРЪНИ КРЪВИ ТВОЕИ • ИЗЛІГАНЪ ЗА ВСЪ МИРЪ • ВЪ
 ѠСТАВЛ.¹⁴³

(141) *Служебник*, ч. 1, 160.

(142) Note 139.

(143) Further in the *O.p.* I.4 the pages are missing.

The indication of the “Koinonikon” or Communion verse, “*Taste and see...*,”¹⁴⁴ included in the current service, is a trace of the ancient tradition of singing Psalm 33 during Communion.¹⁴⁵ The verse, “*Taste and see...*” is also mentioned in other manuscripts of the Old Russian recension: *Sol.* 1016/1125, *Syn.* 598, *Syn.* 892, *Rum.* 398, and *Slav.* 1.

The exclamation “*Be exalted, God, above the heavens...*,” now is made by the priest, when he transfers the Gifts from the Holy Table to the Prothesis. It is contained in five service books of the Old Russian recension, *Rogozh. kladb.* 566, *Syn.* 604, *O.p.* I.4, *Slav.* 1 and *Sof.* 526. The *Syn.* 604 states that the words “*Be exalted, God, above the heavens...*,” are pronounced by the deacon, and the priest responds with the words, “*Always, now and ever...*” The service books *O.p.* I.4 and *Rogozh. kladb.* 566 do not directly state which of the clergy exclaims “*Be exalted, God, above the heavens...*” However, since after this there follows a special instruction for the priest to pronounce the subsequent phrase, “*Always, now and ever...*,” it is likely that the deacon’s exclamation, “*Be exalted, God, above the heavens...*” is meant here as well. The subsequent transfer of the deacon’s words to the priest is another manifestation of the trend of reducing the role of the deacon in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts (cf. note 106).

Codex HAZU III a 32 (fol. 59v – fol. 60v) contains the following prayer, read immediately before the Communion of the clergy: “...бѣ слави встави и прсти мѣ грѣшнаго • съдѣ||ганиа ми вольна же и неволнаа или словомъ или дѣломъ или помышлениемъ створихъ всѣхъ мѣ прсти тако бѣгын члвколюбъцъ • дълготрпѣливѣ и многомѣлостивѣ мѣтвлами прѣнепорочныѣ ти мѣтере нешсудженно слѣви мѣ приети прѣчтѣое и несквернѣое причестие • въ вставлениѣ грѣховѣъ и въ жизнь вѣчноую въ вчищениѣ злыхъ мыслии • въ просвѣщениѣ заповѣдени тако ты и еси сѣтинна наша хѣ бѣ нашъ и текѣ славѣ || всилаемъ ѿцѣу и сѣноу • сѣтноу дхѣу...” Other manuscripts of the Studite tradition do not have this prayer in the text of the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy.

In all manuscripts of the Old Russian recension that preserved the end of the Presanctified Liturgy, it ends with the prayer of Thanksgiving for Holy Communion, “*We thank you, God the Savior of all things...*” and the prayer behind the ambo, “*Master almighty, who fashioned creation with wisdom...*” The service books *Sol.* 1016/1125 and *Syn. typ.* 43, unlike all the other manuscripts of the first recension, provide an in-

(144) Ps 33, 9.

(145) Успенский, *Литургия Преждеосвященных Даров...*, 181.

dication of singing “*Blessed be the name of the Lord...*” (Ps 112, 2). At the present time, “*Blessed be the name of the Lord...*” is both a part of the Presanctified Liturgy and the Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great.

At the end of the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy, all service books of the Old Russian recension have a short (consisting of one sentence) Prayer at the consumption of the Gifts. This Prayer, “*Having finished the Divine...*” has insignificant differences in all the manuscripts of the first recension, except the manuscript *Rogozh. kladb.* 566 that contains a different text (see Appendix, pp. 70). We should note that in the modern service book, another prayer for the consumption of the Gifts is provided: “*O Lord our God, who led us into these most holy days...*” Although this prayer is not found in the manuscripts of the Old Russian recension, it appears in some Slavonic service books of the fourteenth century, including the manuscript of the Studite recension, the service book *HAZU III a 32* (fol. 62r) from the first half of the fourteenth century.¹⁴⁶

For the Prayer behind the ambo, that precedes the Prayer for the consumption of the Gifts and is read by the priest before the end of the Liturgy, all the service books of the thirteenth–fourteenth century contain the Prayer “*Master almighty, who fashioned creation with wisdom...*” which is also the Prayer behind the ambo in the modern ordinance both of the Slavonic and Greek Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts.¹⁴⁷ However, some Greek *Euchologia*, along with the usual prayer behind the ambo that finishes the ordinance of the Liturgy, contain additional prayers behind the ambo with different content depending on the feast or day.¹⁴⁸

(146) In the Greek *Euchologia*, this prayer appears already starting in the tenth–eleventh centuries. See: ΜΩΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η λειτουργία...*, 63.

(147) The critical edition of the Greek manuscripts of the Presanctified Liturgy also provides only this prayer (see: ΜΩΡΑΙΤΗΣ, *Η λειτουργία...*, 58–59, 63, 77.)

(148) On the prayers behind the ambo in the Greek *Euchologia*, see: T. MINISCI, *Le preghiere dei codici criptensi*, *BBGG* 2 (1948) 65–75, 117–126; 3 (1949) 3–10, 61–66, 121–132; 4 (1950) 3–14; A. JACOB, *Les prieres de l’ambon du Barber. gr. 336 et du Vat. gr. 1833*, *Bulletin de l’Institut historique Belge de Roma* 37 (1966) 17–51; *IDEM*, *Les prieres del’ambon du Lening. gr. 226*, *ibid.* 42 (1972) 109–139; *IDEM*, *Nouveaux documents italo-grecs pour servir a l’histoire du texte des prieres de l’ambon*, *ibid.* 42 (1972) 109–144; R. TAFT, *Toward the Origins of the Opisthambonos Prayer of the Byzantine Eucharistic Liturgies*, *OCP* 72 (2006) 5–39, 305–331.

These prayers are present in the earliest *Euchologia*; moreover, the earliest of them, the *Barberini* 336, contains a number of prayers behind the ambo for the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts (those prayers bear a title “Εὐχή ἐπιστὰμβωνος εἰς τὰ προηγιασμένα” in the manuscript¹⁴⁹). Special festal prayers behind the ambo can be found in the Slavonic prayer books.¹⁵⁰ The prayers with a title that mentions the Presanctified Liturgy, are not found among them, but three manuscripts, *Rum.* 398, *Syn.* 598, and *Arch.* D9 from the Library of the Academy of Sciences, contain a prayer with a beginning that coincides with one of the five prayers from the *Barberini* 336, which are named in this manuscript “the prayers behind the ambo of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts.”¹⁵¹ In the Slavonic service books, this prayer is entitled the “weekly prayer behind the ambo” (*Rum.* 398) and the “prayer behind the ambo for all festal days” (*Arch.* D9). (In the manuscript of *Syn.* 598, the prayer does not have a title). Thus, although the earliest Byzantine prayers behind the ambo of the Presanctified Liturgy have entered the Slavonic Liturgy, we do not have evidence of their impact on the direct service of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts.

(149) PARENTI, VELKOVSKA, *L'eucologio Barberini...*, 305–309.

(150) On the prayers behind the ambo, contained in the Slavonic service books, see: А. С. СЛУЦКИЙ, Заамвонные молитвы в рукописных славянских служебниках, *Византиновоссика* 3 (2005) 184–211; R. TAFT, Proper Slavonic Opisthambonos Prayers, *Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano* 10 (2006) 133–166.

(151) СЛУЦКИЙ, Заамвонные молитвы..., 199–201.

APPENDIX

CRITICAL EDITION OF THE LITURGY OF THE PRESANCTIFIED GIFTS IN THE OLD RUSSIAN RECENSION

Because of the special significance of the Old Russian recension for the historical and liturgical research of the Slavonic Liturgy, the critical edition of the text of this recension has been made. The Old Russian recension is identified, primarily, by the specific description of the initial part of the ordinance of the Presanctified Liturgy. The Liturgy is entitled, "The service of Holy Lent"; the text usually begins with instructions for serving the Presanctified Liturgy on Wednesday of Cheese-fare Week; the initial exclamation and text of the prayers for the Lighting of the Lamps are not provided, and the description of Vespers begins with the Entrance with the censer.

At the same time, as the textological analysis of the linguistic material of the prayers from the Liturgy shows, the texts of the Old Russian recension of the twelfth–fourteenth centuries were not subjected to editing and collating with the Greek original, and a large number of variant readings is associated with amendments and conjectures.¹⁵² Such a long existence of the text in a controlled textological tradition leads to the fundamental impossibility of providing a genealogical description of the whole complex of manuscripts.

The text of the Old Russian recension is presented as a critical edition (*editio cum notis variorum*). As the main text, the ordinance the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts from the manuscript *Sol.* 1016/1125, is selected. The absence of part of the text (the prayer behind the ambo) is supplemented with the service book *Sof.* 518. In the interlinear notes, variant readings between the main text and the other fifteen manuscripts of the Old Russian recension, are provided.

The text is reproduced letter-by-letter with divisions into words; the superscript letters are inserted into the main line, all the superscript characters are not reproduced, line characters (full stop and a sign at the end of the paragraph) are rendered in accordance with their location in the manuscript; initials and lowercase letters are rendered as uppercase characters.

(152) АФАНАСЬЕВА, *Литургия Преждеосвященных Даров в славянской рукописной традиции...*, 14.

Table 7.

Manuscripts of the Old Russian Recension				
No.	Location	Call no.	Date (Century)	Designation
1	State Museum of History	<i>Syn.</i> 604	13	α
2	National Library of Russia	<i>Sol.</i> 1016/1125	14–15	β
3	National Library of Russia	<i>Sof.</i> 518	13–14	γ
4	National Library of Russia	<i>Sof.</i> 519	13	δ
5	National Library of Russia	<i>Sof.</i> 525	14–15	ε
6	Yaroslavl Reserve-Museum	15472	14	ζ
7	State Museum of History	<i>Syn.</i> 598	14	η
8	State Museum of History	<i>Syn.</i> 892	14	θ
9	National Library of Russia	<i>Sof.</i> 521	14	ι
10	National Library of Russia	<i>Sof.</i> 526	14	κ
11	National Library of Russia	<i>O.p.</i> I.4	14	λ
12	National Library of Russia	<i>O.p.</i> I.5	14	μ
13	Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts	<i>Syn. typ.</i> 40	14–15	ν
14	Russian State Library	<i>Rogozh. kladb.</i> 568	14	ξ
15	Russian State Library	<i>Rum.</i> 398	14	ο

16	Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts	<i>Syn. typ.</i> 43	15	π
17	New York	<i>Slav.</i> 1	14	ρ

The text has two levels of interlinear comments. The first level contains variant readings of the text; the second level contains the lacunas in the manuscripts and identifies the parts of the text, which are located on the margins of the manuscript. If part of the main text, which has a variant reading, is located on a single page, the *lemma* indicates the number of the line (or lines) that contains this part of the main text. Otherwise, the *lemma*, in addition to line numbers, also provides page numbers. Further, the *lemma* provides the commented part of the main text; after the *lemma*, variant readings are listed, separated from the main text with the sign “[.]” When the variant reading applies to the entire line, the main text is not repeated, but only the line number is indicated.

In the text of the edition, the manuscripts are designated with letters of the Greek alphabet (see Table 7). In the listing of variant readings, the manuscripts that do not have this part of the text are indicated first, then the variant readings according to other manuscripts are listed. In the case, when the same reading occurs in several manuscripts, it is provided according to the service book listed first among the manuscripts with such a reading. Phonetic and graphic differences, as well as readings that do not change the grammatical form of the word, are usually not taken into consideration. Variant readings related to scribal errors are not shown.

Editorial additions are provided in brackets ⟨⟩. The names of the main liturgical parts of the text are shown inside braces; Slavonic characters that do not belong to the manuscript but restore the reading to normalize the spelling are shown inside brackets; and italics designate comments on the text. The following abbreviations are used: *om.* — omittit/omittunt — omission of the text, *add.* — addit/addunt — addition to the text. The text of the initial part of the service with most variant readings (the Vespers and the Communion) is provided according to all seventeen manuscripts in full, not in the interlinear comments, but at the end of the main text. Breakdown into paragraphs, as a rule, does not correspond to the manuscript.

СЛОУЖ(БА) • ЄТ(А)ГО ПОСТА •

- въ сред(Ѹ) • сыропѸс(т)ныма нед(ѣ)лі • веч(ерѣ) • на
 3 ант(Ѹ)ргни • по стих(и)рахъ •
 вындѣт поп и дьяк(о)нъ • съ кадилницею •
 и творит • мол(итвѸ) • вых(о)днѸю • веч(е)рѣ и заѸт(ра) и пол(Ѹ-
 6 дне) •
 и р(е)чет • дьяк(о)н • премоудрос(тъ) пр(о)с(ти) • люд(и) •
 свѣт тихъ стѸа •
 9 и посем прок(именъ) • веч(е)рнии по обычаю • таж(е) паремиа •
 таж(е) пѣньк с(не) • да оуповактъ из(ран)ль на г(о)с(под)а •
 конец до вѣк(а) • люд(и) тож(е) пѣнник •
 12 и посем да сѧ исправитъ м(о)л(и)тва моѧ стих г(о)с(под)и во-
 звахъ к тобѣ •
 сице ж(е) пѣти до великог(о) патка
 15 и посемъ • рцѣмъ вси :-
 отъ всеѧ д(о)ша Ѡ всего по(мышлениѧ) :-
 г(о)с(под)и вседержителю в(ож)е о(т)ець :-
 18 б(о)г(а)тын м(и)л(о)стнию бл(а)гы ц(е)дротами :-
 не хотѧ см(е)рти грѣшни(кѸ) • :-
 о предѣстоѧщихъ лю(дѣ)хъ :-
 21 помилоуи насъ в(ож)е по в(елицѣи) :-

1 слоуж(ба) | чин • і служба е; 2 | om. и; въ понедѣльникъ) • Ѡ недѣли) •
 пос(та) по стих(и)р(ахъ) Ѹ; ante въ add. мол(итва) • вѣхъдьяна • :- вечерѣ и
 заѸтра полоудне • хвалимъ тѧ • бл(а)годаримъ • и молимътисѧ • бл(а)д(ы)ко
 всѣхъ • исправи • м(о)л(и)твы наша • акы кадилъ прѣдъ тобою • и не оукло-
 ни с(е)рдце нашихъ • въ слова лоукавьяна • нѣ избеви ны Ѡ всѣхъ сѣтти
 ловащинухъ д(о)ушь нашихъ • яко къ тебе г(оспод)и г(оспод)и ичи наши на
 тѧ оупѣвахомъ не посрами насъ в(ож)е наш :- безъ еоу(ан)г(е)лия • а коли
 тръзвонъ • съ канг(е)лыкьмъ δ; 2 въ ... недѣли) | om. е, на ξ; 2 сред(Ѹ)] om.
 v; 2 сыропѸс(т)ныма] om. x, v, сыропѸс(т)ноѸю δ, ζ; 2 недѣли) | om. δ, ζ, η, x, λ;
 2 веч(ерѣ) | om. ζ, θ, μ; 2-3 на ант(Ѹ)ргни] om. ξ; 3 ante по стих(и)рахъ] add.
 на г(о)с(под)и възвахъ o; 4-14] descriptions of vespers in the other manuscripts
 are at the end of the text on pages 71 – 75 15 и посемъ] om. η, таж(е) дья(конъ)
 α, γ, x, i, λ, o, таж(е) ζ, v, октенью θ, посемъ • дьяконъ ε, ξ, ρ, дьяк(о)нъ октен(ью) μ,
 дьяконѸ и дьяк(о)нъ π; 15 вси] вси г(оспод)и оуслы(ши) α, вси къ г(о)с(под)Ѹ
 i, x, ζ, вси г(оспод)Ѹ λ, вси г(оспод)и стѸи(и) π; 16 отъ] om. γ, ρ, и Ѡ θ, i, π; 16 Ѡ]
 om. ε, o и Ѡ α, δ, x, λ, μ, v, ζ, и θ; 16 всего] om. γ, δ, ε, θ, μ, o, ρ; 16 по(мышлениѧ)] om.
 α, γ, δ, ε, θ, μ, o, ρ; 17 в(ож)е] om. γ, ε, η, μ, ρ; 17 о(т)ець] om. γ, ε, η, i, μ, o, ξ, ρ, о(т)ець
 наш x, π; 18 бл(а)гы] om. γ, ε, ρ; 18 ц(е)дротами] om. α, γ, ε, η, θ, i, ζ, μ, o, ξ, ρ; 19 грѣ-
 шни(кѸ)] om. γ, ε, η, ρ; 20 о] и o α, γ, δ, ε, θ, λ, μ, o, π; 20 лю(дѣ)хъ] om. γ, ε, o, ρ,
 люд(ѣ)хъ и чающѸ δ люд(ѣ)хъ чаю(щинухъ) v; 21 по] om. α, γ, η, o, ρ; 21 в(елицѣи)]
 om. α, γ, δ, η, o, ρ;

2] безъ еоу(ан)г(е)лия • а коли тръзвонъ • съ канг(е)лыкьмъ in margin δ;
 17-19 г(о)с(под)и ... лю(дѣ)хъ] in margin δ

поп мол(итвоу) прилѣжнѹ тѡи(но) •

г(о)с(под)и б(ож)е нашъ • прилѣжнѹю сию м(о)л(н)твѹ • при-
 3 ни ми Ѡ твоихѹ рабѹ • и помилоуи ны по множествѹ м(н)л(о)сти
 твоѡа • и щедроты твоѡа низъпосли на ны • и на всѡ люд(н) твоѡа
 • чающаѡа Ѡ тебе б(ог)атыѡа м(н)л(о)сти :-

6 молимсѡ о бл(а)говѣрнѣ(мъ) :-
 молимсѡ о архикп(н)с(ко)п(ѣ) :-
 кѡцѣ молимсѡ за всю бр(а)т(н)ю) :-

9 поп в(ъ)згл(а)с • ѡако м(н)л(о)ст(н)вѹ и члѣк(олю)б(е)ц
 •

тоупростр • дѡак(онѹ) помолитесѡ оглашен(ыхѹ) :-

12 вѣрно оглашеныхѹ помо(лимъсѡ) :-

огласить ѡ словомѹ ис(тинным) :-

отъкрыкть имѹ кѹаг(гели)к :-

15 приѡдинить ѡа къ сѣтѣ(н) :-

1] om. δ; 1 поп] om. ζ, таж(е) • поп γ,ε,η,ι, сѣт(н)ѣль μ таж(е) ν; 1 прилѣжнѹ] om. γ,η,θ,ι,μ,ο,π,ρ; 1 тѡи(но)] om. γ,ε,ζ,η,ι,χ,λ,ν,ξ,π; 2 г(о)с(под)и] а тѹ(тѹ) г(о)с(под)и δ; 2 сию м(о)л(н)твѹ] om. γ,ζ,η,θ,ο,π, сию α,ρ, м(о)литвѹ си(ю) δ, сию • писана въ іѡан(новѣ) слѹж(бѣ) η пис(а)но во іѡ(а)новѣ ν; 2-5 прими ... м(н)л(о)сти] om. α,γ,δ,ζ,η,θ,ο,π,ρ; 3-5 Ѡ ... м(н)л(о)сти] om. λ; 3 твоихѹ] своихѹ ξ; 3 и] om. ι; 4 всѡ] om. ζ; 6] om. α; 6 молимсѡ] и еще молимъсѡ γ,ζ, еще молимъсѡ(а)ε,η,χ,ν,ο,π, дѡак(онѹ) молимъсѡ λ,ξ, дѡакон. еще молимъсѡ. μ, дѡак(онѹ). и еще молимсѡ ρ; 6 past] бл(а)говѣрнѣ(мъ) add. еще оуслышати г(о)с(под)ѹ в(ог)ѹ глас ε, кн(а)зѣ) θ, кн(а)зи наш(е)м ім(а)р(е)к ρ; 7] om. α; 7 молимсѡ] и еще молимъсѡ γ,ζ,ρ, еще молимъсѡ(а) ε,χ,μ,ν,ο,π; 7 архикп(н)с(ко)-п(е)] архиепископѣ нашеѡм ім(а)р(екъ) δ, еп(н)с(ко)пѣ ζ, кп(н)с(ко)пѣ наш(емъ) χ,μ,ν,π,ρ, архикп(н)с(ко)пѣ нашеѡм ім(е)мъ λ; 8] om. α,ε; 8 кѡцѣ] om. δ,θ,λ, и еще γ,ζ, (е)ще молимъсѡ о х(ри)с(т)ѣ(анскомѹ) крилѣ(ѣ) еще оуслышати г(о)с(под)ѹ в(ог)ѹ глас м(о)л(н)тв(ы) еще η, кѡцѣ молимсѡ за раба б(ож)и(а) кѡцѣ молимсѡ о х(ри)с(т)ѣ(анскомѹ) ι, (н)ще молимсѡ за рабы б(ож)ни ім(а)р(е)к • нище молимсѡ ѡаже ѡ х(ри)с(т)ѣ(анскомѹ) клир(ѣ) :-нище ν, кѡцѣ молимсѡ за раб(а) :- еще ο, и кѡцѣ молимсѡ за рабы б(ож)ни :- и кѡцѣ ρ; 8 бр(а)т(н)ю] om. δ,ξ, братѹ з(а) θ, братю и за λ,ν; 9] om. θ,ν; 9 поп] om. δ,ε,ζ,θ,λ,ν,π, сѣт(н)ѣль μ, ante поп add. и по кктеньи α; 9 в(ъ)згл(а)с] om. γ,δ,ε,θ,ι,η,χ,λ,ο,π,ρ; 9 м(н)л(о)ст(н)вѹ] бл(а)гѹ η,ν,ξ, бл(а)ги(н) π; 9 и] om. η,ν; 9 члѣк(олю)б(е)ц] om. ν; 9 past] члѣк(олю)б(е)ц add. кстѹ б(ог)ѹ и т(ебѣ) δ,ε, в(ог)ѹ и тебе слав(ѹ) η, в(ог)ѹ кси тѣб(ѣ) ζ, в(ог)ѹ тобе ι, в(ог)ѹ π; 10 past] м(н)л(о)ст(н)вѹ add. егда прилѹчнѣсѡ(а) за оуп(оки) тѹж(е) пом(олимъсѡ) еще молимсѡ въ прис(но)палатнѣм рабѣ б(ож)ни ім(а)р(е)к ѡаχ,θ,ι,π :- еще молимсѡ ѡако да г(оспод)ѹ б(о)гѹ наш :- възгл(а)с ѡако ты кси г(о)с(под)и покон ι животѹ ν; 11 тоупростр] om. all manuscripts 11 дѡак(онѹ)] om. δ,ζ,η,ε,θ,χ,λ,ν,π; 11 оглашен(ыхѹ)] ѡаглашеныхѹ ε,ν, оглашении χ,ι,λ,π,ρ; 12 вѣрно] вѣрнии ѡ α,ε,ζ,χ,λ,μ,ν,ο,π,ρ, вѣрнии γ,δ,η,ι,θ,ξ; 12 помо(лимъсѡ)] om. α,δ,ζ,θ,ο,ρ; 13 ис(тинным)] om. γ,δ,ο; 14 отъкрыкть] и ѡкрыкть ξ; 14 имѹ] om. γ, имѹ и τ; 14 кѹаг(гели)к] past кѹаг(гели)к add. пр(авды) α,χ,θ,ι,π; 15 приѡдинить] прилѣснѣ α, и приѡдинеть ζ,ξ; 15 сѣтѣ(н)] om. δ, сѣтѣ(н) и с(ѹворнѣ)и) θ, сѣтѣ(н)и) свок(н) χ,λ,ν,π;

2 г(о)с(под)и] а тѹ (тѹ) г(о)с(под)и м(о)литвѹ си(ю) in margin δ;

мол(итва) • о оглашен(ы)х • таи(наи) •

- б(ож)е б(ож)е нашъ • зижителю и сдѣтелю всачьскихъ • хотан
 3 вѣмъ сп(а)стїса • и въ разоумъ истиньныи прити • призри на
 рабы твоя оглашеныа • и избави ја ѿ ветхыа лъсти • и козни
 6 имъ д(оу)ша и телеса • и причетаа ихъ къ словесномуу твоемоу
 стадоу • на немъ же има твою наречеса :-

дыак(онъ) • сп(а)си помилуи застѣ(пи) :-

- 9 оглашени глав(ы) •
 в(ъ)зг(ла)с поп да и ти с нами славатъ пр(ѣ)ч(ъ)стно(к) •
 дыак(о)н • кликко оглашени изидѣте • оглашени изидѣте
 12 • кликко оглашени(и) изидѣте •
 да нѣкто ѿ оглашенихъ но кликко вѣрныхъ пак(ы) :-

1] сѣ(ит)ель. мол(итва). таи(но). ѿ оглашен(ы)хъ ѡ, таж(е). попъ. мол(итву) сню гл(агол)еть. таи(но). п; 1 мол(итва)] поп мол(итва) γ,δ,η,ι,ν,ο,ρ, таж(е) мол(итва) ξ; 1 о] om. γ,ε,η,θ,ι, таи(наи) ѡ ν; 1 оглашен(ы)хъ] om. γ,η,ι; 1 таи(наи)] om. γ,δ,η,κ,λ,ν,ο,ξ; 2 б(ож)е б(ож)е] г(оспод)и б(ож)е α,ε,ι,θ,λ,μ,ξ б(ож)е ν; 2 и сдѣтелю всачьскихъ] и сдѣтелю всачьскимъ α,ε,ζ,η,θ,κ,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π,ρ, сдѣтелю всачьскимъ ι, всачьскимъ δ, всачьскимъ сдѣтелю λ; 3 вѣмъ сп(а)стїса] да вси сп(а)соутса α, с(пас)ти вса δ; 3 призри] и призри ε,ι; 3 на] на ны и на х на ны г(о)с(под)и и на ξ; 4 твоя] своа δ,ε,η,π; 4 и] om. ζ,η,ι,ν,ο,ξ,π,ρ; 4 ја] ихъ ξ,π; 4 ѿ] om. π; 5 противнаго] противныхъ θ, противныа μ; 5 и] om. ε,θ,κ,ν,ο; 5 просвѣщаа ... стадоу] просвѣщамы д(оу)шею и тѣломъ • и причти ја къ избраноу стадоу α; 5 просвѣщаа] и просвѣщаа θ,ι; 6 и] om. ι,ο; 6 причетаа] съпричтаа ε, причти ι,ν,ο,ξ,π,ρ, причтаи κ, причта ζ; 6 ихъ] om. δ,μ, ја κ,ν,ο,π,ρ; 6-7 твоемоу стадоу] стаду твоему ν; 7 на] јако на η; 7 немъ] ни хъ ε; 7 има] има сѣок all manuscripts; 7 твою] om. ξ; 7 наречеса] нар(е)чено быс(тъ) ε, чтетьса η; 8] застѣпи сп(а)си помил(оу)и ζ, дыакон. застоупи сп(а)си помил(оу)и μ, дыак(онъ) застѣпи сп(а)си і помилуи ξ; 8 дыак(онъ)] om. δ,ε,θ,η, ν,π; 8 сп(а)си] и сп(а)си δ; 8 застѣ(пи)] om. γ,ε,θ,ι,κ,ρ, застѣпи с(ъ)хр(ани) λ,π, съхрани ны б(ож)е ν; 9 оглашени] ѡ гл(ашени) ν, 9 past] глав(ы) add. ваша α,ε,κ,μ,ο, ваша г(о)с(под)еви поклонит(е) ι,π, ваша г(о)спод(е)ви λ,ξ,ρ наша г(оспод)еви покл(онит)е ν; 10 в(ъ)зг(ла)с] om. α,γ,δ,ε,θ,η,ι,κ,λ,ο,ξ,π,ρ; 10 поп] om. γ,δ,ε,ζ,η,θ,λ,μ,ν,π; 10 славатъ] слават • и воспѣвають ζ,η,ο,π; 10 пр(ѣ)ч(ъ)с-тно(к)] om. α,γ,η,θ,ι,ν,ξ,π,ρ, past пр(ѣ)ч(ъ)стно(к) add. и велелѣпною има твою ѡца и с(ы)на ζ, великолѣпою им(а) λ,π; 11 дыак(о)н] om. γ,δ,η,θ,κ,λ,ν,ξ, поп. прости-ракт литонъ а дыак(онъ) ο, past дыак(о)н add. простираа литонъ α,ζ, простира-еть литона δ, простираа свиток гл(агол)т ε, простираа π; 11 изидѣте] om. θ; 11 оглашени] о гл(ашени) ν, 11-13 оглашени изидѣте ... вѣрныхъ пак(ы)] om. η; 11-61.13 оглашени изидѣте ... д(у)ш(а)мъ нашимъ и тев(ѣ) сл(аву)] om. ε; 11-60.1 изидѣте ... сню мол(итву)] om. δ; 12 кликко оглашени(и) изидѣте] om. θ,ρ; 12 изидѣте] om. α,γ; 13 да] и да 13 да ... пак(ы)] om. γ; 13 past нѣ-кто] add. же ξ; 13 но] om. ζ,θ,κ,μ; 13 кликко вѣрныхъ] om. α,ζ,θ,κ,μ,ρ; 13 пак(ы)] om. α,ζ,θ,κ,λ,μ,ξ,ρ, паки паки мир(омъ) ι,π, паки і паки ν;

таж(ε) сню мол(итвѣ) рци в(ож)е великы и хвал(ьныи) •
 престѹпа дѣак(о)ньники си • и мол(итвѣ) • но до сред(ы)
 3 кр(ь)стыа(нскои) сице(ε) поі :- а на сред(ѹ) кр(ε)стык(анскѹю)
 • на лит(ѹ)ргии по чен(ати) • до великого пѣтка • не рци сего
 стих(а) • кнко оглашени изид(ѣте) • но се преказаныи • как же
 6 ти пис(а)но сн дѣак(о)ньники и мол(итва) прибываетъ • Ѡ сред(ы)
 • д • нед(ѣли) пос(та) • до великого пѣтка • оѹ готовоуцихса на
 сток кр(ь)ци(ε)ние •

9 помолитесѣ оѹ готовоуцагасѣ къ просвѣщению
 изидѣте • кнко къ просвѣщению изидѣте •

12 помолитесѣ иже къ просвѣщению г(о)с(под)оѹ пом(олимъсѣ) :-
 вѣрнии оѹ готовоуцихса братии нашеи къ ст(о)моѹ просвѣще-
 нию г(о)с(под)ѹ помо(лимъсѣ) :-

15 тако да г(о)с(под)ъ в(ог)ъ нашъ оѹтвердитъ ѣ оѹкрѣпитъ ѣ
 г(о)с(под)ѹ :-

18 да подобитъ ѣ во время подобно • банискомоѹ пакыбытью •
 Ѡданик грѣхомъ • и одѣнию неистлѣнномоѹ г(о)с(под)оѹ пом(о-
 лимъсѣ) :-

просвѣтитъ ѣ свѣтомъ разоумнымъ г(о)с(под)оѹ пом(олимъсѣ)
 :-

21 обновитъ ѣ водою и доухомъ г(о)с(под)оѹ помолимс(ѣ) :-

1–61.18 таж(ε) ... кнко вѣрных пак(ы)] om. γ,θ,ι,κ,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π,ρ; 1–61.4 таж(ε) ...
 поп мол(итвѣ) тан(но)] сню • м(о)л(и)твоѹ • по сред(ѣ) хрестыи(ансцѣи) • въ
 сеѣ мѣсто • в(ож)е великыи и хвал(ьныи) α; 1 рци] om. ζ,η,λ; 1 past] хвал(ь-
 ныи) add. иже жив(отворною) ζ,λ; 2 престѹпа] же престѹпаѣ ζ; 2 престѹпа
 ... о изваитисѣ нам] om. λ; 2–10 престѹпа ... къ просвѣщению изидѣте] си-
 це поі сред(ѣ) кр(ь)сты(ански)а до великого пѣтка η; 2 си] om. ζ; 2 но] om. ζ;
 3 сице(ε) поі] om. ζ; сице поміа(ѹи) δ; 3 а] om. δ; 3 на ... лит(ѹ)ргии] Ѡ сред(ы)
 • кр(ь)стыа(нскои) ζ; 4 по чен(ати)] om. ζ; 4 рци] г(лаго)ли ζ; 5 изид(ѣте)]
 om. δ,ζ; 5–6 как же ти] тако же ζ; 6 сн ... къ просвѣщению] мол(итва) •
 и дѣак(о)ньникъ елико оглашении изид(ѣте) • оглашении изидѣте ζ; 8 past]
 сток кр(ь)ци(ε)ние • add. а се по срѣдѣ хрестык(ансцѣи) • г(лаго)ли δ; 9 къ
 просвѣщению] на св(ѣ)токъ просвѣщения г(оспод)ѹ помолимъсѣ δ; 10 изидѣте]
 om. ζ; 10 изидѣте ... иже къ просвѣщению г(о)с(под)оѹ пом(олимъсѣ)] om.
 δ; 10 изидѣте] om. ζ; 11 г(о)с(под)ѹ пом(олимъсѣ)] om. ζ,η; 12 оѹ] om. ζ,η;
 13 помо(лимъсѣ)] om. ζ; 14 тако] и тако ζ; 14 оѹкрѣпитъ] и оѹкрѣпитъ δ,η;
 14–15 ѣ г(о)с(под)] om. ζ; ѣ г(оспод)оѹ помолимъсѣ(ѣ) δ; 16 ѣ] и ζ; 17 Ѡданик]
 и Ѡданию δ,η; и въ Ѡданык ζ; 17 грѣхомъ] грѣховъ η,ζ; 17 неистлѣнномоѹ]
 нестлѣннѹ η,ζ; 17–18 пом(олимъсѣ)] om. η,ζ; 19–20] om. η; 21 помолимс(ѣ)]
 om. η;

1 в(ож)е великыи и хвал(ьныи)] Furthermore the text of the first Prayer of the
 Faithful is erased and the Prayers and the Litany of Catechumens are written over
 the erased text

2–62.17 престѹпа ... о изваитисѣ нам] missing sheets in λ

2 престѹпа ... кр(ε)ци(ε)ние] in margin δ

дасть имъ свершении вѣрѣ г(о)с(под)оу помол(имъса) :-
 причтетъ ꙗ ѿѣ(мь) избранѣмъ своимъ стаде г(о)с(под)оу
 3 п(омолимъса) :-
 поп мол(итву) таи(но) :-

҃ави вл(а)д(ы)ко лице твоѡ • на готовѡщаѡса на ѿѣок про-
 6 свѣщеник • и желающаѡ грѣховноу скверноу ѿтрасти • освѣти
 имъ смыслъ извѣсти ꙗ въ вѣрѣ • оутверди ꙗ въ надежи • сверши
 въ любви оуды ч(е)стѣны х(ри)с(т)а твоѡго ҃ави • давѣшаго са за
 9 избавленик д(у)шъ нашихъ :-

сп(а)си помлоуи заступ(и) :-
 иже къ просвѣщенію главы ваша г(о)с(поде)ви поклонит(е)
 12 :-

в(ъ)зг(ла)с ꙗко ты кси просвѣщеник д(у)ш(а)мъ нашимъ и
 теѡ(ѣ) сл(аву) :-

15 дѡак(онъ) простираѡ свит(о)е гл(аголе)тъ • клико къ просвѣ-
 щенію изидѣте • иже къ просвѣщенію изидѣте :-

клико оглашении изидѣте • да нѣкто ѿ оглашенихъ • но
 18 клико вѣрныхъ пак(ы) :-

мол(итва) вѣрнымъ таи(но) •

1 вѣрѣ] въ вѣрѣ η; 1 помол(имъса)] om. η; 2 ѿѣ(мь)] въ ѿѣмь η; 2 своимъ
 стаде] стаде своимъ ζ; 2-3 п(омолимъса)] om. η; 4 поп] om. ζ; 4 таи(но)]
 ѡ таи(не) δ; 5 вл(а)д(ы)ко лице твоѡ] лице свое вл(а)д(ы)ко η; 5 на гото-
 вающаѡса] om. δ; 6 освѣти] и освѣти δ; 7 ꙗ въ надежи] въ надежи δ, ζ;
 8 сверши въ] сверши ꙗ въ η; 8-9 за избавленик] избавленъ за ζ; 9 д(у)шъ
 нашихъ] д(у)ша наша ζ; 10 сп(а)си помлоуи заступ(и)] заступ(и) сп(а)си по-
 ми(луи) α, η, дѡак(онъ) • заступ(и) сп(а)си пом(и)луи ζ, дѡак(онъ) :- сп(а)си
 помлоуи съхрани насъ в(о)ж(е) своѡю благодатию δ; 11-18 иже ... клико вѣр-
 ныхъ пак(ы)] пр(ѣ)м(у)др(о)сть :- ꙗко ты кси просвѣщеник наше и те(ѡ) α;
 11 иже къ просвѣщенію] оутговѡщениѡса ко просвѣщенію δ; 11 ваша] наш(а)
 η; 13 в(ъ)зг(ла)с] om. δ, η; 13 д(у)ш(а)мъ нашимъ и] наше η, ζ, наш(е) :-
 г(о)с(под)и и в(о)ж(е) наш δ; 14 и теѡ(ѣ) сл(аву)] om. δ; теѡ(ѣ) славу в(ъ)з(с)ыла(емъ)
 ζ, теѡ(ѣ) славу всылаемъ о(т)ъцю і си(ну) η; 15 дѡак(онъ) ... гл(аголе)тъ] (п)оп
 (п)ростирѡктъ литонъ δ, дѡак(онъ) η, распростираѡ свиток ζ; 15 клико къ про-
 свѣщенію изидѣте • иже къ просвѣщенію изидѣте] om. ε 16 иже] еже ζ;
 17 клико оглашении изидѣте] om. δ; 17 да нѣкто ... вѣрнымъ таи(но)] om. ε;
 17 ѿ] om. η; 17 но ... пак(ы)] om. ζ; 18 past] пак(ы) add. пак(ы) η, пакы ми-
 ромъ г(оспод)оу помолимъс(а) δ; 19 мол(итва) вѣрнымъ таи(но)] пакы и пакы
 миромъ :- о съвышнимъ мирѣ и :- о мирѣ всего мира вл(а)го(стоѡнии) :- о
 ѿѣмъ храмъ сѣмъ :- о избавитисѡ намъ ѿ всѡко(го) :- полъ • м(о)л(и)твѡу
 • о вѣрныхъ • таи(но) α, om. ε мол(итва) таи(но) δ, ν, ζ, мол(итва) • ѡ вѣрныхъ •
 таи(на) ζ, мол(итва) • о вѣрныхъ η, поп • мол(итву) • таи(но) • о вѣрныхъ θ,
 поп мол(итву) таи(но) ι, мол(итва) • о вѣрныхъ, таи(но) κ, ѿѣ(и)ѣ. мол(итву).
 таи(но). о вѣрныхъ μ, поп мол(итву) ο, попъ. мол(итву). о вѣрныхъ. таи(но) π,
 мол(итву) • о вѣрныхъ • поп • гл(аголе)тъ • таи(но) ρ;

11 иже ... гл(аголе)тъ] written in cursive uncial over erased text

в(о)ж)е великы и хвальныи • иже животворною смертию х(ри)-
 с(т)а твояго • в нетлѣнник насъ ѿ тла преставивъ • ты вса на-
 3 ша чювьства • страньнаго оум(ь)рщв(е)ннѣя свободи • блага
 вл(а)д(ы)коу симъ вноутрѣнни смыслъ приставивъ • и шко оубо
 непричастно да боудеть всакомъ залѣ въ зрѣнни • слухъ же къ
 6 словесемъ праздному непрестоупнъ • языкъ же да ч(и)ститиса
 ѿ г(а)го(л)ъ неподобнъ • очисти же наша оустыны хвалацага тла
 г(о)с(под)и • рѣкы наша створи ѿ злыхъ оубо възддержатиса
 9 дѣлани • творити же точною оубо годнага тебѣ • вса наша оуды и
 помышленнѣя оутвержага твою бл(а)г(о)стию :-

заступни сп(аси) :-
 12 премоудр(о)с(тъ) тако подобает :-
 паки паки миромъ г(о)с(под)оу(п)омолимъса) :-
 о свышнемъ мирѣ и о сп(а)с(енни) :-
 15 о мирѣ всего мира бл(а)го(у)стоани) :-
 о стѣмъ храмѣ семь иж(е) :-
 о избавитиса намъ ѿ всакаго) :-

1 великы и хвальныи] хвальныи и велики х,ξ; 1 иже] и δ; 2 преставивъ] пре-
 стави ζ,π, преставивыи х,ξ, приведын о; 3 страньнаго] стр(а)стѣнаго α,γ,ε,η,ζ,ι,θ,
 μ,ο,ξ,ρ, страшнаго π; 3 свободи] свободивъ ζ; 3 блага] бл(а)гини ζ,ν, бл(а)гаго
 х,ξ; 3 блага вл(а)д(ы)коу] в(а)д(ы)кѣ бл(а)га θ; 4 вл(а)д(ы)коу] вл(а)д(ы)ко
 η,ζ; 4 вл(а)д(ы)коу... и шко] вл(а)д(ы)ко оумъ оутрѣнни • и смыслъ пристави
 шко ν; 4 симъ] всѣмъ ι; 4 смыслъ] помысль ε; 4 и] om. ι,χ,μ,ο,ξ; 4 шко]
 шчи ε; 4 оубо] om. ζ; 5 непричастно] непричастны ε; 5 да боудеть] бѣди
 ζ; 5 да боудеть всакомъ] во всакомъ да бѣдет π; 5 боудеть всакомъ залѣ въ
 зрѣнни] бѣдѣтъ всакого зла въ зрѣннѣя ε; 5 всакомъ залѣ въ] во всакомъ залѣ
 во θ, въ всакомъ залѣ ν, всакомъ залѣ ο; 5 слухъ] и слухъ π; 6 словесемъ]
 всѣмъ θ; 6 языкъ] и языкъ ι,μ, ante языкъ add. оч(и)сти же наша оустны;
 6 же] om. ι, нашъ μ; 6 ч(и)ститиса] шч(и)ститиса α,γ,ζ,η,θ,χ,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π; 7 ante]
 ѿ add. ѿ всакиа скверны. и π; 7 очисти] и оч(и)сти ι,μ; 7 же] om. χ,μ, и ι,
 г(о)с(под)и ξ; 7 тла] om. θ; 8 г(о)с(под)и] om. ξ; 8 рѣкы] и рѣкы ι,μ,ρ, рѣкы же
 х,ξ; 8 створи] створивъ μ, оубо створи π; 8 оубо] om. α,ο,π,ρ; 8 възддержатиса]
 держатиса ν, оудалатиса ο, оудержатиса ρ; 9 точною] тѣкмо ο,ξ,ρ; 9 вса] и вса
 ι,μ,ο; 10 помышленнѣя] помышленнѣ δ; 10 оутвержага] оутверди ι,μ,ξ, оутвержаи
 ο,π; 10 бл(а)г(о)стию :-] бл(а)годатю α,δ,ε,ζ,θ,ι,χ,μ,ν,π; 11 ante] заступни add.
 дѣлак(онъ) α,γ,δ,ι,μ,ο,π,ρ; 11 сп(аси)] сп(аси) om. ξ, past сп(аси) add. поми(лѣи)
 α,ε,ζ,η,ι,χ,μ,ν,π, и пр(омилѣи) δ; 12 премоудр(о)с(тъ)] моудросте θ; 12 ante] тако
 add. поп γ,ι,μ,ο,ξ,ρ, възглас ζ; 12 past] подобает add. ти вса(ка) α,θ,η,λ,μ, ти
 всака слава ш(тъ)цю и с(ынѣ) δ, ти всака слава ч(е)сть и поклоненѣе ш(тъ)цю
 и с(ы)нѣ и бѣ(о)му ζ, и всака ι, ти всака слав(а) χ,π,ρ, ти всака слава ч(ь)сть
 и поклан(еннѣ) ο; 13 ante] паки add. дѣлак(онъ) ι,μ,ο,ρ; 13 паки] и паки μ;
 13 миромъ] om. γ,η,ι,ο,ρ; 13 г(о)с(под)оу] om. α,γ,δ,η,ι,μ,ν,ο,ρ; 13 п(омолимъса)]
 om. α,γ,δ,ε,ζ,η,ι,μ,ν,ο,ξ,ρ; 14 о свышнемъ] om. π; 14 мирѣ] om. γ,ε,π; 14 и]
 om. α,γ,δ,ε,ζ,η,μ,ν,ο,π,ρ; 14 о сп(а)с(енни)] om. α,γ,δ,ε,η,μ,ν,ο,ρ; 15 мирѣ] сми-
 реннѣ ξ; 15 мира] om. γ,ε,η; 15 бл(а)го(у)стоани)] om. γ,ε,η,θ,ν,ο, ξ,ρ, и δ,μ, и
 бл(а)гоу(ст)оани)] х; 16 семь] om. γ,ρ; 16 иж(е)] om. α,γ,δ,η,θ,μ,ν,ο,ρ, с δ, иже с
 вѣро(ю) χ,π; 17 намъ] om. γ,ε,η,ο,ρ; 17 ѿ] om. γ,δ,ε,η,θ,ι,ν,ο,ξ,π,ρ; 17 в(сакаго)]
 om. γ,δ,ε,η,ζ,θ,ι,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π,ρ;

мол(н)тва) о вѣрныхъ • тая(наа) •

3 вл(а)д(ы)ко стын превл(а)гын • молим т а в(ог)атын въ м(н)-
 3 л(о)сти • м(н)л(о)стивоу быти намъ грѣшникомъ • и достои-
 ны ны створи приатъа • кдиночадаго с(ы)на и в(ог)а нашего
 6 ц(ѣ)с(а)ра славы • се бо ч(ъ)ст(н)ок кго тѣло • и животвора-
 6 щина кго кровь въ настоящии час входаща • на таянѣи сии
 трапезѣ • предъложитиса хоцета • ѿ множества воньства
 н(е)в(е)снаго • невидимо дароприносима • кю же приатък намъ
 9 неосоуженно подажъ • да тою ради разоумнок око просвѣщаеми
 • с(ы)ны свѣтоу и дни боудемъ :-

дыак(онъ) • заступи сп(а)си :- прѣмудро(сть) :-

12 по дароу х(ри)с(т)а твоего с нимъ же бл(а)г(о)с(ло)в(е)нъ
 кси съ прѣстымъ и бл(а)гымъ :-

1] om. γ,θ,χ,ξ ante мол(н)тва) add. попъ α,δ,ι,ρ, ст(н)е)ль μ, past мол(н)тва) add. • в • ε,ζ; 1 о вѣрныхъ] om. α,δ,η,μ,ν,ο,π,ρ; 1 тая(наа)] om. ε,η, w тая(н)е) δ,ν; 2 стын] om. ξ, стын и α, пр(ѣ)стын ζ,ξ,π; 2 в(ог)атын] богатаго α,δ,ε,ι,χ,μ,ν,ξ,π, прев(ог)атаго ο; 2-3 въ м(н)л(о)сти] м(н)л(о)стью ν,ρ; 3 м(н)л(о)стивоу быти] м(н)л(о)стивъ боуди δ,η,ρ; 3 грѣшником] грешнымъ η,θ,ν,ξ,π; 3 и] om. ι,χ,ο,ξ; 4 ны створи] ны сътвори ти γ, нас створи ти ε, створи ны θ,η,μ,ξ, сътвори χ,ν, створи ны ι, створи ти π; 4 приатъа] приати η,ξ, тия π; 4 с(ы)на и] с(ы)на α, с(ы)на твоего ζ,χ,ρ, с(ы)на твоего и η,π, с(ы)на твоег(о) г(о)с(под)а ξ; 5 славы] славѣ η; 5 се бо] сего δ; 5 ч(ъ)ст(н)ок] преч(ъ)ст(н)ок ε,ξ,π,ρ; 5 кго тѣло] к тѣло δ, тѣло π; 6 кго кровь] кровь α,γ,δ,ζ,η,χ,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π,ρ; 6 час] си час ξ; 6 входаща] om. ν, входащи ο, входаща π; 6 таянѣи] страшнѣи ζ, стѣи и таянѣи ξ; 6 сии] om. η,ο,ξ,ρ; 7 предъложитиса] и предложитиса η предложити ν; 7 хоцета] хоташа δ,ε,ζ,η,θ,ν, хоцеть ι, хотан ξ; 7-8 воньства н(е)в(е)сн(а)го] н(е)в(е)снаго воньства ξ; 7-8 воньства ... дароприносима] анг(е)льскаго • невидимоу слоужьбоу приемлеуца α, н(е)в(е)снаго дароприносима ο; 8 дароприносима] дароносима γ,ε,ζ,η,θ,μ,π, даръприсима δ, дарыносима ι, даруприносима ν, дарыприносима ξ; 8 кю же приатък] ихъ же прич(а)стык ε, ею же прити ζ, 8 кю же приатък намъ неосоуженно] кго же приати неосоуженно намъ ν; 8 намъ] om. α,δ,θ,ι,χ,ο,ξ,π; 9 подажъ] намъ подажъ α,ο, намъ подасть δ, сподоби ζ, подаи ε,η, намъ подаи же θ,ι,χ,ξ,π; 9 ради] om. ξ,ρ; 9 разоумнок око] разоумныма очима ι,μ, разоумнок wчи π, разоумнок ρ; 9 просвѣщаеми] просвѣщаемо η, просвѣщающе π; 10 свѣтоу и] света и ι,π; 11 дыак(онъ)] om. α,γ,δ,ε,ζ,η,θ,χ,ν,ξ; 11 сп(а)си] om. ξ, past сп(а)си add. помилоуи α,δ,ζ,η,ι, помилоуи с(о)хр(ани) π; 11 прѣмудрос(тъ)] мудрость δ; 12 ante] по add. ст(н)е)ль в(ъ)зглас ζ, поп да ι, поп. в(ъ)зглас μ, възгл(а)сть ν, поп ο,ξ; 12 past] твоего add. всегда(а) η; 12 с ... бл(а)гымъ] всегда(а) η; 12 нимъ] ними δ; 12 бл(а)г(о)с(ло)в(е)нъ ... бл(а)гымъ] om. γ,ε,θ,ο,ρ; 13 кси ... бл(а)гымъ] om. δ; 13 съ] и с ι; 13 и] om. α,ι,χ,μ,ν,ξ,π; 13 бл(а)гымъ] om. χ,μ,π, past бл(а)гымъ add. и животв(о)рашн(а) ζ, животворящимъ д(х)х(о)мъ тво(имъ) ι, и животворящим д(х)х(о)мъ твоимъ и нын(ѣ) ν, и живоращим д(х)х(о)мъ ι нын(е) ξ;

- и авик • поют пѣвци • нына силы н(ε)в(ε)сныа •
 поп тан(но) за са • пс(а)лмъ • ѿ • помилоуи ма в(ож)ε •
 3 и по пренесены дѣак(онъ) • вса стѣпа помѣнше пак(ы) :-
 о преже(о)с(ва)щ(ε)ныхъ ч(ь)стныхъ дарѣхъ г(о)с(поде)ви
 в(ог)у нашему :-
 6 тако да ч(ε)л(о)в(ε)колюбець в(ог)ъ примъ га въ стѣпн
 прен(ε)в(ε)сны и мыслныи свои жртвенникъ въ вонь(ю) :-
 въспослетъ намъ бл(а)г(о)д(а)тъ :-

1 и авик ... ма в(ож)ε •] и авик ... н(ε)в(ε)сныа and поп тан(но) ... ма в(ож)ε
 • are swapped θ; 1 и авик • поют пѣвци] om. η, таж(ε) • переносъ α, таж(ε)
 γ,δ,ζ, и авик пѣвци поютъ пѣнкъ се • гла(съ) • ē • ε, пѣвци θ, пѣвци поютъ
 ι,κ,ξ,ρ, и поютъ μ, люд(и) ο, пѣвци поютъ в переносъ ξ; 1-2 и авик ... помилоуи
 ма в(ож)ε •] и певци поютъ :- нын(ε) силы н(ε)в(ε)сныа с нами невидимо слѣ-
 жать . се во входить цс(а)рь славы . се жертва таина свершена даром приносит-
 са . вѣрою и съ страхомъ приступимъ да причастници жизни вѣчныи будемъ
 . алл(на)уг(и)а :- попъ мол(итву) в переносъ :- в(ож)ε сѣдди на хѣрови-
 мѣхъ и ѿ сѣрафимъ славимыи призри на ны смѣренныа равы си і въстави оумъ
 нашъ на словословькни твои бл(а)г(о)сти . исторгни же ны г(о)с(под)и всего по-
 мысленныа вражиа да свѣтомъ твоимъ і просвѣтомъ просвѣщакми волею твоею
 управлжми на всако дѣло бл(а)г(о)к . да сподобимса н(ε)в(ε)сному ц(а)рствию
 сочтающеса со всѣми избѣранными твоими . тако ты кси в(ог)ъ нашъ і тебѣ сла-
 ву высылаем :- ν, таж(ε) нына силы н(ε)в(ε)сныа с на(ми) попъ . пс(а)л(о)мъ
 .н . помилуи ма в(ож)ε, попъ . мол(итву) сию . тан(но) . в(ож)ε сѣдди на хѣро-
 вимѣ . и ѿ сѣрафимъ слову прикмаа призри на ны недостонныа и смѣренныа
 равы твоа . и востави оумъ нашъ на призванъ твоя бл(а)гости истергни ны
 ѿ всего помысленныа вражиа . да свѣтомъ просвѣщакми . и волею твоею оуправи-
 ши ны на все дѣло бл(а)го . сподоби ны ц(а)рствию нев(ε)сному . сочтающеса со
 всѣми стѣпами :- π; 1 н(ε)в(ε)сныа] om. γ,η,ρ, past н(ε)в(ε)сныа add. съ нами
 невидимо слѣжать . се во входить цс(а)рь славы . се жертва таина свершена
 даром приноситса . вѣрою и съ страхомъ приступимъ . да причастници жизни
 вѣчныа будемъ . алл(на)ugna ε, с нами невидимо слѣжать се во ι; 2 поп тан(но)
 за са] а поп • гл(аголе)тъ • въ переносъ α, поп γ,κ, ѿ доскѣ (?)а поп оумы-
 валса δ, мол(итва) • въ іван(новѣ) слѣж(вѣ) • никто же достоинъ свазавшихса
 η, ст(итѣ)ль • тан(но) • за са ζ, а поп • за са θ, а поп покъ тан(но) ι, поп κ,
 поп . тан(но) μ, а поп въ преносъ гл(аголе)тъ ο,ρ, поп гл(аголе)тъ ξ; 2 пс(а)лм •
 ѿ] om. δ,ε,θ,ι,μ; 2 помилоуи ма в(ож)ε] om. γ,ζ,κ,ξ past помилоуи ма в(ож)ε
 add.кси • со пр(ѣ)ст(ε)мъ бл(а)г(и)мъ • животворящи(мъ) δ, неса дары ι, по
 велицѣ(и) . весь пс(а)лмъ :- μ; 3 и] om. γ,δ,η,θ,ι,κ,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π, α ρ; 3 по] по по ζ, om.
 γ,δ,θ,ι,κ,ο,ξ,π; 3 пренесены] om. γ,δ,θ,κ,ο, неса дары таже ι, переносѣ μ,ο,ρ, посемъ
 ξ, таж(ε) π; 3 дѣак(онъ)] om. δ,κ,ν,ο дѣак(онъ) . вктен(ью) μ; 3 вса стѣпа пом-
 ѣнше пак(ы)] исполнимъ вечерняа ζ; 3 пак(ы)] om. α,δ,ζ,η,θ,κ,ο,ρ, пакы пакы
 мир(ом) γ пакы пакы ι; 4 о] om. ν; 4 преже(о)с(ва)щ(ε)ныхъ] прѣдположе-
 ныи δ, предложеныхъ δ; 4 ч(ь)стныхъ] om. δ,η,θ,π, и ч(ь)стныхъ ε, с(ва)щ(ен)ныхъ
 ζ; 4 дарѣхъ] om. α,γ,δ,ε,ζ,ι,κ,μ,ξ, π,ρ; 4-5 г(о)с(поде)ви в(ог)у нашему] om. all
 manuscripts; 6 тако ... въ вонь(ю)] om. ε; 6 да] да ι η; 6 в(ог)ъ] г(оспод)ъ
 в(ог)ъ α, г(оспод)ъ ν; 6 примъ] om. α,ζ,ν,ξ, приметъ δ, въспр(нимъ) η,κ,ρ 6-
 7 га ... въ вонь(ю)] om. α,γ,η,ζ,θ,κ,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π,ρ, въ стѣпн св(он) ι, past вонь(ю) add.
 бл(а)гоуханна • г(о)с(под)у по(молимъ)са δ; 6 въ] на δ; 8 бл(а)г(о)д(а)тъ]
 дар δ,ρ, past бл(а)г(о)д(а)тъ add. даръ γ, и д(аръ) κ, ст(а)г(о) π;

2 помилоуи ма в(ож)ε] кси ... животворящи(мъ) in margin δ

3 вса стѣпа помѣнше пак(ы)] исполнимъ вечерняа written in cursive uncial over
 erased text ζ

6 примъ] примъ ... въ вонь(ю) in margin δ;

О ИЗБАВИТИСА НАМ •
МОЛ(ИТВА) • ТАИ(НО) •

- 3 ИЖЕ НЕИЗРЕЧЕНЬНЫХЪ И НЕВИДИМЫХЪ ТАИНЪ Б(ОГ)Ъ • ОУ НЕГО ЖЕ
СОУТЬ СКРОВИЩА • ПРЕМОУДРОСТИ И РАЗОУМОУ • СЪКРОВЕНА ИЖЕ СЛОУЖЕ-
6 НИК СЛОУЖБЫ СЕА ЪКРЫВЪ НАМЪ • И ПОЛОЖИВЪ НЫ ГРѢШНЫА • ЗА
МНОГОК ТВОК ЧЛѢКОЛЮБИК • ПРИНОСИТИ ТЕБѢ ДАРЫ И ЖЕРТВЫ О СВО-
ИХЪ ПРЕГРѢШЕНИИХЪ • И О ЛЮДСКИХЪ НЕВѢДѢНИИХЪ • ТЫ НЕВИДИ-
МЫИ Ц(Ѣ)С(А)РЮ • ТВОРАИ ВЕЛИКА И НЕ(И)СЛѢДОВАНА • СЛАВНА ЖЕ И
9 ИЗРАДЬНА ИМЪ ЖЕ НѢ(СТЬ) ЧИСЛА • ПРИЗРИ НА НЫ НЕДОСТОИНЫА РАВЫ
ТА РАВЫ ТВОА • ПРѢСТОАЩАА СѢТ(О)МУ ТВОКМОУ ЖЕРТВЕНИКОУ • АКЫ
ХЕРОВИМСКОМУ ПРѢСТОЛОУ ТВОКМОУ • НА НЕМЪ ЖЕ КДИНОЧАДЫИ ТВОИ
12 С(Ы)НЪ И Б(ОГ)Ъ НАШЪ • ПРЕДЪЛЕЖАЩИМИ СТРАШНАМИ ТАИНАМИ
ПОЧИВАЕТЪ • И Ѡ ВСЕА НЫ ВѢРНЫА СВОА ЛЮДИ СВОБОДИВЪ НЕЧИ-
СТОТЫ • ОБТИ ВСѢХЪ НАСЪ Д(У)ША И ТЕЛЕСА • СѢГЫНЕЮ НЕѠКМЛЕМОУ
15 • ДА ВЪ ЧИСТѢ СЪВѢСТИ • НЕСРАМНЫМЪ ЛИЦЕМЪ • ПРОСВѢЩЕНЫМЪ
С(Ь)РДЦЕМЪ • Б(О)Ж(Е)СТВ(Е)НЫХЪ СИХЪ ПРИКМЛЮЩЕ ОС(ВА)ЩЕНИИ • И
Ѡ НИХЪ ЖИВОТВОРИМИ • ПРИКДИНИМСА ТОМУ Х(РИ)С(Т)ОУ ТВОКМОУ
18 ИСТИННОМУ Б(ОГ)ОУ НАШЕМОУ • РЕКЪШЕМОУ ТАДЫИ ПЛОТЬ МОЮ • И ПИА

1 о] om. v; 1 нам] om. γ, η past нам add. Ѡ в(сакого) ε, ζ, θ, χ, π, Ѡ ξ; 2] om. η, θ, ξ,
попъ • м(о)л(и)твоу • по перенесѣнны. таи(но) α, мол(итва) по перенос(ѣ) γ, поп
• мол(итвоу) ω • таи(не) δ, таж(е) • м(о)л(и)тва • по переносѣ ε, мол(итва) • по
перенос(ѣ) • таи(но) ζ, χ, λ, попъ мол(итву) таи(но) ι, ο, ρ, сѣт(итє)ль. мол(итву).
таи(но) μ, попъ. мол(итву). по пренесены π; 3 и] om. δ, η; 3 невидимыхъ]
н(є)в(є)сныхъ η; 3 в(ог)ъ] в(ож)ε ε; 3 же] om. ι; 4 преоудрости] моудро-
сти ο; 4 разоумоу] разоума ε, ζ, χ, λ, ο, π, ρ; 4 иже] и се α; 5 Ѡкрывъ намъ] тако
Ѡкрываемъ λ; 5 намъ] om. v; 5 и положивъ] положивыи α, и положивыи ζ;
5 грѣшныа] грѣшнымъ ο; 6 твок] om. λ; 6 члѣколюбик] м(и)л(о)с(є)рдьε π;
6 тебѣ] om. δ, θ, χ, ν, ξ; 6 дары] дары си μ; 6-7 своихъ] нашихъ ο; 7 прегрѣшени-
ихъ] грѣсѣхъ θ, ι, π, съгрѣшенихъ η, ο, ξ; 7 неведѣниихъ] неведѣстивихъ η, ξ,
невидѣниихъ χ; 8 велика] всацьскаа π; 8 не(и)слѣдована] не(и)слѣдимаа λ, не-
свѣдома ν; 8 славна же и израдна] om. ζ; 8 же и] же δ, η, θ, χ; 9 израдна]
неизрадна λ; 9 нѣс(ть)] не бѣ ν; 9 ны] ны г(о)с(под)и ξ; 10 та равы] om.
all manuscripts; 10 прѣстоащаа ... твокмоу] пр(ѣ)сѣт(о)моу твокмоу жертвѣ-
никоу прѣстоащаа • акы хѣровимьскомоу твокмоу прѣстолау α; 10 сѣт(о)му]
къ сѣт(о)му ν; 10 твокмоу] сємоу δ; 11 прѣстолау твокмоу] пр(ѣ)ст(о)лу
ζ, твокму пр(ѣ)ст(о)лу θ; 11-12 твои с(ы)нъ] с(ы)нь твои ι, π; 12 и] om.
ζ, η, ξ; 12 и в(ог)ъ] г(о)с(под)ъ ξ; 12 нашъ] ис(у)сѣ х(ри)с(тос)ъ ξ; 12 таинами]
ante таинами add. твоими ν; 13 почиваетъ] om. ο, почиваютъ π; 13 и] om.
ζ, χ, μ, ν, ο, ρ; 13 всеа] всеа неч(и)стоты η, ι, ο, ξ; 13 ны] om. ι, μ, ο, ξ; 13 ны ...
обти] неч(и)стоты вѣрныа ны люд(и) твоа съвауд(и) и обти ξ; 13 своа] om.
α, твоа δ, θ, χ, ν, ο, ξ, π; 13 люди свободивъ] свободивъ людѣ ρ; 13 свободивъ]
свокодѣ ζ, ι, μ, ο, π, съвауди χ, ξ; 13-14 нечистоты] om. η, ι, ο, ξ; 14 обти] и обти
η, θ, ι, χ, μ, ο, ξ; 15 несрамныа] непосраменоа α; 15 лицемъ] лицемъ • и α, ι, μ, ο;
15-16 просвѣщеннымъ с(ь)рдцемъ] om. η; 16 сихъ] om. ζ, сиганин сихъ θ, силъ
μ, π, твоихъ ο, сиганин ρ; 16 и] om. χ, ο, π; 17 прикдинимса] и прикдинимса ξ,
сѣт(о)му η; 17 тому] om. ξ, самому ε, тому самому ο, сѣт(о)му η; 17 х(ри)с(т)оу]
д(у)ху π;

5-6 за мног ... ным с(є)рдцемъ] missing sheets in ε;

мою кровь • въ мьнѣ пребываетъ • и азъ в немъ • тако да въсе-
 лающуюся в ны • и ходашю словеси твоямоу г(о)с(под)и • боудемъ
 3 ц(е)рк(в)ы пр(ѣ)стаго и покланяемаго твоего д(у)ха • избавлени
 ѿ всакоа неприязниныскыа козни • дѣломъ ли словомъ • ли
 помышленикомъ дѣйствицкыи • и оубоудчимъ обѣщанна благаа •
 6 всѣмъ ст(ы)мъ • оубоудившимъ тебѣ ѿ вѣк(а) :-

и въсклоньс(а) поп отъкрыетъ стыа дары •

дыак(о)нъ • застоупи сп(а)си помилу(и) :-
 9 вечера всего свершена ст(а) :-
 анг(е)ла мирна вѣрна наст(авника) :-
 м(и)л(о)сти ѿпоущеник грѣхо(в) :-
 12 добрыхъ и полезныхъ :-
 прочеа лѣто живота на(шего) :-
 кр(е)стьянскыа кончин(ы) :-
 15 кдиненик вѣры и прич(а)с(тие) :-

и сподоби ны , вл(а)д(ы)ко с дерзн(овениемъ) :-

1 мою кровь] крѣвь мою α, γ, ζ, η, ι, θ, κ, λ, μ, ν, ο, ξ, π, ρ; 1 пребываетъ] бываетъ ζ; 1-
 2 въселающуюся] вселюся ι; 2 и] om. π; 2 ходашю] хоташю δ, γ, ι, π, ходаша
 по η; 3 ц(е)рк(в)ы] прор(о)кы ι; 3 пр(ѣ)стаго] ст(а)го α, η, κ, ξ; 3 и покла-
 няемаго] om. ο, подаемого η; 4 всакоа] всакоа козни ο; 4 неприязнины-
 скыа] неприязненыа ι, неприязнины λ, μ неприязни ξ; 4 козни] om. ο, ξ, льстни
 ι, μ; 4 дѣломъ ли] дѣлом или γ, ε, η, θ, ι, λ, ν, ο, ξ, π, дѣломъ и ζ, ρ; 4 словомъ • ли]
 словомъ • или ζ, θ, η, ι, λ, ν, ο, ξ, π, словомъ и; 5 помышленикомъ] помышленикомъ
 • ли α; 5 дѣйствицкыи • и] и вл(а)годаряствующе κ, дѣйствицкыи ν, дѣйстви-
 цкыи о, вл(а)годаряствующе ξ; 5 обѣщанна] обѣщаннаа λ, ο, обѣтованна π;
 6 всѣмъ] съ всемъ γ, со всеми η, ο; 6 всѣмъ ст(ы)мъ оубоудившимъ] с всѣмъ-
 ми стыими твоими оубоудившими α, θ, ν, всѣмъ стыимъ твоимъ . оубоудившимъ
 δ, съ всѣми стыими оубоудившими ε, ζ, ι, μ, ο, ρ, кже кси оубоудившъ ст(ы)мъ тво-
 ими оубоудившимъ ξ, и всѣмъ стыимъ твоимъ оубоудившимъ π; 6 тебѣ] om. ν;
 7] om. α, ο; 7 и] om. η, ζ, κ, ι, μ, ξ, посем θ; 7 и въсклоньс(а)] om. ζ, ι, μ, ν, и по-
 сем θ, поклонитьс(а) γ; 7 поп] om. ζ, η, θ, κ, ν; 7 отъкрыетъ] скрываетъ γ, и ѿк-
 рыетъ π; 7 стыа] om. γ, θ, ι, κ, μ, ν; 8 дыак(о)нъ] om. α, δ, θ, κ, ν, таж(е) дыакон
 μ; 8 сп(а)си] om. γ, ε, ο; 8 помилу(и)] om. γ, ε, θ, η, ν, ο, ξ, ρ, и помилуи и съхр(ани)
 δ; 9 вечера] дни θ, ο, ρ; 9 свершена] om. ε, ν, ξ; 9 ст(а)] om. γ, δ, ε, ζ, η, μ, ν, ο, ρ, ст(а)
 м(ирна) κ, ξ, π; 10 вѣрна] om. δ, ε, θ, ν, ρ вѣрнымъ α, κ, λ, и вѣрна ζ; 10 наст(авника)]
 om. α, γ, ε, ζ, η, θ, λ, ν, ο, ξ, ρ, хран(ител)а δ; 11 ѿпоущеник] и ѿпоущене(ние) γ, θ, κ;
 11 грѣхо(в)] om. γ, ε, η, θ, μ, ν, ρ, грѣхомъ λ, ξ, π; 12 и] om. δ, ε, η; 12 полезныхъ] om.
 γ, полезныхъ д(у)ш(ам) α, κ, π; 13 живота] om. γ, ο; 13 на(шего)] om. γ, δ, ε, η, μ, ν, ο,
 ξ, ρ; 14 кончин(ы)] om. γ, ε, η, ν, ρ, кончины живота нашего κ; 15 кдиненик] кдинь-
 никомъ δ, θ, κ, π; 15 вѣры] вѣрѣ δ; 15 и] om. γ, δ, ε, η, θ, μ, ν, ρ; 15 прич(а)с(тие)]
 om. γ, δ, ε, θ, μ, ν, ρ, причастикомъ ст(а)го д(у)ха испрошьше сами сов(е) ι, причастик
 ст(а)го д(у)ха испрошьша λ, причастъ ст(а)го д(у)ха ο; 16 и] ο θ, ι, ο, ξ, ante
 и add. възглас ε, ν, поп ι, μ, ο, ρ; 16 ны] om. γ; 16 вл(а)д(ы)ко] om. ρ 16 с
 дерзн(овениемъ)] om. γ, ε, θ, ν, ρ, past с дерзн(овениемъ) add. неосужено η, ι, неос-
 суженно съмѣти и призывать λ, неосуженно съмѣти призываети н(е)в(е)снаго
 в(о)г(а) ш(т)ца и гл(агола)ти ο;

15] in margin ο;

іако твоекъ ксть ц(а)рствіе си(ла) :-

поп миръ всѣмъ • дыакъ(онъ) главы ваша г(о)с(поде)ви •

3 поп мол(итву) таи(но) •

б(ож)е кдинъ бл(а)гы и м(н)л(о)с(е)рдъ живыи въ вышнихъ
• и на смѣренныа призираа • призри м(н)л(о)с(е)рдьнымъ окомъ на
6 вса люди твоа • и схрани а • и съподобіи вса ны неосуженно
примати • животворящихъ твоихъ сихъ таинъ • тебѣ бо своа
главы поклонномъ • чающекъ же ѿ тебе в(ог)атыа м(н)л(о)сти :-

9 в(ъ)згласъ • бл(а)г(о)д(а)тью и щедротами і ч(еловѣ)колюбн-
емь) :-

поп мол(итву) таи(но) •

12 вонми г(о)с(под)и і(н)с(у)се х(ри)с(т)е б(ож)е нашъ • ѿ сѣт(а)-
го жилища твоего • и ѿ престола славы ц(е)с(а)рствіа твоего •
и приди обѣтитъ насъ • иже горѣ съ оц(е)мъ сѣдши • и сдѣ съ
15 нами невидимо сы • и сподоби державною роукою твоею • подати

1 ante] іако, add. поп γ, люд(н). w(т)че н(а)ш. попп̄ ε, ι, λ, ο, ξ, ρ, люд(н) о(т)че наш
η, κ, люд(н). w(т)че наш. поп. възглас. μ, възгласъ ν; 1 ксть] om. δ, ε, η, ζ, θ, ι, κ, λ, μ, ν, ο,
ξ, π, ρ; 1 ц(а)рствіе] om. ρ; ц(а)рство и α, θ, ν; 1 си(ла)] om. γ, ε, λ, ν, ξ, ρ, и сила
η, ι, μ, и си(ла) и слава w(т)ца и с(ы)на и сѣт(а)го ζ, ante си(ла) add. и слава w(т)цю
δ, слав(а) η, и о w(т)ца и с(ы)на π; 2 поп] om. α, γ, δ, ε, η, ζ, θ, ι, κ, λ, μ, ν, ο, ξ, ρ, дыакон λ;
2 дыакъ(онъ)] om. α, γ, δ, η, ζ, θ, κ, λ, ν, ο; 2 ваша] наша α, δ, η, λ, μ, ν; 2 г(о)с(поде)ви]
om. γ, η, ζ, θ, ι, κ, ο г(осподе)ви поклон(ите) α, δ, μ, ν, ξ; 3] om. γ, η, θ; 3 поп] om. κ, ν,
сѣт(ите)ль μ; 3 таи(но)] om. ζ, κ, w таи(не) λ; 4 кдинъ бл(а)гы и м(н)л(о)с(е)рдъ]
кдинъ бл(а)гы и м(н)л(о)с(е)рдьныи α, кдинъ сѣти и м(н)л(о)с(е)рдьныи ο; 4 м(н)-
л(о)с(е)рдъ] м(н)л(о)стивъ δ; 4-5 и] om. ζ, κ; 5 past призри] add. г(о)с(под)и
ξ; 5 окомъ] твоимъ окомъ ρ; 6 твоа] своа ι, κ, ξ; 6 и схрани а] om. θ; 6 past
а] add. вса η; 6 вса ны] om. λ, ны вса ε, а η, вса ι; 7 твоихъ] om. θ, ο,
ти х; 7 сихъ] om. δ, η, θ, κ, λ, ν, ξ, π, ρ; 7 во] om. π; 7-8 своа главы поклонномъ]
поклонномъ своа главы η, главы своа поклонномъ ζ; 8 поклонномъ] покло-
ниша π; 8 же] om. η, κ, λ, ν, ξ, ρ; 9 в(ъ)зглас] om. θ, η, ν, възглас поп ι, поп въз-
глас κ, μ, ρ, выш(?) δ; 9 и] om. θ, κ; 9-10 і ч(еловѣ)колюбнемь)] om. ε, η, ν, ρ, past і
ч(еловѣ)колюбнемь) add. кдиночадаго с(ы)на твоего с нимъ же бл(а)г(о)с(ловенъ)
ζ, въздвигъ рѣци г(а)гола(е)тъ таи(но) г(о)с(под)и оустнѣ мои ѿверзеши оуста
моа възвѣстать ι, г(о)с(под)и оустнѣ мои ѿверзеши θ, кдиночадаго) :- и
въздѣвъ • поп • горѣ рѣцѣ • речетъ • г(оспод)и оустнѣ мои ѿверзеши λ; 11]
om. γ, δ, θ, ι, ν, мол(итва) • вѣнми г(о)с(под)и і(н)с(у)се х(ри)с(т)е б(ож)е нашъ ѿ
сѣт(а)го ж(илища) :- въ іван(новѣ) службѣ пис(ана) :- η; 11 поп] om. κ, λ,
сѣт(ите)ль ζ, μ; 11 мол(итву)] om. ξ, таж(е) попп̄ π; 11 таи(но)] om. ζ таи(но)
гл(аголе)ты α, сню въ таи(не) π; 12-68.2 вонми ... и посем] om. η; 12 г(о)с(под)и]
om. ξ; 12 б(ож)е] om. π; 12-13 и ѿ] ѿ ζ, θ; 13-14 и приди] приди θ, ι, κ, ν, ο, ξ, ρ;
14 обѣтитъ] ѿсѣтитι ε, ι, μ, и обѣти κ, ξ; 14 сѣдши] сѣдъ γ, κ, λ, μ; 14 и] ош, π;
14 сдѣ] долъ α; 15 и сподоби] сподоби ны ζ, и сподоби ны λ, ρ, сподоби ν, ο, π;
15 роукою твоею] твоею роукою α, θ, κ, ξ, си роукою твоею δ, ρ; 67.15-68.1 пр(ѣ)ч(и)-
сток] пр(ѣ)ч(и)стаго α;

14-70.1 съ нами неви ... (про)мыслом и мноюу бл(а)гостію] missing sheets in
ε;

намъ прѣч(и)сток твоѣ тѣло • и ч(ь)стноюю твою кровь • и
нам и всѣмъ людемъ :-

- 3 и посѣм дѣак(онѣ) р(е)чет вонмѣмъ •
поп въздвизаѣ тѣло р(е)чет • преже(св)щ(е)наѣ стѣа
стѣ(ы)мъ •
- 6 люд(и) кдинѣ стѣ кдин •
и потом поп преломит по обычаю • и вземѣ ѿ стѣ(а)го тѣла •
часть • и влагаѣ в чашю гла(аголе)тъ • исполнениѣ стѣ(а)го д(ѣ)х(а)
9 •
дѣак(онѣ) амин • положиѣ оцларь на трѣпез(ѣ) • рекѣ исполни
о(т)ч(е) •
- 12 и поют кѣнанник вкоуцитѣ
и речет поп мол(итвѣ) тан(но) по приатѣ стѣ(ы)хѣ танн • въ
олтар(е) •
- 15 бл(а)годаримъ тѣ сп(а)с(и)т(е)лѣ всѣмъ в(ог)а • о всѣхъ
бл(а)гыхъ ꙗже далъ кси намъ • по приатѣ стѣ(а)го тѣла и
крѣви х(ри)с(т)а твоѣго • и молимъсѣ тѣбѣ • бл(а)д(ы)ко ч(е)-
18 л(о)в(е)к(олю)бче схрани ны подѣ кровомъ крилоу твоѣю • и дажѣ
намъ до послѣднѣго издыхания нашего • достоинно примати •
ос(св)щениѣ твоихъ и просвѣщениѣ д(ѣ)ши и тѣлоу • въ на-
21 слѣдѣк ц(а)рства н(е)б(е)снаго :-

1 твоѣ тѣло] твоѣго тѣла α, тѣло твоѣ γ, ζ, θ, ι, κ, λ, тѣло π; 1 ч(ь)стноюю] ч(ь)с-
тныѣ α; 1 твою] om. α, λ, μ, π; 1 кровь] крѣве α; 1–2 и нам] намъ γ, ζ, θ, ι, κ, ξ, π;
2 и всѣмъ] всѣмъ λ; 2 людемъ] людемъ твоимъ α, ζ, θ, ι, κ, ο, ξ, ρ; 3 и] om. α, δ, θ, ι, ζ,
κ, μ, ν, ο, ξ, π, ρ, таж(е) γ; 3 посѣм] om. α, δ, γ, θ, ι, κ, μ, ν, ο, ξ, π, ρ; 3 дѣак(онѣ)] om. γ, κ, ν;
3 р(е)чет] om. α, γ, δ, η, θ, ι, κ, μ, ν, ο, π, ρ; 3 вонмѣмъ] таж(е) вонмѣм γ; 4] om. κ;
4 поп] om. ν, стѣ(итѣ)ль ζ; 4 въздвизаѣ тѣло] om. α, δ, η, θ, μ, ν, ο, ξ, въздвизаѣ
хлѣбъ γ, ζ, λ, π, ρ, въздвигъ хлѣб ι; 4 р(е)чет] om. α, δ, ζ, η, θ, λ, μ, ο, ξ; 4 преже(св)-
щ(е)наѣ] om. α; 4–5 стѣ(ы)мъ] om. η; 6] om. α, γ, δ, η, θ, ι, κ, ν; 6 кдин •] om.
ζ, λ, μ, ο, ξ, π, ρ; 7–14] попъ мол(итвѣ) тан(но) ι, descriptions of Communion in the
other manuscripts are at the end of the text on pages 75 – 76 15 сп(а)с(и)т(е)лѣ]
бл(а)г(о)дѣ(ѣ)т(е)лѣ ο; 15 всѣмъ] всѣхъ α, γ, ζ, ν, ο, ξ, π; 15 в(ог)а] и в(ог)а θ;
15 о] и ѡ π; 15–16 бл(а)гыхъ] бл(а)гыхъ твоихъ ρ; 16 ꙗже] и ꙗже π; 16 по]
ѡ ζ, η, θ, ι, κ, ν, ο, ξ, π, и ѡ α, γ, δ, μ, ρ; 16 стѣ(а)го] om. δ, стѣ(ы)хѣ α; 16 тѣла] твоѣго
тѣла η; 16–17 и крѣви] крѣви δ; 17 и] om. ζ, η, ι, ν, ο, ξ, π, ρ; 17 молимъсѣ тѣбѣ]
молимътисѣ π; 17 тѣбѣ бл(а)д(ы)ко] владыко δ, бл(а)д(ы)ко тобѣ μ; 18 ны]
om. ι pastны add. г(о)с(под)н ξ; 18 и дажѣ] подан же ι, дан же ζ, η, θ, κ, ξ, π; 19 до]
и до ξ; 19 издыхания нашего] дыхания нашего δ, въздыхания нашего ι, нашего
издыхания μ, ξ, ρ; 19 примати] примати и ι, причащатисѣ δ; 20 ос(св)щениѣ]
стѣ(ы)нь η; 20 и] въ α, δ, η, θ, ι, κ, μ, ν, ο, ξ, π, ρ, на ζ; 20 просвѣщениѣ] оцѣщениѣ η,
просвѣщениѣ ι, прощениѣ ν; 20 въ] и въ α, ζ, θ, ι, μ, π;

и кончавъ мол(итвѣ) покадить стѣша дары • и р(е)чет
всегда нынѣ присно(но) •

3 пѣвци в перенос • хвалим тѣ х(ри)с(т)е б(ож)е нашъ • тако
сподобилъ ны кси пр(ѣ)ч(и)стѣмъ тѣлѣ • и стѣи крѣви •
причащатисѣ смотрениа твоѣго ала(ил)ѣг(на) :-

6 дѣак(о)н • прости приемъши б(о)ж(е)ст(венныхъ) :-
застоупи сп(а)си помилѣ(и) •
вечера всего свершена •

9 поп в(ъ)згл(а)с тако ты кси ст(ы)ни наша и теб(ѣ) :-
дѣак(онѣ) мироу изидѣм г(о)с(под)ѣ помо(лимъсѣ) :-
поп мол(итвѣ) забовноу •

12 вл(а)д(ы)ко г(о)с(под)и вседержителю • и(же) всю тварь прѣ-
моудростию съдѣлавъ • иже неиздреченнымъ промысломъ и мно-
1–5 и кончавъ ... ала(ил)ѣг(на)] om. α,χ,μ,ν; 1–3 и кончавъ ... в перенос] все-
гда и нынѣ и присно дѣак(онѣ). аминѣ и, п(е)ренос :- всегда и нынѣ и при(сно)
люд(и) о, и покадит стѣша дары гл(агол)ѣ. възнесеса на н(е)в(е)са б(ож)е по всеи
земли. поп р(е)чет всегда и нынѣ(ѣ) при(сно). пѣвци р(е)кѣт ѣ, посем покадить
окр(е)стѣ пр(е)ст(о)ла стѣша дары гл(агол)ѣ. възнесеса на н(е)в(е)са б(ож)е по
всеи земли слав(а) :- i възгл(а)с поп • всегда и нынѣ :- люд(и) ρ; 1 и] om. η,π,
таж(е) γ, дѣак(онѣ) δ; 1 кончавъ мол(итвѣ)] om. γ,ζ,η,θ, кончавъ м(о)л(и)твы
δ, поконча мол(итвы) π; 1 стѣша] om. γ; 1 past] дары add. кѣн(аникѣ) вкѣ-
ситеѣ; 1 и р(е)чет] таж(е) γ, и р(е)четѣ ст(ите)ль ζ гла се η; 2 нынѣ] om.
γ, и нынѣ δ,ζ,η,θ,π; 2 присно] om. γ,θ; 1 и присно(но) ζ,η, и π; 3 пѣвци в пе-
ренос] люд(и) γ,ζ,η,θ,π, и по прѣнесеніи δ; 3–5 хвалим ... ала(ил)ѣг(на)] om.
δ; 3–5 х(ри)с(т)е ... ала(ил)ѣг(на)] om. γ; 3–5 тако сподобилъ ... ала(ил)ѣ-
г(на)] om. π; 4 пр(ѣ)ч(и)стѣмъ] причаститис(а) ст(ы)мъ твоимъ тайнамъ
пр(ѣ)ст(о)лу η; 4 пр(ѣ)ч(и)стѣмъ ... ала(ил)ѣг(на)] причаститисѣ ст(ы)мъ
твоимъ тани(амъ) ζ; 4 тѣлѣ] тѣлѣ твоѣм θ,ο,ρ; 4 и] om. η; 4 стѣи] ч(е)стнѣи
η; 4 крѣви] om. η, крові твоѣи θ,ο,ρ; 5 причащатисѣ] твоѣи причащатисѣ i;
6 дѣак(о)н] om. η,θ,ν, дѣак(о)нѣ речет ζ, а поп • таж(е) • дѣак(он)
ρ; 6 б(о)ж(е)ст(венныхъ)] om. γ,θ,ζ,ρ, стѣх ζ,π, пр(ѣ)ч(и)ст(ыхъ) i; 7 помилѣ(и)]
om. γ,η,μ,ν,ο,ξ, и помилѣи δ, помилѣи с(о)хра(ни) χ,π; 8 вечера] om. i, д(е)не ο,ρ;
8 всего] всакъ α,δ; 8 свершена] om. γ,ν, свершена стѣ мирна η,χ, свершена стѣ π;
9 поп] om. α,γ,δ,ζ,η,θ,i,χ,ν,π; 9 в(ъ)згл(а)с] om. α,γ,δ,η,θ,i,χ,μ,ο,ξ,π,ρ; 9 и теб(ѣ)]
om. α,γ,η,θ,i,ν,ο,ρ, х(рист)е б(ож)е наш δ, и тѣвѣ славѣ всылакμ ζ, г(о)с(под)и
б(ож)е χ, г(о)с(под)и б(ож)е наш μ,ξ г(оспод)и π; 10 дѣак(онѣ)] om. α,γ,δ,η,θ,i,χ,μ,
ν,π, ст(ите)ль ζ; 10 мироу] с(ѣ) мироу α,θ,χ,ξ,π; 10 изидѣм] om. γ; 10 г(о)с-
(под)ѣ помо(лимъсѣ)] om. γ,δ, люд(и). о имени г(о)с(под)ни. ст(ите)ль г(о)с(под)ѣ
помолимъс(а). г(оспод)и пом(ил)ѣи ζ, дѣак(онѣ) г(о)с(под)ѣ помолимъ(сѣ) π;
11] om. θ,ρ; 11 поп] om. δ,η,χ,μ,ν,ο,π; 11 мол(итвѣ) забовноу] мол(итва)
замбоннаѣ δ,χ,μ,ν,π; 11 забовноу] заамбонноу. вѣлами α, за амбономъ ο,
та(ино) ам(вона) ζ; 12 г(о)с(под)и] г(оспод)и б(ож)е α,γ,δ,θ,ζ,μ; 12–70.8 всю
тварь ... прѣч(е)стн(ое)] by the manuscript δ (in β is lost); 12–13 прѣмоуд-
р(о)стыю] моудростию α,γ,η,ζ,θ,i,χ,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π, моудрѣсти γ; 13 съдѣлавъ] om. γ,
сдѣлавыи θ; 13 иже] и μ; 13 промысломъ] твоимъ промысломъ α,ζ,η,χ,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π,
ρ; 69.13–70.1 и многоу] многоу i;

12–70.8 всю тварь ... прѣч(е)стн(ое)] missing sheets in β;

13–70.14 съдѣлавъ ... until end] missing sheets in γ;

- гою бл(а)гостию • вѣвѣдъ ны въ прѣч(н)стыа дни сиа • къ очище-
 нию д(у)шамъ и тѣломъ • къ оудържанию страсти • къ надѣжи въскъ-
 3 сениа • иже четыремидесаты дни • на дѣскахъ скрижали въроучивъ
 в(ог)ъ(на) чертанаа писмьна • оугоднику твоямоу мостѣвн • подажь намъ
 бл(а)же • подвигъ добрыи подвижатиса • теченик поста съвършити •
 6 вѣроу неразоученоу съблюсти • главы невидимыхъ змикъ съкроушити •
 и повѣдителя грѣхоу явитиса • и неосоуженно донти и поклонитиса еѣтомуу
 твоямоу въскрѣсенню • яко бл(а)гос(ло)виса и прослависа прѣч(е)стѣн(ое)
 9 люд(н)амн(нъ) • бѣди има г(о)с(под)не • г̄ •
 поп прекр(ъ)ста люд(н) • бл(а)г(о)с(ло)в(е)ник г(о)с(под)не на
 нас всегда нына :-
 12 мол(н)тва потребити хотѣше •
 кончавъше б(о)ж(е)ствноюу тиноу • и слоужбоу славоу и
 бл(а)годареник всылаемъ о(т)цю и с(ы)ну и сѣ(ом)у

1 бл(а)гостию •] бл(а)г(о)д(а)тью Ѡ,ν; 1 вѣвѣдъ ны] вѣведи ны μ; 1 дни]
 om. α,η,ι,λ; 1 къ] и къ ζ,ο,ξ,π,ρ; 2 оудържанию] въздѣржанью ε,ζ; 2 страсти]
 стр(а)ст(ь)мъ ξ; 2 къ] и къ α,ε,ζ,ι,μ,ο,ξ,π; 3 на] ι на ν; 3 дѣскахъ] om.
 μ,ο,π,ρ; 3 скрижали] om. ζ, скрижалию ε, скрижалехъ ο; 3 въроучивъ] въру-
 чивы и ε,η, врѣци ι; 4 писмьна] твоя писмена η; 4 подажь] подажь и α,
 подан же ε,ζ,η,Ѡ,ι,ξ,π, и подажь ρ; 5 подвигъ добрыи] подвиг(о)мъ добрым
 ε добрый подвигъ η; 5 подвижатиса] подвижавшеса ι; 5 теченик] и теченык
 ζ,ν,π; 6 вѣроу] и вѣру Ѡ,ξ,π; 6 неразоученоу] неразоучимъ ζ,ι,μ; 6 съблюсти]
 сблюди и ι; 6 главы] и глав(ы) ζ,Ѡ,ο,π,ρ; 6-7 и повѣдителя грѣхоу] и повѣ-
 дителемъ грѣха α,ε,Ѡ,μ,ν,ο,ξ,π, повѣдителямъ грѣха η,ζ,ρ, повѣдителямъ грѣху ι;
 7 и неосоуженно] и нѣосоуженномъ α,ε,ζ,η,Ѡ, μ,ξ,π, неосоуженно ι, неосоуженомъ
 ο,ρ; 7 и поклонитиса] поклонитиса η; 8 твоямоу въскрѣсенню] воскр(е)с(е)нью
 твояму π; 8 яко] и яко ι; 8 бл(а)гос(ло)виса] om. ι 8 прѣч(е)стѣн(ое)] om.
 ε, past прѣч(е)стѣн(ое) add. и великолѣпно имъ твое α,ζ,η,ι, μ,ν,ξ, и великолѣпок
 имъ π,ρ past твое add. w(т)ца и с(ы)на и сѣ(а)го д(у)ха ζ,η,μ,ν,ξ о(т)ца и с(ы)на
 и сѣ(а)го ι, past д(у)ха add. всегда и нына и присно в вѣкы вѣкомъ аминь :- ζ, и
 великолѣпно(е) имъ. w(т)ца и с(ы)на и сѣ(а)го д(у)ха :- μ, past прѣч(е)стѣн(ое)
 add. и великолѣпно имъ w(т)ца и си(на) ο; 9-11] om. all manuscripts except π,
 таж(е). бѣди има г(о)с(под)не .г. жѣд(ы). а поп бл(а)г(о)с(ло)в(е)нык г(оспод)-
 не н(а) насъ всегда и ны(на) таж(е). попъ. π; 12 потребити] похранити ν;
 12 хотѣше] om. ξ, дар(ы) ζ,Ѡ,ι,ν, хотѣша :- свершишася η, хотѣше дар(ы) ρ; 13-
 14 кончавъше ... и сѣ(ом)у] хвалимъ тѣ х(ри)с(т)е в(о)ж(е) нашъ. на семъ мѣ(сте)
 сѣ(ом)ъ. на немъ же лежить сѣла сѣ(ы)хъ тиннь. и товѣ славу всылаемъ w(т)цю ξ;
 13 тиноу и слоужбоу] тиннюу службоу ζ,ο,π,ρ, службу тинюу η,Ѡ; 13 славоу] и
 славу ι,ν; 14 о(т)цю] со w(т)цемъ ζ; 14 и с(ы)ну] om. ο, с(ы)н(о)мъ ζ; 14 и
 сѣ(ом)у] om. α,ο, и съ прѣсѣ(ты)мъ и бл(а)гымъ животворящимъ д(у)хомъ тво-
 нимъ • и нына и пр(и)сно ζ, past и сѣ(ом)у add. д(у)ху • и всегда и ны(не) δ,
 д(у)ху ι нына ι присно ι въ вѣкы вѣк(овъ) η, д(у)ху Ѡ, д(у)хоу и нына и присно
 μ,ν,π, д(у)хоу ι нын(е) ρ;

2-70.14 и тѣломъ ... until end] missing sheets in x;
 3 скрижали] erased in ζ;

Vespers in α

въход(итъ). гл(аго)л(е)тъ. поп. мол(итвѣ). шбычноую.
таж(е). прок(именъ). таж(е). днак(онъ). пр(ѣ)м(ѣ)дрос(тъ). таж(е). паре-
мью.

и пак(и). ишедъ. днак(онъ). съ кадилицею. и съ трѣми свѣщами. гл(аго)-
л(е)тъ. свѣтъ х(ри)с(то)въ просвѣщаѣтъ. таж(е). пр(ѣ)м(ѣ)дрос(тъ). таж(е). па-
ремыю.

таж(е). прок(именъ). да оуповаѣтъ из(раи)ль на г(оспод)а стих г(оспод)и не
възнесеса ср(ъ)дце мое.

Vespers in γ

вынидететь • поп • і дѣак(онъ) • съ кадѣлице(е)ю

і р(е)четь • преоудрос(тъ) • люд(и) свѣ(тъ) тыхъ :-

3 і р(е)ч(еть) вънмѣм поп миръ всем прок(и)мо(нъ) иже въ парим(ъи) • таж(е)
• ѿ бытѣи • ѿ • парим(ъи) :-

таж(е) • про(к)именъ • ѿ • и тѣгда • вынидетъ • съ кади(о)мъ і р(е)четъ

6 • свѣтъ х(ри)с(то)въ :- таж(е) ѿ • парим(ъ)ю •

таж(е) • да са исправитъ м(о)л(и)тва

Vespers in δ

вынидетъ • поп • и днак(онъ) • съ кадѣлицею • и творитъ • поп выхо-
дѣноую •

3 и речеть • днак(онъ) свѣтъ тихъ стѣша • люд(и) • славы вѣсьмьр(тнаго)
и посемь • прок(и)м(енъ) :- таж(е) :- пармию •

а по первой паремьи • вышед поп съ • ѿ • ми свѣщами • и съ кадѣлицею

6 • и речеть • свѣтъ х(ри)с(то)въ просвѣщаѣтъ • вса ны •

мир ти • преудрос(тъ) • да са исправитъ • а стих г(оспод)и възвахъ •

Vespers in ϵ

выдет. поп. с кадилицею. и творит. мол(итвѣ). вѣч(е)рѣ заут(ра) пол(ѣ)дне.
и реч(еть) дѣак(онъ). свѣт тихъ стѣ(ша).

таж(е). прок(именъ) и паремьи.

таж(е). да са исправит.

Vespers in ζ

выидетъ поп • и дѣак(онъ) • с кадилицею • и творит • мол(итвѣ) • выходѣноу
:-

и речет • дѣак(онъ) • пр(ѣ)м(ѣ)дрос(тъ) • люд(и) свѣтъ тихъ •

и посем • прок(именъ) • иже в паремьи • и паремью

и выидетъ • дѣак(онъ) с кадилом и со свѣтилом • и реч(еть) • свѣтъ х(ри)-
с(т)о(въ) таж(е) • паремья

7 таж(е) • да са исправитъ м(о)л(и)тва] in margin γ ;

5 а по первой ... г(оспод)и възвахъ] in margin δ ;

и посем · си(ε) да оуповаєть из(ран)ль ·:-· стих г(о)с(под)и не вознесє(ε)
ср(ь)дце мок ·

в п(о)нед(ѣ)льникъ · ā · нед(ѣ)ли · пос(та) проким(енъ) да сѧ исправитъ ·
стих · г(о)с(под)и възвахъ к тебѣ ·

Vespers in η

выидеть поп · дьякон с кад(и)лицею · і створить мол(итву) выходн(и)ю
в(ε)черъ заутра ·

р(ε)чет дьякон · свѣт тих

посемъ прок(и)м(енъ) · таж(ε) · паремю ·

таж(ε) пѣнье да оуповаєть из(ран)ль на г(оспод)а ·

таж(ε) · в пѣток

в понед(ѣ)льникъ · ā · нед(ѣ)ли пос(та)

выидет прок(именъ) въ паремі оѡ быт(и)а · ā

выидет дьякон с кад(и)ломъ · съ свѣщам(и) · аще ли не бѣд(еть) · дьякон
· поп · по прок(имнѣ) · р(ε)чет · свѣт х(ри)с(то)въ пр(о)с(в)ѣщаетъ всѧ пр(ѣ)-
м(и)др(о)сть ·:-·

таж(ε) · чтение · б̄ ·

таж(ε) · да сѧ исправитъ м(о)л(и)тва мо(а) ·:-·

таж(ε) · і до велик(аго) дни ·:-·

Vespers in θ

выидеть поп и дьяк(онъ) с кадиллицею ·

и р(ε)четъ премѣдрос(тъ) · свѣт тихъ стѣла ·:-·

таж(ε) · прок(именъ) · иже в паремь ·

таж(ε) · б̄ · прок(именъ) ·

и тогда дьяк(онъ) выидет с кадиллицею · и двѣ свѣш(и) преди носим

и реч(еть) свѣт х(ри)с(то)въ просвѣщаетъ всѧк премѣдрос(тъ) · таж(ε) ·
паремю ·

таж(ε) · прок(именъ) · да сѧ исправитъ м(о)л(и)тв(а) ·

Vespers in ι

г(о)с(под)и бл(а)г(о)с(ло)ви ш(т)це

иже в паремь · чтенык · ā · κ · ѿ бытъа

3 по сконцань паремь · изидет дьякон · с кадиломъ · и свѣщамь и р(ε)четъ
свѣтъ х(ри)с(то)въ просвѣщаетъ чтенык · б̄ · κ · ѿ приточъ)

потом да сѧ исправит

6 потом стих(и)ры на г(о)с(под)и възвахъ

Vespers in κ

поп. выидет с кадил(лицею). и творить м(о)л(и)тву веч(ε)р и

дьяк(онъ). пр(ѣ)м(и)др(о)сть. люд(и) свѣтъ тих.

таж(ε) парем(и)а.

таж(ε) да сѧ исправитъ м(олитва) ·:-·

1] written in cursive uncial in place of the title ι;

Vespers in λ

ВЫНИДЕТЬ ПОП НА ВЫХОДЪ -:- и ДЬЯК(ОНЪ) • С КАДЕЛЬНИЦЕЮ • А ТВОРИТЬ ПОП
МОЛ(ИТВУ) ВЫХОДНЮЮ -:- ВЕЧЕРЪ И ЗАУТРА •
ДЬЯКОН Р(Е)ЧЕТЪ • ПРЕМУДРОС(ТЬ) • ЛЮД(И) • СВѢТЪ ТЫ(ХЪ) СЪТЪПА • ПА СЛАВ(Ы)

•
ТАЖ(Е) ПАРЕМЬЯ •
И ПОТОМЪ • ПѢНИКЪ СЕ • ДА • ОУПОВАЕТЪ ИЗ(РАИ)ЛЬ НА Г(ОСПОД)А • СТИХ •
Г(ОСПОД)И НЕ ВЪЗНЕСЕА СР(Ъ)ДЦЕ •
И ВСА СЛУЖ(БА) • ПО РАДУ • ТАКОЖ(Е) • И ВЪ ПАТ(ОКЪ) -:-
ВЪ ПОНЕД(ѢЛЬНИКЪ) • .ā • НЕД(ѢЛИ) • ПОСТА •
ТАКОЖ(Е) ВЫХОД • ТАКО ЖЕ КЕСТЪ РЕЧ(Е)НО •
ТАЖЕ ПРОК(ИМЕНЬ) • СЪ ПАРЕМЬЮ • Ѡ ВЫТЪПА • ИСКОНИ СТВОРИ В(ОГ)Ъ •
ТАЖ(Е) ВЫНИДЕТ • ДЬЯКОН • С КАДѢЛЬНИЦЕЮ • И Р(Е)ЧЕТЪ • СВѢТЪ Х(РИ)С(ТО)ВЪ
ПРОСВѢЩАЕТЪ ВСА НЫ ПРЕМУДРОС(ТЬ) • ТАЖ(Е) • БЮ ПАРЕМЬЮ •
И ПОТОМЪ • ДА СЯ ИСПРАВИТЬ • СТИХ Г(ОСПОД)И ВОЗВАХЪ •
И ПОП ПОКЛОНИТСА ПРѢДЪ ТРАПЕЗОЮ •
СИЦЕ ПѢТ(И) ДО ВЕЛИКАГО ПАТКА •

Vespers in μ

ВЫДЕТ. ПОП. И ДЬЯКОН. СЪ КАДИЛНИЦЕЮ. И ГЛА(АГОЛ)ЕТЪ. МОЛ(ИТВУ). ВЫХОД(ИЮ).
ВЕЧЕРЪ ЗАУТРА -:-
И РЕЧЕТ. ДЬЯКОН. СВѢТЪ ТИХЪ СЪТЪПА. ЛЮД(И) ВСЕМ(Е)РТНАГО Ѡ(Т)ЦА Н(Е)Б(Е)СНАГО.
ПОСЕМ. ПРОКЫМ(ЕНЪ). ВЕЧЕРНИИ. ПО ШЫЧАЮ. ТАЖ(Е). ПАРЕМЬИ.
ТАЖ(Е). ПѢН(И)КЪ. ДА ОУПОВАЕТЪ ИЗ(РАИ)ЛЬ НА Г(О)С(ПОД)А. ЛЮД(И). ТОЖЕ.
ПѢВ(Е)Ц. СТИХ. Г(О)С(ПОД)И НЕ ВЪЗНЕСЕА СР(Ъ)ДЦЕ. ЛЮД(И). ДА ОУПОВАЕТЪ ИЗ(РАИ)ЛЬ
-:- ДО КОНЦА. ПѢВ(Е)Ц ТОЖ(Е). ДА ОУПОВАЕТЪ ИЗ(РАИ)Л -:- ЛЮД(И). КОНЕЦЪ. РЬКОУТ
-:- ѠСЕЛѢ И ДО ВѢКА. ПѢВ(Е)Ц. ТОЖ(Е). ѠНЫНѢ И ДО ВѢКА -:-
ТАКОЖ(Е). И В ПАТОК. СЛОУЖИТИ -:-
А В ПОНЕД(ѢЛЬНИКЪ) .ā. НЕД(ѢЛИ). ПОСТА -:- ПО СТ(И)Х(ИРАХЪ)
ВЫДЕТ. ПОП. И ДЬЯКОН. СЪ КАДИЛНИЦЕЮ. И РЕЧЕТ. ДЬЯК(ОНЪ). СВѢТЪ ТИХЪ
СЪТ(ЫА) -:-
ДЬЯК(ОНЪ). ВОМѢМ. ПОП. МИРЪ ВС(Е)М -:- ЛЮД(И) И Д(У)Х(О)ВИ ТВОКМЪ -:-
ДЬЯК(ОНЪ). ПРЕМ(У)ДРОС(ТЬ). ПѢВЕЦ. ПРОК(ИМЕНЬ). ИЖЕ В ПАРЕМЬИ -:- ПОТОМ.
Ѡ ВЫТЪПА ЧТ(ЕН)Ь(Е) .ā.
И ТАКО Ж(Е) КОНЧАЕТЪ. ЧТЕН(ИЕ) .ā. ВЫДЕТ ДЬЯК(О)Н -:- СЪ КАДИЛНИЦЕЮ. И СЪ
СВѢЩАМА. ИЗЪ ВАТАРА(А). А ПѢВЕЦ. ПОКЕТ. ПРОК(ИМЕНЬ) .б.
И ТАКО Ж(Е). КОНЧАЕТ. ПРОК(ИМЕНЬ). И РЕЧЕТ -:- СВѢТЪ Х(РИ)С(ТО)ВЪ ПРОСВѢ-
ЩАЕТЪ ВСА. И ИДЕТ В ОЛТАРЬ -:-
И РЕЧЕТ. ПРЕМОУДРОС(ТЬ). ПѢВ(Е)Ц. Ѡ ПРИТОЧ. ЧТЕН(ИЕ) .б.
ТАЖ(Е). ПѢН(ИЕ) -:- ДА СЯ ИСПРАВИТЬ М(О)Л(И)Т(ВА) -:- СТИХ .в. Г(О)С(ПОД)И
ВОЗВАХЪ К ТОВ(Ѣ) -:-
СИЦЕ ЖЕ ПѢТИ. ДО ВЕЛИКАГ(О). ПАТКА.

Vespers in ν

ПОЮТЪ. ПРОК(ИМЕНЬ). І ПАРЕМІ(Ю).
И ПОСЕМ ДА СЯ ИСПРАВИТЬ М(О)Л(И)Т(ВА) -:-
СТИХ Г(О)С(ПОД)И ВЪЗВАХЪ -:-

Vespers in ξ

бывает. выход с кад(и)лом • поп. творит. мол(итвѣ) выходнѣю.
 посемь дыакон р(е)чет пр(ѣ)м(ѣ)др(о)сть свѣт тих люд(и) р(е)кѣт сѣтъна сла-
 в(ы).

таж(е) прок(именъ). в паремь. і чететса парема.

таж(е) поют да сѣ исправит мол(итва). стих • ā • г(о)с(поди) возвах. стих
 • Б • положи г(о)с(поди) и сохранен(и)е. егда ж(е) ерѣи поют да сѣ исправ(итса).
 тогда бывают поклон(ы) великиа

Vespers in o

выдет поп на выходъ съ кадилницею. и творит. мол(итвѣ). выход(нѣю). ве-
 черъ заутра полуд(не).

дыак(онъ) р(е)четъ • прем(ѣ)др(о)сть прости. люд(и) • свѣтъ тихъ сѣтъна
 слав(ы) • и поидет въ алтарь гл(агол)а вл(а)г(о)с(ловн)но вхож(д)еные х(ри)-
 с(т)а истиннаго в(ог)а нашего. всегда и нын(ѣ)

таж(е) прок(именъ) дн(е)вныи. таж(е) паремью. •

таж(е) дыак(онъ) р(е)четъ. свѣтъ х(ри)с(то)въ просвѣщають вса ны

прем(ѣ)др(о)ст -:- таж(е) паремью •

таж(е) пѣнык да • оуповаеть из(ран)ль на г(о)с(под)а ѿныне и до вѣка -:-
 стих. г(о)с(под)и не възнесеса ср(ъ)дце мок.

се же і въ пѣток тоа нед(ѣли).

в понед(ѣльникъ) • ā • нед(ѣли) поста. по паремь прок(именъ) да сѣ ис-
 править. стих г(о)с(под)и възвахъ к тов(ѣ) -:-

се же пои и до велик(а)го пѣтка.

Vespers in π

выидеть. попъ. и дѣ(а)кианъ съ кадиломъ. и творить. мол(итвѣ) выходнѣю.
 вечеръ заутра пол(удне).

дыак(онъ). р(е)четъ. прем(ѣ)др(о)сть. и люд(и) свѣтъ тихъ.

посемь. прок(именъ). в(е)чернии. таж(е) паремья.

таж(е) пѣнык се. да оуповають из(ран)ль на г(оспода). стих. г(оспод)и не воз-
 неси ср(ъ)дце мок

тако же и в пѣт(окъ).

и въ понед(ѣльникъ) • ā • нед(ѣли) поста. по ст(и)х(и)рахъ. выидеть. попъ.
 и дѣ(а)кианъ. съ кадиломъ.

и р(е)четъ. дыак(онъ). прем(ѣ)др(о)сть. и люд(и) свѣтъ тихъ.

дыак(онъ). вонмѣм. поп. миръ всѣмъ. люд(и). д(ѣ)х(о)ви твоимѣ. дыак(онъ).
 прем(ѣ)др(о)сть. таж(е) прок(именъ). иже в паремь. и кончаютъ чтеные первое.

таж(е) прок(именъ) . Б . и выидеть. попъ. с кадилом. тако же кончаютъ прок(и-
 менъ). и р(е)четъ. прем(ѣ)др(о)сть. попъ. речеть. свѣтъ х(ри)с(то)въ просвѣщаютъ
 вса ны. и идеть во алтарь.

таж(е). чтеные . Б .к .

и посемь. да сѣ исправить. а попъ. станеть и поклонитса предъ трапезою

Vespers in ρ

вынидетъ поп • с кадилицъ • и гл(аголе)тъ мол(итвѣ) • вечеръ заоутра и полудн(е) •

и р(е)четъ • дьяк(онъ) • свѣтъ ты(хъ) стѣша слав(ы) • люд(и) бесм(е)ртънаго о(т)ца) :-

посемь • прок(именъ) вечернии • таж(е) • паремью •

таж(е) • пѣньк • гл(а)с • ѿ • да оуповакть из(ран)ль на г(оспод)а ѿнын(е) :- стих • г(оспод)и не възнесеса ср(ъ)дце м(ое) :-

и по радѣ • литургіа пос(т)нама :-

также • и в пѣт(окъ) • тоа нед(ѣ)ли :-

в понед(ѣ)льникъ • ѿ • нед(ѣ)ли • пос(та) • по ст(и)х(и)ражъ. вынидетъ. поп. и дьяк(онъ). съ кадилиц(ею) • и гл(аголе)тъ мол(итвѣ) • вечеръ заоутра и :-

и реч(ет) • дьяк(онъ) • свѣтъ ты(хъ) стѣша :- люд(и) • бесм(е)ртънаго о(т)ца) •

посемь прок(именъ) • иже в паремьи • потом • чтеник ѿ выт(и)а •

и потом вынидетъ попъ с кад(и)ломъ • и свѣтиломъ • и р(е)четъ свѣтъ х(ри)с(то)въ просвѣщаеъ вса ны прем(ѣ)дро(сть)

таж(е) • чтеник • ѿ приточ •

и потом • пѣньк • да са исправит м(о)л(и)т(ва) :- стих • г(оспод)и возвах

.

Communion in α

таж(е). прѣломить по обычаю. и причаститьса. таж(е) дьяк(онъ). покадитъ стѣ(а) дары гл(агол)а. възнесиса на н(е)б(е)са в(ож)е. попъ. всегда и нынѣ и присно и въ :- попъ. м(о)л(и)твоу. въ преносъ. таи(но)

Communion in γ

и преломить по обычаю • таж(е) • причаститьса :- мол(итва) • таи(но) • по принесени • ст(и)хъ • таи

Communion in δ

и потомъ все по обычаю :- мол(итва) • по причащени :- таи(но)

Communion in ζ

и причастатьса по обычаю • мол(итва) по причащен(и)

Communion in θ

причащаются(а) по обычаю :- кѣнаник :- вкүсите і вид(е)те :- мол(итва) :- по причасты γ, кен(аник) :- вкүсите и в(идете) :- мол(итва) по причас(т)и

Communion in χ

поп. ѿ ст(а)го хлѣба влагает в потырь гл(агол)а :- смѣшеник ст(а)го тѣла и крове х(ри)с(т)а в(ог)а :- причастатьса(а). възнесеса на н(е)б(е)са в(ож)е. пѣвци. хвалим тѣ х(ри)с(т)е в(ож)е :- мол(итва). по прич(а)стѣи :-

Communion in λ

таж⟨ε⟩ • поп • прѣломит хлѣвъ • на четыри части по обычаю • и влагають въ чашю часть • и дьякон положит • оурарь на трапѣзѣ • и р⟨ε⟩четь • исполни ш⟨тъ⟩че • чашю сию -:- поп же въкладаа речет • исполнениѣ сѣт⟨а⟩го д⟨у⟩ха • дьякон • аминь • и причаститсѣ • поп • и дьяк⟨онъ⟩ • пѣвци • кин⟨аникъ⟩ • поють въкусите и видите таж⟨ε⟩ • покадит • сѣтѣа дары -:- гл⟨агол⟩а сице ш тан⟨не⟩ • възнесисѣ на н⟨ε⟩б⟨ε⟩са б⟨ож⟩ε • поп • възглас • всѣгда и нынѣ • и присн⟨о⟩ -:- пѣвци • хвалимъ тѣ х⟨рист⟩ε б⟨ож⟩ε нашъ яко сподовил ны кси • причаститсѣ сѣт⟨ε⟩мъ тѣлѣ твоѣмъ • и ч⟨ъ⟩стѣнѣи крѣви твоѣи • излишан⟨е⟩и за в⟨ъ⟩сь миръ • въ устава⟨енне⟩

Communion in μ

дьякон. исполни ш⟨тъ⟩че чашю сию -:- поп речет. исполнениѣ сѣт⟨а⟩го д⟨у⟩ха -:- сѣт⟨итѣ⟩ль. мол⟨итвѣ⟩. тан⟨но⟩. по причас⟨тнн⟩ -:-

Communion in ο

и причастатсѣ по обычаю -:- мол⟨итва⟩ ѱ, кѣн⟨аникъ⟩. въкусите. и приапстатсѣ по обычаю -:- и покадите около пр⟨ѣ⟩ст⟨о⟩ла. гл⟨агол⟩а таи⟨но⟩ -:- възнесисѣ на н⟨ε⟩б⟨ε⟩са б⟨ож⟩ε. и по всеи земли слава твоѣа -:- мол⟨итва⟩ тан⟨но⟩.

Communion in π

взем попъ дастъ сѣт⟨а⟩го хлѣва. и влагаетъ въ потир гл⟨агол⟩а смѣшен⟨и⟩к сѣт⟨а⟩го тѣл⟨а⟩ дьяк⟨он⟩и. вливаекъ оурарь. р⟨ε⟩ч⟨ет⟩ • исполни ш⟨тц⟩че чаш⟨у⟩. и прич⟨а⟩статсѣ по обыч⟨а⟩ю. мол⟨итва⟩ таи⟨но⟩ ξ, таж⟨ε⟩. преломить по обычаю. и вземъ сѣт⟨а⟩го тѣла часть. влагаа въ чашю гл⟨агол⟩етъ. исполнениѣ сѣт⟨а⟩го д⟨у⟩ха. дьяк⟨онъ⟩. положь оурарь на трапѣзѣ. и р⟨ε⟩четъ. исполни ш⟨т⟩че. и поють. кѣн⟨аникъ⟩. вкусите. таж⟨ε⟩. попъ. мо⟨литвѣ⟩ в тан⟨не⟩

Communion in ρ

поп • преломить по обычаю • и вземъ часть ѿ сѣт⟨а⟩го тѣла • прекр⟨ε⟩щаа чаш⟨у⟩ • гл⟨аголе⟩тъ • смѣшенниѣ ч⟨ε⟩стнаго тѣла и крове г⟨оспод⟩а нашего и⟨и⟩с⟨уса⟩ х⟨риста⟩ -:- дьяк⟨он⟩ • исполни о⟨т⟩че чашю сию • поп • исполнениѣ сѣт⟨а⟩го д⟨у⟩ха • ами⟨нь⟩ пѣвци • кенаник • вкусите и вид⟨ете⟩ -:- поп • и дьяк⟨он⟩ причастнитсѣ по обычаю -:- посем • поп • мол⟨итвѣ⟩ тан⟨но⟩

Articles

Andrei A. Orlov
Milwaukee, WI

ESCHATOLOGICAL YOM KIPPUR IN THE *APOCALYPSE OF ABRAHAM*: PART I. THE SCAPEGOAT RITUAL¹

Introduction

In the second part of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a Jewish pseudepigraphon written in the first centuries of the Common Era, its hero — the patriarch Abraham — encounters an angelic being appointed by God to be his celestial guide. This creature, named in the apocalypse as the angel Yahoel, baffles the seer's imagination with his enigmatic appearance. The text describes him as a composite pteromorphic being with a body shining like sapphire² and a face resembling chrysolite.³ The wardrobe of the angel also appears wondrous. Dressed in purple garments, he wears a turban reminiscent of "the bow in the clouds."⁴ Abraham also sees a golden staff in the right hand of his celestial companion.

Scholars have previously noted the sacerdotal significance of the angel's attire.⁵ Thus, Martha Himmelfarb argues that Yahoel's "wardrobe has strong priestly associations. The linen band around his head

(1) An expanded version of this article is forthcoming in *Henoah*.

(2) Slav. *сапфиръ*. B. PHILONENKO-SAYAR, M. PHILONENKO, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham. Introduction, texte slave, traduction et notes* (Paris: Librairie Adrien Maisonneuve, 1981) (*Semitica*, 31) 60.

(3) Slav. *хрысолитъ*. Ibid.

(4) "...and a turban (*кидаръ*) on his head like the appearance of the bow in the clouds..." A. KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* (Atlanta: Scholars, 2004) (*TCS*, 3) 19; PHILONENKO-SAYAR, PHILONENKO, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham...*, 60.

(5) Thus, Dan Harlow observes that "Yahoel's clothing ... indicates that he is the heavenly high priest: he wears a 'turban on his head like the appearance of the bow in the clouds,' his garments are purple, and he has a golden staff in his hand (11:2). These elements evoke the wardrobe and accoutrement of Aaron (Exodus 28; Numbers 17)." D. S. HARLOW, *Idolatry and Otherness: Israel and Nations in the Apocalypse of Abraham* (forthcoming).

recalls Aaron's headdress⁶ of fine linen (Ex. 28:39)."⁷ Other details of the angel's appearance also reveal his connections with the priestly office. Himmelfarb reminds us that the purple of Yahoel's robe betrays connections to one of the colors of the high-priestly garments of Exodus 28.⁸ The angel's golden staff also seems to have a sacerdotal meaning, invoking the memory of Aaron's rod which miraculously sprouted in the wilderness after Korah's rebellion "to indicate the choice of Aaron and his descendants as priests (Num. 17:16–26)."⁹

Himmelfarb also brings attention to the rainbow-like appearance of Yahoel's turban, which, in her opinion, "brings together the two central color schemes employed elsewhere in the description of God as high priest, whiteness and the multicolored glow."¹⁰

Indeed, the tradition about "the rainbow in the cloud" associated with the headgear of the highest ranking sacerdotal servant is known from several texts, including the description of the high priest Simon in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira 50:7.¹¹ Later rabbinic traditions¹² de-

(6) Jacob Milgrom observes that the high priest's head covering was a turban (מַצְנִיפָה) and not מַגְבַּעוֹת, the simpler headdresses of the ordinary priests (Exod. 28:39–40). J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 1–16* (New York: Doubleday, 1991) (Anchor Bible, 3) 1016.

(7) M. HIMMELFARB, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York—Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 62.

(8) HIMMELFARB, *Ascent to Heaven...*, 62.

(9) *Ibid.*, 62. Yahoel's role as a heavenly high priest is also hinted at later in the text (*Apoc. Ab.* 10:9) through his liturgical office as choirmaster of the Living Creatures, which is reminiscent of the liturgical office of Enoch-Metatron in the Merkabah tradition. Cf. A. ORLOV, *Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch and the Merkabah Tradition*, *JSP* 14.1 (2004) 3–24.

(10) HIMMELFARB, *Ascent to Heaven...*, 62.

(11) "Greatest of his brothers and the beauty of his people was Simeon the son of Johanan the priest ... how honorable was he as he gazed forth from the tent, and when he went forth from the house of the curtain; like a star of light from among clouds, and like the full moon in the days of festival; and like the sun shining resplendently on the king's Temple, and like the rainbow which appears in the cloud" C. N. R. HAYWARD, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996) 41–42.

(12) One of the extensive descriptions of קָדָשׁ is found in the *Book of Zohar* which describes its unusual luminosity: "[Rabbi Simeon] began quoting: 'And they made the plate of the holy crown of pure gold, [and wrote upon it a writing, like the engravings of a signet: Holy to the Lord]' (Exodus 39:30). Why was this plate called קָדָשׁ? It means 'being seen, to be looked at.' Since

scribe the high priest's front-plate (יָרֵאֵ), which he wore on his forehead.¹³ Made of gold and inscribed with the divine Name, the plate shone like a rainbow.¹⁴

The priestly affiliations of Abraham's celestial guide are not coincidental. He appears in the crucial juncture of the story at which the young hero of the faith has just left his father's destroyed sanctuary that had been polluted by idolatrous worship and is now called by God "to set a pure sacrifice" before the deity. In this respect Yahoel appears to be envisioned in the text not merely as an *angelus interpres* whose role is to guide a visionary on his heavenly journey, but as a priestly figure initiating an apprentice into celestial sacerdotal praxis. Scholars have previously reflected on the peculiar cultic routine that surrounds the relationship between Abraham and his celestial guide as he explains to the seer how to prepare the sacrifices, deliver praise to the deity, and enter the heavenly Throne room. Indeed, the intensity of these sacerdotal instructions and preparations hints at the importance of priestly praxis for the overall conceptual framework of the text. It also appears that in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, as in many other Jewish accounts, including *1 Enoch* 14 and the *Testament of Levi* 8 the entrance of a seer into the celestial realm reveals the cultic dimension and is envisioned as a visitation of the heavenly temple. Thus, scholars have previously noted that the authors of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* seem to view heaven as a temple.¹⁵ This emphasis on the links of

it was there to be seen by people, it was called יָרֵאֵ. Whoever looked upon this plate was recognized by it. The letters of the holy name were inscribed and engraved upon this plate, and if the person who stood in front of it was righteous, the letters inscribed in the gold would stand out from bottom to top and would shine out from the engravings, and illuminate the person's face." (*Zohar* II.217b) I. TISHBY, *The Wisdom of the Zohar: An Anthology of Texts*, 3 vols. (London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1989) Vol. 3. 920–921.

(13) Ex 39:30–31 "They made the rosette of the holy diadem of pure gold, and wrote on it an inscription, like the engraving of a signet, 'Holy to the Lord.' They tied to it a blue cord, to fasten it on the turban above ..."

(14) *b.* Yoma 37a.

(15) In this respect Himmelfarb observes that "the heaven of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is clearly a temple. Abraham sacrifices in order to ascend to heaven, then ascends by means of the sacrifice, and joins in the heavenly liturgy to protect himself during the ascent. ... The depiction of heaven as a temple confirms the importance of the earthly temple. The prominence of the heavenly liturgy lends importance to the liturgy of words on earth, which at the time of the apocalypse provided a substitute for sacrifice, a substitute

priestly praxis with the heavenly sanctuary does not appear coincidental in such a text as the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, which was written in a very special period of Jewish history. It was a time when, faced with a wide array of challenges revolving around the loss of the terrestrial sanctuary, the authors of the Jewish apocalyptic writings were seeking various theological alternatives for preserving and perpetuating traditional priestly practices. The *Apocalypse of Abraham* is drawing on one such option connected with the idea of the celestial sanctuary represented by the divine Chariot when it offers the story of the young hero of the faith who travels from the destroyed terrestrial shrine polluted by idols to the heavenly Temple.

Indeed, priestly concerns permeate not only the second apocalyptic section of the text, which deals with the patriarch's transition into the heavenly realm, but the fabric of the entire pseudepigraphon.¹⁶ It has also been previously noted that besides Yahoel, whom the text envisions as the heavenly high priest *par excellence*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* offers an extensive roster of other priestly characters, including "fallen" priests culpable for perverting true worship and polluting heavenly and terrestrial shrines. Thus, Dan Harlow observes that besides the two "positive" priestly servants represented by the high priest Yahoel and his priestly apprentice Abraham, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* also offers a gallery of negative priestly figures, including the "idolatrous priests" Terah and Nahor¹⁷ as well as the "fallen priest" Azazel.¹⁸ Harlow's observation is sound and one can safely assume

that in the apocalypse's view was to be temporary." HIMMELFARB, *Ascent to Heaven...*, 66.

(16) Thus, for example, Harlow views the whole structure of the work as the composition which includes five sacerdotal steps or "movements": "Abraham's separation from false worship (chs. 1–8); Abraham's preparation for true worship (chs. 9–14); Abraham's ascent for true worship (chs. 15–18); Abraham's vision of false worship (19:1–29:1–13); Abraham's vision of true worship restored (29:14–31:12)." HARLOW, *Idolatry and Otherness...*

(17) Alexander Kulik argues that the description of the sacrificial services of Terah's family found in the first chapter of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* "precisely follows the order of the Second Temple daily morning *tamid* service as it is described in the Mishna: first, priests cast lots (*Yoma* 2, 1–4; *Tamid* 1, 1–2; cf. also Luke 1:9), then they sacrifice in front of the sanctuary (*Tamid* 1–5), finishing their service inside (*Tamid* 6)." KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 86.

(18) Harlow's research helps to clarify the priestly status of Azazel by drawing on the structural parallelism between the high priestly profile of

that all the major characters of the Slavonic apocalypse have priestly affiliations.

All these details demonstrate the importance of priestly praxis in the conceptual framework of the Slavonic apocalypse, a work written at a time overshadowed by the challenging quest for priestly and liturgical alternatives that could compensate for the loss of the terrestrial sanctuary.

While identifying the priestly settings of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* does not pose significant difficulties, understanding the relationship between these sacerdotal rituals and initiations and a particular cultic setting or festival is more challenging. To what kind of Jewish festival might the order of Abraham's sacrifices and initiations be related? Several possibilities have been entertained. Ryszard Rubinkiewicz suggests that the priestly initiations of Abraham could be connected with the feast of *Shavuot* or Pentecost, which commemorates the giving of the Torah on Mount Sinai.¹⁹ To support this hypothesis, Rubinkiewicz appeals to certain "Mosaic" details of Abraham's priestly initiation, including references to the seer's forty-day fast and the naming of the place of the patriarch's sacrifices as Horeb.

While these hints of a *Shavuot* setting are valid, given the aforementioned complexity of the sacerdotal universe of the Slavonic apocalypse, it is possible that the priestly traditions found in the text are not limited to only one particular setting or festival but possibly reflect connections with several events of the liturgical year. Thus, some other symbolic features of the Slavonic apocalypse, including the figure of the main antagonist of the story Azazel, as well as pervasive usage of the terminology of two lots, suggest that the imagery of the distinctive rites taking place on the Day of Atonement might play a significant role in the authors' theological worldview.

This article examines the peculiar priestly traditions found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* that might reflect a Yom Kippur liturgical setting. The article will also try to show that some portions of the second, apocalyptic part of the pseudepigraphon can be seen as a re-enactment

Yahoel in chs. 10–11 and the Azazel's priestly profile in chs. 13–14. HARLOW, *Idolatry and Otherness...*

(19) R. RUBINKIEWICZ, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave. Édition critique du texte, introduction, traduction et commentaire* (Lublin, 1987) (Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego: Źródła i monografie, 129) 98–255, at 58–60.

of the Yom Kippur ritual, one of the most enigmatic cultic ceremonies of the Jewish tradition.

I. Mosaic Background of Abraham's Priestly Initiations and the Day of Atonement

Chapters 9–12 describe the beginning of Abraham's priestly initiation, during which Yahoel teaches the young hero of the faith how to prepare sacrifices in order to enter the presence of the Deity. Scholars have previously observed that some details of this initiation recall the story of another remarkable visionary of the Jewish tradition — the son of Amram, the seer who was privileged to receive a very special revelation on Mount Sinai.

As was already mentioned, the liturgical setting of Abraham's priestly initiation might be related to the Festival of Weeks — *Shavuot* or Pentecost.²⁰ This feast celebrates Moses' reception of revelation at Mount Sinai and is also known in Jewish tradition as the Festival of the Giving of Our Torah.

Indeed, as many scholars have already noted, some motifs found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* appear to reflect the peculiar details surrounding the reception of the Torah on Sinai by the great Israelite prophet. One of the distinctive hints here for establishing the connection with the Mosaic traditions is the theme of Abraham's forty-day fast.

This motif is first introduced in *Apoc. Ab.* 9:7, where God orders Abraham to hold a strict fast for forty days.²¹ It is noteworthy that, as in the Mosaic traditions, so in the Slavonic apocalypse this fast coincides with the promise of a divine revelation on a high mountain:

But for forty days abstain from every food which issues from fire, and from the drinking of wine, and from anointing [yourself] with oil. And then you shall set out for me the sacrifice which I have

(20) RUBINKIEWICZ, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave...*, 60.

(21) David Halperin notes the Mosaic flavor of this passage, observing that "in preparation, Abraham must abstain from meat, wine, and oil (*Apocalypse of Abraham*, chapter 9). The immediate source of this last detail seems to be Daniel 10:3. But, significantly, it recalls the abstentions of Moses and Elijah (Exodus 34:28, Deuteronomy 9:9, 18, 1 Kings 19:7–8); for like Moses and Elijah, Abraham is to have his experience on 'the Mount of God, the glorious Horeb....'" D. J. HALPERIN, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) (TSAJ, 16) 105.

commanded you, in the place which I shall show you on a high mountain.²²

The theme of the forty day fast on the mountain receives an even more distinctly “Mosaic” shape in chapter 12, where it coincides with another cluster of Mosaic traditions, including the reference to Horeb (a name for Sinai in some biblical passages) and information about the nourishment of a seer through the vision of a celestial being:

And we went, the two of us alone together, forty days and nights.
And I ate no bread and drank no water, because [my] food was to see
the angel who was with me, and his speech with me was my drink.
And we came to the glorious God’s mountains—Horeb.²³

Scholars often see in this passage an allusion to Exodus 34:28,²⁴ which reports that Moses was with God forty days and forty nights on Mount Sinai without eating bread or drinking water.²⁵ The refer-

(22) KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 17.

(23) *Ibid.*, 19.

(24) Dan Harlow observes that “the patriarch’s fasting for forty days is only one of several places in the apocalypse where the author models Abraham’s experience on Moses’, who according to Exod. 34:28 ‘was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights’ and ‘neither ate bread nor drank water.’” HARLOW, *Idolatry and Otherness...*

(25) Martha Himmelfarb observes that “the account in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* implicitly compares Abraham’s ascent to Moses’ experience at Sinai. Thus, for example, Abraham performs the sacrifice described in Genesis 15 at Mount Horeb (the name for Mount Sinai in some biblical sources) after forty days of fasting in the wilderness. The exegetical occasion for the association of Genesis 15 and Exodus 19–20 is the manifestation of the presence of God in smoke and fire in both passages.” HIMMELFARB, *Ascent to Heaven...*, 62. For the Mosaic background of the patriarch’s actions in chapter twelve see also N. L. CALVERT, *Abraham Traditions in Middle Jewish Literature: Implications for the Interpretation of Galatians and Romans* (Ph.D. diss.; Sheffield, 1993). Calvert observes that “the similarity between Abraham’s actions in chapter twelve and those of Moses are striking. He first travels to the mountain Horeb, known also in the Old Testament as Mt. Sinai, which is called ‘God’s mountain, glorious Horeb’ in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 12:3. Like Moses when he receives the law, Abraham spends forty days and nights on the mountain. Abraham is said neither to eat bread nor to drink water because his food ‘was to see angel who was with me, and his discourse with me was my drink.’ (*Apoc. Abr.* 12:1–2). Philo reflects a Jewish tradition of Moses’ time on the mount, saying that Moses neglected all meat and drink for forty days, because he had more excellent food than that in the contemplations with which he was inspired from heaven

ence to alternative nourishment through the vision of a celestial being again evokes the cluster of interpretive traditions associated in Second Temple²⁶ and rabbinic literature²⁷ with the figure of Moses.

Although the biblical accounts of Moses' and Elijah's theophanic experiences often "mirror" each other by sharing similar imagery,²⁸ David Halperin argues that in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* Mosaic traditions have greater formative value than traditions about Elijah. He notes that

... when the angel tells Abraham that he will see God "come straight towards us" (chapter 16), this reminds us that God "passes by" both Moses and Elijah (Exodus 33:22; 34:6; 1 Kings 19:11–12). But it is only

(*De Vita Moses* II.69). Because Mt. Horeb and Mt. Sinai are names for the same mountain, Abraham receives his revelation from God in the same place that Moses received God's commandments. Finally, as the Lord 'was like a devouring fire on the top of the mountain' in the Exodus account, so the fire on top of Mt. Horeb burns the sacrifices over which Abraham and the angel ascend to heaven where God also appears as fire." CALVERT, *Abraham Traditions in Middle Jewish Literature...*, 274.

(26) Box notes the connection of this idea of alternative nourishment with the Mosaic tradition found in Philo. He observes that "...there is a close parallel to our text in Philo, *Life of Moses*, III. 1, where it is said of Moses in the Mount: 'he neglected all meat and drink for forty days together, evidently because he had more excellent food than that in those contemplations with which he was inspired from above from heaven.'" G. H. BOX, J. I. LANDSMAN (eds.), *Apocalypse of Abraham* (London: Macmillan, 1918) (Translations of Early Documents, 1.10) 50.

(27) David Halperin elaborates this tradition of the unusual nourishment of the patriarch and its connection to Moses' feeding on the *Shekhinah* attested in some later rabbinic accounts. He notes that "...Moses also discovered that the divine presence is itself nourishment enough. That is why Exodus 24:11 says that Moses and his companions beheld God, and ate and drank. This means, one rabbi explained, that the sight of God was food and drink for them; for Scripture also says, 'In the light of the King's face there is life'.... We may assume that the author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* had such midrashim in mind when he wrote that 'my food was to see the angel who was with me, and his speech — that was my drink.'" HALPERIN, *The Faces of the Chariot...*, 111.

(28) Christopher Begg observes that "making Mt. Horeb (*Apoc. Ab.* 12:3) the site of this incident (contrast *Jubilees*, where it takes place at Hebron) serves to associate Abraham with the figures of Moses and Elijah, both of whom received divine communications at that site ..." C. BEGG, *Rereading of the "Animal Rite" of Genesis 15 in Early Jewish Narratives*, *CBQ* 50 (1988) 36–46 at 44.

Moses who is told in this connection that “you cannot see my face” and “my face shall not be seen” (33:20, 23), just as the angel goes on to tell Abraham that God “Himself thou shalt not see.” Moses, not Elijah, “bowed down upon the earth and prostrated himself” when God passed (34:8) — which explains Abraham’s frustrated urge to do the same thing (chapter 17).²⁹

Previous studies have convincingly demonstrated the importance of Mosaic typology for the authors of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, who decided to transfer several important Mosaic motifs into Abraham’s story. Yet, despite scholars’ thorough attention to the Mosaic background of the story, one portentous detail appears to have escaped their notice: Moses’ forty-day fast occurred immediately after his fight with idolatry and his destruction of the Golden Calf, when he returned to Sinai again to receive a second set of tablets from the deity.

It is intriguing that in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, as in the Exodus account, the forty-day fast follows the hero’s fight with idolatry. One can see a certain parallelism between the stories of the two visionaries. Like Moses who burns the Golden Calf (Exodus 32) and then fasts (Exodus 34), Abraham too is described earlier in the text as burning the idol of his father, a figurine bearing the name Bar-Eshath.³⁰ It is important that in both cases the transition to the initiatory purifying fast occurs immediately after the accounts dealing with idolatry and the demotion of idols.

The tradition of the hero’s fast that occurs after his fight with an idolatrous statue betrays distinctly priestly concerns and appears important for discerning the sacerdotal background of Abraham’s story and its possible connections with Day of Atonement traditions. Yet, the main question remains open: how can a Yom Kippur setting be reconciled with the Mosaic details of Abraham’s initiation, given that these details point unambiguously to the cluster of motifs associated with the *Shavuot* festival which celebrates Moses’ reception of the Tablets of the Law?

It is intriguing that later rabbinic writers identify the day on which Moses received the tablets of the law for a second time with another

(29) HALPERIN, *The Faces of the Chariot...*, 110.

(30) On the Bar-Eshath episode see A. ORLOV, “The Gods of My Father Terah”: Abraham the Iconoclast and the Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, *JSP* 18.1 (2008) 33–53; IDEM, Arboreal Metaphors and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, *HTR* 102 (2009) 439–451.

Jewish festival, the Day of Atonement. Thus, *b. Baba Bathra* 121a records the following tradition:

...One well understands why the Day of Atonement [should be such a festive occasion for it is] a day of pardon and forgiveness. [and it is also] a day on which the second Tables were given ...³¹

An almost identical tradition is found in *b. Taanith* 30b:

...R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: There never were in Israel greater days of joy than the fifteenth of Ab and the Day of Atonement. I can understand the Day of Atonement, because it is a day of forgiveness and pardon and on it the second Tables of the Law were given....³²

It appears that this cluster of traditions about the “day of pardon and forgiveness” draws on biblical traditions similar to the one found in Exodus 32:30, where, after the idolatry of the Golden Calf, Moses tells the people that he will go to the Lord asking for atonement of their sin.

Several midrashic passages make even more explicit this connection between the repentance of the Israelites after the idolatry of the Golden Calf in Exodus 33 and the establishment of Yom Kippur. In these materials the Israelites’ repentance serves as the formative starting point for observance of the Day of Atonement. Thus, *Eliyahu Rabbah* 17 reads:

When Israel were in the wilderness, they befouled themselves with their misdeeds, but then they bestirred themselves and repented in privacy, as is said, Whenever Moses went out to the Tent, all the people would rise and stand, each at the entrance of his tent, and gaze after Moses. And when Moses entered the tent, the pillar of cloud would descend and stand at the entrance of the Tent ... When all the people saw the pillar of cloud poised at the entrance of the Tent, all the people would rise and bow low, each at the entrance of his tent (Exod. 33:8, 9, 10), thus intimating that they repented, each one in the privacy of his tent. Therefore His compassion flooded up and He gave to them, to their children, and to their children’s children to the end of all generations the Day of Atonement as a means of securing His pardon.³³

(31) I. EPSTEIN (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud. Baba Bathra* (London: Soncino, 1938) 498.

(32) I. EPSTEIN (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud. Taanith* (London: Soncino, 1938) 161.

(33) *Tanna Debe Eliyahu: The Lore of the School of Elijah*. Tr. W. G. BRAUDE, I. J. KAPSTEIN (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1981) 190.

It is noteworthy that this passage from *Eliyahu Rabbah* invokes the memory of the familiar events found in Ex 33 which occurred immediately after the Golden Calf episode.³⁴ The midrashic evidence indicates that the rabbinic tradition attempts repeatedly to place the institution of Yom Kippur's atoning rites into the framework of the traditions surrounding Moses' reception of the second set of the Tablets of the Law.

Thus, a passage found in *Pirke de R. Eliezer* 46 unveils the tradition connecting Moses' vision of the Glory of God in Exodus 33 with the Day of Atonement:

(34) As can be seen, some midrashic materials try to connect the establishment of the Day of Atonement festival with repentance of the Israelites after the idolatry of the Golden Calf. Later Jewish mysticism deepens this connection even further when it interprets the scapegoat ritual in the light of the Golden Calf traditions. Thus some Jewish texts connect the Golden Calf episode with the beginning of the enigmatic practice of assigning a share to "the other side" in sacrificial ritual. Isaiah Tishby refers to the tradition found in the *Book of Zohar* according to which "... one of the consequences of Israel's sin with the Golden Calf was that 'the other side' was assigned a share in the sacrificial ritual." (Тішбѣ, *The Wisdom of the Zohar...*, 891). *Zohar* II, 242b tells that "...from that day the only thing they could do was to give a portion of everything to 'the other side' through the mystery of the sacrifices, the libation, and the whole-offerings." (Ibid., 891). In the dualistic framework of the Zoharic tradition the goat which is dispatched to Azazel comes to be understood as "the principal offering that is destined in its entirety for 'the other side.'" (Ibid., 821). Tishby notes that "in many passages [of the *Zohar*] this is described, following a late midrash, as a bribe that is offered to Samael. The *Zohar* quotes a number of parables to explain this matter of the bribe. One describes how a king wishes to rejoice with his son or his friends at a special meal. In order that the happy occasion should not be spoiled by the presence of ill-wishers and quarrelsome men, he orders a separate meal to be prepared for them. According to this parable the purpose of sending a goat to Azazel is to remove *sitra ahra* from the 'family circle' of Israel and the Holy One, blessed be He, on the Day of Atonement..." (Ibid., 892). These references to the later Jewish dualism connected with the Yom Kippur ritual are not completely irrelevant in light of the dualistic imagery of the two lots found in the Apocalypse of Abraham. Often, students of the Slavonic apocalypse try to interpret the dualistic developments found in the pseudepigraphon as later interpolations by the Bogomils. Yet, as we will see further in this investigation, the dualistic understanding of the Yom Kippur traditions found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and the *Zohar* can be traced to the Second Temple traditions found in the Dead Sea Scrolls where the imagery of the two lots was put in a dualistic eschatological framework.

Moses said: On the Day of Atonement I will behold the glory of the Holy One, blessed be He, and I will make atonement for the iniquities of Israel. Moses spake before the Holy One, blessed be He: Sovereign of all the universe! "Shew me, I pray thee, thy glory" (Ex. xxxiii, 18). The Holy One, blessed be He, said to him: Moses! Thou art not able to see My glory lest thou die, as it is said, "For men shall not see me and live" (Ibid, 20)...³⁵

This tradition of Moses' quest to behold the *Kavod*, now placed in the liturgical setting of the Day of Atonement, anticipates the vision of the concealed Glory of God in the Holy of Holies by the high priest on Yom Kippur.

It is even more important for our study, in view of the Mosaic traditions found in the Slavonic apocalypse, that several midrashic passages link Moses' forty-day ordeal on Sinai with the institution of the Day of Atonement. Thus, the passage found in *Pirke de R. Eliezer* 46 preserves the following tradition:

The Son of Bethera said: Moses spent forty days on the mount, expounding the meaning of the words of the Torah, and examining its letters. After forty days he took the Torah, and descended on the tenth of the month, on the Day of Atonement, and gave it as an everlasting inheritance to the children of Israel, as it is said, "And this shall be unto you an everlasting statute" (Lev. xvi. 34).³⁶

It is also intriguing that the passage from *Pirke de R. Eliezer* links the revelation given to the son of Amram with the instructions about Yom Kippur in Leviticus 16. Another passage, *Eliyahu Zuta* 4, goes even further by connecting the forty-day fast that preceded Moses' reception of the tablets for a second time with the establishment of the practice of self-denial on Yom Kippur:

During the last forty days when Moses went up a second time to Mount Sinai to fetch the Torah, Israel decreed for themselves that the day be set aside for fasting and self-affliction. The last day of the entire period, the last of the forty, they again decreed self-affliction and spent the night also in such self-affliction as would not allow the Inclination to evil to have any power over them. In the morning they rose early and went up before Mount Sinai. They were weeping as they met Moses, and Moses was weeping as he met them, and at

(35) G. FRIEDLANDER, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (New York: Hermon Press, 1965) 364.

(36) *Ibid.*, 362.

length that weeping rose up on high. At once the compassion of the Holy One welled up in their behalf, and the holy spirit gave them good tidings and great consolation, as He said to them: My children, I swear by My great name that this weeping will be a joyful weeping for you because this day will be a day of pardon, atonement, and forgiveness for you — for you, for your children, and for your children's children until the end of all generations.³⁷

All this evidence from the rabbinic literature indicates that in later Jewish interpretation Moses' fight with idolatry, his forty-day fast, his vision of the deity, and his reception of the portentous revelation on Sinai were understood as a chain of formative events linked to the establishment of the Yom Kippur ceremony. Moreover, some of these traditions envisioned Moses' ordeal as the cosmic prototype of the symbolic actions that, while the Temple still stood, were re-enacted annually by the high priest in the Holy of Holies.

Now it is time to return to the Slavonic apocalypse, where a very similar constellation of motifs is found. It is possible that by evoking this particular cluster of Mosaic traditions the authors of the apocalypse were attempting to connect the patriarch's sacrificial practices on Mount Horeb with Moses' receiving the tablets of the law for the second time, the event which later rabbinic traditions interpreted as the inauguration of the Yom Kippur holiday.

It is intriguing that in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, as in the aforementioned rabbinic accounts, the self-afflicting practice of the forty-day fast which follows the sin of idolatry is then connected to Day of Atonement imagery. It is possible that in the Slavonic apocalypse, as in rabbinic accounts, a very similar combination of Mosaic motifs is permeated with Yom Kippur symbolism.

While several scholars have previously pointed to the existence of Yom Kippur imagery in the Slavonic apocalypse,³⁸ no sufficient ex-

(37) *Tanna Debe Eliyyahu...*, 385.

(38) See, for example, L. L. GRABBE, *The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation*, *JSJ* 18 (1987) 165–179 at 157; C. FLETCHER-LOUIS, *The Revelation of the Sacral Son of Man*, in: F. AVEMARIE, H. LICHTENBERGER (eds.), *Auferstehung-Resurrection* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2001) (WUNT, 135) 282; R. HELM, *Azazel in Early Jewish Literature*, *Andrews University Seminary Papers* 32 (1994) 217–226 at 223; B. LOURIÉ, *Propitiatorium in the Apocalypse of Abraham*, in: L. DI TOMMASO and C. BÖTTCHICH, with the assist. of M. SWOBODA (eds.), *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity* (Tübingen, 2009) (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum) (forth-

planation was offered for why this cluster of traditions surrounding the scapegoat Azazel and the two lots suddenly appears in the Abrahamic pseudepigraphon. In this respect it is noteworthy that other Abrahamic pseudepigrapha (for example, the *Testament of Abraham*), while sharing some other common conceptual tenets with the *Apocalypse of Abraham*,³⁹ do not show any interest in appropriating Day of Atonement symbolism. Such imagery is also absent from other early extra-biblical elaborations of the patriarch's story found in the *Book of Jubilees*, Josephus, and Philo as well as in the later rabbinic materials (*Genesis Rabbah*, *Tanna debe Eliyyahu*, *Seder Eliyyahu Rabba*).⁴⁰ There too one fails to find any references to Azazel or the imagery of the two lots, the very themes that play such a significant theological role in the Slavonic apocalypse. The aforementioned Abrahamic materials also contain no references to the peculiar cluster of Mosaic traditions found in our text.

Yet the uniqueness of this cluster of motifs opens up the possibility that in the Slavonic apocalypse the story of the patriarch might be patterned not according to biblical Mosaic typology but according to a later version, found also in the aforementioned rabbinic accounts, which now connects the hero's fight with idolatry and his practice of self-denial with the establishment of the observance of the Yom Kippur festival. In this respect the highly "developed" shape of certain Mosaic themes found in the apocalypse — such as, for example, the motif of the unusual nourishment of a seer during his forty-day fast — points to apparent departures from the early biblical blueprint.

coming); D. STÖKL BEN EZRA, Yom Kippur in the Apocalyptic Imaginaire and the Roots of Jesus' High Priesthood, in: J. ASSMAN, G. STROUMSA (eds.), *Transformations of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 349–366; IDEM, The Biblical Yom Kippur, the Jewish Fast of the Day of Atonement and the Church Fathers, *SP* 34 (2002) 493–502; IDEM, *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2003) (WUNT, 163) 94.

(39) For the common anti-anthropomorphic tendencies of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and the *Testament of Abraham* see ORLOV, "The Gods of My Father Terah" ..., 33–53; IDEM, *Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham*, *JBL* 127.1 (2008) 53–70.

(40) For the expansion of Abraham's story in the *Book of Jubilees*, Josephus, Philo and the later rabbinic materials (*Genesis Rabbah* 38:13, *Tanna debe Eliyyahu* 2:25, *Seder Eliyyahu Rabba* 33), see: BOX, LANDSMAN, *Apocalypse of Abraham*..., 88–94; RUBINKIEWICZ, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave*..., 43–49.

II. Two Lots

From a Sacrificial Animal to a Fallen Angel

One of the challenges in arguing for a Yom Kippur setting in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* lies in the fact that the accounts of Abraham's sacrificial practices lack any explicit reference to the two goats of biblical and rabbinic traditions. These emblematic sacrificial animals played a distinctive role in the Yom Kippur rite, wherein one goat was sacrificed to God and the other was released into the wilderness for Azazel.⁴¹

Yet in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a writing which exhibits a great deal of influence from the Enochic tradition, allusions to the Yom Kippur ritual seem to be affected also by Enochic re-interpretation of the scapegoat imagery and especially the enhanced symbolism of its chief antagonist, the scapegoat Azazel, envisioned now not as a sacrificial animal but as a demoted celestial being.⁴² Scholars have previously

(41) In this respect the authors of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon appear to be bound by the formative blueprint manifested in the biblical account of Abraham's sacrifices found in Gen 15. Thus G. H. Box notes that "the apocalyptic part of the book is based upon the story of Abraham's sacrifices and trance, as described in Gen. xv." Box, LANDSMAN, *The Apocalypse of Abraham...*, xxiv.

(42) On the Azazel traditions, see J. DE ROO, Was the Goat for Azazel destined for the Wrath of God?, *Biblica* 81 (2000) 233–241; W. FAUTH, Auf den Spuren des biblischen Azazel (Lev 16) : Einige Residuen der Gestalt oder des Namens in jüdisch-aramäischen, griechischen, koptischen, äthiopischen, syrischen und mandäischen Texten, *ZAW* 110 (1998) 514–534; E. L. FEINBERG, The Scapegoat of Leviticus Sixteen, *BSac* 115 (1958) 320–31; M. GÖRG, Beobachtungen zum sogenannten Azazel-Ritus, *BN* 33 (1986) 10–16; GRABBE, The Scapegoat Tradition..., 165–179; HELM, Azazel..., 217–226; B. JANOWSKI, *Sühne als Heilgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterchrift und der Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982) (WMANT, 55); IDEM, Azazel, in: K. VAN DER TOORN et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1995) 240–248. B. JURGENS, *Heiligkeit und Versöhnung: Leviticus 16 in seinem Literarischen Kontext* (New York: Herder, 2001); H. M. KÜMMEL, Ersatzkönig und Sündenbock, *ZAW* 80 (1986) 289–318; R. D. LEVY, *The Symbolism of the Azazel Goat* (Bethesda: International Scholars Publication, 1998); O. LORETZ, *Leberschau, Sündenbock, Asasel in Ugarit und Israel: Leberschau und Jahvestatue in Psalm 27, Leberschau in Psalm 74* (Altenberge: CIS-Verlag, 1985) (UBL, 3); J. MACLEAN, Barabbas, the Scapegoat Ritual, and the Development of the Passion Narrative, *HTR* 100 (2007) 309–334; J. MILGROM, *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology*

noted that in the *Book of the Watchers* the scapegoat rite receives a striking angelological reinterpretation in incorporating some details of the sacrificial ritual into the story of its main negative hero — the fallen angel Asael. Thus, *1 Enoch* 10:4–7 reads:

And further the Lord said to Raphael: “Bind Azazel by his hands and his feet, and throw him into the darkness. And split open the desert which is in Dudael, and throw him there. And throw on him jagged and sharp stones, and cover him with darkness; and let him stay there for ever, and cover his face, that he may not see light, and that on the great day of judgment he may be hurled into the fire. And restore the earth which the angels have ruined, and announce the restoration of the earth, for I shall restore the earth ...⁴³

Several distinguished students of the apocalyptic traditions have previously discerned that some details of Asael’s punishment are reminiscent of the scapegoat ritual.⁴⁴ Thus, Lester Grabbe points to a num-

(Leiden: Brill, 1983) (SJLA, 36); D. RUDMAN, A note on the Azazel-goat ritual, *ZAW* 116 (2004) 396–401; W. H. SHEA, Azazel in the Pseudepigrapha, *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 13 (2002) 1–9; STÖKL BEN EZRA, Yom Kippur..., 349–366; IDEM, “The Biblical Yom Kippur, the Jewish Fast of the Day of Atonement and the Church Fathers,” *SP* 34 (2002) 493–502; IDEM, *The Impact of Yom Kippur...*; A. STROBEL, Das jerusalemische Sündenbock-ritual. Topographische und landeskundische Erwägungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Lev. 16,10,21f, *ZDPV* 103 (1987) 141–168; H. TAWIL, ‘Azazel the Prince of the Steepe: A Comparative Study, *ZAW* 92 (1980) 43–59; M. WEINFELD, Social and Cultic Institutions in the Priestly Source against Their ANE Background, *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1983) 95–129; D. P. WRIGHT, *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1987) (SBLDS, 101).

(43) M. KNIBB, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 87–88.

(44) R. H. CHARLES, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1893); D. DIMANT, *The Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Related Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (Ph.D. diss.; The Hebrew University in Jerusalem, 1974) [in Hebrew]; IDEM, *1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective*, *SBLSP* (1978) 323–339; A. GEIGER, Zu den Apokryphen, *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 3 (1864) 196–204; GRABBE, *The Scapegoat Tradition...*, 165–179; P. HANSON, Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in *1 Enoch* 6–11, *JBL* 96 (1977) 195–233; HELM, Azazel..., 217–226; G. NICKELSBURG, Apocalyptic and Myth in *1 Enoch* 6–11, *JBL* 96 (1977) 383–405; R. RUBINKIEWICZ, *Die Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11 und das Neue Testament*. Tr. H. ULRICH (Klosterneuberg, 1984) (Osterreichische Biblische Studien, 6) 88–89; STÖKL BEN EZRA, Yom Kippur..., 349–366; IDEM, *The Impact of Yom Kippur...*, 85–88.

ber of parallels between the Asael narrative in *1 Enoch* and the wording of Leviticus 16, including “the similarity of the names Asael and Azazel; the punishment in the desert; the placing of sin on Asael/Azazel; the resultant healing of the land.”⁴⁵ Daniel Stökl also observes that “the punishment of the demon resembles the treatment of the goat in aspects of geography, action, time and purpose.”⁴⁶ Thus, the place of Asael’s punishment designated in *1 Enoch* as *Dudael* is reminiscent of the rabbinic terminology used for the designation of the ravine of the scapegoat (בֵּית הַדּוֹרֵר / הַדּוֹרֵר) in later rabbinic interpretations of the Yom Kippur ritual. Stökl remarks that “the name of place of judgment (*Dudael* – בֵּית הַדּוֹרֵר) is conspicuously similar in both traditions and can likely be traced to a common origin.”⁴⁷

Several Qumran materials also appear cognizant of this angelological reinterpretation of the scapegoat figure when they choose to depict Azazel as the eschatological leader of the fallen angels, incorporating him into the story of the Watchers’ rebellion. Thus, 4Q180 1:1–10 reads:

Interpretation concerning the ages which God has made: An age to conclude [all that there is] 2 and all that will be. Before creating them he determined [their] operations [according to the precise sequence of the ages,] one age after another age. And this is engraved on the [heavenly] tablets [for the sons of men,] [for] / [a]ll/ the ages of their dominion. This is the sequence of the son[s of Noah, from Shem to Abraham,] [unt]il he sired Isaac; the ten [generations ...] [...] Blank [...] [And] interpretation concerning ‘Azaz’el and the angels wh[o came to the daughters of man] [and s]ired themselves giants. And concerning ‘Azaz’el [is written ...] [to love] injustice and to let him inherit evil for all [his] ag[e ...] [...] (of the) judgments and the judgment of the council of [...]]⁴⁸

Lester Grabbe points to another important piece of evidence — a fragmentary text from the *Book of Giants* found at Qumran (4Q203).⁴⁹

(45) GRABBE, *The Scapegoat Tradition...*, 153.

(46) STÖKL BEN EZRA, *The Impact of Yom Kippur...*, 87.

(47) *Ibid.*, 87–88.

(48) F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols. (Leiden—New York—Köln: Brill, 1997) Vol. 1, 371–373. On the similar traditions see also 4Q181.

(49) GRABBE, *The Scapegoat Tradition...*, 155.

In this document⁵⁰ the punishment for all the sins of the fallen angels is placed on Azazel.⁵¹

Later rabbinic materials also link the sacrificial animal known from the scapegoat ritual to the story of the angelic rebels. Thus, for example, *b. Yoma* 67b records the following tradition:

The School of R. Ishmael taught: Azazel — [it was so called] because it obtains atonement for the affair of Uza and Aza'el."⁵²

As can be seen, the conceptual link between the scapegoat and the fallen angel is documented in a number of important materials across a substantial span of history. A broad scholarly consensus now recognizes this connection.

It appears that such an “angelological” pattern also operates in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, where Azazel, like the antagonist of the Enochic tradition, is envisioned as a fallen angelic being. It has previously been noted that the Azazel story in the apocalypse reflects several peculiar details of the Enochic myth of the fallen watchers.⁵³ Thus, for example, Rubinkiewicz argued that

... the author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* follows the tradition of *1 Enoch* 1–36. The chief of the fallen angels is Azazel, who rules the stars and most men. It is not difficult to find here the tradition of Genesis 6:1–4 developed according to the tradition of *1 Enoch*. Azazel is the head of the angels who plotted against the Lord and who

(50) On this text see also STUCKENBRUCK, *The Book of Giants from Qumran...*, 79–101.

(51) 4Q203 7:1–7 reads: “[...] ... [...] and [yo]ur power [...] Blank Th[en] 'Ohyah [said] to Hahy[ah, his brother ...] Then he punished, and not us, [bu]t Aza[ze]l and made [him ... the sons of] Watchers, the Giants; and n[o]ne of [their] be[loved] will be forgiven [...] ... he has imprisoned us and has captured yo[u]...” GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, TIGCHELAAR, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition...*, 411.

(52) I. EPSTEIN (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud. Yoma* (London: Soncino, 1938) 316. On the afterlife of the Asael/Azazel tradition see A. Y. REED, From Asael and Šemihazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: 3 Enoch 5 (§§ 7–8) and Jewish Reception-History of 1 Enoch, *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 8 (2001) 105–136; IDEM, *What the Fallen Angels Taught: The Reception-History of the Book of the Watchers in Judaism and Christianity* (Ph. D. Dissertation; Princeton, 2002); IDEM, *Fallen Angels and the history of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

(53) PHILONENKO-SAYAR, PHILONENKO, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham...*, 31–33; RUBINKIEWICZ, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave...*, 50.

impregnated the daughters of men. These angels are compared to the stars. Azazel revealed the secrets of heaven and is banished to the desert. Abraham, as Enoch, receives the power to drive away Satan. All these connections show that the author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* drew upon the tradition of *1 Enoch*.⁵⁴

It is clear that in the Slavonic apocalypse, as in the Enochic and Qumran materials, Azazel is no longer a sacrificial animal, but an angelic being. Already in his first appearance in chapter 13:3–4,⁵⁵ he is depicted as an unclean (impure) bird (Slav. *птица нечистая*).⁵⁶ In the pteromorphic angelological code of *Apocalypse of Abraham*, which chooses to portray Yahoel with the body of griffin, the bird-like appearance of Azazel points to his angelic form.⁵⁷

The assumption that Azazel was once an angelic being is further supported by *Apoc. Ab.* 14 which tells about the celestial garment that the fallen angel once possessed: “For behold, the garment which in heaven was formerly yours has been set aside for him (Abraham)...”⁵⁸

Yet, in comparison with the early Enochic developments, the angelic profile of Azazel appears to be more advanced. Lester Grabbe suggests that in the depiction of its main antagonist the *Apocalypse of Abraham* seems to be referring to the “basic arch-demon complex under the name of Azazel.”⁵⁹ In his opinion, there “Azazel is no longer just a leader among the fallen angels but *the* leader of the demons.

(54) R. RUBINKIEWICZ, *Apocalypse of Abraham*, in: J. H. CHARLESWORTH (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) Vol. 1, 681–705, at 685.

(55) *Apoc. Ab.* 13:3–4 “And an impure bird flew down on the carcasses, and I drove it away. And the impure bird spoke to me...” KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 20.

(56) The reference to the impurity of the “bird” betrays the connection to the scapegoat figure who in the materials pertaining to the Yom Kippur ritual is understood as an impure entity, a sort of a “gatherer” of impurity which contaminates anyone who comes in contact with him, including his handlers, who must perform purification procedures after handling the goat. Milgrom observes that Azazel was “the vehicle to dispatch Israel’s impurities and sins to wilderness/netherworld.” MILGROM, *Leviticus 1–16...*, 1621.

(57) On the pteromorphic angelological language of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* see A. ORLOV, *The Pteromorphic Angelology of the Apocalypse of Abraham*, *CBQ* 72 (2009) 830–842.

(58) KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 20.

(59) GRABBE, *The Scapegoat Tradition...*, 158.

Figures originally separate have now fallen together while the various names have become only different aliases of the one devil."⁶⁰

The Goat for YHWH?

Abraham's symmetrical role in relation to Azazel in the Slavonic apocalypse again evokes the memory of the Enochic tradition and its legendary hero — the seventh antediluvian patriarch. In both cases the protagonists appear to be mirroring their respective negative counterparts, as both stories portray them exchanging attributes and roles with one another. Just as Enoch takes the priestly and celestial offices of Asael, while the fallen angel assumes some human roles, so in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* too, Azazel surrenders his angelic garment to the hero of the faith. Both parties, thus, accept the roles and offices of their counterparts as they enter the realms of their opponents. In this respect it is noteworthy that the transition of the antagonist of the Slavonic apocalypse into the lower realm, as in the case of Asael of the Enochic tradition, encompasses two steps: his removal first to the earth,⁶¹ then further, to the fiery abyss of the subterranean sphere.⁶²

Furthermore, similarly to the *Book of the Watchers*, in the Abrahamic pseudepigraphon the protagonist progresses in the direction opposite to his negative counterpart by ascending into heaven, as he acquires a special status and a celestial garment that allows him to enter the celestial sanctuary.⁶³ The progression of the patriarch into upper sancta has here, like in *1 Enoch*, a sacerdotal significance, as it betrays connections

(60) GRABBE, *The Scapegoat Tradition...*, 158.

(61) "Reproach is on you, Azazel! Since Abraham's portion is in heaven, and yours is on earth, since you have chosen it and desired it to be the dwelling place of your impurity." (*Apoc. Ab.* 13:7–8).

(62) "May you be the fire brand of the furnace of the earth!" (*Apoc. Ab.* 14:5).

(63) The apocalyptic story thus can be seen as a re-enactment of the two spatial dynamics which are also reflected in the Yom Kippur ritual — the entrance into the upper realm and the exile into the underworld. In this respect Daniel Stökl notes that the Yom Kippur ritual "consisted of two antagonistic movements ... centripetal and centrifugal: the entrance of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies and the expulsion of the scapegoat. As the first movement, the holiest person, the High Priest, entered the most sacred place, the Holy of Holies of the Jerusalem Temple, burned incense, sprinkled blood and prayed in order to achieve atonement and purification for his people and the sacred institutions of the Jewish cult. As a second movement, the scapegoat burdened with the sins of the people was sent with an escort to the desert."

with the Yom Kippur ceremony of the high priest's entrance into the divine presence. Moreover, it is possible that Abraham's progressive movement into the heavenly Holy of Holies might be understood here as encompassing not only the priestly but also the sacrificial dimension, in view of the patriarch's symmetrical position to the celestial scapegoat, by virtue of which Abraham's lot is repeatedly juxtaposed with the lot of Azazel.

The Slavonic text conceals many details, and it remains unclear whether Abraham is understood in the Slavonic apocalypse as the sacrificial goat for the Lord. Yet, some cryptic traditions found in the text might hint at this possibility. As is known from the biblical and rabbinic descriptions of the Yom Kippur ritual, the flesh of the goat⁶⁴ for YHWH was destroyed by fire, while his blood (which represents in Jewish tradition the soul of the sacrificial animal) was then brought into the Holy of Holies by the high priest and used there for purification.⁶⁵

In light of these traditions, could Yahoel and Abraham's entrance into the heavenly Throne room in chapter 18 be understood as an allusion to the entrance of the high priest who brings the purifying sacrifice into the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur?

It is interesting that in *Apoc. Ab.* 13:4-5 Azazel warns his counterpart representing the "divine" lot that he will be destroyed by fire along with other sacrificial animals:

And the impure bird spoke to me and said, "What are you doing, Abraham, on the holy heights, where no one eats or drinks, nor is there upon them food of men? But these will all be consumed by fire and they will burn you up. Leave the man who is with you and flee! Since if you ascend to the height, they will destroy you."⁶⁶

Azazel's arcane warning remains one of the most profound puzzles of the text. Yet, the motif of a seer's encounter with fire appears sig-

D. STÖKL, *The Biblical Yom Kippur, the Jewish Fast of the Day of Atonement and the Church Fathers*, *SP* 34 (2002) 493–502 at 494.

(64) Lev 16:27 "The bull of the sin offering and the goat of the sin offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall be taken outside the camp; their skin and their flesh and their dung shall be consumed in fire."

(65) Milgrom observes that "the blood of the slain goat may have been brought into the adytum in its entirety." MILGROM, *Leviticus 1–16...*, 1031.

(66) KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 20.

nificant for the authors of the pseudepigraphon, who envision fire as a theophanic substance surrounding the very presence of the deity. Thus, later in the text Abraham's transition into the divine realm is described as his entering into the fire.⁶⁷ Could the promise of a celestial garment to the patriarch in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* signify here, as in many other apocalyptic accounts, that his "mortal" body must be "altered" in the fiery metamorphosis?⁶⁸ Unfortunately, the text does not provide direct answers for such inquiries.

In order to better understand Abraham's connections with the "divine" lot, which might help us further clarify his eschatological role as the "goat for YHWH," we must now explore the imagery of the two lots found in the Slavonic apocalypse.

Eschatological Lots

We have already noted that the remarkable angelic metamorphosis of the sacrificial animal associated with the lot of Azazel has had a long-lasting conceptual afterlife in Jewish apocalypticism and its eschatology. Yet one should not forget another portentous aspect of Yom Kippur symbolism that similarly exercised a formative influence on some Second Temple apocalyptic materials, including the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the Qumran writings one encounters a broad appropriation of the imagery of two lots, symbolism that has profound significance in the scapegoat ordinance. Like the figure of Azazel, who is enhanced with a new celestial profile, the imagery of the sacrificial lots also receives a novel eschatological reinterpretation. Thus, in a number of Qumran materials such as 1QM, 1QS, 4Q544, and 11Q13, the two lots become associated not with two sacrificial goats but with celestial protagonists, both positive — like Melchizedek or the Angel of Light — as well as negative — like Melchireša^c, Belial, or the Prince of Darkness. Those fascinating characters come to be understood in these documents as the leaders of the "portions of humanity" associated with the

(67) Cf. *Apoc. Ab.* 15:3 "And he carried me up to the edge of the fiery flame..."; *Apoc. Ab.* 17:1 And while he was still speaking, behold, a fire was coming toward us round about, and a sound was in the fire like a sound of many waters, like a sound of the sea in its uproar."

(68) In this respect it should be noted that the entrance of a visionary into a fire and his fiery transformation represent common apocalyptic motifs found in texts ranging from Daniel 3 to 3 *Enoch* where Enoch undergoes the fiery metamorphosis that turns him into the supreme angel Metatron.

lots of good and evil, darkness and light.⁶⁹ In Qumran documents one can find repeated references to these eschatological lots representing the respective good and evil portions of humanity, often designated as “the men of the lot of Melchizedek”⁷⁰ (11Q13 2:8) or “the men of the lot of Belial”⁷¹ (5Q11 1:3).

Such eschatological re-interpretation of the lots looms large in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* as well. Numerous references to the two lots are widely dispersed in the second, apocalyptic part of the pseudepigraphon. Scholars have previously noted that the peculiar conceptual elaborations that surround the imagery of the lots are reminiscent of the eschatological reinterpretations and terminology found in the Qumran materials.⁷² Thus, it has been previously noted that the word “lot” (Slav. *участь*) appears to be connected to the Hebrew גורל, a term prominent not only in biblical descriptions of the scapegoat ceremony⁷³ but also in the Qumran materials.⁷⁴

Similarly to the Qumran materials where the lots are linked to angelic representatives (like Belial or Melchizedek), in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* the lots are now tied not to the sacrificial animals but to the

(69) Paul Kobelski notes that each of these “lots” or “portions” of humanity is “characterized by one of the two spirits allotted by God — the spirit of truth and the spirit of perversity (1QS 3:18–21). Those belonging to the lot of God, of Melchizedek, of light, etc., are characterized by spirit of truth; they are the sons of righteousness whose leader is the Prince of Light (1QS 3:20). Those who belong to the lot of Belial, of darkness, etc., are characterized by the spirit of perversity; they are the sons of perversity whose leader is the Angel of Darkness (1QS 3:20–21).” P. J. KOBELSKI, *Melchizedek and Melchirešaʿ* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981) (CBQMS, 10) 57.

(70) אַנְשֵׁי גוֹרֵל מִלְּ [כִּי] צִדְקָה. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, TIGCHELAAR, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition...*, 1206.

(71) אַנְשֵׁי גוֹרֵל בְּלִיַּעַל. Ibid., 1132–1133.

(72) PHILONENKO-SAYAR, PHILONENKO, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham...*, 33; RUBINKIEWICZ, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave...*, 54. On the two lots see also B. PHILONENKO-SAYAR, M. PHILONENKO, *Die Apokalypse Abrahams, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* 5.5 (1982) 413–460 at 418.

(73) For the גורל terminology in its connection with the scapegoat ritual see Lev 16:8, 9, 10.

(74) See for example, 1QS גורל בליעל (the lot of Belial); גורל קדושים (the lot of the holy ones). 1QM גורל בני חושך (the lot of the sons of darkness); גורל חושך (the lot of darkness). 11Q13 אַנְשֵׁי גוֹרֵל מִלְּ [כִּי] צִדְקָה (the men of the lot of Melchizedek).

main heroes of the story — the fallen angel Azazel⁷⁵ and the translated patriarch Abraham.⁷⁶

Yet, in comparison with the Qumran materials, connections to the underlying formative pattern of the scapegoat ritual appear even more distinctive and therefore more easily recognizable in the Slavonic accounts of the lots.⁷⁷ Thus, in *Apoc. Ab.* 13, in one of the first passages in the text to invoke imagery of two “lots” or “portions,” one can easily discern allusions to particular details associated with Yom Kippur observance. *Apoc. Ab.* 13:7–8 reads:

And he [Yahoel] said to him, “Reproach is on you, Azazel! Since Abraham’s portion is in heaven, and yours is on earth, since you have chosen it and desired it to be the dwelling place of your impurity. Therefore the Eternal Lord, the Mighty One, has made you a dweller on earth...”⁷⁸

Here the distinctive reference to the dwelling place of the “impurity” of the antagonist immediately recalls the motif of the removal of impurity into another realm by means of Azazel, a concept which plays a prominent role in the original scapegoat ceremony.

Further connections can be seen in the description of the other lot, associated with Abraham. Thus, similarly to the Day of Atonement commemoration, wherein the lot of the goat for YHWH is called the lot for the Lord, in *Apoc. Ab.* 20:5 the lot of Abraham is designated as the lot of the deity (my [God’s] lot):

20:1 And the Eternal Mighty One said to me, “Abraham, Abraham!”
20:2 And I said, “Here am I!” 20:3 And he said, “Look from on high

(75) *Apoc. Ab.* 13:7: “... And he said to him, “Reproach is on you, Azazel! Since *Abraham’s portion* (часть Авраамля) is in heaven, and *yours* is on earth ...” KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 20; PHILONENKO-SAYAR, PHILONENKO, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham...*, 66.

(76) *Apoc. Ab.* 10:15: “Stand up, Abraham, go boldly, be very joyful and rejoice! And I am with you, since *an honorable portion* (часть вѣчная) has been prepared for you by the Eternal One.” KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 18; PHILONENKO-SAYAR, PHILONENKO, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham...*, 60.

(77) The sacerdotal significance of the eschatological lots in the Slavonic apocalypse is underlined also by the fact that the Slavonic term “жребий” used for the designation of the “lots” of humanity in the *Apoc. Ab.* 20:5 and *Apoc. Ab.* 29:21 is also used in *Ap. Ab.* 1:2 for designation of the priestly lot that Abraham shares in Terah’s temple. Cf. PHILONENKO-SAYAR, PHILONENKO, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham...*, 36, 82 and 102.

(78) KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 20.

at the stars which are beneath you and count them for me and tell me their number!" 20:4 And I said, "Would I be able? For I am [but] a man." 20:5 And he said to me, "As the number of the stars and their host, so shall I make your seed into a company of nations, set apart for me in my lot with Azazel."⁷⁹

This identification of the positive lot with the lot of God is also present in the Qumran materials.⁸⁰

While the parallels between the imagery of the lots found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and in Qumran materials have often attracted scholars' attention, they have often failed to discern the pronounced similarities with the rabbinic developments. Yet the intriguing details in the descriptions of the lots in the Slavonic apocalypse seem to point to close connections with later rabbinic re-interpretations of Yom Kippur imagery found in the Mishnah and the Talmud. A captivating parallel here involves the spatial arrangement of the lots on the left and right sides, found both in the Slavonic apocalypse and in rabbinic materials.

Thus, a passage found in *Apoc. Ab.* 22 portrays two portions of humanity arranged according to the two lots and situated on the left and right sides:

22:4 And he said to me, "These who are on the left side are a multitude of tribes who were before and who are destined to be after you: some for judgment and justice, and others for revenge and perdition at the end of the age. 22:5 Those on the right side of the picture are the people set apart for me of the people [that are] with Azazel. These are the ones I have destined to be born of you and to be called my people."⁸¹

In *Apoc. Ab.* 27:1–2 and 29:11 this division of the two lots arranged on the left and right is repeated again:

And I looked and saw, and behold, the picture swayed, and a heathen people went out from its left side and they captured those who were on the right side: the men, women, and children. And some they slaughtered and others they held with them (*Apoc. Ab.* 27:1–2).

(79) KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 25.

(80) Cf. 1QM 13:5–6: "For they are the lot of darkness but the lot of God is for [everlast]ing light." GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, TIGCHELAAR, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition...*, 135.

(81) KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 26–27.

And that you saw going out from the left side of the picture and those worshipping him, this [means that] many of the heathen will hope in him (*Apoc. Ab.* 29:11).

It should be noted that while in the Qumran materials the spatial arrangement of the lots on the left and right sides does not play any important theological role, such a distinction receives its paramount cultic significance in the rabbinic descriptions of the Yom Kippur custom of the selection of the goats.⁸²

In this respect it is intriguing that the spatial arrangement of the lots on the left and right sides in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is reminiscent of the descriptions found in the mishnaic treatise *Yoma* where the ritual selection of two goats — one for YHWH and the other for Azazel — also operates with the symbolism of the left and right sides.

Thus in *m. Yoma* 4:1 the following tradition is found:

He shook the casket and took up the two lots. On one was written "For the Lord," and on the other was written "For Azazel." The prefect was on his right and the chief of his father's house on his left. If the lot bearing the Name came up in his right hand the Prefect would say to him, "My lord High Priest, raise thy right hand"; and if it came up in his left hand the chief of the father's house would say to him, "My lord High Priest, raise thy left hand." He put them on the two he-goats and said "A sin-offering to the Lord."⁸³

Although the passage from Mishnah does not openly identify the right side with the divine lot, as does the Slavonic apocalypse, the Babylonian Talmud makes this connection explicit. Thus *b. Yoma* 39a reads:

Our Rabbis taught: Throughout the forty years that Simeon the Righteous ministered, the lot ["For the Lord"] would always come

(82) Besides the mishnaic and talmudic materials such topological arrangements of the lots on the left and right sides plays a significant role in later Jewish mysticism. Thus, for example, Box noticed that *Apoc. Ab.*'s distinction between the left and right side is reminiscent of some developments found in the *Book of Zohar*. He observes that "in the Jewish Kabbalah ... 'right side' and 'left side' ... become technical terms. In the emanistic system of the *Zohar*, the whole world is divided between "right" and "left," where pure and impure powers respectively operate—on the right side the Holy One and His powers, on the left the serpent Samael and his powers..." Box, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, xx.

(83) H. DANBY, *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992) 166.

up in the right hand; from that time on, it would come up now in the right hand, now in the left. And [during the same time] the crimson-colored strap would become white. From that time on it would at times become white, at others not.⁸⁴

This imagery of the selection of the goats in rabbinic materials, in which the scapegoat is placed on the left and the goat for the Lord on the right, recalls the spatial arrangement of the lots in the Slavonic apocalypse where the divine lot is similarly situated on the right side and the lot of Azazel on the left side.⁸⁵

III. Re-enactment of the Yom Kippur Festival in the *Apocalypse of Abraham: The Scapegoat Ritual*

The High Priest and Azazel

Like in the Enochic tradition where the profiles of both protagonists⁸⁶ and antagonists⁸⁷ often reveal their cultic affiliations, in the Slavonic apocalypse too both Azazel and Abraham are envisioned as priestly figures. As has already been mentioned, this sacerdotal vision permeates the fabric of the entire pseudepigraphon, in which all main

(84) EPSTEIN, *The Babylonian Talmud. Yoma...*, 184.

(85) In the light of the passage from *b. Yoma* which talks about the right hand of the high priest in relation to the goat for YHWH, it is also noteworthy that in *Apocalypse of Abraham* Yahoel, who is portrayed as a high priest, is often depicted as putting his right hand on Abraham: *Apoc. Ab.* 10:4 "And the angel whom he sent to me in the likeness of a man came, and he took me by my right hand and stood me on my feet." *Apoc. Ab.* 15:2 "And the angel took me with his right hand and set me on the right wing of the pigeon..."

(86) On Enoch's priestly roles, see M. HIMMELFARB, *The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira*, in: J. SCOTT, P. SIMPSON-HOUSLEY (eds.), *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991) 63–78; IDEM, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," in: *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987) (SBLSP, 26) 210–217. See also: J. MAIER, *Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apokalyptik und "Gnosis," Kairos* 5 (1) (1963) 18–40, esp. 23; IDEM, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis* (Salzburg: Müller, 1964) (*Kairos*, 1) 127–128; G. W. E. NICKELSBURG, *Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee, JBL* 100 (1981) 575–600, esp. 576–582; A. ORLOV, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2005) (TSAJ, 107) 70–76.

(87) On the priestly traditions related to the fallen Watchers see D. SUTER, *Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: the Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–16, HUCA* 50 (1979) 115–135.

characters are endowed with cultic roles. The most spectacular cultic attributes are, of course, given to Yahoel, who is presented in the text as the heavenly high priest and the celestial choir-master. The repeated instructions about sacrificial rites and proper liturgical procedures that he conveys to his human apprentice Abraham reveal Yahoel as the most distinguished sacerdotal figure of the story. It is possible that, in his role as instructor and revealer of cultic mysteries, Yahoel discloses his teachings to the patriarch not only in speech but also through direct participation in priestly praxis. One such instance may be seen in chapters 13 and 14 of the Slavonic apocalypse, where Yahoel appears to perform one of the central ordinances of the Yom Kippur atoning ceremony, in which impurity is transferred onto Azazel and the scapegoat is dispatched into the wilderness.

Thus, in *Apoc. Ab.* 13:7–14 the following arcane encounter between the high priest Yahoel and the scapegoat Azazel can be found:

... “Reproach is on you, Azazel! Since Abraham’s portion is in heaven, and yours is on earth,

Since you have chosen it and desired it to be the dwelling place of your impurity. Therefore the Eternal Lord, the Mighty One, has made you a dweller on earth. And because of you [there is] the wholly-evil spirit of the lie, and because of you [there are] wrath and trials on the generations of impious men.

Since the Eternal Mighty God did not *send* the righteous, in their bodies, to be in your hand, in order to affirm through them the righteous life and the destruction of impiety.

... Hear, adviser! Be shamed by me, since you have been appointed to tempt not to all the righteous!

Depart from this man! You cannot deceive him, because he is the enemy of you and of those who follow you and who love what you desire. For behold, the garment which in heaven was formerly yours has been set aside for him, and the corruption which was on him has gone over to you.”⁸⁸

In view of the cultic affiliations of Yahoel, it is possible that his address to the scapegoat has a ritual significance, since it appears to be reminiscent of some of the actions of the high priest on Yom Kippur. The first thing that draws attention is that Yahoel’s speech contains a command of departure: “Depart from this man!” Crispin Fletcher-Louis has noted a possible connection between this command found

(88) KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 20.

in *Apoc. Ab.* 13:12 and the dispatching formula given to the scapegoat in *m. Yoma* 6:4 — “Take our sins and go forth.”⁸⁹

Scholars have also pointed out that some technical terminology found in chapter 13 appears to be connected with Yom Kippur terminology. Thus, Daniel Stökl draws attention to the expression about “sending” things to Azazel in *Apoc. Ab.* 13:10,⁹⁰ which Alexander Kulik traces to the Greek term ἀποστέλλω or Hebrew פִּלְשׁוֹ.⁹¹ Stökl proposes that this terminology “might allude to the sending out of the scapegoat.”⁹²

The phrase “dwelling place of your impurity” is also noteworthy since it alludes to the “purgation” function of the scapegoat ceremony, the rite which centered on removing the impurity heaped on the sacrificial animal to the “dwelling” place of the demon in the wilderness.

Putting reproach and shame on Azazel in *Apoc. Ab.* 13:7 and 13:11 may also relate to the ritual curses bestowed upon the scapegoat.

Another important detail of Yahoel’s speech is the angel’s mention that the corruption of the forefather of the Israelite nation is transferred now to Azazel.

Reflecting on this utterance of the great angel, Robert Helm sees its connection to the Yom Kippur settings by proposing that “the transference of Abraham’s corruption to Azazel may be a veiled reference to the scapegoat rite...”⁹³ Similarly, Lester Grabbe also argues that the phrasing in the statement that “Abraham’s corruption has ‘gone over to’ Azazel suggest[s] an act of atonement.”⁹⁴

It is also possible that the high priest Yahoel is performing here the so-called “transference function” — the crucial part of the scapegoat

(89) FLETCHER-LOUIS, *The Revelation...*, 282.

(90) *Ap. Ab.* 13:9–10: “And because of you [there is] the wholly-evil spirit of the lie, and because of you [there are] wrath and trials on the generations of impious men. Since the Eternal Mighty God did not *send* the righteous, in their bodies, to be in your hand, in order to affirm through them the righteous life and the destruction of impiety.” KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 20.

(91) A. KULIK, *Apocalypse of Abraham. Towards the Lost Original* (Ph.D. diss.; Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2000) 90.

(92) STÖKL BEN EZRA, *The Impact of Yom Kippur...*, 94.

(93) HELM, *Azazel...*, 223.

(94) GRABBE, *The Scapegoat Tradition...*, 157.

ritual — when the high priest conveys the sins of Israel onto the head of the goat through confession and laying-on of hands.⁹⁵

Abraham and the Scapegoat

It is quite clear that in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* Yahoel functions as a senior priest explaining and demonstrating rituals to a junior sacerdotal servant — Abraham.⁹⁶ This parallelism between the instructions of the master and the actions of the apprentice is manifested already in the beginning of the apocalyptic section of the text, where the patriarch faithfully follows the orders of his angelic guide about the preparation of the sacrifices.⁹⁷ The same pattern of sacerdotal instruction in which orders of the master are then followed by the performance of the disciple is also discernable in the depiction of the ritual of dispatching the scapegoat.

In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, after Yahoel's own "handling" of Azazel, the angel then verbally instructs Abraham on how to deal with the scapegoat:

Say to him, "May you be the fire brand of the furnace of the earth! Go, Azazel, into the untrodden parts of the earth. <Since your inheritance are those who are with you, with men born with the stars and clouds. And their portion is you, and they come into being through your being. And justice is your enmity. Therefore through your own destruction vanish from before me!" And I said the words as the angel had taught me. (*Apoc. Ab.* 14:5–8).⁹⁸

In this narrative the dispatching formulas appear to be even more decisive and forceful than in the previously investigated passage from chapter 13, now including such commands to the scapegoat as:

(95) Lev 16:21–22 "Then Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all their transgressions, all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat, and sending it away into the wilderness by means of someone designated for the task. The goat shall bear on itself all their iniquities to a barren region; and the goat shall be set free in the wilderness." On the "transference" function see also MILGROM, *Leviticus 1–16...*, 1041.

(96) HARLOW, *Idolatry and Otherness...*

(97) Harlow observes that "in chap. 12 Yahoel acts like a senior priest showing a junior priest the ropes; he instructs Abraham: 'Slaughter and cut all this, putting together the two halves, one against the other. But do not cut the birds.'" HARLOW, *Idolatry and Otherness...*

(98) KULIK, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha...*, 21.

“Go” (Slav. *иду*)⁹⁹ and “Vanish from before me” (Slav. *буди от мене истреэлв*).¹⁰⁰

Another captivating detail is that the dispatching formula “Go, Azazel, into the untrodden parts of the earth” designates the destination of the demon’s removal as “the untrodden parts of earth.” The word “untrodden” (Slav. *беспроходна*)¹⁰¹ is significant since it designates a place uninhabitable (lit. impassable) to human beings. Reflecting on the language of Lev 16 where the scapegoat is dispatched “to the solitary place” (אֶל-אֲרָץ גִּזְרֵה) “in the wilderness,” (במדבר),¹⁰² Jacob Milgrom observes that “the purpose of dispatching the goat to the wilderness is to remove it from human habitation.”¹⁰³

In view of these observations it is possible that in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* one encounters another, so-called “elimination,” aspect of the scapegoat ritual whereby impurity must be removed from the human *oikumene* into an inhabitable (or in the language of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, “untrodden”) realm.

In this respect Daniel Stökl also observes that the terminology found in *Apoc. Ab.* 14:5, where Azazel goes “into untrodden parts of the earth,” is reminiscent of the Septuagint version’s translation of Leviticus 16:22 (εἰς γῆν ἄβατον)¹⁰⁴ and the expression chosen by Philo in *De Specialibus Legibus* 1:188 in his description of Yom Kippur.¹⁰⁵

The concluding phrase of the passage from chapter 14, which reports that Abraham repeated the words he received from the great angel, confirms our suggestion that Abraham is depicted here as a sort of a priestly apprentice receiving instructions from his master Yahoel and then applying this knowledge in dispatching the scapegoat.¹⁰⁶

(99) PHILONENKO-SAYAR, PHILONENKO, *L’Apocalypse d’Abraham...*, 68.

(100) *Ibid.*

(101) *Ibid.*

(102) Lev 16:22 “The goat shall bear on itself all their iniquities to a barren region; and the goat shall be set free in the wilderness.”

(103) MILGROM, *Leviticus 1–16...*, 1045.

(104) KULIK, *Apocalypse of Abraham...*, 90.

(105) STÖKL BEN EZRA, *The Impact of Yom Kippur...*, 94.

(106) Harlow notes that “Yahoel teaches Abraham a kind of exorcistic spell to drive Azazel away.” HARLOW, *Idolatry and Otherness...*

Conclusion

In the conclusion of our study of the Yom Kippur imagery discernable in the second part of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, we should again draw attention to the possible connections between these sacerdotal traditions and the conceptual developments found in the first, haggadic section of the pseudepigraphon.

As has already been mentioned, the first part of the text is also permeated with cultic concerns as it depicts the idolatrous worship of the household of Terah, envisioned there through the metaphor of the polluted sanctuary. The section ends with the demise of the infamous house of worship and the death of its sacerdotal servants — Abraham's father Terah and his brother Nahor — perishing in the fire of the destroyed shrine polluted by idols.

In this respect it is intriguing that the description of the Yom Kippur ritual found in Leviticus 16 also begins with a reference to two priests who have perished: Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu who, like Terah and Nahor in the Slavonic apocalypse, were killed by the fire proceeding from God because their improper priestly practice defiled the sanctuary.

This reference to priests who have perished and caused a contamination which now requires purgation appears to serve well for the cultic agenda of Lev 16, which then offers the description of the purificatory rite of Yom Kippur.¹⁰⁷ As was already seen, later rabbinic materials that link the Golden Calf episode with the establishment of Yom Kippur hint at this correspondence between sacerdotal transgression and the need for its cultic repair.

In light of the aforementioned traditions, it appears that the re-enactment of the Yom Kippur observances found in the second part of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* also fits nicely in the overall structure of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon where the hero's transition from the pol-

(107) In this respect Jacob Milgrom reminds us that in the beginning, before becoming an annual festival, Yom Kippur was understood as an "emergency rite" for purgation of the sanctuary. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1070. Scullion also observes that "... the purpose of the feast is purgation. The sins of the Israelites, inadvertent and advertent, defile the land and the temple, and even the holy of holies. Leviticus anachronistically projects back into presettlement times a feast to purify the tent/temple and camp/city to protect them from the buildup of impurity." J. P. SCULLION, *A Traditio-historical Study of the Day of Atonement* (Ph.D. diss.; Catholic University of America, 1991) 83.

luted and destroyed sanctuary depicted in the beginning of the story to the true place of worship shown him by Deity at the end is mediated by the atoning ritual.

SUMMARY

The article investigates the sacerdotal dimension of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. The study shows that the entrance of a seer into the celestial realm reveals the cultic dimension and is envisioned as a visitation of the heavenly temple. The study theorizes that some portions of the second, apocalyptic part of the pseudepigraphon can be seen as an eschatological re-enactment of the Yom Kippur ritual — one of the most enigmatic cultic ceremonies in the Jewish tradition.

Silviu N. Bunta
Dayton, OH

**“YOUR OWN OF YOUR OWN”:
JEWISH ADAM SPECULATIONS
AND CHRISTIAN LITURGY
IN THE SLAVONIC AND ROMANIAN
LIFE OF ADAM AND EVE**

The title “Life of Adam and Eve” (henceforth *LAE*) is commonly used in reference to an entire corpus of literature¹ that contains the Greek *Apocalypse of Moses*,² the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*,³ the Armenian *Penitence of Adam*,⁴ the Slavonic *Book of Adam and Eve*,⁵ the Georgian

(1) For succinct introductions to this corpus, see particularly M. E. STONE, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) (SBLEJL, 3), and M. DE JONGE, J. TROMP, *The Life of Adam and Eve* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

(2) This title is a misnomer based on an introduction prefaced to the text at a later time and uncritically appropriated by the earlier editions of the book (cf. M. DE JONGE, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as part of Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) 201, n. 2). A synoptical presentation of the major text forms is available in John R. LEVISON, *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000) (SBLEJL, 16). Critical editions of the Greek text exist in A.-M. DENIS, *Concordance grecque des pseudépigraphes d’Ancien Testament* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université catholique de Louvain, 1987); J. TROMP, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

(3) W. MEYER, *Vita Adae et Evae, Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie des Wissenschaften, Philosoph.-philologische Klasse 14* (1878) 185–250.

(4) M. E. STONE, *The Penitence of Adam* (Louvain: Peeters, 1981) (CSCO, 429–430); IDEM, *Texts and Concordances of the Armenian Adam Literature* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) (SBLEJL, 12) 70–81.

(5) Only the longer recension has received a critical edition to date: V. JAGIĆ, *Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apocryphen, I: Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches, Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philos.-hist. Klasse 42* (1893) 1–104. In 1925 Jordan Ivanov published another manuscript of the longer recension, MS 433 of the National Library in Sofia, which was apparently unknown to Jagić: I. IVANOV, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi* (Sofia, 1925). I consulted this work in its French translation, J. IVANOV,

Book of Adam,⁶ and the Romanian *Story of Adam and Eve* (*Povestea lui Adam și a Evei*).⁷ The Latin writing is the only one of these texts to actually carry the title used loosely in reference to the entire corpus. All text forms follow generally a similar story line. All texts narrate the expulsion of Adam and Eve from paradise, Abel's death at the hands of his brother Cain, a fatal illness of Adam, Adam's account of the fall, Eve's and Seth's quest for healing oil, Eve's account of the fall, Adam's death and assumption to paradise, Adam's burial, Abel's burial, and Eve's death and burial.

While the different versions of the story generally adhere to this structure, they diverge from each other significantly. One such disagreement occurs in the story of Adam's burial. Only the Slavonic and Romanian versions have God or, respectively, the earth pronouncing the phrase "your own of your own" (ТВОА ѿ ТВОИХ; *al tău dintr-ale tale*) during the entombment of Adam. While this phrase is immediately recognizable as one of the formulas of the Orthodox anaphora prayer and its presence in the Slavonic and Romanian *LAE* could be thus read simply as a very late liturgical insertion in an ancient text, the contention of this paper is that the odd Slavonic and Romanian texts are best read as witnesses to a much earlier conjunction between the Orthodox liturgical formula and ancient Jewish speculations about Adam appropriated by ancient Christianity.

Livres et légendes bogomiles: Aux sources du catharisme. Tr. M. RIBEYROL (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1976).

(6) French translation in J.-P. MAHÉ, *Le Livre d'Adam géorgienne de la Vita Adae*, in R. VAN DEN BROEK, M. J. VERMASEREN (eds.), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 1981) 227–260.

(7) The only manuscript of the Romanian version published to date is MS 469: M. GASTER, *Texte române inedite din sec. XVII*, *Revista pentru istorie, arheologie și filologie* 1 (1883) 78–80. Gaster reprinted the same text in his *Chrestomathie roumaine*, 2 vols. (Leipzig—Bucarest: Brockhaus-Socecu, 1891) Vol. 1, 63–65. Gaster also introduced the text in *Literatura populară română* (București: Ig. Haimann, 1883) 271–274. However, even this publication is incomplete. It only covers the final seven folios (400r–407r) of the text in its original Cyrillic characters. My forthcoming article, "The Shorter Recension of the *Life of Adam and Eve*: The Oldest Manuscript of the Romanian Version" (*JSP*), is meant to fill in this gap. It provides the entire text of MS 469, with an English translation.

The Slavonic Recensions

The Texts

The Latin manuscripts of *LAE* do not contain an account of the burial of Adam similar to the other versions. Instead, it offers at this point in the narrative the *Legend of the Wood of the Cross*.⁸ The Greek, Armenian, and Georgian versions of *LAE* contain similar versions of the beginning of Adam's burial service. The Greek text form I, represented by manuscripts D and S, reads:

And God called and said, "Adam, Adam." And the body answered from the earth and said, "Here I am, Lord." And God said to him, "I told you that earth you are and to earth shall you return (γῆ εἶ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσει). Again I promise to you the Resurrection; I will raise you up in the Resurrection with every man, who is your seed." After these words, God made a (three-fold)⁹ seal and sealed the tomb, that no one might do anything to him for six days till his rib should return to him.¹⁰

The other Greek text forms do not present any major differences.¹¹ The Armenian and Georgian versions do not differ from this text significantly.¹²

A significant departure from this story line occurs in the Slavonic texts. The Greek texts of *LAE* were translated into Slavonic sometime during the fourteenth century.¹³ The translation process produced two different recensions, one shorter than the other. Given the differences between these two Slavonic recensions, it is reasonable to assume that

(8) For a thorough analysis of the legend, see B. BAERT, *A Heritage of Holy Wood: The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image* (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 289–333.

(9) Τρίγγωνον/τρίγωνον only appears in text forms II and III. See the Greek texts in LEVISON, *Texts in Transition...*, 109.

(10) The English translation is the one published in G. A. ANDERSON, M. E. STONE, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2nd 1999) 89–90E. I used the Greek text in LEVISON, *Texts in Transition...*, 109–110.

(11) The main Greek text-forms are presented in LEVISON, *Texts in Transition...*, 109–110.

(12) For the Armenian and Georgian versions, see MAHÉ, *Le Livre d'Adam géorgienne...*; STONE, *The Penitence of Adam...*; IDEM, *Texts and Concordances of the Armenian Adam Literature...*

(13) É. TURDEANU, *Apocryphes Slaves et Roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1981) 90–93, 99–100.

they were most probably produced independently of each other, from two distinct Greek versions, even though there is no extant Greek text to resemble the shorter Slavonic recension.¹⁴

The longer recension, published in the 1893 critical edition of Vatroslav Jagić,¹⁵ generally agrees with the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian witnesses to the above story. Like in all of these, in the longer Slavonic text God calls Adam, Adam's body answers, and God reminds the protoplast of his destiny to return to the earth from which he was made. In further agreement with the other texts, the longer Slavonic recension contains the promise of a future resurrection of Adam and of all humankind. However, in contrast to the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian witnesses, the longer Slavonic recension describes God as making the sign of the cross over Adam's tomb and pronouncing what sounds like a votive formula, "what is yours, taken from you":

And the Lord called Adam to himself and said, "Adam, Adam, where are you?" And his body answered, "I am here, Lord." The Lord said [to Adam], "So I told you, 'You are earth and to the same earth you will return again.' And at the resurrection, you will rise with all mankind." And the Lord made on four sides the sign of the cross over his grave, and one laid him in the grave, and he anointed it and said, "What is yours, taken from you (ꙗꙗꙗ ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ), is again returned to you." (Slavonic LAE 47)¹⁶

One is left to assume that the final divine utterance is addressed to the earth, particularly since God has just reminded Adam that he is to return to the earth from which he was taken. In the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian versions the same idea surfaces earlier in the narrative. In all these versions, a voice from the earth (Greek) or from heaven (Armenian and Georgian) stops the burial of Abel from taking place before Adam's, by saying that what has first been taken from the earth must be first returned to the earth.¹⁷

(14) I have argued this in my forthcoming article, "The Shorter Recension of the *Life of Adam and Eve*."

(15) JAGIĆ, *Slavische Beiträge...*, 1–104.

(16) The English translation is the one published in ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 90E. The Slavonic text is the one published in JAGIĆ, *Slavische Beiträge...*, 98.

(17) ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 88–88E.

In contrast to the longer recension, in the shorter Slavonic version God speaks as a “voice from heaven” (ГЛАСЪ СО/СЪ НЕБЕСИ)¹⁸ and addresses the phrase ТВОА ѿ ТВОИХ explicitly to the earth. Manuscripts *pp*, arguably the best witness to the shorter Slavonic recension,¹⁹ and *tr* read И ЗЕМЛИ РЕЧЕ ТВОА ѿ ТВОИХЪ, “and to the earth he [God] said, ‘Your own from your own’.”²⁰

Orthodox Liturgy

The phrase “your own of your own” is part of the anaphora prayer in the Byzantine liturgies of St. John Chrysostom²¹ and St. Basil,²² and in the Alexandrian liturgies of St. Basil²³ and St. Mark.²⁴ It has been previously noted²⁵ that most probably the earliest witness to the incorporation of this formula into Christian liturgy could very well occur in Irenaeus’ *Adv. haereses* 4.18.4–5:

Inasmuch, then, as the Church offers with single-mindedness, her gift is justly reckoned a pure sacrifice with God. As Paul also says to the Philippians, “I am full, having received from Epaphroditus the things that were sent from you, the odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, pleasing to God” (Phil 4:18). For it behoves us to make an oblation to God, and in all things to be found grateful to God our Maker, in a pure mind, and in faith without hypocrisy, in well-grounded hope, in fervent love, offering the first-fruits of His own created things. And the Church alone offers this pure oblation to the Creator, *offering to Him, with giving of thanks, from His creation...*

(18) I have consulted manuscripts *pp* and *tr* in Н. С. ТИХОПРАВОВ, Памятники отреченной русской литературы, 2 т. (Санкт-Петербург—Москва, 1863) Т. 1, 298–304, here p. 303, and respectively 1:1–6, here p. 5, and manuscript *pp*¹ in А. Н. ПЫПИН, Памятники старинной русской литературы, 3 т. (Санкт-Петербург, 1860–1862) Т. 3, 4–7.

(19) See Turdeanu’s argument in *Apocryphes*, 100.

(20) This is my own translation of *pp* from ТИХОПРАВОВ, Памятники..., т. 1, 303. Manuscript *tr* (ТИХОПРАВОВ, Памятники..., т. 1, 5–6) contains the same text.

(21) R. F. ТАФТ, St. John Chrysostom and the Byzantine Anaphora that Bears His Name, in: P. F. BRADSHAW (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997) 195–226, here pp. 220–221.

(22) A. HÄNGGI, I. PAHL (eds.), *Præx eucharistica. Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti* (Fribourg: Editions universitaires, 1968) 236.

(23) *Ibid.*, 352.

(24) *Ibid.*, 114.

(25) E.g., ТАФТ, St. John Chrysostom..., 220, n. 56.

We offer to Him His own, announcing consistently the fellowship and union of the flesh and Spirit. For as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly; so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity.²⁶

The phrase is clearly attested as part of the Liturgy of St. John in the apocryphal *Apocalypse of St. John*.²⁷ The writing contains Jesus' answers to a long series of questions by John of Patmos relating to fasting, monastic behavior, communion, and the liturgy. The original publisher of the text, F. Nau, dates the text to between the fifth and eighth centuries and prefers a date closer to the fifth century.²⁸ J. K. Elliot proposes a possible range of dating between the sixth and eighth centuries.²⁹ In the second edition of the text, John M. Court supports a date between the fifth and eighth centuries.³⁰ More recently, Alice Whealey suggests that verse 13 contains a reference to iconoclasm and that other passages reflect the threat of Muslim conquest. Therefore, she argues, the text should be dated to the early Islamic period, specifically between the 720's and 843.³¹

In its short explanation of the liturgy, the text relates the phrase τὰ σα̅ ἐκ τῶν σα̅ων with the tradition about Jesus' descent into Hades:

“We offer to you what is yours from your own” (τὰ σα̅ ἐκ τῶν σα̅ων) means that the Lord went into Hell and destroyed the spirits of wickedness and the gates of Hell, and resurrected the first-created man, Adam (συνύγηρεν τὸν προτόπλαστον Ἀδᾶμ). Then he said to the spirits, “We offer you what is yours from your own, in all and through all

(26) Translation from ANF.

(27) F. NAU, the discoverer of the manuscript, provided the first publication of the text, with a French translation, in: Une deuxième apocalypse apocryphe grecque de Saint Jean, *Revue Biblique* 11 (1914) 209–221. The Greek text has been republished with an English translation in J. M. COURT, *The Book of Revelation and the Johannine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

(28) NAU, *Une deuxième apocalypse...*, 213.

(29) J. K. ELLIOT, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) 684.

(30) COURT, *The Book of Revelation...*, 72.

(31) A. WHEALEY, *The Apocryphal Apocalypse of John: A Byzantine Apocalypse from the Early Islamic Period*, *JTS* 53 (2002) 533–540.

(Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέρονταις, κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα).
The angels answered with the praise “We praise you.”³²

The phrase τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν was evidently part of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom by the eighth century.

There is also extensive evidence that the phrase τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν was used as a common votive formula as early as the sixth century. With no explicit connection to the anaphora (although probably alluding to it), the formula appears on a sixth-century cross at Sinai, on a sixth-century chalice, on a baptismal font from shortly before 597, on an inscription mounted by Justinian somewhere in an Ephesus church, and under a window in a sixth-century church at Iznik.³³ Its inscription on the altar of St. Sophia, ordered according to Georgios Kedrenos by Justinian and Theodora,³⁴ is more explicitly a reference to the anaphora prayer.³⁵ This cumulative evidence supports Robert F. Taft’s conclusion that the phrase “was liturgical Formelgut already by the sixth century and probably entered the liturgy even earlier.”³⁶ Moreover, it also seems that the phrase circulated quite widely as a common votive formula during the sixth century.

This history of the phrase in the liturgical traditions of eastern Christianity could explain its occurrence in the Slavonic (and Romanian) versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*. As seen above, already in between the fifth and eighth centuries the apocryphal *Apocalypse of St. John* associates the phrase with Adam. Specifically, this is the phrase that Jesus says to the angels when he raises the protoplast from hell. The scene obviously implies that Adam’s original and proper place was with the angels. Despite the fact that the association of Adam with angels is a traditional motif in both ancient Judaism and Christianity,³⁷ the scene is not unproblematic. First, it implies that Christ brings

(32) Text and translation from COURT, *The Book of Revelation...*, 80–81.

(33) This evidence is reviewed in K. WEITZMANN, I. ŠEVČENKO, The Moses Cross at Sinai, *DOP* 17 (1963) 385–398, here pp. 392–394.

(34) *Historiarum compendium* in I. BEKKER (ed.), *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* I (Bonn: Weber, 1838), 677 (= PG 121, 737).

(35) WEITZMANN, ŠEVČENKO, The Moses Cross..., 394; G. DOWNEY, The Inscription on a Silver Chalice from Syria in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, *American Journal of Archaeology* 55 (1951) 349–353, here p. 351.

(36) TAFT, *St. John Chrysostom...*, 220–221.

(37) To cite only a few studies: Ch. GIESCHEN, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 153–155; C. FLETCHER-LOUIS, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997)

an offering to angels, who are his inferiors in the *Apocalypse*. Second, Adam's return to heaven cannot commonly be an offering "in all and through all."

However, the scene, even in its difficult elements, parallels strongly the Slavonic version of *LAE*. First, just as in the *Apocalypse*, in both recensions of the Slavonic *LAE* the offering is Adam. Second, in both texts the one to make the offering is Christ. Unlike the Greek recensions, which simply name the central character of the burial ceremony as θεός,³⁸ the Slavonic longer recension identifies him specifically as Christ (хс: section 46).³⁹ Third, in both texts Christ makes the offering by pronouncing the same offering phrase, "your own of your own." Fourth, there is an obvious parallelism between Adam's death and his resurrection or salvation from hell. The commitment of Adam's body to the earth mirrors the commitment of his body to heaven. The latter solves the former. Moreover, the Slavonic *LAE* specifically introduces Adam's entombment with a reference to the protoplast's future resurrection.

This complex parallelism between the Slavonic version of *LAE* and the *Apocalypse of St. John Chrysostom* suggests that the votive formula **Ѡ БОА Ѡ Ѡ БОА** has already been associated with Adam by the eighth century and that the Slavonic version of Adam's burial is not a fourteenth century innovation inserted arbitrarily into the narrative of *LAE*, but it is rather the development of an ancient Adam speculation.

140–145; IDEM, *All the Glory of Adam* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 88–135; J. FOSSUM, The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis, in: *Geschichte, Tradition, Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) Vol. 1, 529–539; S. NIDITCH, The Cosmic Adam: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature, *Journal of Jewish Studies* 34 (1983) 137–146; A. SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 108–115; P. SCHÄFER, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engeltauschvorstellung* (Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 1975); B. BARC, La taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles après J.-C., *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 49 (1975) 173–185; J. JERVELL, *Imago Dei: Gen 1:26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulischen Briefen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 99–100, 105–107; W. D. DAVIES, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (London: SPCK, 1948) 45–46; A. ALTMANN, The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 35 (1945) 371–391.

(38) LEVISON, *Texts in Transition...*, 109–110.

(39) JAGIĆ, *Slavische Beiträge...*, 98.

Furthermore, there is a subtle parallelism between the Slavonic text, on the one hand, and the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian narrative in which an intervening voice stops the burial of Abel from taking place before Adam's.⁴⁰ First, in the Armenian and Georgian narratives the divine presence speaks as a voice from heaven⁴¹ as it does in the shorter Slavonic recension (ГЛАСЪ СО/СЪ НЕБЕСИ).⁴² Second and more significantly, the subject of all these versions is the return of Adam to the earth from which he was taken.

The Romanian Version

The Romanian version of Adam's burial points to another connection of *LAE* to ancient Adam speculations, that are attested both within Christian and Jewish sources.

The Texts

The Romanian version of *LAE* contains only the shorter recension and is undoubtedly translated from Slavonic.⁴³ It survives in eight manuscripts, namely 469 (384r–407r), 1255 (18r–18v), 2158 (9r–12r), 3813 (91r–101v), 5299 (1r–6r), all known to and introduced by Émile Turdeanu,⁴⁴ and 3275 (1r–5v), 5022 (208r–212v), and respectively 5916 (14v–23v), all from Biblioteca Academiei Române, that is, the Library of the Romanian Academy (henceforth BAR). Differences between the Romanian shorter recension and the extant manuscripts of the shorter Slavonic recension suggest that the Romanian text attests to a manuscript tradition that is no longer extant in Slavonic.⁴⁵

The Romanian version is the only extant text form of the entire *LAE* corpus in which the *earth* addresses the offering formula “your own of your own” to *God*. The oldest known manuscript of the Romanian recension, MS 469, reads:

Și fu glas din ceri de grăi: “Adame, Adame!” El zise: “Ce iaste, Doamne?” Dumnezeu zise: “Crez spusu-[ț]-am ție, că din pământ ești și iară în pământ veri merge.” Iară pământul zise: “Al tău dintr-

(40) ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 88–88E.

(41) *Ibid.*

(42) ТИХОНРАВОВ, ПАМЯТНИКИ..., т. 1, 303; ПЫПИН, ПАМЯТНИКИ..., т. 3, 5.

(43) See the introduction in TURDEANU, *Apocryphes...*, 104–110.

(44) TURDEANU, *Apocryphes...*, 104–110.

(45) I have made this argument in my article “The Shorter Recension of the *Life of Adam and Eve*”.

ale tale, ție aduce de toate.” Așa îngropară pre Adam cu cununa ce era în capul lui.⁴⁶

And a voice came from heaven and said: “Adam, Adam!” He said: “Yes, Lord?” God said: “Believe now what I told you, that you are earth and to earth you will go.” And the earth said: “Your own from your own, to you we bring all.” Thus they buried Adam with the wreath that was on his head.⁴⁷

Turdeanu, Moses Gaster, and Nicolae Cartoian, all agree that MS 469 dates from the first quarter of the seventeenth century.⁴⁸ Furthermore, Cartoian notes that most probably the text is not an autograph, but only a copy of a translation from Slavonic made in the sixteenth century, if not earlier.⁴⁹ The fact that the text was produced by two different hands, as I have noticed in my own study of the manuscript, supports Cartoian’s statement. The first copyist produced folios 384r to 393r. The handwriting is askew and untidy. The second hand produced the second half of the text, in a neat penmanship. It is highly unlikely that this variation would occur in the original translation. Therefore, it does seem that the origins of the text of MS 469 should be sought in the sixteenth century, if not even earlier.

Another valuable manuscript of the Romanian version, namely BAR 3813, does not present major differences from MS 469:

Și s-au făcut glas din ceri grăind: “Adame, Adame!” Și el au zis: “Doamne?” Domnul au zis: “Ți-am spus ție, că din pământ ești și iar în pământ te vei intoarce.” Iar pământul au zis: “Al tău dintru ale tale, ție aducem de toate.” Așa au îngropat pe Adam cu cununa ce era în capul lui.⁵⁰

And a voice came from heaven saying: “Adam, Adam!” And he said: “Lord?” The Lord said: “I told you, that you are earth and to earth you will return.” And the earth said: “Your own from your own, to you we bring all.” Thus they buried Adam with the wreath that was on his head.⁵¹

(46) BAR MS 469, f. 406r–406v.

(47) This is my own translation.

(48) TURDEANU, *Apocryphes...*, 106; GASTER, *Chrestomathie roumaine...*, vol. 1, 63; IDEM, *Texte române inedite din sec. XVII...*, 74; N. CARTOIAN, *Cărțile populare în literatura românească*, 2 vols. (București: Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1929, 1938) Vol. 1, 49, 57.

(49) CARTOIAN, *Cărțile populare...*, vol. 1, 57.

(50) BAR MS 3813, f. 101r.

(51) This is my own translation.

The mention of “a voice from heaven” parallels the same story in the shorter Slavonic recension (ГЛАСЪ СО/СЪ НЕБЕСИ)⁵² and the Armenian and Georgian stories of the interruption of Abel’s entombment.⁵³ In the Greek versions of the latter story, it is the earth that speaks out against Abel’s burial. The Romanian version of Adam’s burial is the only one in which the earth speaks. Adam remains the object of the votive formula “your own of your own,” but in the unique case of the Romanian version the formula is addressed to God. This use of the phrase “your own of your own” presents Adam as standing in a special relationship to God. This idea reflects the early liturgical and votive use of the phrase, in which, as noted above, the formula is always addressed to God, with the sole extraordinary exception of the apocryphal *Apocalypse of St. John*. Moreover, the offering of Adam’s body to God rather than to the earth, as “your own of your own,” echoes, I would contend, ancient Jewish and Christian speculations about Adam.

*The Return of Adam to God
in Jewish and Christian Speculations
about Adam*

Several studies have noted that the phrase of the eastern liturgies, “your own of your own,” is most probably based on the Septuagint rendering of 1 Chron 29:14: σὰ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δεδώκαμέν σοι.⁵⁴ However, Enrico Mazza astutely remarks that early Christian sources do not seem to use 1 Chron 29:14.⁵⁵ It is possible that Irenaeus’ *Adv. haereses* 4.18.4–5 alludes to it, but the connection is not absolutely certain.

In contrast to the silence of ancient Christian sources, the passage is commented upon in early rabbinic texts.⁵⁶ In a particular case the phrase is used to construct an anthropological concept. *Mishnah Avot/ Pirqe Avot* 3, a text slightly later than Irenaeus’ *Adv. haereses* 4.18.4–5, attests to a Jewish tradition circulating already in the third century

(52) ТИХОНРАВОВ, Памятники..., т. 1, 303; ПЫПИЦ, Памятники..., т. 3, 5.

(53) ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 88–88E.

(54) TAFT, *St. John Chrysostom...*, 220; E. MAZZA, *Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rites* (New York: Pueblo, 1986) 77, 304; R. J. LEDOGAR, *The Eucharistic Prayer and the Gifts over Which It Is Spoken*, in: R. KEVIN SEASOLTZ (ed.), *Living Bread, Saving Cup* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1987) 60–79, here p. 73.

(55) Cf. MAZZA, *Eucharistic Prayers...*, 304, n. 114.

(56) See also *Exod. Rab.* 31:9.

that interprets 1 Chron 29:14 as a statement on the iconic nature of humanity:

R. Eleazar of Bartotha said: Give him what is his, for you and yours are his (תן לו משלו שאתה ושלך שלו). For so does it say about David, 'For all things come of you, and of your own have we given you' (1 Chron 29:14). (*Mishnah Avot/Pirqa Avot* 3)⁵⁷

According to this text, 1 Chron 29:14 is about the giving of the human person to God. The two stand in an iconic relation. Moreover, 1 Chron 29:14, according to R. Eleazar of Bartotha,⁵⁸ presents an ethical imperative to dedicate the icon, the human person, to its paradigm, God.

The same anthropological statement, accompanied by the same ethical imperative, resurfaces in *Lev. Rab.* 34:3:

Hillel the Elder once, when he concluded his studies with his disciples, walked along with them. His disciples asked him: Master, whither are you bound? He answered them: To perform a religious duty. What, they asked, is this religious duty? He said to them: To wash in the bath-house. Said they: Is this a religious duty? Yes, he replied; if the statues (אִיקוֹנוֹתַיִם) of kings, which are erected in theatres and circuses, are scoured and washed by the man who is appointed to look after them, and who thereby obtains his maintenance through them—nay more, he is exalted in the company of the great of the kingdom — how much more I, who have been created in the image and likeness; as it is written, For in the image of God made He man (Gen 9:6). (*Lev. Rab.* 34:3)⁵⁹

I have shown elsewhere how the rabbinic speculation about the iconic value of humanity is often illustrated with parables about the

(57) Translation from J. NEUSNER, *Judaism and Story: The Evidence of the Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992) 161–172, here p. 165; see also IDEM, *The Mishnah. A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991) 679. For the poetry of this *Pirqa Aboth* passage, see A. D. TROPPEL, *Wisdom, Politics, and Historiography. Tractate Avot in the Context of the Graeco-Roman Near East* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 84.

(58) I do not take the attributions of early rabbinic traditions to be historical.

(59) H. FREEDMAN, N. SIMON (eds.), *Midrash Rabbah*, 10 vols. (London: Soncino Press, 1961) Vol. *Leviticus*, 428. The story is retold slightly different in *Abot R. Nat.* B 30.

Roman emperor and his cultic statues.⁶⁰ The same iconic association between humanity and the divine, extended in the same way into a similar ethical imperative, and illustrated through a parallelism with images of the Roman emperor, transpires in the story of Mt 22:15–21 (and parallels: Mark 12:14–17, Luke 20:22–25):

Then the Pharisees went and plotted to entrap him in what he said. So they sent their disciples to him, along with the Herodians, saying, "Teacher, we know that you are sincere, and teach the way of God in accordance with truth, and show deference to no one; for you do not regard people with partiality. Tell us, then, what you think. Is it lawful to pay taxes to the emperor, or not?" But Jesus, aware of their malice, said, "Why are you putting me to the test, you hypocrites? Show me the coin used for the tax." And they brought him a denarius. Then he said to them, "Whose head is this, and whose title?" They answered, "The emperor's." Then he said to them, "Give therefore to the emperor the things that are the emperor's, and to God the things that are God's." (Mt 22:15–21, NRSV)

Jesus' imperative at the end of this story closely echoes the interpretation of 1 Chron 29:14 in *Mishnah Avot/Pirqe Avot* 3: "Give him [that is, God] what is his, for you and yours are his." Tertullian perceptively notes the more or less subtle anthropological meaning of Jesus' saying. For the North African writer, the story is about the iconic nature of humanity.⁶¹ What people are to give to God are their own beings, because they belong to God in the first place:

What things, then, are Caesar's? Those, to wit, about which the consultation was then held, whether the poll-tax should be furnished to Caesar or no. Therefore, too, the Lord demanded that the money should be shown Him, and inquired about the image, whose it was; and when He had heard it was Caesar's, said, "Render to Caesar

(60) S. BUNTA, The Likeness of the Image: Adamic Motifs and **צלם** Anthropology in Rabbinic Traditions about Jacob's Image Enthroned in Heaven, *JSJ* 37 (2006) 55–84, particularly pp. 76–82.

(61) Several scholars have also made the argument that the gospel text is best understood as a statement about the iconic value of humanity. See M. RIST, Caesar or God (Mark 12:13–17)? A Study in "Formgeschichte", *Journal for the Study of Religion* 16 (1936) 317–331, particularly p. 328; Ch. H. GIBLIN, The 'Things of God' in the Question Concerning Tribute to Caesar (Lk 20:25; Mk 12:17; Mt 20:21), *CBQ* 33 (1971) 510–527; D. T. OWEN-BALL, Rabbinic Rhetoric and the Tribute Passage (Mt. 22:15–22; Mk. 12:13–17; Lk. 20:20–26), *NT* 35 (1993) 1–14.

what are Caesar's, and what are God's to God"; that is, the image of Caesar, which is on the coin, to Caesar, and the image of God, which is on man, to God (*et imaginem Dei Deo, quae in homine est*); so as to render to Caesar indeed money, to God yourself (*Deo temetipsum*). (*On Idolatry* 15)⁶²

The use of the phrase "your own of your own" for the relation between God and Adam in the Romanian recension of *LAE* reflects a similar iconic anthropology and closely echoes these ancient Jewish and Christian speculations. Like in *Mishnah Avot/Pirque Avot* 3 and Mt 22: 15–21, in the Romanian version of the pseudepigraphon the referents of the votive phrase are God and humanity. While in all other versions the phrase is about humanity and the earth, in the Romanian recension the earth says the votive formula to God over Adam's inanimate body. The emphasis on Adam's physical resemblance to God is implicit.

This proposed reading of the Romanian text coincides with the strong emphasis throughout the *LAE* corpus on Adam's iconic status. Thus, the Latin, Armenian, and Georgian versions contain the story of the fall of Satan. Michael Stone has convincingly argued that, even if the Greek version lacks this passage, it implicitly assumes the tradition in the development of its narrative,⁶³ as do, one may add, the Romanian and Slavonic versions. The Georgian version of the story reads:

¹³ Le diable lui (i.e. to Adam) répondit et lui dit: "[Tu ne m'as (rien) fait,]⁶⁴ mais c'est à cause de toi que je suis tombé sur la terre. Le jour même où tu fus créé, ce jour là, je tombai de la face de Dieu parce que, comme Dieu t'avait soufflé l'Esprit sur ton visage, tu avais l'image et la ressemblance de la divinité. Puis Michel arriva; [il te présenta et te fait prosterner devant Dieu].⁶⁵ Et Dieu dit à Michel: 'J'ai créé Adam selon (mon) image et ma divinité.' ¹⁴ Alors Michel vint; il convoqua toutes les troupes des anges et il leur dit: 'Prosternez vous devant le semblable et l'image de la divinité.' Or, quand Michel les convoqua et que tous se prosternèrent devant toi, il me convoqua moi aussi et je lui dis: 'Éloigne toi de moi, car je ne saurais me prosterner de-

(62) Translation from ANF. I have consulted the Latin text in PL 1:683.

(63) M. STONE, *The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on The Books of Adam and Eve*, *JTS* 44 (1993) 153–156.

(64) I provided between brackets the correction that J.-P. Mahé subsequently made to his original translation (ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, vii).

(65) The words between brackets contain the correction that Mahé subsequently made to his original translation "il (ordonna) qu'on se prosternât devant toi en présence de Dieu" (ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 16E).

vant celui qui est plus jeune que moi; en effet, avant celui-ci, je suis seigneur, et c'est à lui qu'il convient de se prosterner devant moi.'¹⁵ Cela, d'autres anges des six classes l'entendirent et ma parole leur plut et ils ne se prosternèrent pas devant toi.¹⁶ Alors Dieu s'irrita contre nous et il nous ordonna, à eux et à moi, de descendre de nos demeures vers la terre." (Georgian *LAE* 13:1–16:1)⁶⁶

The tradition associates the angelic worship of Adam with the protoplast's identity as the image of God. As John R. Levison emphasizes, "the image consists of physical similarity to God."⁶⁷ This physical resemblance enables Adam to function as a cultic statue of God. The connection between Adam's physical resemblance to God and the angelic worship of Adam is evident in Michael's command to Satan: *adorate imaginem domini dei* in Latin, and "prosternez vous devant le semblable et l'image de la divinité" in Georgian. *Astowac*,⁶⁸ which the Armenian version uses for Adam's iconic function,⁶⁹ means both 'god' and 'idol.'⁷⁰ Given the latter connotation, the Armenian version better reflects the early Second Temple conception of Adam as the equivalent of a pagan cult statue or idol.⁷¹

(66) Translation from MAHÉ, *Le Livre d'Adam géorgienne de la Vita Adae...*, 234–235. The tradition is also preserved in *Apoc. Sedr.* 5:1–2. The opposition of the fallen angels to the worship of the iconic Adam is also recorded in several Jewish-Christian and Christian sources, such as *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4:52–56, a Coptic text attributed to Peter of Alexandria, a Coptic *Encomium on Michael*, a Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*, the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*, Origen's *De Principiis* I.V.4–5, and Tertullian's *On Patience* 5. The extensive presence of the tradition in third century Christian sources indicates that it had a widespread circulation in second century Jewish circles.

(67) J. R. LEVISON, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988) (JSPSS, 1) 178.

(68) I follow here the transliteration of classical Armenian proposed by R. W. THOMPSON, *An Introduction to Classical Armenian* (Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1989) 11–12.

(69) "Bow down to god (*Astowac*) whom I have made" (ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 16E). Stone notes that manuscript no. 3461 from Erevan, Matenadaran, replaces *astowac* with Adam (*The Penitence of Adam*, 2:4, n. 1 on ch. 14).

(70) B. A. OLSEN, *The Noun in Biblical Armenian* (Berlin—New York: M. de Gruyter, 1999) 545–546. *Astowac* translates the Hebrew Bible use of ʾēlōhîm for idols: Exod 20:23; 34:15–17; Num 25:2; Deut 4:28; Josh 24:14.

(71) Adam's resemblance to God is offered as justification for worship in *Gospel of Bartholomew* and *Encomium on Michael*. The reading of the latter

General Conclusions

The evidence presented in this article leads to the following tentative conclusions:

1. The Romanian version of the *Life of Adam and Eve* preserves the only text form in which, during the burial of Adam's body, the phrase "your own of your own" is addressed by the earth to God. All other extant versions have God utter the phrase to the earth. Thus these versions understand Adam's body to be a possession of the earth, while the Romanian recension associates the body of the protoplast with God.

2. The phrase is identical to the votive formula that has been part of the anaphora prayer in the Byzantine liturgies from as early as the fifth century.

3. The Romanian use of the formula in reference to God echoes better the early liturgical and votive history of the phrase (in which it is almost always addressed to God) and fits best within the context of the ancient Jewish and Christian speculations about the iconic nature of humanity and, implicitly and particularly, of the protoplast. Two of these texts, *Mishnah Avot/Pirqe Avot* 3 and Mt 22:15–21, contain very similar votive phrases and in both cases, just like in the Romanian text, the one to whom the offering should be made is God and the offering is the human person.

4. Slightly more than a decade ago, Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp astutely noted that in recent scholarship

it has rightly become less natural to assume that an old, more primitive stage in a writing's development is intrinsically more important than later stages, especially if one acknowledges (as the present authors do) that later stages of the writing may contain traditions that are older than the earlier stages of the writing which do not contain those traditions.⁷²

The cumulative evidence analyzed in this article presents an illustrative case. The idiosyncratic presence in the Slavonic and Romanian versions of *LAE* of the liturgical/votive phrase "your own of your own" (ГБОЛ ѿ ГБОУХ; *al tău dintr-ale tale*) reflects, despite the lateness of the manuscripts, ancient developments in the Christian liturgy. Fur-

is worth mentioning: "The angels beheld the likeness and image of God in Adam and they fell down and worshipped him and gave him glory *as the likeness of God* [my emphasis]" (CRUM, *Texts Attributed...*, 396–397, n. 3).

(72) DE JONGE, TROMP, *The Life of Adam and Eve...*, 65.

thermore, the Romanian use of the formula in reference to God echoes ancient Jewish and Christian speculations about the iconic nature of humanity and, implicitly and particularly, of the protoplast.

5. It is probable that the Romanian version owes this idiosyncratic element to an early text form that is no longer extant in Greek or Slavonic. The addressing of the votive formula to God may have collapsed, at later states of transmission, into another element of the larger narrative, namely, the proper return of Adam's body to the earth from which it was taken.

This speaks for the ongoing fluidity of the Adamic corpus throughout late antiquity and the Middle Ages.

SUMMARY

The Romanian version of the *Life of Adam and Eve* preserves the only text form in which, during the burial of Adam's body, the offering formula "your own of your own," which has been used in eastern liturgies from as early as the sixth century, is addressed by the earth to God. All other extant versions have God utter the phrase to the earth. Thus these versions understand Adam's body to be a possession of the earth, while the Romanian recension associates the body of the protoplast with God. Similar votive phrases, based primarily on 1 Chron 29:14, are used in ancient Jewish and Christian speculations to describe the iconic relation between humanity, particularly the human body, and God. This paper argues that, in its idiosyncratic reading, the Romanian recension of the *Life of Adam and Eve*, although preserved in late medieval manuscripts, seems to reflect the merger of the eastern liturgical formula with these ancient Jewish and Christian speculations about the iconic nature of Adam.

Bogdan G. Bucur
Pittsburgh, PA

“THE MOUNTAIN OF THE LORD”: SINAI, ZION, AND EDEN IN BYZANTINE HYMNOGRAPHIC EXEGESIS¹

Introduction

In the manifesto of the “Theophaneia School,” Alexander Golitzin ventures the following bold statement:

Theophany permeates Orthodox Tradition throughout, informing its dogmatic theology and its liturgy. That Jesus, Mary’s son, is the very One who appeared to Moses and the prophets — this is the consistent witness of the ante-Nicene Fathers, and remains foundational throughout the fourth century Trinitarian controversies and the later christological disputes.²

In the pages to follow, I would like to show that, aside from the history of creeds, councils, and condemnations, and accompanying the patristic works of Christology or trinitarian theology, the identification of the Son of Mary with “the Lord of Glory whom Moses saw of old” is also affirmed by the hymnographic tradition of the Christian East. The witness of Byzantine hymnography is extremely relevant, as no single patristic work has been read so extensively and with such unconditional acceptance throughout the ages. Nevertheless, as I will show, the exegetical dimension of Byzantine hymnography is difficult to define using the categories commonly used for early Christian exegesis (“allegory,” “typology,” etc); I submit that a more suitable category

(1) Except where indicated, the English translation of the hymns is taken from *The Festal Menaion* (trans. Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware; London—Boston: Faber&Faber, 1969) and *The Lenten Triodion* (trans. Mother Mary and Kallistos Ware; London—Boston: Faber&Faber, 1977), modified only to conform to contemporary use of pronouns and verbs. For biblical references, in cases of divergence between biblical book, or between the numbering of chapters or verses in the LXX and the MT, the first abbreviation and number refers to the LXX, the second to the MT.

(2) A. GOLITZIN, *Theophaneia: Forum on the Jewish Roots of Orthodox Spirituality*, *Scr 3* (2007) xviii.

is that of “rewritten Bible,” developed by scholars working with Old Testament pseudepigrapha.

As the title indicates, I will discuss hymns that interpret theophanies associated with Sinai, theophanies associated with Zion, and theophanies associated with the primordial mountain of Eden. This approach to understanding biblical texts and traditions is suggested by a passage in *Jubilees* — “the Garden of Eden was the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord. And Mount Sinai [was] in the midst of the desert, and Mount Zion [was] in the midst of the navel of the earth. The three of these were created as holy places, one facing the other” (*Jub.* 8.19) — and it is the established way of “entering the Scriptures” in both Jewish and Christian tradition.³

“Byzantine Hymnography”

It is a commonplace that Byzantine hymnography is “dogmatic,” in the sense that the hymns function as a vehicle for dogmatic statements. One may think, for instance, of the hymns celebrating the achievements of Ecumenical Councils, or of certain hymns to the Theotokos, aptly called “Dogmatika.”⁴ With reference to these “dogmatic hymns” one can rightly speak of “the era of hymnographers” (successive to “the era of the councils”), which produced “a rich popularized theology ... formulating, clarifying, supporting and defending the Orthodox faith against heretical deformations,” and thus supplying the Church with “one of the most secure means of protection ... against the return of the great heresies.”⁵

(3) I have in mind Jon D. LEVENSON’s beautiful and influential book *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 1987). See also B. G. BUCUR, *Sinai, Zion, and Thabor: An Entry into the Christian Bible*, *Journal of Theological Interpretation* (forthcoming).

(4) For instance, the “dogmatic hymns” in praise of the Theotokos constantly remind worshippers that the incarnate Word is *truly God and truly human*, double in *ousia*, yet one according to *hypostasis*, etc. Many of the hymns of Pentecost or those celebrating the restoration of icons in 843 (“Sunday of Orthodoxy”) provide little else than sound doctrinal instruction.

(5) E. BRANIȘTE, *Le culte byzantin comme expression de la foi orthodoxe*, in: *La liturgie expression de la foi: Conférences Saint Serge XXV^e semaine d’études liturgiques, Paris, 1978* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1979) 77; A. KNIAZEFF, *Hymnographie byzantine et confession de foi*, in: *La liturgie expression de la foi...*, 179.

I hasten to say, however, that the hymns to be discussed in this article are *not* of the dogmatic type, but rather of a more primitive kind, originating in early Christian Paschal celebrations in Jerusalem.

“Byzantine hymnography” as we know it today is the result of intense interaction between the liturgical centers of the Christian East — namely, St. Sabbas Monastery in Palestine, the “Great Church” and the Stoudion monastery in Constantinople, and the monastic community of Mount Athos — over a period ranging from the end of the iconoclastic crisis to the end of the Hesychastic debate (9th–14th centuries). The hymnographic material itself, however, existed prior to the codification, scattered in loose collections of hymns.⁶ The Studite emphasis on hymnography was inherited from St. Sabbas, and can be traced back to fourth or fifth-century Jerusalem. Indeed, within the complex theological exchange that characterizes the “tale of two cities” (Jerusalem and Constantinople) that shaped the Byzantine liturgical tradition, the monastery of St. Sabbas near Jerusalem supplied the hymnography, receiving “in exchange” the lections. The synthesis created by the monks at Stoudion — “a Palestinian horologion with its psalmody and hymns grafted onto a skeleton of litanies and their collects from the euchology of the Great Church” — was later adopted by the monastic community of Mount Athos from where it then spread to the entire Byzantine world.⁷ On the other hand, there is evidence of “a

(6) The codification of the Triodion dates to the tenth century. Yet, “before the constitution of hymnographic anthologies, such as the Oktoechos, the Triodion, and the series of Menaia, the hymnography contained therein was spread out in loose collections of *kanones*, *stichera*, *kontakaria*, *tropologia*, and *kathismata*” (Th. POTT, *La réforme liturgique byzantine* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000) 107; R. F. TAFT, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992) 75, 83). About two centuries prior to the most ancient manuscript of the Triodion (dated around 1027–1029, POTT, *Réforme liturgique...*, 106, n. 42), the Studite emphasis on hymnography was in full swing; yet, as Pott notes (*Ibid.*, 118), Theodore and his monks inherited the hymnographic tradition of St. Sabbas’ monastery, after the invasion of the Persians, in 614, and the conquest of Jerusalem by the Arabs in 638.

(7) The “tale of two cities” is, of course, much more complex. The influence of Jerusalem over Constantinople was due not only to the natural pre-eminence of the Mother Church, but also to an influx of Palestinian monks on Mt. Olympus in Bythinia, following the Arab conquest of Jerusalem in 638, and the subsequent move of Theodore with his monks from Mt. Olympus to the Stoudion monastery in Constantinople in 799. The final “monasticization” of the Constantinopolitan cathedral rite and the complete capitulation to

Palestinian monastic influence in Southern Italy and Rome," dated to end of the seventh or early eighth century.⁸

If, as Robert Taft notes, "in Jerusalem lies the key to much of the present-day Byzantine rite,"⁹ the same holds true for hymnography. Indeed, "it was Jerusalem that produced the earliest annual cycle of chants, the earliest known true chantbook, and the first repertories organized in eight modes."¹⁰ Some of the Byzantine festal hymns — more than two hundred, according to Peter Jeffery¹¹ — are found in the eighth-to-tenth century manuscript of the Georgian *Iadgari* (roughly "chantbook"), which contains a translation of hymns used at Jerusalem; some also occur in the Georgian lectionary.¹² The Greek hymno-

Sabbaitic liturgical usage was also facilitated by the disastrous loss of the city to the crusaders in 1204, and the rising importance of monastics after the recapture of Constantinople in 1261. For a more detailed presentation, see POTT, *Réforme liturgique...*, 99–167; R. TAFT, Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite, 182–183; A Tale of Two Cities, 22–23, 31; In the Bridegroom's Absence, 72–73; all three articles are collected, with their original pagination, in R. TAFT, *Liturgy in Byzantium and Beyond* (Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate Variorum, 1995). On the other hand, "around the turn of the millennium our Holy Week documentation reveals a fascinating symbiosis: as the rite of Constantinople is being monasticized via Palestine, the rite of Palestine is being further byzantinized" (TAFT, In the Bridegroom's Absence..., 73).

(8) A. ROSE, Les fêtes de Noël à Rome et l'hymnographie orientale, in: A. M. TRIACCA, A. PISTOIA (eds.), *L'Hymnographie: Conférences Saint-Serge XLVI^e semaine d'études liturgiques, Paris, 29 Juin – 2 Juillet 1999* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000) 248; POTT, *Réforme Liturgique...*, 111. The hymns have been edited and published in thirteen volumes in: I. SCHIRÓ (ed.), *Analecta hymnica graeca e codicibus eruta Italiae inferioris* (Rome: Istituto di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici, Università di Roma, 1966–1983). See also, specifically for the import of the *Impropria* from Syria to the West around the eighth century, A. BAUMSTARK, Der Orient und die Gesänge der Adoratio Crucis, *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 2 (1922) 1–17, at 16.

(9) TAFT, In the Bridegroom's Absence: The Paschal Triduum in the Byzantine Church, in: I. SCICOLONE (ed.), *La celebrazione del Triduo Pasquale: Anamnesis e mimesis. Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Liturgia, Roma, Pontificio Istituto Liturgico, 9–13 May 1988* (Rome: Abbazia di S. Paolo, 1990) 71–97 at 72.

(10) P. JEFFERY, The Earliest Christian Chant Repertory Recovered: The Georgian Witnesses to Jerusalem Chant, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 47 (1994) 1–38, at 34. See Egeria's *Itinerarium*, 25.5.

(11) JEFFERY, The Earliest Christian Chant..., 17 n. 36.

(12) E. METREVELI et al., *Udzvelesi Iadgari* (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1980); M. TARCHNIŠVILI, *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem, V^e–VIII^e siècles*

graphic material preserved in these sources is now dated to late fourth or early fifth century.¹³ In fact, it is generally the case that “classics” of Byzantine hymnography such as Romanos the Melodist, John Damascene, and Cosmas of Maiuma are deeply indebted to fourth-century writers like Ephrem Syrus and Gregory Nazianzen.¹⁴

If one considers the *Improperia* hymnography — that is, the various earlier forms of the tradition that also found expression in the *Improperia* of the Roman Holy Friday liturgy¹⁵ — and other compositions that are intimately connected with the *Reproaches*¹⁶ or modeled after them,¹⁷ the roots of Christian hymnography lie even further in the past.

(Louvain; Secretariat du CSCO, 1959–1960) 188–189, 204–205. I rely on the following translations and studies: H.-M. SCHNEIDER, *Lobpreis im rechten Glauben: Die Theologie der Hymnen an den Festen der Menschwerdung der alten Jerusalemer Liturgie im Georgischen Udzelesi Iadgari* (Bonn: Borengässer, 2004); H. LEEB, *Die Gesänge im Gemeindegottesdienst von Jerusalem vom 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert* (Vienna: Herder, 1980); P. JEFFERY, The Sunday Office of Seventh-Century Jerusalem in the Georgian Chantbook (Iadgari): A Preliminary Report, *Studia Liturgica* 21 (1991) 52–75; IDEM, The Earliest Christian Chant...

(13) LEEB, *Gemeindegottesdienst von Jerusalem...*, 30; BAUMSTARK, *Comparative Liturgy* (revised by B. Botte; London: Mowbrey & Co, 1958) 95; JEFFERY, The Earliest Christian Chant..., 8 n. 18; Ch. RENOUX, Une hymnographie ancienne en géorgien, in: CLAIR, TRIACCA, PISTOIA, *L'Hymnographie: Conférences Saint-Serge...*, 138, 148.

(14) P. KARAVITES, Gregory Nazianzos and Byzantine Hymnography, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 113 (1993) 81–98; W. L. PETERSEN, The Dependence of Romanos the Melodist upon the Syriac Ephrem: Its Importance for the Origin of the Kontakion, *VC* 39 (1985) 171–187; IDEM, *The Diatessaron and Ephrem Syrus as Sources of Romanos the Melodist* (Louvain: Peeters, 1985); S. P. BROCK, From Ephrem to Romanos, *SP* 20 (1989) 139–151.

(15) H. AUF DER MAUR, *Die Osterhomilien des Asterius Sophistes als Quelle für die Geschichte der Osterfeier* (Trier: Paulinus, 1967) (Trierer Theologische Studien, 19) 134 n. 380.

(16) Here I have in mind those hymns that connect the lofty status of Christ with his extreme humiliation at the Passion. See, for instance, Antiphon 15 of Holy Friday, quoted below.

(17) E.g., the *Glory Sticheron* at the Ninth Hour of the Eve of Nativity, quoted below. A thorough clarification of the liturgical terms that will be used in this article would be impractical for reasons of space. Suffice it to say that *sticheron*, *kontakion* (as found in today's liturgical books), and *troparion* simply designate various hymns consisting of one stanza, differentiated by their position and function in various services. By contrast, the “canon” is a lengthy composition, comprising nine odes or Odes, each of which is in turn made up

Scholars have pointed out the extraordinary diffusion of the *Improperia* compositions in Syriac, Greek, and Latin liturgical usage; in patristic writers such as Aphrahat, Ephrem of Nisibis, Jacob of Serug, Melito of Sardis, Cyril of Jerusalem, Asterius Sophistes, Romanos the Melodist, Pseudo-Cyprian (the author of *Adversus Iudaeos*); in the sermon “On the Soul and the Body” ascribed to Alexander of Alexandria and preserved only in Coptic; in New Testament Apocrypha such as the *Acts of Pilate*, the *Acts of Thomas*, and the *Gospel of Bartholomew*.¹⁸ The oldest example of *Improperia* is generally thought to be Melito’s paschal homily, dated to the third quarter of the second century.¹⁹ Consider the following passages, taken from Melito’s “On Pascha,” and Byzantine hymns of the Passion and the Nativity:

He who hung the earth is hanging
 He who fixed the heavens in place has been fixed in place
 He who laid the foundations of the universe has been laid on a tree
 The Master has been profaned, God has been murdered
 The King of Israel has been destroyed ...²⁰

Today, He who hung the earth upon the waters is hung
upon the Cross.

He who is King of the angels is arrayed in a crown of thorns.
 He who wraps the heaven in clouds is wrapped
in the purple of mockery.

He who in the Jordan set Adam free receives blows upon His face.
 The Bridegroom of the Church is transfixed with nails.
 The Son of the Virgin is pierced with a spear ...²¹

of several stanzas. The theme song and first hymn of each Ode of a canon is called “heirmos” (usually transcribed “irmos,” in accord with the Byzantine Greek pronunciation common in the Eastern Orthodox Church).

(18) For a detailed presentation, see W. SCHÜTZ, Was habe ich dir getan, mein Volk?, *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 13 (1968) 1–39; AUF DER MAUR, Die Osterhomilien des Asterius Sophistes...; S. JANERAS, *Le Vendredi-Saint dans la tradition liturgique byzantine: Structure et histoire de ses offices* (Rome: Benedictina, 1988) (*Studia Anselmiana*, 99) 264–270.

(19) E. WELLESZ, Melito’s Homily on the Passion: An Investigation into the Sources of Byzantine Hymnography, *JTS* 44 (1943) 41–48; E. WERNER, Melito of Sardis, the First Poet of Deicide, *Hebrew Union College Annual* 37 (1966) 191–210; AUF DER MAUR, *Osterhomilien des Asterius Sophistes...*, 142; SCHÜTZ, Was habe ich dir getan..., 1, 2, 38; JANERAS, *Vendredi-Saint...*, 264–270.

(20) Melito of Sardis, *On Pascha*, 96.

(21) Holy Friday: Antiphon 15 (*Triodion*, 587).

Today, He who holds the whole creation in the hollow of His hand
is born of the Virgin.

He whom in essence none can touch
is wrapped in swaddling clothes as a mortal.

God who in the beginning founded the heavens
lies in a manger.

He who rained manna down on the people in the wilderness
is fed on milk from His Mother's breast.

He who is the Bridegroom of the Church calls unto Himself
the Magi.

The Son of the Virgin accepts their gifts ...²²

The christological proclamation follows an evidently similar pattern in Melito's rhythmic prose and in the later Byzantine hymns. Christ's lofty identity, suggested by recourse to biblical statements about the Old Testament divinity, is united in a paradoxical way with the humility of the New Testament events. As the quotations suggest, festal hymns (Baptism, Palm Sunday, Nativity, Presentation, etc) are patterned creatively after the Paschal hymnography, which in turn seems indebted to archaic material.²³

Sinai: "The Lord of Glory whom Moses Saw of Old"

As announced in the title, I propose to take a closer look at the way in which Byzantine hymnography interprets Old Testament theophanies. The obvious starting point are the theophanies associated with Sinai — the call of Moses, the exodus from Egypt, and the giving of the Law. The centrality of Sinai in the life of biblical Israel cannot be overstated: "whatever the experience of the people Israel on Mount

(22) Ninth Royal Hour at the Eve of Nativity: *Glory Sticheron (Menaion, 245–246)*.

(23) The application of the pattern of paschal hymns to other festal hymns (see JANERAS, *Vendredi-Saint...*, 254–256) is evident in the writings of the celebrated sixth-century hymnographer Romanos the Melodist. Romanos, however, is indebted to the fourth-century Ephrem Syrus (see the references to studies by Petersen and Brock above). And Ephrem's paschal hymns "almost immediately recall the most ancient paschal homily that we know, that of the Quartodeciman Melito of Sardis" (G. A. M. ROUWHORST, *Les hymnes pascales d'Ephrem de Nisibe*, 2 vols. (New York: Brill, 1989) Vol. 1, 128), although one can also point to Aphrahat's *Demonstration* 6.9. Indeed, Melito's homily appears to have engendered a homiletic tradition that eventually produced the Byzantine hymnography of Holy Friday (SCHÜTZ, *Was habe ich dir getan...*, 37).

Sinai was, it was so overwhelming that the texts about it seem to be groping for an adequate metaphor through which to convey the awesomeness of the event.²⁴ If, however, “we know nothing about Sinai, but an immense amount about the traditions concerning Sinai,” scholarly analysis of the manifold ways in which Sinai was remembered, interpreted and appropriated by generations of Jewish, Christian, and Moslem exegetes should also include a discussion of the Byzantine hymnography associated with Sinai. I begin with some controversial passages selected from hymns of the *Improperia* type:

O My people, what have I done to you, and how have you repaid Me? Instead of manna, you have given me gall, instead of water, vinegar ...²⁵

Today the Jews nailed to the Cross the Lord who divided the sea with a rod and led them through the wilderness. Today they pierced with a lance the side of Him who for their sake smote Egypt with plagues. They gave Him gall to drink, who rained down manna on them for food.²⁶

With Moses' rod You have led them on dry ground through the Red Sea, yet they nailed You to the Cross; You have suckled them with honey from the rock, yet they gave You gall.²⁷

Be not be deceived, Jews: for this is He who saved you in the sea and fed you in the wilderness.²⁸

Read in isolation, the heavy anti-Jewish polemic in these verses is deeply disturbing, especially since hymns of this kind have at times been part of the explosive mix that led to violence against Jews.²⁹ It seems more than legitimate, therefore, to eliminate or rewrite such

(24) LEVENSON, *Sinai and Zion...*, 16, 17.

(25) Holy Friday: Antiphon 12 (*Triodion*, 583). The similarity with the Western *Reproaches* is evident. See Baumstark's detailed analysis of the text in his "Der Orient und die Gesänge der Adoratio Crucis."

(26) Holy Friday: Antiphon 6 (*Triodion*, 577).

(27) Royal Hours of Holy Friday: Troparion of the Third Hour (*Triodion*, 603).

(28) Holy Friday: Antiphon 12 (*Triodion*, 584).

(29) According to P. KENEZ, Pogroms and White Ideology of the Russian Civil War, in: J. D. KLIER, Sh. LAMBROZA (eds.), *Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History* (Cambridge 1992) 306, "[a]lthough Thursday and Friday of Holy Week were not so often days of violence in pre-revolutionary Russia, there is no doubt that traditionally the worst time for pogroms was Easter."

hymns, as has been done or proposed in all Christian denominations where the *Reproaches* are part of Holy Week services.³⁰

Nevertheless, such an approach, although well-intentioned and serving a worthy cause, is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the hymns. The problem is one of theological contextualization. The *Improperia* continue and reinterpret a venerable Jewish tradition, with roots in the prophetic literature.³¹ If, however, “the Lord’s reproaches to Israel” are placed on the lips of Jesus, it is clear that the *Improperia* are, first and foremost, christological affirmations, not polemical injunctions. Their central message is that it is Christ who rained manna in the desert, it is Christ who divided the Red Sea — in short, that Christ is the “Lord” of the Exodus account. Rather than excise these christological statements by way of liturgical reform, it would be more necessary to educate Christians about the fact that the hymns do not warrant any sort of anti-Semitism, since their intention is primarily christological.

These observations can be verified by recourse to other festal hymns, in which the anti-Jewish polemic is absent, yet in which one encounters the very same reading of biblical theophanies, and, by way of consequence, the same type of “YHWH Christology.” For instance, a hymn in preparation of Nativity reads: “Make ready, O Bethlehem; throw open your gate, O Eden! For He-Who-Is [Exod 3:14] comes to be that which He was not, and He who formed all creation takes form.”³² Similarly, in the celebration of the Transfiguration, as the hymns bring together Christ’s manifestation on Thabor with his earlier apparition before Moses on Sinai:

(30) In Roman-Catholic, Lutheran, and Methodist parishes, the *Reproaches* are often replaced with other texts (e.g., Ps 22) to exclude references to Exodus, or replaced with new compositions reproaching Christians for their anti-Semitism and the ensuing Holocaust. S. HACKEL, *The Relevance of Western Post-Holocaust Theology to the Thought and Practice of the Russian Orthodox Church*, *Sobornost* 20 (1998) 7–25, has called for similar reforms in the Eastern Orthodox Church.

(31) J. HARVEY, Le “Rib-Pattern”, *requisitoire prophétique sur la rupture de l’alliance*, *Biblica* 43 (1962) 172–196; IDEM, *Le Plaidoyer prophétique contre Israël après la rupture de l’alliance* (Bruges—Paris—Montreal, 1967); R. MURRAY, *Some Rhetorical Patterns in Early Syriac Literature*, in: R. H. FISCHER (ed.), *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus* (Chicago, Ill.: The Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1977) 129; M. D. BROCKE, *On the Jewish Origin of the Improperia*, *Immanuel* 7 (1977) 44–51.

(32) Forefeast of Nativity Vespers, Apostichon (*Menaion*, 202).

In the past, Christ led Israel in the wilderness with the pillar of fire and the cloud [Exod 14:19]; and today ineffably He has shone forth in light upon Mount Thabor.³³

What Moses once saw in darkness, he now sees in the blazing light of Transfiguration: the same glory, the same “most pure feet,” the same mountain (at least in some hymns!), the same Lord:

The mountain that was once gloomy and veiled in smoke has now become venerable and holy, since Your feet, O Lord, have stood upon it.³⁴

You have appeared to Moses both on the Mountain of the Law and on Thabor: of old in darkness, but now in the unapproachable light of the Godhead.³⁵

He who once spoke through symbols to Moses on Mount Sinai, saying, “I am He who is” [Exod 3:14] was transfigured today upon Mount Thabor before the disciples ...³⁶

You, O Christ our God, have delivered the written Law upon Mount Sinai, and have appeared there riding upon the cloud, in the midst of fire and darkness and tempest [Exod 19:16–19; 31:18; Deut 4:11] to deliver the Law to Moses.³⁷

The hymns of the Presentation are replete with the same christological reading of Sinai theophany.

Receive, O Simeon, Him whom Moses once beheld in darkness, granting the Law on Sinai, and who has now become a babe subject to the Law, yet this is the One who spoke through the law! ...³⁸

The Ancient of Days, who in times past gave Moses the Law on Sinai, appears this day as a babe. As Maker of the Law, He fulfills the Law, and according to the Law He is brought into the temple ...³⁹

(33) First Canon of Transfiguration: Ode 3 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 484).

(34) Great Vespers of Transfiguration, Sticheron at *Lord I have cried* (*Menaion*, 471).

(35) Second Canon of Transfiguration, Ode 1 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 483).

(36) Great Vespers of Transfiguration, Apostichon (*Menaion*, 476).

(37) First Canon of Transfiguration: Ode 4 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 485).

(38) Great Vespers of the Presentation: Sticheron at *Lord I have cried* (*Menaion*, 408).

(39) Great Vespers of the Presentation: Sticheron at the Lity (*Menaion*, 412). See also: “Today He who once gave the Law to Moses on Sinai submits Himself to the ordinances of the Law, in His compassion becoming for our sakes as we are ...” (Great Vespers of the Presentation: Sticheron at the Lity (*Menaion*, 412)); “Today the holy Mother, who is higher than any temple, has come into

Today Simeon takes in his arms the Lord of Glory whom Moses saw of old in the darkness, when on Mount Sinai he received the tables of the Law ...⁴⁰

This paradoxical fusion of exaltation and kenosis, supported by a christological interpretation of the theophanies, is a pattern that occurs in the hymns for the Presentation of both Romanos and Jacob of Serug.⁴¹

The same exegesis of Exodus narratives is frequent in the hymns of "Theophany" (the common Eastern designation of Epiphany). The Baptist is shaken with awe, knowing that he is to baptize the Creator of Adam,⁴² the God of Jacob,⁴³ the God of Mos-

the temple, disclosing to the world the Maker of the world and Giver of the Law" (Small Vespers of the Presentation: *Glory Sticheron (Menaion, 407)*).

(40) Presentation of the Lord: Sticheron at the Lity (*Menaion, 413*).

(41) See for instance Romanos' *Hymns on the Presentation*, Proemium I (174), Hymns 1 (176), 7 (182), 15 (192). Simeon holds in his arms the one before whom the heavenly powers tremble; the creator of Adam is born as a baby; Christ, who formerly received the oblation of Abel and of all the righteous, offers his own sacrifice, as keeper of the Law; He is the God who took up into heaven Enoch and Elijah. Cf. Jacob of Serug's homily on the Presentation (Joseph Kollampampil, *Jacob of Serug: Select Festal Homilies* [Rome: CIIS, 1997], 141–158): "The Ancient of Days whom Mary wrapped in swaddling clothes / and the aged Simeon held in his arms without being weakened" (17–18); "He gave the law to Moses on the Mount together with His Father / and He came to fulfill in His own person the order that He himself taught (23–24)"; "He carries Him in his hands and believes in Him that He is upon the chariot / He is held in the hands as a child and Simeon seeks release from Him" (135–136); "Simeon had become a Cherub of flesh on account of Jesus / and instead of wheels he carried Him solemnly in his hands" (187–188).

(42) "The Maker saw the man whom He had formed with His own hand, held in the obscurity of sin, in bonds that knew no escape. Raising him up, He laid him on His shoulders (Luke 15:5), and now in abundant floods He washes him clean from the ancient shame of Adam's sinfulness" (Second Canon of Theophany: Ode 5 Sticheron [*Menaion, 372–373*]); "Thus spoke the Lord to John: 'O Prophet, come and baptize Me who created you, for I enlightened all by grace and cleanse them. Touch my divine head and do not doubt'" (Eve of Theophany: Sticheron at the Sixth Royal Hour [*Menaion, 327*]).

(43) "Today the prophecy of the psalms swiftly approaches its fulfillment: the sea looked and fled, Jordan was driven back before the face of the Lord, before the face of the God of Jacob [Ps 113/114:3–7], when He came to receive baptism from His servant" (Eve of Theophany: Sticheron at the Sixth Royal Hour [*Menaion, 327*]).

es,⁴⁴ the Lord who drowned the Egyptian army in the Red Sea.⁴⁵ The dramatic dialogue between the two protagonists, which highlights



Christ giving the Law to Moses, 12th century
(Winchester Bible, fol 5r, detail).

Photo by Dr. John Crook, Winchester Cathedral

(44) [John the Baptist speaking to Jesus]: “Moses, when he came upon You, displayed the holy reverence that he felt: perceiving that it was Your voice that spoke from the bush, he forthwith turned away his gaze [Exod 3:6]. How then shall I behold You openly? How shall I lay my hand upon You?” (First Canon of Theophany: Ode 4 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 370)); “If I baptize You, I shall have as my accusers the mountain that smoked with fire [Exod 19:8], the sea which fled on either side, and this same Jordan which turned back (Ps 113/114:5)” (First Canon of Theophany: Ode 4 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 370)).

(45) “He who in ancient times hid the pursuing tyrant beneath the waves of the sea, now is cloaked and hidden in the stream of Jordan” (Forefeast of Theophany Canon: Ode 1 Irmos (*Menaion*, 297)). Compare: “He who in ancient times hid the pursuing tyrant beneath the waves of the sea, is hidden in a manger and Herod seeks to kill Him” (Forefeast of the Nativity: Compline Canon, Ode 1 Irmos (*Menaion*, 204)).

the paradoxical union of an exalted Christology with the humility of the Jordan baptism, is a common theme of the Theophany hymns. It occurs in John of Damascus (the presumed author of the Theophany Canon), Sophronius of Jerusalem, Romanos, Jacob of Serug, and Ephrem of Nisibis, who all use the same imagery — the lamp is to enlighten the Light; the servant is to place his hand on the Master; John must baptize the one upon whom the seraphim dare not look upon; he must baptize the one who created him with his own hand; mortal flesh is to touch the divine Fire without being consumed.

Zion: The Throne and Footstool of the Lord

If “Sinai is the mountain of Israel’s infancy, of the days of Moses, when the nation, as the story has it, was but a few generations old,” later on “the traditions of YHWH’s theophany, his earth-shattering apparition ... [were] transferred from Sinai to Zion.”⁴⁶ “The One of Sinai” (Ps 67:9, 18) comes to be known as “he who dwells on Mount Zion” (Isa 8:18), because “the Lord chose Zion and desired it as a dwelling place for himself” (Ps 131:13), so that his presence no longer makes Sinai quake and tremble, but instead shines forth from Zion (Ps 49:2).

Long before the advent of Christianity, Jewish exegetical and liturgical traditions associated with the celebration of Shavuot were connecting the Sinai theophany with Ezekiel 1 (“Zion”), and the depictions of the bridegroom in the Song of Songs.⁴⁷ The fundamental element of this exegetical constellation is that on both Sinai and Zion Israel meets the enthroned Lord: if the Sinai theophany depicts the giving of the Law, and hints only briefly at the Lawgiver’s feet resting on a crystalline structure (Exod 24:10), throne-visions such as those of Isaiah or Ezekiel, in which “art became the reality to which it pointed” and “the Temple mythos came alive,”⁴⁸ fill out the picture of God’s humanlike

(46) LEVENSON, *Sinai and Zion...*, 89, 91.

(47) The most recent and extensive treatment of this topic is that of S. PARK, *Pentecost and Sinai: The Festival of Weeks as a Celebration of the Sinai Event* (New York—London: T&T Clark, 2008). See also M. WEINFELD, Pentecost as Festival of the Giving of the Law, *Immanuel* 8 (1978) 7–18; R. ELIOR, *The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford—Portland: Litman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2005) 135–164; D. J. HALPERIN, Origen, Ezekiel’s Merkabah, and the Ascension of Moses, *Church History*, 50 (1981) 261–275; R. KIMELMAN, Rabbi Yohanan and Origen on the Song of Songs: A Third-Century Jewish-Christian Disputation, *HTR* 73 (1980) 567–595.

(48) LEVENSON, *Sinai and Zion...*, 123.

manifestation of the likeness of a throne, of which the Song of Songs offers an even more detailed portrayal.

The depiction of Israel's God seated on a fiery throne of cherubim in the innermost sanctum of a heavenly temple, attended by thousands upon thousands of angels that perform their celestial liturgies according to precisely appointed times and rules, is at the heart of apocalyptic literature during the Second Temple era.⁴⁹ As expected, throne-imagery looms large in both Jewish merkabah mysticism ("mysticism of the chariot-throne"),⁵⁰ and in its Christian counterpart, the New Testament and patristic literature. Throne imagery remains crucially important for Christian visionary literature, for iconography and hymnography, for christological and trinitarian doctrine (cf. *synthronos* as a description of Christ in relation to the Father), and by extension, for mariology and ascetic theory (Mary and the saints depicted as living thrones). Finally, throne imagery (and its apocalyptic background of the angelic worship before the heavenly temple) is used to highlight the importance of the Eucharist, sometimes in polemics against heretical claims to vision, or against Jewish throne-speculation.⁵¹

Moreover, the theme of the heavenly throne is, for Christian writers, not only an element of sacred tradition, but also the basis on which

(49) M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 191–209; T. D. N. METTINGER, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Lund: Wallin & Darholm, 1982); ELIOR, *Three Temples...*, 40–62, 82–87; M. DE JONGE, *Throne*, in: K. VAN DER TOORN, B. BECKING, P. W. VAN DER HORST (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (Leiden—Boston: Brill; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999) 1628–1631.

(50) For the texts, see P. SCHÄFER, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981) (TSAJ, 2); IDEM, *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur*, 4 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987–1995) (TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46). See the studies of G. SCHOLEM, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1967); SCHÄFER, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany, NY: SUNY, 1992); ELIOR, *Three Temples...*, 36–38, 194–200, 232–265.

(51) For the abundance and theological relevance of throne-imagery in the New Testament, see R. BAUCKHAM, *The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus*, in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Pages from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (Leiden—Boston—Cologne: Brill, 1999) 43–69. For patristic literature, see Golitzin, *The Image and Glory of God in Jacob of Serug's Homily, On that Chariot that Ezekiel the Prophet Saw*, *Scr 3* (2007) 180–212; IDEM, *The Demons Suggest an Illusion of God's Glory in a Form: Controversy over the Divine Body and Vision of Glory in Some Late Fourth, Early Fifth Century Monastic Literature*, *ibid.*, 49–82.

to make claims about the divine status of Jesus. It is this christological message that resonates in the hymns, which proclaim Jesus as the very rider of the *merkabah*:

Before Your birth, O Lord, the angelic hosts looked with trembling on this mystery and were struck with wonder: for You who have adorned the vault of heaven with stars have been well pleased to be born as a babe; and You who hold all the ends of the earth in the hollow of Your hand are laid in a manger of dumb beasts;⁵²

O You who ride on the cherubim and are praised by the seraphim, You have sat, O gracious Lord, like David on a foal, and the children honored You with praise fitting for God.⁵³

Be glad, O Bethlehem! ... for from you comes forth, before the sight of all, the Shepherd who tends Israel, He that is seated upon the cherubim, even Christ;⁵⁴

All have taken palms into their hands and spread their garments before Him, knowing that He is our God, to whom the cherubim sing without ceasing: Hosanna in the highest!⁵⁵

Seated in heaven upon Your throne and on earth upon a foal, O Christ our God, You have accepted the praise of angels and the songs of children who cry out to You: Blessed are You who come to call back Adam!⁵⁶

In these hymns, “throne” functions as an indicator of divinity, and thereby as a legitimation of worship. It is also, however, a code for bearer of divinity. If the manger holds no less than the Lord, who in heaven is enthroned on the living cherubic throne, what of the Virgin? “A strange and most wonderful mystery do I see: the cave is heaven; the Virgin — the throne of the cherubim.”⁵⁷ The Virgin, the manger of Bethlehem, the elder Simeon, the foal on which Christ enters Jerusalem, are all described as “thrones” inasmuch as they are bearing Christ:

The captain of heaven was sent to the living Pavilion of the Glory, to make ready an everlasting Dwelling for the Maker. And coming before her he cried: ‘Hail, fiery throne, more glorious by far than the

(52) Eve of Nativity: Sticheron at the Third Royal Hour (*Menaion*, 231).

(53) Palm Sunday Vespers: Apostichon (*Triodion*, 492).

(54) Second Canon of the Nativity: Ode 3 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 271).

(55) Palm Sunday Vespers: Apostichon (*Triodion*, 492).

(56) Palm Sunday Kontakion (*Triodion*, 499).

(57) First Canon of the Nativity: Ode 9 Irmos (*Menaion*, 282).

living creatures with four faces [Ezek 1:5–6]! Hail, seat of the King of heaven! ...⁵⁸

Simeon was amazed when he beheld incarnate the Word that is without beginning, carried by the Virgin as on the throne of the cherubim, the Cause of all being Himself become a Babe ...⁵⁹

O happy manger! Receiving the Creator as the babe, it is made the throne of cherubim, for our salvation who sing O God our Deliverer, blessed are You!⁶⁰

He who is borne on high by the cherubim and praised in hymns by the seraphim, is brought today according to the Law into the holy temple and rests in the arms of the Elder as on a throne.⁶¹

When You were about to enter the Holy City, O Lord ... they saw You riding on a foal, as though upon the cherubim ...⁶²

... how shall He whose throne is heaven and whose footstool is the earth [Isa 66:1], be held in the womb of a woman? He upon whom the six-winged seraphim and the many-eyed cherubim cannot gaze has been pleased at a single word to be made flesh of this His creature! ...⁶³

... He who in glory makes the clouds His chariot [Ps 103/104:3], comes borne upon a cloud, that is the Virgin ...⁶⁴

... You who have heaven as Your throne are laid in a manger. You whom the host of angels attend on every side have come down among shepherds...⁶⁵

The “payoff,” as it were, for the high and asymmetric christology defended by the councils of Nicaea I, Ephesus, and Chalcedon is the “high anthropology” typically expressed by the term “deification.” But this inextricable connection between ὁμοούσιος and θέωσις is simply a technical formulation of what is abundantly clear in biblical

(58) Great Vespers of the Annunciation: Sticheron at the Lity (*Menaion*, 443).

(59) Canon of the Presentation: Ode 4 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 421).

(60) Compline Canon of the Forefeast of the Nativity: Ode 7 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 208).

(61) Great Vespers of Presentation: *Glory* Apostichon (*Menaion*, 416).

(62) Palm Sunday Canon: Sticheron at Praises (*Triodion*, 501).

(63) Great Vespers of the Annunciation: *Glory* Sticheron at *Lord I have cried* (*Menaion*, 440).

(64) Matins Canon of the Forefeast of the Nativity: Ode 7 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 214).

(65) Vespers of the Synaxis of the Theotokos (26 December): Apostichon (*Menaion*, 291).

(and parabiblical) theophanies, where God condescends to the perceptive capability of the visionary, while the latter is transfigured, transformed, and sent out to bear witness to the encounter. Hence, Moses's shining face as he descends from Sinai or returns from the tent of meeting (Exod 34:29–30; 34–35); Enoch's progressive transfiguration before the throne of God (1 *En.* 71; 2 *En.* 22); Stephen's luminous appearance, "like the face of an angel" (Acts 6:15) before he will bear witness to the Son of Man at the right hand of God (Acts 7:56).

The same considerations hold true for the hymnographic exegesis of theophanies: if the biblical "Lord of the (angelic) powers" (κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, κύριος σαβαώθ),⁶⁶ enthroned upon the cherubim, is identified with Jesus, the elder Simeon is by implication likened to the cherubim. Such "angelomorphism" — quite clearly, Simeon is not *identified* with a cherub — is simply the poetic and liturgical expression of the doctrine of deification.⁶⁷ Believers even enjoy a certain preeminence over the angels, since by his Incarnation, "God who is enthroned on high upon the cherubim and yet cares for the lowly, is Himself come in power and glory,"⁶⁸ unveiling the innermost mystery formerly inaccessible to angels. A certain reversal of the apocalyptic framework, in which the interest for τὰ ἐπουράνια, "heavenly things" (John 3:12) — namely, ascending to heaven (John 3:13), entering the kingdom of God (John 3:4), and seeing the kingdom of God (John 3:3) — is redirected towards, and made dependent on, an incarnational, sacramental, and communitarian context, is part of the earliest Christian kerygma.⁶⁹ Byzantine hymnography is very insistent on the

(66) For details, see T. N. D. METTINGER, YHWH Zebaoth, in VAN DER TOORN, BECKING, VAN DER HORST, *DICTIONARY OF DEITIES AND DEMONS*, 920–924, esp. 920; S. OLOFSSON, *God is My Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990) (ConBOT, 30) 121–126.

(67) I am using "angelomorphism" in the sense defined by Crispin FLETCHER-LOUIS, *Luke-Acts: Angels, christology and Soteriology* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997) (WUNT, 2/94) 14–15: "we propose its use wherever there are signs that an individual or community possesses specifically angelic characteristics or status, though for whom identity cannot be reduced to that of an angel."

(68) Palm Sunday Canon: Sticheron at Ode 5 (*Triodion*, 498).

(69) W. GRESE, Unless One is Born Again: The Use of a Heavenly Journey in John 3, *JBL* 107 (1988) 677–693. According to J. DANIELOU, Les traditions secrètes des apôtres, *Eranos Jahrbuch* 31 (1962) 199–215, at 214, some of the traditions ascribed to the apostles and circulating among early Christian

privileged vantage-point that humans have in beholding the theophany of the incarnate Lord:

From fear the cherubim dare not gaze upon Him; yet the children honor Him with palms and branches.⁷⁰

Before Your birth, O Lord, the angelic hosts looked with trembling on this mystery and were struck with wonder: for You who have adorned the vault of heaven with stars have been well-pleased to be born as a babe; and You who hold all the ends of the earth in the hollow of Your hand are laid in a manger of dumb beasts.⁷¹

The seraphim, O Savior, beheld You on high, united inseparably with the Father, yet they saw You below lying dead in the tomb; and they trembled with fear.⁷²

All things above and all beneath the earth quaked with fear at Your death, as they beheld You, O Savior, upon Your throne on high and in the tomb below. For beyond our understanding You lie before our eyes, a corpse yet the very Source of Life.⁷³

**“Exalt Christ, the God Most Good,
and Venerate His Divine Footstool!”**

Off-recurring in Byzantine hymnography, yet understudied in biblical and patristic scholarship, is the reference to the footstool of the divine throne.

With the psalmist, O Master, do we now behold the footstool on which Your undefiled feet rested, Your precious Cross, exalted this day with love ...;⁷⁴

teachers during the first three centuries of the common era represent “the continuation within Christianity of a Jewish esotericism that existed at the time of the Apostles,” which concerned in large measure the mysteries of the heavenly worlds; more precisely, starting as early as the apostles themselves, the concern was to relate the mysteries of the heavenly world — angelic ranks, etc — to the central and commanding mystery of Christ’s death and resurrection.”

(70) Palm Sunday Vespers: Sticheron at the Lity (*Triodion*, 490).

(71) Eve of Nativity: Sticheron at the Third Hour (*Menaion*, 231).

(72) Holy Saturday Matins: Sticheron at the Second Stasis of the Lamentations (*Triodion*, 632).

(73) Holy Saturday Canon: Ode 1 Sticheron (*Triodion*, 647).

(74) Small Vespers of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September): Sticheron at *Lord I have cried* (*Menaion*, 131).

Today, the holy words of David have truly received their fulfillment: for lo! in the sight of all the world, we venerate the footstool of Your undefiled feet! ...;⁷⁵

Today, O Christ our God, we sinners venerate with unworthy lips Your precious Cross... which David the psalmist commanded to be venerated as Your footstool ...;⁷⁶

Today the words of the Prophet are fulfilled: for see, we worship at the place on which Your feet have stood [Ps 98/ 99:5], O Lord;⁷⁷

The words of the Psalmist are fulfilled: for see, we worship at the footstool of Your most pure feet, O Lord all powerful, at Your precious Cross, the thrice-blessed Wood.⁷⁸

The biblical references of the hymns just quotes are Ps 98/99:5 (“Exalt the Lord our God, and worship at His footstool, for He is holy!”) and Ps 131/132:7 (“Let us worship at His footstool”). But how and why could the Cross be understood as the footstool of God’s throne? The key lies in the archaic origin of the hymns. In early Christianity, following a conception that was current in Second Temple Judaism, and ultimately rooted in ancient Mesopotamia, the exalted status of heavenly entities was often expressed by descriptions of physical greatness. The greatness of the God of Israel finds expression in the depictions of an enormous body filling the heavens, whose feet rested on the earth as on a footstool. Early Christians described the *kenosis* in terms of a “shrinking” of this enormous body to human dimensions.⁷⁹

In biblical Israel, the ark in the holy of holies was understood precisely as the footstool of God’s throne.⁸⁰ There is some debate over the cherubim throne. The traditional view is that “the official cult was early aniconic: over the cherubim throne and ark, the God of Israel was

(75) Great Vespers of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September): Sticherion at the Lity (*Menaion*, 136).

(76) Great Vespers of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September): *Glory/ Now and ever* Apostichon (*Menaion*, 140–141).

(77) Third Sunday of Lent: Canon, Sessional Hymn of the Cross (*Triodion*, 339).

(78) Third Sunday of Lent: Canon, Ode 6, Sticherion 4 (*Triodion*, 342).

(79) GOLITZIN, *The Image and Glory of God...*, 350, notes that the representation of the Incarnation as “downsizing” of sorts “is both ancient and frequent, particularly among Syriac-speaking Christians” and “might well comprise the original force of the *kenosis* passage of Phil 2:6–7 itself.”

(80) M. HARAN, *Temple and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Winona Lake, In.: Eisenbrauns, 1985) 254–255.

enthroned in unseen majesty. The place usually occupied by the deity is empty."⁸¹ Other scholars, however, argue that, even though it is difficult to decide whether the enthronement was invisible or in the form of a statue, the existence of a cultic statue of the YHWH seated on the throne is very likely.⁸²

In this light, identifying the Cross with the footstool is an affirmation of Christ's divine identity and kingly majesty, in line with the Johannine understanding of the Cross as glorification: *Regnavit a ligno Dominus*, the God of Israel rules from the Cross.⁸³ This understanding of the Cross seems to be rooted in the New Testament, since Rom 3:25 and the Gospel of Mark, for instance, seem to interpret the Cross as the mercy-seat, the locus of sacrifice and supreme theophany.⁸⁴ In any case, the hymns view the Cross, as well as the ark, as the place where God's presence and voice are made manifest. This can be understood

(81) T. METTINGER, The Veto on Images and the Aniconic God in Israel, in: H. BIEZAIS (ed.), *Religious Symbols and Their Functions* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1979) 15–29, at 22, 27. See also IDEM, *No Graven Image? Israelite Aniconism in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995); IDEM, *Israelite Aniconism: Developments and Origins*, in: K. VAN DER TOORN (ed.), *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997) 173–204.

(82) C. M. McCORMICK, *Palace and Temple: A Study of Architectural and Verbal Icons* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002) 171, 184n. 74, 188; H. NIEHR, In Search of Yahveh's Cult Statue in the First Temple, in: VAN DER TOORN, *The Image and the Book...*, 73–99; S. BUNTA, YHWH's *Cultic Statue* After 597/586 B. C. E: A Linguistic and Theological Reinterpretation of Ezekiel 28: 12, *CBQ* 69 (2007) 222–241.

(83) Cf. the following stanza from the Latin hymn "Vexilla Regis," written by Venantius Fortunatus (530–609): "The things are fulfilled which David foretold in faithful song, saying to the nations, "God ruled from the Tree!" "Vexilla Regis" and two other hymns were composed for the festive reception of fragments from the Holy Cross, sent from Constantinople to the Frankish ruler Clothaire. See J. Szövérfy, Venantius Fortunatus and the Earliest Hymns to the Holy Cross, *Classical Folia* 20 (1966) 107–122; IDEM, *Hymns of the Holy Cross: An Annotated Edition with Introduction* (Leiden: Brill, 1976). According to Ephrem of Nisibis, Christ is "enthroned" on the Cross as on his heavenly chariot throne: Hymns on Paradise 6.5; Hymns on Faith 17.8.

(84) N. S. L. FRYER, The Meaning and Translation of *Hilastērion* in Romans 3:25, *Evangelical Quarterly* 59 (1987) 99–116; D. P. BAILEY, Jesus As the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul's Use of *Hilastērion* in Romans 3:25 (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1999); H. L. CHRONIS, The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37–39, *JBL* 101 (1982) 97–114, at 110–111.

both as a “definition” of Jesus Christ in light of Old Testament imagery (“*It is the God of Israel who rules from the Cross*”), and as a specifically Christian qualification of the traditional YHWH cult (“the true face of the God of Israel can only be grasped in his Cross”).



Christ in the vision of Isaiah, 11th century
(Athos Cod. Vatop. 760, fol 280 v).

Photo courtesy of the Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies,
Thessaloniki, Greece

Eden: The Feet that Eve Heard at Dusk and Hid Herself for Fear

Scholars have noted the numerous correspondences between the creation account in Genesis and the accounts of the building of the tent and of the Temple.⁸⁵ “Obviously, these correspondences mean,” notes

(85) J. BLENKINSOPP, *Structure of P*, *CBQ* 38 (1976) 275–292; P. J. KEARNEY, *Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25–40*, *ZAW* 89 (1977) 375–387; M. WEINFELD, *Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord: The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1–2:3*, in: A. CAQUOT, M. DELCOR (eds.), *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l’honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1981) 501–512; LEVENSON, *Sinai and Zion...*, 142–145; C. FLETCHER-

Crispin Fletcher-Louis, "that creation has its home in the liturgy of the cult, and that the tabernacle is a mini cosmos."⁸⁶ More specifically, according to Weinfeld, "the Sitz im Leben of Gen 1:1–2:3 is cultic-liturgic": the text accompanied temple sacrifices in the Second Temple era, and, after the destruction of the temple, it was incorporated into the Amidah prayer of the Sabbath Eve.⁸⁷ That the temple's physical appearance and cult should be conceived as the architectural and liturgical reiteration of the cosmogonic myth, aiming at reintegrating time, space, and the cultic protagonists into the paradisiac *illud tempus*, is, of course, not peculiar to biblical religion. The same point was made as early as 1947 by Mircea Eliade in his famous *Myth of the Eternal Return*.⁸⁸

If the Jerusalem temple, as well as the restored temple of Ezekiel 47, are, symbolically, the garden of Eden, it is no less true that the vantage point of the Eden narrative is God's theophanic presence on Sinai, indelible in the memory of Israel and replicated culturally in the tent of meeting and in the Temple.⁸⁹ In other words, Eden is also conceived as sacred temple and sacred mountain of theophany, symbolically overlapping with Sinai and Zion. This view is affirmed by canonical and extracanonical witnesses alike.⁹⁰ For instance, "in Ezekiel (or his school) ... the same language describes life in Eden, the Garden of De-

LOUIS, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) (STDJ, 42) 63–64.

(86) FLETCHER-LOUIS, *All the Glory of Adam...*, 63:

(87) WEINFELD, *Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement...*, 510–511.

(88) M. ELIADE, *The Myth of the Eternal Return: Cosmos and History* (New York: Pantheon, 1954). The French original was published as *Le mythe de l'éternel retour: Archétypes et répétition* (Paris: Galimard, 1947).

(89) FLETCHER-LOUIS, *All the Glory of Adam...*, 19: "The close association of temple and paradise is widespread in post-biblical texts including those cherished at Qumran ... It is already enshrined in the narrative of Genesis 2–3 which draws heavily on the symbolism and traditions of the Temple, including something like Ezekiel 28:12–19."

(90) See M. HIMMELFARB, *The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira*, in: J. SCOTT, P. SIMPSON-HOUSLEY (eds.), *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York: Greenwood, 1991) 63–78; J. T. A. G. M. VAN RUITEN, *Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in the Book of Jubilees*, in: G. P. LUTTIKHUIZEN (ed.), *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 63–81, esp. 75–79; IDEM, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 85–89.

light, and Zion, the Temple mount, in which the primal perfection of Eden is wonderfully preserved."⁹¹

The topography of Eden, as given in Gen 2:10–14, suggests that Eden is an elevated place. Like Ezekiel 28:13–14, therefore, the writer most likely equates “the garden of God” and “the mountain of God.” Like Ezekiel 28:13–14, therefore, the writer most likely equates “the garden of God” and “the mountain of God.” In this sacred space of Eden God moves about (Gen 3:8, מִתְהַלֵּךְ בְּנֶן; περιπατοῦντος ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ) just as he is said to move about in a tent and a tabernacle (2 Rgns / 2 Sam 7:6, וּבִמְשֻׁכָּן בְּאֹהֶל מִתְהַלֵּךְ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ; ἐμπεριπατῶν ἐν καταλύματι καὶ ἐν σκηנῇ), in the camp of Israel (Deut 23:15 (14), מִתְהַלֵּךְ בְּקֶרֶב מַחֲנֶיךָ; ὁ θεός σου ἐμπεριπατεῖ ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ σου), or, more generally, in the midst of his chosen people (Lev 26:12, וְהִתְהַלַּכְתִּי בְּתוֹכְכֶם; ἐμπεριπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν). If Eden is a sanctuary, it makes perfect sense that Adam and Eve are assigned the levitical duties of performing their work and keeping guard over the holy place (Gen 2:15–16; cf. Num 3:7–8; 8:26). The *Book of Jubilees* is quite explicit about the Eden-Zion when it states: “the Garden of Eden was the holy of holies and the dwelling of the LORD” (*Jub.* 8:19). Access to this place is correspondingly governed by Levitical laws concerning sexuality, pregnancy, and birth (*Jub.* 3:8–14; cf. Leviticus 12). *Jubilees* further confirms the sacral status of Eden by its reference to the morning and evening offering up of incense, one of the priestly duties and privileges (Exod 30:7–8, 34–38; Num 17:4–5; 2 Chron 26:16–20): on the morning of his first day of exile, Adam offers up incense outside of the garden Eden (*Jub.* 3.27) — corresponding to the incense burned in the holy place of the temple, outside of the holy of holies — and Enoch will offer up incense in the evening (*Jub.* 4.25).

The connection between Sinai, Zion, and Eden remains vital in Christian tradition. Ephrem of Nisibis’ *Hymns of Paradise* are perhaps the best example in this respect:

The Paradise Hymns provide us with a number of topographical details which, taken together, can give us some idea of how St Ephrem conceptualized this Paradisiacal mountain. We learn that the mountain is circular (I.8) ... Halfway up is the Tree of Knowledge which provides an internal boundary beyond and higher than which Adam and Eve were forbidden to go (III.3); this Tree acts as a sanctuary curtain hiding the Holy of Holies, which is the Tree of Life higher up (III.2). On the summit of the mountain resides the Divine Presence, the Shekhinah

(91) LEVENSON, *Sinai and Zion...*, 128–129.

(Syriac *shkinta*). This Paradise mountain is also understood as consisting of three concentric circles which divide the mountain up into three separate levels, reserved for different categories of the blessed. These levels at the same time correspond to the various levels in the Ark and on Mount Sinai (II.10–13). The Tree of Knowledge and Tree of Life are ... described respectively as the “sanctuary curtain or veil” (III.5, 13, compare XV.8; Syriac *appay tar’a*) and the “inner sanctuary” or “Holy of Holies” (III.5, 14; Syriac *qdush qudshe*); in other words, Paradise also represents both the Temple and ... the Church.⁹²

If anything, the Sinai-Zion-Eden connection gains in force and coherence in the Christian era, due to the application of the same christological reading lens to all three theophanies. The witness of Byzantine hymnography is illustrative in this respect. The famous ninth-century hymn of Cassiane, now chanted during Holy Week, reads as follows:

O Lord, the woman who has fallen into many sins, perceiving Your divinity and taking upon herself the duty of a myrrh-bearer, with lamentations brings sweet-smelling oil of myrrh to You before Your burial. Woe is me, she says, for night surrounds me: a dark and moonless frenzy of unrestraint, the lust for sin. Accept the wells of my tears, for it is You that draws down from the clouds the waters of the sea. Incline to the groanings of my heart, for it is You that have bowed down the heavens in Your ineffable self-emptying. I shall tenderly kiss Your most pure feet and also wipe them with the locks of my hair — those feet whose sound Eve heard at dusk in Paradise, and hid herself for fear. Who can search out the multitude of my sins and the abyss of Your judgments, O Savior of my soul? Despise me not, Your handmaiden, for You have mercy without measure.⁹³

The hymn is structured on the antithetic parallelism between Eve and the sinful woman. Unlike Eve, who had sinned, but chose to *run away* and hide instead of repenting, “the sinful woman” *runs towards*

(92) S. BROCK, introductory study to St. Ephrem the Syrian, *Hymns on Paradise* (Scarsdale, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1990) 52–53. See also the detailed analysis in N. SÉD, *Les hymnes sur le Paradis de saint Éphrem et les traditions juives*, *Le Muséon* 81 (1968) 455–501. Ephrem’s theological vision is also operative in Ps.-Dionysius. See in this respect, A. GOLITZIN, “*Et introibo ad altare Dei*”: *The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita with Special Reference to its Eastern Christian Predecessors* (Thessalonica: Patriarchal Institute of Patristic Studies, 1994) 368–370; IDEM, *Dionysius Areopagita: A Christian Mysticism?*, *Pro Ecclesia* 12 (2003) 161–212; 185–189.

(93) Holy Wednesday Matins: *Glory / Now and ever* Apostichon (Translation mine. Cf. *Triodion*, 540).

Christ, embraces his feet and washes them in her tears. These feet, however, are the same feet that walked through Eden in the cool of the day: the feet of YHWH. The christological implication is obvious: the Genesis narrative's *YHWH Elohim* or κύριος ὁ θεός is straightforwardly "recognized" as Jesus Christ.

This is not an oddity of Cassiane's. Her predecessor by three centuries, Romanos the Melodist, imagines the incarnate Christ addressing Adam as Lord of Paradise: "He came again to him, calling him with His holy voice: 'Where are you, Adam? Do not hide from Me henceforth; I will to see you, naked and poor though you are. Do not be ashamed, for I have made myself like you.'⁹⁴ In fact, this is the unanimous voice of Byzantine hymnography: Christ is the Maker, Creator, and Author of life, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of the patriarchs and prophets, "the God of our fathers." In a manner reminiscent of Melito's homily, a hymn celebrating the Jordan Baptism states that Jesus who is baptized is the one who suspended the earth upon the primordial void (Job 26:7; Ps 103/104:3):

When the creation beheld You in the flesh covered by the streams, who hast established the whole earth in the void above the waters, it was seized with great amazement and cried: "There is none holy save You, O Lord!"⁹⁵

The last portion of this hymn is quoting a verse from the third biblical ode (Hannah's payer, 1 Sam 2:1–10), thus applying the Old Testament designation of "Lord" to Jesus. The very same exegesis of 1 Sam 2:2 occurs in hymns of Holy Week and Nativity.

When the creation beheld You hanging in Golgotha, who have hung the whole earth freely upon the waters, it was seized with amazement and it cried: "There is none holy save You, O Lord!"⁹⁶

When creation beheld You born in a cave, who have hung the whole earth in a void above the waters, it was seized with amazement and cried: "There is none holy save You, O Lord."⁹⁷

It is Christ who bowed the heavens (Ps 17:10/18:9), and holds the creation in the hollow of His hand (Isa 40:12):

(94) Romanos le Mélode, *Hymnes. Tome II: Nouveau Testament (IX–XX)*. Trans. and notes by J. GROSODIER DE MATONS (Paris: Cerf, 1965) (SC, 110) 238.

(95) Canon of the Forefeast of Theophany: Ode 3 Irmos (*Menaion*, 297).

(96) Canon of Holy Saturday: Ode 3 Irmos (*Triodion*, 647).

(97) Compline Canon of the Forefeast of the Nativity: Ode 3 Irmos (*Menaion*, 205).

He who bowed the heavens, bowed His head, and the clay cried aloud to Him that formed him: "Why do You command of me what lies beyond my power? For I have need to be baptized by You."⁹⁸

Open to me the gates, and entering within, I shall see as a child wrapped in swaddling clothes Him who upholds the creation in the hollow of His hand, whose praises the angels sing with unceasing voice, the Lord and Giver of Life who saves mankind.⁹⁹

It is Christ who fashioned Adam with his hands after his own image, and fashioned Eve from Adam's side.

Make ready, O Bethlehem; throw open your gates, O Eden. For He-Who-Is [Exod 3:14] becomes that which He was not, and He who formed all creation takes form.¹⁰⁰

Behold, the time of our salvation is at hand. Make ready, O cave; the Virgin draws nigh to give birth... For Christ comes in His love for mankind, to save the man He fashioned.¹⁰¹

You, O Christ, with invisible hands have fashioned man in Your image; and You have now displayed the original beauty in this same human body formed by You;¹⁰²

O You who have fashioned Eve from Adam's side, Your side was pierced and from it flowed streams of cleansing;¹⁰³



Christ fashioning Eve from Adam's rib, 12th century
(Winchester Bible, fol 5r, detail).

Photo by Dr. John Crook, Winchester Cathedral.

(98) Vespers of Theophany: Sticheron at *Lord I have cried* (*Menaion*, 338).

(99) Vespers of the Forefeast of the Nativity: *Glory* Apostichon (*Menaion*, 203).

(100) Forefeast of Nativity Vespers, Apostichon (*Menaion*, 202).

(101) Eve of the Nativity Vespers, *Glory/Now and ever* Sticheron at *Lord I have cried* (*Menaion*, 202).

(102) Second Canon of Transfiguration: Ode 5 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 487).

(103) Holy Saturday Matins: First Stasis of the Lamentations (*Triodion*, 627).

It is Christ who blessed the Sabbath as the day of rest.

What is this sight we behold? What is this present rest? The King of the ages ... keeps the Sabbath in the tomb, granting us a new Sabbath.¹⁰⁴

Moses the great mystically prefigured this present day saying, "And God blessed the seventh day" [Gen 2:3]. For this is the blessed Sabbath, this is the day of rest on which the only-begotten Son of God rested from His works. Suffering death in accordance with the plan of salvation, He kept the Sabbath in the flesh.¹⁰⁵

He is the Creator, "who covers the heavens with clouds" (Ps 146/147:8), the hidden God, "who wraps himself with light as with a garment" (Ps 103/104:2), and who condescends to be wrapped in swaddling-clothes at his nativity, clothed in the waters of Jordan at his baptism, and wrapped in a funeral shroud like a mortal:

"O sweetest child, how shall I feed You who give food to all? How shall I hold You, who hold all things in Your power? How shall I wrap You in swaddling clothes, who wrap the whole earth in clouds?" So cried the all-pure Lady whom in faith we magnify;¹⁰⁶

O Savior, who clothe Yourself with light as with a garment, You have clothed Yourself in the waters of Jordan; and You who have measured heaven with a span (Isa 40:12), have bowed down Your head before the Forerunner ...;¹⁰⁷

Joseph together with Nicodemus took You down from the Tree, who clothe Yourself with light as with a garment; and looking upon You dead, stripped, and without burial, in his grief and tender compassion he lamented, saying: ... How shall I bury You, my God? How shall I wrap You in a winding sheet?¹⁰⁸

He is also the Wisdom pervading all creation, which "in the latter days" condescended to be incarnate:

The Wisdom of God that restrains the untamed fury of the waters that are above the firmament, that sets a bridle on the deep and keeps

(104) Holy Saturday Matins: Sticheron at Praises (*Triodion*, 652).

(105) Holy Saturday Matins: *Glory* Sticheron at Praises (*Triodion*, 652).

(106) Matins Canon of the Forefeast of the Nativity: Ode 9 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 216).

(107) Matins of Theophany, *Glory* Sticheron at Praises (*Menaion*, 383).

(108) Great Friday Vespers: *Glory / Now and Ever* Apostichon (*Triodion*, 615).

back the seas, now pours water into a basin; and the Master washes the feet of His servants.¹⁰⁹

Exegetically, these are the results of a consistently christological reading of key-passages in Genesis, the Psalms, and the Wisdom literature. Theologically, there is nothing innovative or unusual in proclaiming Christ as creator or co-creator; patristic literature is replete with such affirmations. What is specific and different in the hymnographic treatment of this widespread theology is the extensive and masterful cultivation of antithesis, parallelism, and paradox. A hymn will typically connect a lofty image from the Old Testament with a New Testament passage illustrating the extreme *Kenōsis* of the Son of God.

A strange wonder it is to see the Maker of heaven and earth stand naked in the river, and as a servant receive baptism from a servant, for our salvation...;¹¹⁰

... How shall I stretch forth my hand and touch the head of Him that rules all things? ... You, whose praises the seraphim sing, walk upon the earth. And I who am but a servant know not how to baptize the Master...;¹¹¹

Beholding You, the Fashioner and Creator of all, hanging naked on the Cross, the whole creation was transfixed with fear and it lamented ... O strange wonder!¹¹²

Today a tomb holds Him who holds the creation in the hollow of His hand; a stone covers Him who covers the heavens with glory!¹¹³

He who holds the earth in the hollow of His hand [Isa 40:12] is held fast by the earth.¹¹⁴

The hymns exploit the occurrence of similar words, images, or actions (for instance, “he hung,” “he was wrapped,” “he holds,” “hands,” “rest”): “The traitor takes Bread *in his hands*, but stretches them out secretly to receive the price of Him who fashioned man *with His own hands*.¹¹⁵ The following hymns, one sung on Holy Friday, the other (ob-

(109) Holy Thursday Matins, Ode 5 Sticheron (*Menaion*, 383).

(110) Eve of Theophany, Sticheron at the Ninth Hour (*Menaion*, 332).

(111) Matins of Theophany, Sticheron after Gospel reading (*Menaion*, 366).

(112) Great Vespers on the Third Sunday of Great Lent, *Glory* Sticheron at the Lity (*Triodion*, 335).

(113) Holy Saturday Matins: Sticheron at Praises (*Triodion*, 652).

(114) Holy Saturday Matins: First Stasis of the Lamentations (*Triodion*, 624).

(115) Holy Thursday Kontakion (*Triodion*, 551–552).

viously patterned after the first) on the Eve of Nativity, are perfectly illustrative:

Today He who hung the earth upon the waters is hung upon the Cross. He who is King of the angels is arrayed in a crown of thorns. He who wraps the heaven in clouds is wrapped in the purple of mockery. He who in the Jordan set Adam free receives blows upon His face. The Bridegroom of the Church is transfixed with nails. The Son of the Virgin is pierced with a spear. We venerate Your Passion, O Christ. Show us also Your glorious Resurrection.¹¹⁶

Today, He who holds the whole creation in the hollow of His hand is born of the Virgin. He whom in essence none can touch is wrapped in swaddling clothes as a mortal. God who in the beginning founded the heavens lies in a manger. He who rained manna down on the people in the wilderness is fed on milk from His Mother's breast. He who is the Bridegroom of the Church calls unto Himself the Magi. The Son of the Virgin accepts their gifts. We worship Your birth, O Christ. Show us also Your divine Theophany!¹¹⁷

The emotional impact of these majestic hymns, which enshrine the birth and death of Jesus within the framework of a cosmic drama, and actualize it liturgically, can hardly be overstated. It is no surprise that the Christian East is particularly attached to these compositions. The poetic force of their christological proclamation, however, depends on an implicit exegesis that become obvious at closer examination: *the Creator of heaven and earth speaks to the disciples, the Master of creation stands before Pilate, the Maker of all things is given up to the Cross. Similarly, in the hymns of Nativity, born in Bethlehem is He who fashioned all creation, yet reveals Himself in the womb of her that He formed;*¹¹⁸ *He who formed all creation takes form.*¹¹⁹

The Exegesis of Biblical Theophanies in Early Christianity

In according central importance to the christological interpretation of the Old Testament theophanies, Byzantine hymnography inherits and carries on a venerable Christian tradition. To quote again

(116) Holy Friday: Antiphon 15 (*Triodion*, 587).

(117) Eve of Nativity: *Glory/Now and ever* Sticheron at the Ninth Royal Hour (*Menaion*, 245–246).

(118) Eve of the Nativity, Sticheron at the Sixth Royal Hour (*Menaion*, 238).

(119) Forefeast of Nativity Vespers, Apostichon (*Menaion*, 202).

from the manifesto with which I began this article, “this is the consistent witness of the ante-Nicene Fathers, and remains foundational throughout the fourth century Trinitarian controversies and the later christological disputes.” Indeed, second-century apologists such as Justin Martyr and Theophilus of Antioch use Old Testament theophanies as a means of affirming that Christ is the One who appeared to Adam in the Garden of Eden, to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and, especially, to Moses on Sinai. A second context in which theophanies play an important role is the antidualistic polemic of authors such as Irenaeus and Tertullian. Their argument that Christ is not a “new” God, rests upon the thesis that Christ has already manifested himself in the old dispensation. Theophanies were also invoked against modalism, the argument being that since Christ has appeared in Old Testament theophanies, whereas the Father has not, he must be distinct from the Father.¹²⁰

In the second half of the fourth century, the interpretation of theophanies became an area of fierce contention between three parties: Modalists (who denied the hypostatic existence of the Word, claiming that the three hypostases are merely three “modes” of divine manifestation), the Homoians (for whom the Son was only “similar,” *homoios*, to the Father), and the supporters of Nicea.¹²¹ The Homoians sought to refute the modalist denial of Christ’s preexistence by appealing to theophanies. However, they also extracted a subordinationist doctrine from theophanies: since the Son was manifested in theophanies, he

(120) For a voluminous dossier of passages illustrating the christological understanding of theophanies in the first five centuries, see G. LEGEAY, *L’Ange et les théophanies dans l’Ecriture Sainte d’après la doctrine des Pères*, *Revue Thomiste* 10 (1902) 138–158, 405–424; 11 (1903) 46–69, 125–154; J. LEBRETON, *Saint Augustin, théologien de la Trinité: Son exégèse des théophanies*, *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 (1931) 821–836; L. J. VAN DER LOF, *L’exégèse exacte et objective des théophanies de l’Ancien Testament dans le “De Trinitate,” Augustiniana* 14 (1964) 485–499. See also the “Epistle of the Six Bishops” against Paul of Samosata (G. BARDY, *Paul de Samosate: Étude historique* (Paris: E. Champion, 1929) 16–18); Eusebius of Caesarea against Marcellus (*De eccl. theol.* 2.2.1).

(121) B. STUDER, *Zur Theophanie-Exegese Augustins: Untersuchung zu einem Ambrosius-Zitat in der Schrift ‘De Videndo Deo’* (Rome: Herder, 1971) (*Studia Anselmiana*, 59); M. R. BARNES, *Exegesis and Polemic in Augustine’s De Trinitate I*, *Augustinian Studies* 30 (1999) 43–60; IDEM, *The Visible Christ and the Invisible Trinity: Mt. 5:8 in Augustine’s Trinitarian Theology of 400*, *Modern Theology* 19 (2003) 329–356.

must be visible in a way that the Father is not, and therefore must be of a different nature than the Father.¹²²

This is the context in which a new understanding of the theophanies was born, which was to remain normative in the Christian West. This turning-point is due to Augustine of Hippo. Unsatisfied with the anti-Homoian arguments of his Orthodox predecessors (essentially, that the theophanies are acts of divine condescension toward human weakness, acts of the divine will, rather than acts of divine nature, from which nothing can be inferred about Christ's nature), Augustine proposed a new solution. He considered the theophanic apparitions — the light, the glory, the visions — as created phenomena, produced by angelic manipulation of matter.¹²³ For the mature Augustine, theophanies were not Christophanies — revelation of Christ's own divine glory — but created manifestations of the divine nature: "created matter being used as an instrument of communication by the Trinity."¹²⁴ And while "an encounter with such an instrument ... was an occasion for faith in God," it is obvious that theophanies no longer have transformative, transfigurative power.¹²⁵ Theophanies are thus relegated from the center to the periphery of Christian theology; or, in a vertical perspective, they now represent the bottom of a ladder leading to vision of God.¹²⁶

This solution gradually imposed itself in Western Christianity as Augustine's theology came to dwarf all other patristic authors and to

(122) STUDER, *Zur Theophanie-Exegese Augustins...*, 8; BARNES, *Visible Christ...*, 341.

(123) In *De Trinitate* 3.10.19, Augustine distinguishes several subtypes: theophanies are (1) either apparitions of angels, or (2) the result of angelic manipulation of preexistent bodies, or (3) evanescent creatures and phenomena brought about by God for the purpose of signifying something at the moment of theophany, and thereupon returned to nothingness.

(124) For a careful historical study of Augustine's treatment of theophanies from the *Commentary on Galatians* (384) to *Against Maximinus* (428), see J.-L. MAIER, *Les missions divines selon saint Augustin* (Fribourg: University of Fribourg, 1960) 101–121.

(125) BARNES, *Visible Christ...*, 346; LEBRETON, *Saint Augustin, théologien de la Trinité...*, 835.

(126) In *De Genesi ad litteram* 12, Augustine presents a hierarchy of three levels of vision of God: corporeal, spiritual, and intellectual. According to this classification, theophanies offer instances either of corporeal vision (Isa 6:1–7, Rev 1:13–20) or spiritual vision (Exodus 19 and 33). Theophanies can certainly not grant the higher, "intellectual" vision.

mute alternative voices. Whether Augustine's solution to the problems raised by the subordinationist use of theophanies was a theological breakthrough or a break with tradition, in which more was sacrificed than gained, remains a matter of confessional debate.¹²⁷ Whatever the case, virtually everyone East of the Adriatic continued to interpret the divine manifestations recorded in the Old Testament as apparitions of Christ. In the aftermath of the Hesychast debate, the alternative view (theophanies as created manifestations), professed by Palamas's adversaries, was ruled out as contrary to the spiritual tradition of the saints.¹²⁸ This is not surprising. As I noted earlier, biblical and parabolic accounts of theophanies emphasize not only the divine communication to the visionary, but also the visionary's transformation. Quite understandably, therefore, the (preeminently monastic) representatives of a Christianity devoted to ascetical, liturgical, and mystical practices centered around the transfiguration of the human being were adamant in their affirmation and reaffirmation of theophanies as the fiery heart of all theology.¹²⁹ It is noteworthy that the pre-Augustin-

(127) Basil Studer sees Augustine's exegesis of the theophanies as a breakthrough. Eastern Orthodox writers, by contrast, lament Augustine's solution as a break with tradition: J. S. ROMANIDES, Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics, *GOTR* 6 (1960/61) 186–205; 9 (1963/64) 225–270; D. BRADSHAW, *Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and the Division of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 228–229; 222 and 275; BUCUR, Theophanies and Vision of God in Augustine's *De Trinitate*: An Eastern Orthodox Perspective, *SVTQ* 52 (2008) 67–93.

(128) Gregory Palamas borrowed extensively from the later books of *De Trinitate* (which he read in Maximus Planudes' Greek translation). On the question of theophanies, however, his view is the exact opposite of Augustine's. See R. FLOGAUS, Palamas and Barlaam Revisited: A Reassessment of East And West in the Hesychast Controversy of 14th Century Byzantium, *SVTQ* 42 (1998) 1–32; A. GOLITZIN, Dionysius Areopagites in the Works of Saint Gregory Palamas: On the Question of a "Christological Corrective" and Related Matters, *SVTQ* 46 (2002) 163–190; ROMANIDES, Notes on the Palamite Controversy...

(129) In this respect, the ascetical and mystical theology of the Christian East has significant points of continuity with the Second Temple apocalyptic tradition, and significant parallels with later Jewish merkabah mysticism. See in this respect A. GOLITZIN, Earthly Angels and Heavenly Men: The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Nicetas Stethatos, and the Tradition of Interiorized Apocalyptic in Eastern Christian Ascetical and Mystical Literature, *DOP* 55 (2001) 125–153; *IDEM*, Theophaneia: Forum on the Jewish Roots...; BUCUR, From Jewish Apocalypticism to Orthodox Mysticism, in: A. CASIDAY (ed.), *The Orthodox Christian World* (London: Routledge), forthcoming.

ian view of theophanies as christophanies is assumed not only in the compositions of Romanos the Melodist and his Syriac predecessors Jacob of Serug and Ephrem Syrus, but also in Western hymnody of Eastern origin.¹³⁰ The Latin *Improperia* chanted during the veneration of the cross on Holy Friday, the Advent hymn *Veni Immanuel*, and the so-called “O” Antiphons still describe Christ as the one who appeared to Moses and led Israel out of captivity.

Theologically, the identification of Christ with the Glory, Name, Angel, or Son of Man manifested to the patriarchs and prophets was neither the fruit of second-century polemics, nor simply a pious exegetical tradition among many. This identification is rather, as a number of authors have shown, a constitutive element of early christology.¹³¹ The New Testament often alludes to the divine Name (Exod 3:14: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν), and proclaims Jesus Christ as “Lord” (κύριος), obviously in reference to the Old Testament “Lord” (κύριος in the LXX) seen by the prophets. This sort of “YHWH Christology” has been traced back to the Gospel of Mark, the Gospel of John, the Pauline corpus, and the Catholic Epistle of Jude. It remained quite prominent for at least two centuries.¹³²

(130) AUF DER MAUR (*Osterhomilien...*, 150) believes that a Latin translation of Melito constituted the earliest stratum of the Western *Improperia* tradition. There is evidence of a later Palestinian monastic influence in Southern Italy and Rome, dated to end of the seventh or early eighth century (see my remarks above).

(131) See *Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*; L. HURTADO, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003).

(132) HANSON, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament...*; J. FOSSUM, Kyrios Jesus as the Angel of the Lord in Jude 5–7, *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987) 226–243; E. EARLE ELLIS, Deity-Christology in Mark 14:58, in: J. B. GREENE, M. M. TURNER (eds.), *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ: Essays in the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994) 192–203; D. CAPES, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul’s christology* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992) (WUNT, 47/2); W. BINNI, B. GIANLUIGI BOSCHI, *Cristologia primitiva: Dalla teofania del Sinai all’Io sono giovanneo* (Bologna: Dehoniane, 2004); Ch. GIESCHEN, The Real Presence of the Son Before Christ: Revisiting an Old Approach to Old Testament Christology, *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 68 (2004) 105–126 (with abundant references). For the christological use of the divine Name in early Christianity, see J. DANÍELOU, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964) 147–163; J. BEHR, *The Way to Nicaea* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir’s Seminary, 2001) 62–66; Ch. A. GIESCHEN, The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology, *VC* 57 (2003) 115–158.

What place can this type of biblical exegesis assume in the larger framework of patristic exegesis? Before answering this question, it is important to note some difficulties related to describing the various types of patristic exegesis.

The Exegetical Dimension of Byzantine Hymnography: Inadequacy of Scholarly Categories

Patristic scholarship has attempted to grasp the hermeneutical principles underlying early Christian biblical interpretation, and the various exegetical techniques deployed by its representatives, by coining a number of concepts. Of these, the most important are, by far, “typology” and “allegory.”¹³³ I venture to say that neither of these — and, I dare say, none of the categories commonly used for patristic Scripture interpretation — offer an adequate description of hymnographic exegesis as exemplified in the pages above.

Jean Daniélou insisted on a clear distinction between “typology” and “allegory.” In his view, typological exegesis, with its two forms — christological and sacramental — is Christian *par excellence*. Rooted in the biblical view of history (time flows in a linear, continual, irreversible and progressive fashion and is punctuated “in the fullness of time” by the incarnation of Christ),¹³⁴ typology answers to the specifically Christian necessity of relating the Old Testament to the life of the Church. To give a few examples, Joshua is a “type” of Jesus, the flood and the passing through the Red Sea are a “type” of baptism, the manna is a “type” of the Eucharist, and so on.¹³⁵ By contrast, allegory

(133) For a detailed survey of literature, see P. W. MARTENS, *Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction: The Case of Origen*, *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 16 (2008) 283–317, esp. 283–296.

(134) Here Daniélou is obviously in line with, and perhaps directly indebted to, O. CULLMANN, *Christus und die Zeit: Die urchristliche Zeit- und Geschichtsauffassung* (Zürich: Zollikon, 1946), who draws a net distinction between the “Greek” and the “Hebrew” conceptions of time. An early critique of this approach, as overly simplistic and unfair to the patristic tradition, was articulated by Vladimir Lossky in the late forties. See the English translation in V. LOSSKY, *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction* (Scarsdale, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1978) 60–63.

(135) J. DANÉLOU, *Sacramentum futuri: Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1950); *idem*, *Bible et liturgie: La théologie biblique des sacraments et des fêtes d’après les Pères de l’Eglise* (Paris: Cerf, 1951). In the English-speaking world, the typology-allegory distinction was discussed by G. W. H. LAMPE, K. J. WOOLLCOMBE, *Essays in Typology* (London: SCM, 1957).

has its origin in the exegesis of Homeric literature (and, later, of Plato's dialogues). The use of allegory in the interpretation of biblical texts, common in the Alexandrian diaspora, was eventually adopted among cultured Christians in Alexandria, who seem to have inherited it together with the Philonian corpus. Although Christianized, allegory retains the Greek idea of a cyclical time, and subordinated the biblical distinction between "this eon" and "the future eon" to the vertical relation between "down here" and "up there." This is why, according to Daniélou, allegory, despite its brilliant career, first in Alexandria and then in the entire Christian world, remained an element of Hellenistic culture that we can now discard without many regrets.

Daniélou's approach, however, is no longer tenable. One reason would be that the clear-cut distinction he proposed does not account for the much vaguer terminology perpetuated in Christian tradition. In the "classic" passage of Gal 4:25, for instance, Paul discusses the "typological" relation between Hagar and the Old Testament, and, respectively, between Sarah and the New Testament, but he refers to this relation as "allegory." If, however, Paul says "allegory" when he proposes an interpretation that Daniélou would call "typological," and if later patristic writings appear to perpetuate this "confusion," it may well be that the fault lies less with the ancients than with our modern perspective. "Typology" itself is, after all, a 19th-century coinage,¹³⁶ and the allegory-typology distinction reflects the agenda of modern patristics rather than the mind of patristic authors.¹³⁷ Guided by similar considerations, scholars such as Henri de Lubac, Henri Crouzel, and, more recently, Manlio Simonetti, David Dawson, and Frances Young, prefer to use the term "allegory" in a very broad sense, so as to cover any interpretation that proposes something other than the literal sense. Typological exegesis appears, then, as a species of allegory.¹³⁸

(136) The Latin "typologia" dates to 1840, whereas "typology" appears in print in 1844; see D. DAWSON, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California, 1992) 254 n. 51.

(137) See F. YOUNG, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (New York: Cambridge University, 1997) 194–195.

(138) H. DE LUBAC, "Typologie" et "allégorisme", *Recherches de science religieuse* 34 (1947) 180–247; H. CROUZEL, La distinction de la "typologie" et de "l'allégorisme", *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 65 (1964) 161–174; M. SIMONETTI, *Lettera e/o allegoria: Un contributo alla storia dell'esegesi patristica* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum," 1985) 24–25 n. 32; Allegoria, in: A. DE BERNARDINO (ed.), *Dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane*, 3 vols. (Ca-

Given the complex history of Byzantine hymnography, and its harmonization of numerous sources and strata along the centuries, it is hardly surprising to find that the hymns feature more than one type of biblical exegesis. The central event — the Exodus — is sometimes “retold” by the hymns to highlight the fact that the pillar of fire was, in fact, Christ. At other times the hymns interpret the Exodus as an “exodus” of the soul from the slavery of sin. Simply terming both approaches “allegory,” because both see “something other” in the biblical narration, fails to account for their obvious differences.

A possible solution would be to take into consideration the criterion of purpose. Hymnographic exegesis can have a christological purpose, because it proclaims the Christ of the Church as God of Israel, implicitly defining the Church of Christ as “the Israel of God” (Gal 6:16), “the Jerusalem from above” (Gal 4:25), or “kingly priesthood, holy people” (1 Peter 2:9; cf. Exod 19:6, LXX). There are also numerous examples of exegesis whose purpose is mainly ethical. Suffice it to mention in this respect the “Great Canon” (composed by Andrew of Crete, ca. 660–740), which is prayed during Lent.¹³⁹ One could, therefore, distinguish between at least two types of allegory: christological and moral.

It must be noted, however, that the christological reading of Scripture documented above cannot be identified with typological allegory” (although it goes without saying that the latter is also present in Byzantine hymnography). In the case of a type–antitype relation, one would expect the hymns to acknowledge a non-allegorical, non-christological, level of the text (e.g., the historical event of the Exodus, or the giving of the Law), and then posit a second, christological, level as the fulfillment of the Old Testament types. Yet, the hymns discussed in this article do not contemplate the Exodus as a type or a foreshadowing of Christ or of the church. Christ is not signified typologically,

sale Monferrato: Marietti, 1983–1988) Vol. 1, 140–141; DAWSON, *Allegorical Readers...*, 15–17, 255–258; J. O’KEEFE, *Allegory*, and R. A. NORRIS JR., *Typology*, in: J. A. MCGUCKIN (ed.), *The Westminster Handbook to Origen* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004) 49–50 and 209–211. Young prefers the term “figural allegory” (*Biblical Exegesis*, 198), and distinguishes between its several subtypes (192).

(139) See in this respect D. COSTACHE, *Reading the Scriptures with Byzantine Eyes: The Hermeneutical Significance of St Andrew of Crete’s Great Canon*, *Phronema* 23 (2008) 51–66.

but he is straightforwardly *identified* with the “Lord,” or “Angel of the Lord” in the biblical narratives.¹⁴⁰

A significant point of comparison for the hymns may be the interpretation of the theophanies in the Qu’ran.¹⁴¹ One may also refer to the category “rewritten Bible,” coined by Geza Vermes in 1961 and widely used since, to designate biblical interpretation ranging from Rabbinic *midrash*, back to the Palestinian Targum, Josephus’s *Jewish Antiquities*, Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, Old Testament Pseudepigrapha such as the *Book of the Watchers* (in 1 Enoch), the *Book of Jubilees*, or the Qumran document known as the “Genesis Apocryphon.”¹⁴² Even though Scripture itself contains “inner-biblical

(140) As early as 1965, A. T. HANSON, *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament* (London: SPCK, 1965) pointed out the distinction between what he called “real presence,” on the one hand, and “typology,” on the other, and argued that the former is typical of New Testament authors. Unfortunately this book did not receive the attention it deserved.

(141) The Qu’ran extends its history of Israel to encompass Jesus, and reinterprets theophanies in light of the final revelation to Mohammad. See, for instance, the following passages in the Qu’ran (2:40ff, trans. Abdullah Yusuf Ali): “Children of Israel! Call to mind the (special) favor which I bestowed upon you, and that I preferred you to all other (for My Message). ... And remember, We delivered you from the people of Pharaoh: They set you hard tasks and punishments, slaughtered your sons and let your women-folk live; therein was a tremendous trial from your Lord. ... And remember We divided the sea for you and saved you and drowned Pharaoh’s people within your very sight. ... And remember We appointed forty nights for Moses, and in his absence ye took the calf (for worship), and ye did grievous wrong. ... And remember We gave Moses the Scripture and the Criterion (Between right and wrong): There was a chance for you to be guided aright. ... And remember ye said: ‘O Moses! We shall never believe in thee until we see Allah manifestly,’ but ye were dazed with thunder and lightning even as ye looked on. ... And We gave you the shade of clouds and sent down to you Manna and quails, saying: ‘Eat of the good things We have provided for you.’ (But they rebelled); to us they did no harm, but they harmed their own souls.”

(142) For a presentation and discussion of numerous examples, see G. VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1961) (*Studia Postbiblica*, 4) 67–126; M. SEGAL, *Between Bible and Rewritten Bible*, in: M. HENZE (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2005) 10–28; A. LAATO, J. VAN RUITEN (eds.), *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland, August 24–26 2006* (Åbo: Åbo Academy University Press — Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008) (*Studies in Rewritten Bible*, 1).

interpretation,¹⁴³ the proliferation of “rewritten Bible” is undoubtedly a characteristic feature of the late Second Temple era.¹⁴⁴ It is during this time that elaborate alternatives to the Genesis flood story are popularized in the *Book of the Watchers*, the *Book of Giants*, and *Jubilees*. Similarly, various representatives of Second Temple and later Rabbinic Judaism “rewrite” the Sinai event, pointing out, for instance, that Moses received the Law in the course of an ascent to heaven,¹⁴⁵ or, in the case of *Jubilees*, that the content of the heavenly was dictated to Moses by the Angel of the Presence, as it had in fact been dictated earlier to some of the patriarchs. Consider the hymnographic exegesis presented above. The hymns invoke the Paradise story, the stories of the patriarchs and prophets, the narratives of Sinai and Exodus. But all these stories are rewritten in light of a fundamental innovation, the identification of the biblical “Lord” with Jesus Christ. It seems that the christological interpretation of biblical theophanies and the implicit re-presentation of various Old Testament figures as proto-Christians, in Byzantine hymnography, is quite similar, for instance, to the reinterpretation of Moses and the Sinai revelation in *Jubilees*.

Hindy Najman has rightly observed, however, that “like the classification of texts as pseudepigraphic, the characterization of Second Temple texts as ‘Rewritten Bible’ is problematic.”¹⁴⁶ Indeed, the very terminology suggests that these are forged versions of the “authentic” text, a “second telling” superimposed on the “original” biblical text. In fact, however, the re-presentation of certain biblical traditions (e.g., the giving of the Law, the Exodus) in “rewritten Bible” was intended to ensure the faithful interpretation and transmission of the respective

(143) M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford—New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); IDEM, *Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, in: G. H. HARTMAN (ED.), *Midrash and Literature* (Sanford Budick; New Haven, Conn.: Yale University, 1986) 19–37; SEGAL, *Between Bible and Rewritten Bible*...

(144) In this respect, see the essays by J. H. CHARLESWORTH (In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation), J. VANDERKAM (Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees) and D. AUNE (Charismatic Exegesis), in: J. H. CHARLESWORTH (ed.), *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (Sheffield, U.K.: JSOT Press, 1996).

(145) For such Moses-traditions in Philo and rabbinic Judaism, see W. MEEKS, *The Prophet King: Moses-Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (Leiden: Brill, 1967) 122–125, 205–209.

(146) H. NAJMAN, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Boston: Brill, 2003) (SJSJ, 77).

traditions, so that the resulting texts should be seen as “discourses tied to a founder” (e.g., “Mosaic discourse,” “Adamic discourse,” “Enochic discourse,” “Noachic discourse”).¹⁴⁷ As far as the Byzantine hymns are concerned, the intention is, of course, the same one professed by Christianity in general: not to abolish the Law or the prophets (Matt 5:17), but to reinterpret them in light of the fundamental assumption that Christ is the *telos* of the Law (Rom 10:4).

The exegetical developments of the “Rewritten Bible” (the term remains convenient, especially if one rejects any negative connotations) was continuously shaped by the intra-Jewish polemics, specifically by the exaltation of certain biblical characters (Adam, Moses, Enoch, Seth, Noah, Melchisedech) over against another.¹⁴⁸ This polemical factor, given special prominence by Andrei Orlov, is certainly at work in *Jubilees*, where the Sinai event is relativized, in the sense of being presented as part of a larger tradition of heavenly revelations to earlier patriarchs. In other words, what Najman calls “Mosaic Discourse” can sometimes include what Orlov calls “anti-Mosaic polemics” — designed, for instance, to exalt the “rival” figure of Enoch. In early Christianity, Jesus is also exalted by being compared and contrasted with Melchisedech, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Elijah, John the Baptist. The hymns simply carry on and dramatize the encounter between Christ as “Lord” and the patriarchs and prophets who bear witness to his supremacy.

Najman asserts the following difference between the exegesis of Jewish Pseudepigrapha and that of New Testament and patristic texts: “In contrast to the familiar Christian claim to *supersede* the Sinaitic covenant with a *new* covenant ... *Jubilees* invoked an archaic, pre-Sinaitic covenant, whose pre-eminence depends on its claim to *precede* Sinai.”¹⁴⁹ This affirmation does not stand up to scrutiny, however. According to the hymns, the Christian revelation is superior, paradoxically, not because it is *newer*, an “upgrade” of sorts, but rather because it is *more ancient*, since Jesus Christ is said to be “before Abraham” (cf. John 8:58) and certainly “before Moses,” so long as he gave Moses the Law on Sinai. Just as for *Jubilees* “Sinai is but one of a series of revelations, a reaffirmation of earlier patriarchal revelations,” and “Moses is re-pre-

(147) NAJMAN, *Seconding Sinai...*, 8, 12–13, 18.

(148) For the importance of polemics in the production of Pseudepigrapha by the various competing strands of Second Temple Judaism, see A. ORLOV, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) (TSAJ, 107) 211–336.

(149) NAJMAN, *Seconding Sinai...*, 125.

sented as standing in the authentic line of Enochic and Abrahamic inheritance,¹⁵⁰ and just as in 3 Enoch Moses is said to have received the Law from Enoch-Metatron (3 *En.* 48D), so also does much of Christian tradition (including the hymns under discussion) affirm that Christ is superior to Abraham or Moses or Ezekiel because he is the very one the prophets saw, the very Lawgiver on Sinai, the very rider of Ezekiel's *merkabah*.¹⁵¹ Thus, the "logic" of the Christian proclamation is precisely that of "rewritten Bible" literature.

Fundamental to documents in the "rewritten Bible" category is the claim of being divinely inspired, the result of "charismatic exegesis," which, according to Aune, was the prevalent form of prophecy in Second Temple Judaism. Charismatic exegesis is not identifiable as one or the other type of biblical interpretation, on the basis of its distinctive form, content, or function. For Aune, it is "essentially a *hermeneutical ideology* that provides divine legitimation for a particular understanding of a sacred text."¹⁵² This aspect of the "Rewritten Bible" is highly significant for our understanding of Christian hymnography, since the proclamation of Jesus Christ as "Lord" can, indeed, be seen as a matter of "charismatic exegesis," prompted by prophetic experience in the course of liturgical action (1 Cor 12:3; Luke 24:30–31; John 14:26).

"Alternative Christology"

The most ancient hymns appear to develop a sort of "alternative" Christology: instead of "defining" Christ in terms of *hypostasis*, *proso-pon*, *ousia*, *thelema*, *energeia*, and so forth — "that extraordinary panoply of polysyllabic Greek abstractions which we meet in the Greek Fathers, and which modern Orthodox theologians — God bless them! — are so anxious to invoke"¹⁵³ — the hymns offer a christological exegesis of theophanies. The ensuing "YHWH Christology" is coupled with a clear affirmation of Jesus' humanity: the glorious Old Testament "Lord" is wrapped in swaddling cloths, suckled like a babe, humili-

(150) NAJMAN, *Seconding Sinai...*, 57, 67.

(151) The insistence with which Byzantine liturgies and hymns depict Christ as seated on the cherubic throne is remarkable. This depiction offers a fascinating parallel to the Rabbinic *merkabah* lore. Sometimes, Christian hymnographers became explicitly critical of the competing interpretations in *merkabah* mysticism; see GOLITZIN, *The Image and Glory of God...*

(152) AUNE, *Charismatic Exegesis...*, 130.

(153) GOLITZIN, *The Image and Glory of God...*, 360.

ated, slandered, sentenced unjustly, scourged and beaten bloody; and he learns to die the death of fallen Adam.

This christology is just as ancient, universal, and well “received” in the Church as the “technical” christology of the councils. In fact, some of the hymns *precede* such towering theological authorities as Dionysius the Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor, John of Damascus, or Gregory Palamas. Moreover, it is quite certain that no single writing of the Church Fathers has ever enjoyed such large acceptance as the hymns surveyed in this article, which have been and continue to be chanted, listened to, and called to mind by believers from almost all times and places. The classic criterion of Orthodoxy, articulated by Vincent of *f* Lérins (“that is to be regarded as true, which has been believed by all, in all places and at all times”) is more than satisfied. So much for “reception” and, implicitly, for the authority that these hymns should command.

As for the “technicality” of their theological language, it must be noted that the distinction between hymnographic and conciliar Christology corresponds to a distinction of their *Sitz im Leben*. The Councils articulated the faith of the Church in the face of heretical distortion. The formulae of faith are meant as *horoi* (“definitions”), precisely because they *delimitate* what, with a formula repeated by all councils, “seemed to the Holy Spirit and to us” (Acts 15:28) as authentic belief in (and experience of) God from false experience and belief. In doing so, the language of the Councils (and, similarly, Christian apologetic literature in general) seeks for the most apt instruments to formulate the definition, borrowing from disciplines such as Philosophy, Logic, Medicine, etc. With the hymns, however, the situation is quite different. Unlike the “dogmatic hymns,” the hymns discussed in this essay are not engaged in demonstration, clarification, or polemics, but in worship; they do not address the adversaries of faith, but give expression the spiritual intimacy between the Bride and the Bridegroom, constantly recalling their covenant recorded in the Scriptures. This is what scholarship calls “doxological language,”¹⁵⁴ and, in the absence of heresies, it may very well have been the only Christology.

The difference between hymnological and conciliar Christology may perhaps be understood by analogy with today’s concerns about

(154) T. BERGER, *Theology in Hymns? A Study of the Relationship of Doxology and Theology According to ‘A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People Called Methodists (1780)* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1995) 17.

Christian use of language. According to Geoffrey Wainwright, “it would be too simplistic to say that we must choose between ‘the language of Canaan’ and ‘the language of CNN.’ Christians may rightly use one ‘language’ for their internal discourse within the Church, and another for their external work in apologetics, evangelism, or dialogue.”¹⁵⁵ In early Christianity, the philosophical jargon of the councils — the era’s “language of CNN” — was adopted precisely for the purpose of apologetics, evangelism, or dialogue; at the same time, “the language of Canaan” continued to be used “ad intra.” These two types of language have always coexisted. One finds a perfect illustration of this state of affairs in the persons of Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem (560–638), who is deeply involved in the monothelite controversy, but also responsible for part of the Holy Friday hymnography, or John of Damascus, hailed both as the author of the *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* and as an inspired hymnographer.

To conclude, Byzantine hymnography provides a wealth of christological material, and has much to teach in terms of both theological method and exegetical practice. The hymns are bearers of an elaborate Christology, which essentially proclaims the same theandric mystery that is defended by the Councils, yet in a language very different from that of conciliar definitions. Retrieving the properly doctrinal elements present in hymnography remains, I think, a project worthy of serious consideration. of serious consideration.

Conclusions

The Christian kerygma is insoluble from the exegesis of Old Testament theophanies. To paraphrase the opening quotation from Golitzin, theophany permeates early Christian tradition throughout, informing its dogmatic theology and its liturgy. With the notable exception of Augustine, the identification of Jesus with “the Lord of glory whom Moses saw of old” is the normative view in Greek, Syriac, and Latin (pre-Augustinian) Christianity. In the pages above I have shown that Byzantine hymnography, which offers the enduring distillate of patristic tradition, articulates the same theology.

Hymns can be read both as a christological “definition” of the biblical deity, and as an interpretation of the Cross and the Crucified One in light of the Old Testament theophanies. The hymns ask,

(155) G. WAINWRIGHT, “Bible et Liturgie”: Daniélou’s Work Revisited, *Studia Liturgica* 22 (1992) 161.

for instance, whom Joseph and Nicodemus wrapped in linen cloths; their answer points to "Him who wraps himself in light as in a garment" (Ps 103/104:3). Similarly, whom does Judas deliver to death? Him who delivered Israel out of bondage. Who is given gall and vinegar? He who sent manna to his people in the wilderness. Who is judged? The Judge of Israel. Who is it that has his arms stretched out and is hanging on the Cross? He who stretched out the heavens, he who hung the earth upon the waters (Ps 136:6; Isa 42:5, 44:24; Job 26:7). In other words, the hymns are reading the Scriptures in light of Christ just as much as they are discerning Christ in light of the Scriptures.

This exegetical dimension of Byzantine hymnography, while obvious and undisputed, remains difficult to define using the categories commonly used by scholars of patristic exegesis. I have made the case that the interpretation of theophanies surveyed by this article is neither "allegory," nor "typology," nor "figural," nor "figurative"; it comes closest, rather, to the category of "rewritten Bible" developed by scholars working with Old Testament pseudepigrapha.

Yet, the theophanic exegesis of the hymns, outlined above, is not simply christological exegesis of the Old Testament, in the sense in which exegesis is generally understood today. What is at stake in the christological identification of the "Lord," the "angel of the Lord," the "Presence," the "Glory," etc., is the christological interpretation of the transformational *experience* shared by "our fathers," the patriarchs and prophets. It is crucial, in this respect, to take seriously the liturgical context and the performative character of hymnographic exegesis. In the hymns, theology comes alive in the sense in which Levenson (see above) speaks of Isaiah's vision: art becomes the reality to which it points, and the theophany on "God's holy mountain" is re-presented in the liturgical chronotope. The exegete's vantage point is no longer outside the event to which it refers, but rather the event itself — Eden, Sinai, Zion, and Tabor made present liturgically and encompassing worshippers past, present and future:

"Today He who holds the whole creation in the hollow of His hand is born of the Virgin";

"Today a tomb holds Him who holds the creation in the hollow of His hand";

"Today the Master of creation stands before Pilate";

"Today the Maker of all things is given up to the Cross";

"This is the Day of Resurrection ... the Pascha of the Lord!"

SUMMARY

The exegesis of biblical theophanies was crucially important for early Christians: it underlay their appropriation of the Scriptures of Israel as "Old Testament," it lent itself to polemical use against dualism and monarchianism, and, it was eventually absorbed into Byzantine festal hymnography, thereby gaining wide acceptance in Byzantine theology. Part of a larger project dealing with the exegesis of biblical theophanies in patristic literature, this essay discusses the interpretation of theophanies associated with Sinai, Zion, and Eden found in Byzantine hymnography. After presenting and commenting on the exegesis of specific Old Testament theophanies in Byzantine festal hymns, the author argues that this type of exegesis is difficult to frame within the categories commonly used to describe patristic exegesis, and that a more suitable category would be that of "rewritten Bible," current among scholars of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. He then examines relationship between the Christology emerging from the hymns under discussion and the normative conciliar Christology.

Jack Custer
Pittsburgh, PA

INSPIRED WORD AND SPIRITUAL WORSHIP: HOW BYZANTINE HYMNOGRAPHY INTERPRETS SACRED SCRIPTURE

Liturgical poetry, along with psalmody, is the defining feature of the liturgy of the hours in the Byzantine rite. That Byzantine troparia,¹ kontakia² and canons³ draw heavily on Sacred Scripture is obvious not only to those who have studied the texts but even to those who experience them regularly in worship.⁴ Oddly, philologists, liturgists and theologians alike have largely ignored this rich corpus of poetry and, until recently, modern biblical scholarship took scant interest in patristic prose, much less in poetry. Nevertheless, it may be safely asserted that Byzantine liturgical hymns are as much products of biblical interpretation as they are of poetic inspiration and therefore stand as important documents of Greek patristic exegesis. Moreover, their poetic form and liturgical function have kept them alive in the consciousness of the faithful across the centuries.

(1) Singular “troparion.” The term is used in several distinct senses in Byzantine liturgy. Simply put, the troparion is the oldest and most basic genre of Byzantine hymnography, consisting of a single stanza. The term is also used to refer to the particular stanza sung as the dismissal hymn of Vespers, at the start of Matins, and during the Divine Liturgy.

(2) Singular “kontakion.” The term originally referred to a genre of long verse homily, dialogic and dramatic in form, identified with its most famous practitioner, Romanus the Melodist (6th century). The single-stanza kontakion now sung at Matins and at the Divine Liturgy is a fossil of this longer form. For older feasts, what is now called the kontakion is often the prooimion of the original verse homily by Romanus.

(3) The canon is a poetic composition in nine “odes” reflecting nine biblical hymns. Each “ode” is introduced by an “eirnos” followed by two or more troparia. The particular characteristics of the canon will be explained below.

(4) The most accessible English translation of this whole hymnographic corpus is the work of Archimandrite Ephrem LASH at

<http://www.anastasis.org.uk>.

If, in the modern era, biblical exegesis has generally understood itself as an academic exercise, performed in studies and classrooms and circulated among a restricted scholarly audience, this was not the case in the period between the 5th and 9th centuries when Byzantine hymnography flourished. Frances Young reminds us that biblical interpretation⁵ effectively created Christian culture.⁶ All the activities of the patristic Church — liturgy, preaching, catechesis of the faithful, polemics against heretics, organizing monastic life and critiquing secular culture — all were firmly rooted in an ongoing, living and pastoral engagement with the sacred text carried out according to exegetical methods inherited from Greek and Jewish antecedents.

Festal Homilies and Festal Canons

The biblical roots of Byzantine hymnography can be traced in several ways. The most obvious is their often clear dependence on older homilies. The homily was the ordinary form in which many of the Greek Fathers performed and disseminated biblical interpretation. The aim might be catechetical, didactic, paraenetic, mystagogic, polemic, monitory or panegyric; the style might be more or less elevated. The exercise was never purely academic, however, for the homilist was always aware of the real needs of a real community of believers. The great preachers of the 4th and 5th centuries cast a long shadow and, by the 6th century, few homilists could imagine measuring up to their predecessors. The Council in Trullo (691–692)⁷ encouraged bishops to imitate or even to borrow from the writings of the Fathers, and anthologies of patristic homilies for the liturgical year were circulating by the 9th century.⁸ Effectively, particular patristic homilies became traditional components of the liturgical offices for

(5) This paper will use the terms “exegesis” and “interpretation” more or less interchangeably. The Byzantine authors and homilists under consideration would not have seen the point of the modern tendency to distinguish exegesis (what the text meant to its original author and audience) from interpretation (one of a number of things the text might mean to any other particular audience).

(6) F. M. YOUNG, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Peabody MA, 2002).

(7) Canon 19; J. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Paris, 1901–1927) Vol. 11, 952D.

(8) R. F. TAFT, Sermon, in: A. KAZHDAN et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (New York—Oxford, 1991) Vol. 3, 1880.

various feasts.⁹ These familiar homilies, in turn, provided inspiration for the newest genre of liturgical poem, the canon, which flourished particularly in the 8th and 9th centuries and remains a major component in the office of Matins.

The dependence of canons on homilies is most obvious in the offices of Christmas, Pascha and Pentecost. It was noted with mock apology in the 18th century by St Nicodemus of the Holy Mountain, who argued that those who need bread go to the baker and that those who needed festive words should go to the “panegyrist and encomiast, Gregory who is great in theology.”¹⁰ In fact, the exordium of Gregory the Theologian’s Theophany homily (Oration 38):

Χριστὸς γεννᾶται, δοξάσατε· χριστὸς ἐξ οὐρανῶν, ἀπαντήσατε·
χριστὸς ἐπὶ γῆς, ὑψώθητε. Ἄισατε τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ· καὶ ἴν’
ἀμφοτέρω συνελών εἶπω, εὐφραινέσθωσαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ
ἀγαλλιάσθω ἡ γῆ, διὰ τὸν ἐπουράνιον, εἶτα ἐπίγειον...¹¹

is reprised almost verbatim as the eirmos of the first ode of Cosmas of Maiouma’s Canon for the Nativity:

Χριστὸς γεννᾶται, δοξάσατε· χριστὸς ἐξ οὐρανῶν, ἀπαντήσατε·
χριστὸς ἐπὶ γῆς, ὑψώθητε. Ἄισατε τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ· καὶ ἐν
εὐφροσύνῃ ἀνθμνήσατε λαοί, ὅτι δεδόξασται.

The next seven odes of the canon do not show obvious dependence on Gregory’s sermon. The ninth and final ode, however, draws on another patristic homily, traditionally (and spuriously) credited to John Chrysostom: Μυστήριον ξένον καὶ παράδοξον βλέπω (“I contemplate a strange and marvelous mystery”).¹²

A similar borrowing, again from Gregory the Theologian (Oration 1), is evident in the eirmos of the first ode of John Damascene’s well-

(9) This practice survives in the traditional reading of (Ps) John Chrysostom, *Sermo catecheticum in pascha*, PG 59, 721–724 at the Liturgy of Pascha. All non-liturgical texts are cited from *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* unless otherwise indicated.

(10) Νικοδήμου τοῦ Ἁγιορείτου, *Εορτοδρόμιον*, τ. Α΄ (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1987) 149–150.

(11) Gregory the Theologian, *In Theophania*, PG 36, 312.

(12) (Ps) John Chrysostom, *In natalem Christi diem*, PG 56, 385. Very similar incipits occur in (Ps) ATHANASIUS, *Sermo in natiuitatem Christi*, PG 28, 960 and (Ps) Epiphanius, *Homilia in laudes Mariae deiparae*, PG 43, 501.

known Paschal Canon.¹³ This time, however, there are also several borrowings from another of the Theologian's paschal orations (Oration 45) *πάσχα κυρίου πάσχα* ("Pascha, the Lord's Pascha," ode 1 eirmos);¹⁴ *συνεγείρεσθε* ("raised with [viz. Christ]," ode 3, tropar 2);¹⁵ *σήμερον σωτηρία τῷ κόσμῳ* ("Today salvation for the world," ode 4 eirmos);¹⁶ *ἄρρεν*¹⁷ and *ἄμωμον* ("male" and "spotless," ode 4, troparion 1); *σκίων* ("shadows," ode 4, troparion 3);¹⁸ *δικαιοσύνης ἥλιον* ("Sun of Righteousness," ode 5, eirmos)¹⁹ and *Αὕτη ἑορτῶν ἡμῖν ἑορτή, καὶ πανηγυρις πανηγύρεων* ("This is for us the feast of feasts and festival of festivals," ode 8, eirmos).²⁰ The opening motif of the 9th ode eirmos, *φωτίζου φωτίζου* ("Shine, shine") derives from Isaiah 60,1 and also appears in paschal contexts in the works of Cyril of Alexandria although never with reference to the Virgin and never with the Damascene's distinctive "**new** Jerusalem."²¹ The Christological titles, "Wisdom, Power, and Word of God" (ode 9, troparion 2; cf. 1 Corinthians 1,24) draw again from Gregory's Oration 45.²²

In all these examples, it might be objected that the hymnographer has simply lifted sonorous phrases from well-known sermons. In the case of Cosmas of Maiouma's Canon for Pentecost, however, the borrowings are more substantial and reflect real exegetical engagement with the details of Acts 2.²³ In the second troparion of the fourth ode, Cosmas quotes, not from Gregory's Pentecost homily, but rather from his 3rd dogmatic poem on the Holy Spirit, naming the tongues of fire that fell on disciples a "sign of divinity:" *οἷς ρᾶ καὶ ἐν γλώσσησι*

(13) Gregory the Theologian, *In sanctum Pascha et in tarditatem*, PG 35, 396–401.

(14) Gregory the Theologian, *In sanctum Pascha*, PG 36, 624.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Ibid. Gregory's homily begins by evoking Habakkuk's watch.

(17) Ibid., 640–641, with reference to the liturgical laws regarding the Passover lamb, Exodus 12,5.

(18) Gregory the Theologian, *In sanctum Pascha*, PG 36, 637, with reference to the typological quality of the Old Testament Passover sacrifice.

(19) Gregory the Theologian, *In sanctum Pascha*, PG 36, 645.

(20) Ibid., 624.

(21) Cyril of Alexandria, *litterae paschales seu homiliae*, PG 77, 405 and 476.

(22) Gregory the Theologian, *In sanctum Pascha*, PG 36, 664.

(23) Cosmas signals his dependence on Gregory from the outset. The acrostic upon which the whole piece is built is Πεντηκοστήν ἑορτάζομεν, taken verbatim from Gregory the Theologian, *In Pentecosten*, PG 36, 436.

πυρὸς μετέπειτ' ἔμερίσθη, σῆμα φέρον θεότητος.²⁴ The point made by Gregory and reaffirmed by Cosmas is, of course, the personal divinity of the Holy Spirit, the symbolic equation of God with fire being presumed on the basis of such texts as Deuteronomy 4,24 (quoted by Hebrews 12,29): "The Lord your God is a consuming fire." The same troparion borrows from Gregory's hymn a second time, again asserting the personal divinity of the Spirit, who "comes from the Father, remaining God, self-commanding" (πατρὸθεν ἐρχόμενον, θεῖον μένος αὐτοκέλευστον).²⁵

Cosmas has recourse to Gregory's Pentecost homily twice in the ninth ode. In the first troparion, he repeats Gregory's claim that the same Spirit who descended upon the disciples in the form of fire was the force behind Elijah's ascent in a fiery chariot.²⁶ The common denominator of fire is obvious and the antithesis of ascent and descent invites further contemplation. The pairing of Elijah and Pentecost resonates with the article of the Nicene Creed that names the Holy Spirit as the divine person who "spoke through the prophets." The transport of Elijah likewise reminds us that the Spirit's mission is not limited to empowering charisms on earth but is fully realized only when humanity is created anew (Ezekiel 36,26; 37,14; 2 Corinthians 5,17; Galatians 6,15), adopted into the divine family (Romans 8,23; Galatians 4,5), made citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem (Galatians 4,26; Ephesians 2,19) and divinized (Hebrews 6,4; 2 Peter 1,4). The descent of the Spirit to earth enables the ascent of humanity to heaven.

In the next troparion, the hymnographer demonstrates his awareness of the Theologian's meticulous reading of Acts 2,6:²⁷

γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης συνῆλθεν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεχύθη ὅτι ἤκουον εἰς ἕκαστος τῆ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ λαλούντων αὐτῶν.

And at this sound the multitude came together, and they were bewildered, because each one heard them speaking in his own language. (RSV)

Gregory claims that the sense of the text depends upon the punctuation. If the pause is placed after ἤκουον the miracle consists in the

(24) Gregory the Theologian, *Carmina Dogmatica* 3, PG 37, 410.

(25) *Ibid.*, 408.

(26) Gregory the Theologian, *In Pentecosten*, PG 36, 445.

(27) *Ibid.*, 449.

Apostles speaking together in a single language but being heard by the audience in a variety of tongues. Gregory himself insists that this is not the case and argues that the pause belongs after the phrase ἤκουον εἰς ἕκαστος so that τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ λαλούντων αὐτῶν becomes a discrete phrase describing the apostles speaking different languages. Gregory's exegesis is certainly reflected in Cosmas' description of the event:

Νόμου τῶν φύσεων δίχα ξένον ἠκούετο, τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς μιᾶς γὰρ φωνῆς ἀπηχοομένης, πνεύματος χάριτι, ποικίλως ἐνηχούντο, λαοί, φυλαὶ καὶ γλῶσσαι²⁸ τὰ μεγαλεῖα²⁹ τῆς τριάδος γνῶσιν μουμένοι. (Canon of Pentecost, ode 9, troparion 2)

A strange thing is heard, contrary to laws of nature; for the disciples sounding with a single voice, resounded with the mighty deeds of God in a variety (of tongues) by the grace of the Spirit; peoples, tribes and tongues are initiated into the knowledge of the Trinity.

The poet's syntax is unusual, deriving probably from his desire to play contrasting compound forms of ἐχέω (to make a sound) — ἐνηχέω (to resound) and the rare ἀπηχέω (here perhaps 'to sound from' or 'to sound out') — against ἠκούετο (from ἀκούω, to hear). In the process, however, Cosmas revives the alternative reading that Gregory had raised only to reject: the marvel lies not in the disciples' speaking but in the crowd's hearing. It is noteworthy that this is clearly a minority opinion. Most interpreters, guided by Acts 2,11, understand that the apostles actually spoke in different languages.³⁰ The phrase "people, tribes and tongues," which reproduces a phrase found four times in Theodotion's version of Daniel (3,4,7; 5,19; 7,14), subtly suggests a reversal of the exile dramatized in that book and still a reality for the polyglot Jews who made Israel a place of Pentecost pilgrimage but not of permanent residence. The gathering of the scattered people is cited elsewhere in the liturgy of Pentecost but in

(28) The triple evocation of the nations is found verbatim in Daniel (Theodotion) 3,4,7; 5,19; 7,14

(29) Acts 2,11: τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

(30) Thus, for example, Chrysostom, *In Acta apostolorum* 4, PG 60, 45; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses ad illuminandos* 17,16; Didymus the Blind, *Fragmenta in Psalmos*, 883; Basil of Seleucia, *Homilia in pentecosten*, 100; Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in xii prophetas minores*, 228; Severian of Gabala in *Catena in Acta*, 27; Severus of Antioch, *Ibid.*, 30.

terms of reversing the dispersion of the nations at the tower of Babel (Genesis 11).³¹

Intertextual Dynamics in the Canon

As a literary form, the canon always stands in a rather complex relationship to Scripture. Each of the nine odes of a canon corresponds to one of nine biblical odes originally sung in the morning office. Thus each ode of the canon must make some allusion to its biblical antecedent while also expounding the particular theme of the day in language that is likewise scriptural. It is not difficult to sound the appropriate Marian theme in the 9th ode (corresponding to the Magnificat; Luke 1,46–55) but it can be challenging to link Christian feasts and themes with the Odes of Moses (Exodus 15; Deuteronomy 32), Hannah (1 Kingdoms=1 Samuel 2), Habakkuk (chapter 3), Isaiah (chapter 26), Jonah (chapter 2), and the three youths (Daniel 3). Often the relationship is superficially verbal, such as a mechanical insertion of γὰρ δεδόξασται (“for he has been glorified;” Exodus 15,1) in troparia of a canon’s first ode. The three youths in the furnace (Daniel 3; Odes 7 and 8), on the other hand, lend themselves to various typological and allegorical treatments.

In the best of cases, the canon effects an impressive interplay of static ode text and changeable liturgical context. Several examples on a single theme can be found in Cosmas of Maiouma’s canon for Holy Thursday. In all cases, Cosmas identifies Christ with the female personification of Wisdom (Proverbs 9), who has built a house, prepared a banquet, and her invited guests to eat and drink.³² The connection with the institution of the Eucharist, a major theme of the Holy Thursday liturgy, is immediately apparent. The wisdom banquet theme is all the more appropriate to the Johannine account of Last Supper, where there is only the barest hint of actual food (John 13,26–30) and no institution of the Eucharist, but instead a symposium-like exchange

(31) Thus, for example, the Pentecost kontakion of Romanus the Melodist: J. GROSDIDIER DE MATONS, *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vols. 1–5 (SC, 99, 110, 114, 128, 283) (Paris, 1964–1981) # 49; or P. MAAS, C. A. TRYPANIS (eds.), *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica* Genuina (Oxford, 1963) # 33.

(32) The grammatical gender of the Greek Sofia (Wisdom) requires feminine pronouns whose antecedent is ultimately Christ. In English, gender is natural, not grammatical, and the precedent of ecclesiastically received translations has guided our decision to translate such pronouns as masculine in italics.

with the disciples followed by a series of discourses by Jesus (John 13,31–16,33).

The limitless (ἄπειρος)³³ wisdom of God, the origin of all (παντα-
τία)³⁴ and the producer of life (παρεκτικὴ ζωῆς),³⁵ has built *his* house
in the holy Mother who knew not man (ἄπειράνδρου), having been
clothed in the temple of our flesh. Christ our God is gloriously glori-
fied. (Ode 1, troparion 2)

The poet's debt to the biblical ode is satisfied by the final words, ἐνδόξως δεδόξασται, which reprise Exodus 15,1. The Christologi-
cal temple image pairs with the identification of Mary as the "house"
that Wisdom (Christ) has built (Proverbs 9,1–5).³⁶ The paronomasia in
the Christological and Marian attributes ἄπειρος and ἀπειράνδρου
is audible, but we might miss two more subtle references to Christ's
passion. Περιθήμενος (clothed) reflects περιτιθέασιν, the verb used
to report how Jesus was clothed in mock royal purple by his captors
(Mark 15,17). The "temple of our flesh" meanwhile recalls both the
identification of incarnation and sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews
(especially 10,5 and 10,20) and Jesus' first passion prediction about the
"temple of his body" (John 2,21). It is on the Cross that the Wisdom of
God is most clearly revealed (1 Corinthians 1,18–25).

The most striking feature of this next stanza is the complex use of
quotation:

Let us the faithful all listen the voice of the uncreated and wisdom
inviting us with an exalted announcement. For *he* cries out: Taste
and seeing how good (χρηστός) I am, cry out Christ (Χριστός) our
God is gloriously glorified. (Ode 1, doxastichon)

The hymn makes Christ/Wisdom the speaker of LXX Psalm 33,9;
then subtly turns the biblical citation into Christ's proposal of how

(33) In the patristic period the expression is unique to John Chrysostom, *In genesim homiliae*, PG 53,35; in *Matthaeum*, PG 57, 364; in *epistulam ad Romanos*, PG 60, 557.

(34) Applied to Wisdom by Procopius of Gaza, *Fragmentum in Canticum*, PG 87,1756; (Ps) Procopius of Gaza, *Commentarii in Proverbia*, PG 87, 1528.

(35) Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 5.3.3.

(36) The identification of Mary as Wisdom's house goes back at least as far as the 3rd century: Hippolytus, *Fragmenta in Proverbia (e Pseudo-Anastasio Sinaita)*, fragment 37. See also Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridui inter mortem et resurrectionem domini nostri Jesu Christi spatio*, in E. GEBHARDT, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, 9,1 (Leiden, 1967) 291 (= *In Christi resurrectionem oratio i*, PG 46, 616).

the believer should respond. The effect is to suggest that participants in Christ's banquet are so perfectly united with Him that their words coalesce with His. The play on the homonyms *χρηστός* and *Χριστός* uses paronomasia to reveal the presence of Christ in the psalm while *ἀκουτισῶμεν*³⁷ reinforces *ἀκτίστου* (uncreated), a corrective against the Arian misreading of Proverbs 9 which reduced the Son of God to creaturely status. There is an undeniably erotic dimension to the evocations of the personified female Wisdom in Proverbs and the hymnographer seems to intend something similar in this stanza. Where Psalm 33,9 has "taste and see" (*ἴδετε*), the hymn links 'tasting' with 'knowing' (*γινώντες*), appropriate enough in the Wisdom context but also bearing a sexual connotation in Genesis 4,1 and frequently thereafter. It was, moreover, after tasting the forbidden fruit, that Adam and Eve first 'knew' good and evil (Genesis 3,5.7.22). The Wisdom banquet is thus subtly assumed into the broader typological antithesis between the Tree of Eden and the Tree of the Cross.

The Father begot (*γεννᾶ*) me, the Creator (*δημιουργόν*), the beginning of his ways (*ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν*), the Wisdom before the ages who created (*ἔκτισε*) the works now mystically completed (*ἔργα τελούμενα*). For being (*ὦν*) the Word, uncreated (*ἄκτιστος*) by nature, I take to myself the voices (*φωνὰς*) of what I have now assumed. (Ode 9, troparion 2)

The troparion follows Proverbs 8,22–23 closely: *κύριος ἐκτίσέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ πρὸ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέν με ἐν ἀρχῇ* and picks up the important verb *γεννᾶ με* from Proverbs 8,25. While never applied to Wisdom in the Old Testament, *δημιουργός* is a divine title in Hebrews 11,10. It would also be possible to hear a divine title (LXX Exodus 3,14) in the participle *ὦν*. The poet intentionally departs from the syntax of Proverbs with regard to the problematic verb *ἔκτισε*. It is no longer the Lord who "created" wisdom, but rather "begot" wisdom so that wisdom might "create" everything else. Any potential Arian misinterpretation of *ἔκτισε* is further opposed by the attribution of *ἄκτιστος* ("uncreated") to Wisdom. The equation of Wisdom and Word reflects St John's description of the creation of all things though the Logos in the beginning (John 1,1–3). The vague expression *ἔργα τελούμενα* is likewise Johannine (John 4,34; 17,4; 19,30)

(37) It is perhaps not coincidental that two of this verb's relatively rare biblical occurrences are Song of Songs 2,14 and 8,13.

and here refers to the rebirth of human nature through water and the Holy Spirit (John 1,11–12; 3,1–8).

In his canon for Midpentecost, Andrew of Crete chooses to reflect the Ode of Moses by alluding, not to the crossing of the Red Sea, but rather to the first of the ten plagues that turned the Nile into blood (Exodus 7,17–21).

You exhibited a wonder, making water pass over³⁸ into wine, O Master, who in Egypt had turned the rivers into blood; and by raising the dead you perfected this second sign. Glory to your ineffable will, O Savior, glory to your condescension, through which you have made us new. (Ode 1, troparion 2)

On the literal level, the transformation of water is what the Exodus plague shares with the sign at Cana. The visual similarity of blood and wine and their common metaphorical identification reinforce this unexpected pairing of biblical events as does the fact that blood and water flowed from the crucified body of Christ (John 19,34). In Cosmas' hymn "condescension" clearly refers to incarnation for the express purpose of the Passion (Philippians 2,5–8).

The connection between the plague of the waters and the resurrection of the dead, however, is left tantalizingly unexplained. The deadly blood of the first plague may suggest its opposite, the life-saving blood of the paschal lamb, which marked the houses of the Israelites against the angel of death at the tenth plague (Exodus 12,12–13). This identification, in a hymn addressed to Christ, naturally points forward to the life-giving atonement for sin effected by His blood sacrifice on the Cross (1 Corinthians 5,7; Hebrews 9–10). A paschal theme unites all these elements: Christ suffered the Passion at the third Passover of his public ministry; His first sign at Cana occurred near the first Passover (John 2,13).³⁹

The whole Exodus event was broadly read as a type of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ as early as the 2nd century paschal homily of Melito of Sardis and the Christian Pascha became the preferred

(38) The translation attempts to capture something of the odd transitive use of μετέρχομαι whose meaning ranges from go over, pursue, undergo, go through, to discuss; see G. W. H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961) 864.

(39) The Byzantine lectionary clearly hears a paschal theme in the Cana pericope; it is appointed (out of sequence) for the second Monday after Pascha.

time for the baptism of catechumens. The hymn's water imagery suggests baptism, which is sacramentally identified with Christ's death (Romans 6,3) and described as "rebirth" (John 3,4; 1 Peter 1,23). The waters turned to blood brought death but the resurrection of the dead to life is made possible by baptism.

One or more of these typologies must be what Cosmas had in mind. The beauty of the hymn lies both in the variety of interpretations possible and in the fact that the worshipper is challenged to actually make the connections which the hymnographer merely implies. By juxtaposing two biblical events, the hymn invites its performers and hearers to engage in biblical interpretation.

Exegetical Strategies in Liturgical Hymns

Thusfar we have seen how Byzantine hymnographers repackaged exegetical insights from patristic homilies in a new poetic form. We have also shown how the interweaving of various strands of biblical revelation around new Christian themes amounts to an exegetical approach broadly comparable to midrash.⁴⁰ The hymnographers also regularly employed the standard exegetical tools of their day including etymology, allegory, typology and the juxtaposition of texts based on verbal or formal similarities. Whether original to the hymns or derived from patristic sources, the use of such tools constitutes in every case an act of biblical interpretation. For convenience, we can organize the most common examples under three headings: verbal devices, visual devices, and dramatic devices.

Verbal Devices

To the contemporary American ear, wordplay sounds dry and forced, barely tolerable as humor and surely incapable of any high-

(40) There is little consensus among contemporary scholars not only about Christian appropriation of midrash but also about the formal characteristics of the genre in Judaism. There is, however, no denying its fundamentally intertextual nature and the element of creativity in bringing together the most disparate texts. See, for example, Jacob NEUSNER, *What is Midrash?* (Philadelphia, 1987) xi, who distinguishes prophetic styles, systematic paraphrase and "the parable, inclusive of allegorizing tendencies" but also summarizes the process broadly as the search for "deeper meanings" (2). Similarly broad is the definition of F. KERMODE, *The Genesis of Secrecy* (Cambridge MA, 1979) xi: "narrative interpretation of a narrative, a way of finding in the existing narrative the potential of more narrative."

er purpose. In contrast, **etymological play on names** was esteemed as a token of real wit in Semitic and Hellenic cultures.⁴¹ In liturgical hymns, etymology often amounts to no more than a trite repetition of a single conceit based on a saint's name (e.g., Anna and "grace" from the Hebrew; George and "farmer" from the Greek). Occasionally, however, the appeal to etymology provides real and surprising theological insights.

Inspired by Justin, Eusebius, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, and John Chrysostom⁴², the office for the Ascension repeatedly presents the dialogue of LXX Psalm 23,7–10 as the words of the angels as they witness Christ ascending in glory into heaven. We will explore this exegetical strategy, called *prosopopoeia*, below. For the moment our attention must be directed to the second apostichon at Vespers for the Ascension. Following the usual first question, "who is this?" the hymnographer reproduces the psalmist's response rather closely: "He is the mighty conqueror; he is the mighty one in battle; he is indeed the King of Glory." Another question follows, "and why are his garments crimson?" to which the response is "because he comes from Bosor, which is the flesh." This second round of questioning comes from Isaiah 63,1–6 and resembles the rabbinic strategy called *gezerah shavah*, the bringing together of two texts which share a common verbal element, in this case, "who is this?" Origen was the first to unite these two texts in the context of the Ascension although Cyril of Alexandria's Ascension homily is probably the more immediate inspiration for this hymn.⁴³ The striking fidelity of the hymn to its biblical sources is clearly evident:

(41) See, for example, Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 2, 23,29; and Quintilian *Institutio Oratoriae* 5,30–31. Etymology is clearly at work in the exegesis of Genesis 14 in Hebrews 7,1–2.

(42) Justin, *Apologia* 51,7; and *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 36,4; Eusebius, *Demonstratio evangelica* 6.2.6 and 7.1.13; Gregory of Nyssa, in *ascensionem Christi*, in E. GEBHARDT (ed.), *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 9.1 (Leiden, 1967) 326; John Chrysostom, *De sancta pentecoste*, PG 50, 460.

(43) Origen, *Commentarius in Ioannem*, 6,56; Origen, *Commentarius in Matthaeum* 16,19; Cyril of Alexandria (= Ps. Athanasius), *Oratio in ascensionem Domini*, in C. DATEMA, *Une homélie inédite sur l'ascension, Byzantion* 44 (1974) 136.

<i>Biblical Sources</i>	<i>Apostichon for the Ascension</i>
LXX Psalm 23:7–10 ἄρατε πύλας οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπάρθητε πύλαι αἰώνιοι καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης τίς ἐστὶν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης κύριος κραταιὸς καὶ δυνατός, κύριος δυνατός ἐν πολέμῳ ... κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτός ἐστὶν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης	Ἐναλαμβανομένου σου Χριστέ ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, αἱ δυνάμεις ὀρῶσαι, ἑτέρα τῇ ἑτέρα ἐβόων· τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος; καὶ φησὶ πρὸς αὐτάς· οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ κραταιὸς καὶ δυναστὴς οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ δυνατός ἐν πολέμῳ, οὗτος ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης. ...
Isaiah 63:1–3 τίς οὗτος ὁ παραγινόμενος ἐξ Ἐδωμ ἐρύθημα ἱματίων ἐκ Βοσορ οὕτως ὠραῖος ἐν στολῇ βία μετὰ ἰσχύος ἐγὼ διαλέγομαι δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν σωτηρίου διὰ τί σου ἐρυθρὰ τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ τὰ ἐνδύματά σου ὡς ἀπὸ πατητοῦ ληνοῦ	... καὶ ἵνα τί αὐτοῦ ἐρυθρὰ τὰ ἱμάτια; Ἐκ Βοσορ ἤκει ὅπερ ἐστὶ τῆς σαρκός. Αὐτὸς δὲ ὡς Θεός, ἐν δεξιᾷ καθίσας τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, ἀπέστειλας ἡμῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἵνα ὀδηγήσῃ, καὶ σῶσῃ τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

Less immediately apparent is the etymology that fuels the hymn's exegesis. The Hebrew "Bozrah" was transliterated by the LXX as "Bosor," the virtual homonym of *basar*, the Hebrew for "flesh;" and so, the place name comes to foretell the incarnation of Christ as early as Eusebius.⁴⁴ Cyril of Alexandria⁴⁵ may have suspected this interpretation as artificial but it responds to a fundamental patristic principle upon which so much typological and allegorical exegesis is based: if Scripture takes the trouble to specify details, these details must be meaningful. Here, the etymology actually leads to more substantial considerations.

(44) Eusebius, *Commentarii in Isaiam* 2,7, in: J. ZIEGLER, *Eusebius Werke*, Band 9: *Der Jesajakommentar* (Berlin, 1975) (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller). Likewise Didymus the Blind, *Commentarii in Zacchariam* 1, 24 and Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses ad illuminandos* 13,27; Procopius of Gaza, *Commentarii in Isaiam*, PG 87, 2669; Theodoret, *Commentaria in Isaiam* 19, and Theodoret, *Explanatio in Canticum canticorum*, PG 81, 117.

(45) In his correspondence with John of Antioch, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* 1,1,4, page 46, Cyril offers συνοχή and θλίψις as complimentary alternatives to interpreting Bosor as "flesh." Still, Cyril repeats the traditional etymology on a number of occasions, including *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*, PG 70, 744.

Structurally, Isaiah 63, LXX Psalm 23 and the Ascension narrative (Luke 24,50–53; Acts 1,6–11) share significant details. In all three cases a hero returns victorious from battle, in two cases still bearing gory evidence of the fight (Isaiah 63; Luke 24,39), and in two cases specifically entering into his kingdom (Psalm 23,9; Luke 24,51; Acts 1,11). Interpreting angels appear in the account in Acts (1,10–11) and can be inferred even from a rather literal reading of the psalm. “Powers” (LXX Psalm 23,10; κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων) is an angelic title (Romans 8,38; cf. Mark 13,25) and ἄρχοντες (LXX Psalm 23,9) approximates ἄρχαι, another Pauline term for angels (Romans 8,38; Ephesians 3,10; 6,12; Colossians 1,16; 2,15).⁴⁶ The hymnographer simply ascribes to these angels the words of Isaiah along with those of the psalmist. Meanwhile, even if the association of Bosor with flesh is a stretch, Edom actually does derive from a word meaning “red” and, in traditional Christian etymology, is identified with Adam (the Hebrew consonants are identical).⁴⁷ Two further details should be noticed. First, the poet’s addition of the word ἀληθῶς is the exegetical lynchpin of the whole hymn. Already in the Fourth Gospel, forms of “truth” or “true” regularly accompany the claim that something foreshadowed in the Old Testament finds its final and fullest meaning in Jesus Christ.⁴⁸ Secondly, the hymnographer’s description of Jesus’ arrival in heaven (ἐν δεξιᾷ καθίσας τῆς μεγαλωσύνης) paraphrases Jesus’ own revelation before the Sanhedrin as the heavenly Son of Man (Matthew 26,64 Mark 14,22; Luke 22,69; itself a conflation of Daniel 7,13 and LXX Psalm 109,1). This bold claim to divine authority is what sends Jesus to the Cross according to the Synoptic Gospels. Thus, this brief stanza masterfully balances the divinity and humanity of the ascend-

(46) The identification of LXX Psalm 23 with the angels in the context of the Ascension was first made by Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 36,4.

(47) Eusebius, *Commentarius in Isaiam 2,7* and *Generalis elementaria introductio* (= *Eclogae propheticae*), T. GAISFORD, *Eusebii Pamphili episcopi Caesariensis eclogae propheticae* (Oxford, 1842) 233, interprets Edom as γηινός (earthly) retaining both the notion of red clay and the etymology of “Adam” from Hebrew *adamah* (earth) implied by Genesis 2,7. The etymology recurs, inter alios, in Theodoret, *Commentaria in Isaiam* 19 who, in *Explanatio in Canticum canticorum*, PG 81,53, also knows the common Jewish identification of Edom with Rome.

(48) More than 50 times in John; most strikingly, for example in John 6,14.32.55.

ing Christ, recalls the Passion that precedes His exaltation and makes it the climax toward which the triumphs of the Old Testament point.

Paronomasia is the classical name for what contemporary English dismisses as a **pun**. It is freer than etymology, not limited to latent lexical meanings and not dependent upon a second language. Defined as the juxtaposition of similar-sounding words with different meanings,⁴⁹ its effect is much the same as etymological play.

The Lenten Triodion contains a number of hymns that allegorize the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10,30–37) in terms of Adam's fall (or subsequent human fallenness) and Christ's intervention.

Beset by spiritual thieves (λησταῖς λογισμοῖς) Adam was robbed of his mind (ἐκλάπη τὸν νοῦν), wounded in spirit (τραυματισθεὶς τὴν ψυχὴν) and lay stripped of help (γυμνὸς ἀντιλήψεως). The priest from before the Law did not help him, nor did the Levite from after the Law notice him, but rather you, O God, who come not from Samaria but from Mary (οὐκ ἐκ Σαμαρείας ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας) the Theotokos. O Lord, glory to you. (Second apostichon, Vespers, Fourth Sunday of Lent)

There are several exegetical subtleties here. The fine distinction between the priest and the Levite reflects the fact that, while Levites were clearly instituted after Sinai, the OT knows at least one priest before the law — Melchizedek (Genesis 14). The actual wordplay — οὐκ ἐκ Σαμαρείας ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας — is crucial in that it provides the only text-based connection between the anonymous Samaritan and Jesus. The fact that the name of the Mother of God lies 'hidden' in the evangelical detail that the good neighbor came from Samaria in a sense authorizes the rest of the allegory. Whether or not the hymnographer intended it, his wordplay also refutes the hostile crowd's attempt to insult Jesus by calling him a Samaritan (John 8,48).

Rabbinic exegesis delights in gematria, the discovery of correspondences between words based on their numerical value.⁵⁰ There is only the occasional hint of such techniques in the NT and patristic literature,⁵¹ I know of none in Byzantine hymnography. Where the biblical

(49) The anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4,29–32.

(50) In both Hebrew and Greek the letters of the alphabet also stand for numbers.

(51) Few doubt that the specification of 153 fish in John 21,11 reflects gematria but there is little agreement on how to interpret the number, unlike the a broad consensus that the 666 of Revelation 13,18 represents the value of

text chooses to note specific **numbers**, however, patristic exegetes are prone to draw allegorical correspondences and in this they are followed by the hymnographers. The three youths in the fiery furnace (Daniel 3), who appear in the 7th and 8th odes of Matins, are frequently seen to stand for the Trinity. Beyond satisfying the formal constraints of the canon genre (especially in the doxastichon, which follows a Trinitarian doxology), this allegory plays into a variety of symbolic evocations of divinity and Trinity as fire and light in the Bible and in classic patristic texts.⁵²

The number four also lends itself to allegory in a hymn for Vespers on the evening of the First Sunday of the Great Fast. Nothing in 2 Kings 2 suggests that the fiery chariot that carried Elijah off had four wheels; that inference may reflect the influence of a particular reading of the four living creatures and the wheels of Ezekiel's chariot visions (Ezekiel 1 and 10). Only once this exegetical step is recognized can we make sense out of the exhortation to "make the four cardinal virtues a chariot of fire for ourselves like Elias the Tishbite."⁵³ This interpretation also provides a particularly striking example of inculturated exegesis. The only biblical mention of the four cardinal virtues is Wisdom 8,7 but these qualities would have been fundamental to any native Greek understanding of virtue. Hence, via a number-based correspondence with Ezekiel, the Byzantine hymnographer discovers them in Elijah and proposes them for the faithful.

Visual Devices

The narrowly philological, historical or dogmatic focus of so many students of religious literature has often prevented them from seeing the full range of expression at work in the Scriptures and in the Fathers. In its esteem for the literal, such a reading often misses the literary, specifically those interpretive strategies that exploit the visual

"Nero Caesar" in Hebrew letters. Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*. 2.4.43,3 identifies the ten-stringed lyre (LXX Psalm 32,2) with the name of Jesus, whose Greek initial has the value of ten.

(52) Exodus 24,17; Leviticus 10; Numbers 11; Deuteronomy 4,24; 1 Kings 18; 2 Kings 1; LXX Psalm 17,9; 49,3; Daniel 7,9; Ezekiel 1 and 10; Luke 3,16; Acts 2,3; Hebrews 12,29. From the Fathers, suffice it to mention John Damascene, *Expositio fidei* 8,96 (=Book 1,8).

(53) Third sticheron at Psalm 140, Sunday evening of the First Sunday of Lent. The same idea is expressed even more cryptically in the fourth sticheron at Psalm 140, Wednesday of the first week of Lent.

rather than the strictly verbal or conceptual dimensions of language. Lexicons and concordances will not capture such exotic prey.

In the canon for Thursday of the fifth week of Lent, the eirmos of the eighth ode surprises us by pairing the formally required mention of the three youths in the fiery furnace with a reminiscence of Elijah's contest with the prophets of Baal (1 Kings 18). The parallels are visual, not verbal: dew and flames in the furnace, water and divine fire on Mount Carmel. Still the conjunction of images is exegetically fertile. Both narratives recount contests between endangered devotees of the Lord and far more numerous proponents of false gods who enjoy royal support. In both, the faithful few are saved by a supernatural intervention and in both some of their opponents are destroyed (1 Kings 18,40; Daniel 3,22). In Daniel, God reveals Himself in refreshing dew despite fire; for Elijah, His intervention is characteristically fire despite water. In two elements that Hebrews considered polar opposites — fire and water (Psalm 66,12; Mark 9,22; Matthew 17,15) — the Lord is found to be present for His faithful.

It is also possible to accumulate related images. Here the exegetical equivalent is the catena, the linking of texts out of context according to some new organizing principle. Such an approach is already evident in 1 Peter 2,4–8 with its repetition of λίθος (stone) and, of course, the accrual of all these images to Christ:

Come to him, to that living stone (λίθον ζῶντα), rejected by men but in God's sight chosen and precious; and like living stones (λίθοι ζῶντες) be yourselves built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. For it stands in scripture: "Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone, a cornerstone (λίθον ἀκρογωναῖον) chosen and precious (Isaiah 28,16), and he who believes in him will not be put to shame." To you therefore who believe, he is precious, but for those who do not believe, "The very stone (λίθος) which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner" (Psalm 118,22), and "A stone (λίθος) that will make men stumble, a rock (πέτρα) that will make them fall" (Isaiah 8,14); for they stumble because they disobey the word, as they were destined to do. (RSV)

The related architectural imagery in the katavasia⁵⁴ of the ninth ode of the canon for the first Sunday of Lent is much less obvious:

(54) An additional troparion at the end of each ode in festal canons.

Christ, the stone (λίθος) not cut by human hand (ἀχειρότητος) was cut from you, O unhewn (ἀλαξεύτου)⁵⁵ Virgin as the cornerstone (ἀκρογωνναῖος), fitting together the separated natures. . .

The hymn, unlike the epistle passage, operates entirely on the visual level with no verbal repetition at all. Christ had applied to Himself the image of the rejected stone becoming the head of the corner from LXX Psalm 117,22 (Matthew 21,42; Mark 12,10; Luke 20,17; likewise Acts 4:11 and 1 Peter 2:7). To this obvious opening allusion, the hymnographer adds a reference to Daniel 2,34–35. The stone cut from the mountain “with no human hand” was already a common type of the virgin birth by the 8th century. The identification of the Mother of God with the mountain in Daniel in its turn recalls another traditional typology which saw her in the “overshadowed shady mountain” of Habakkuk 3,3 (LXX: ἐξ ὄρους κατασκίου δασέος) from which “God comes.”⁵⁶

The final allusion is to Ephesians 2,14–22. Whereas Paul⁵⁷ here refers to Christ’s reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles into one Church, the common Greek patristic reading sees here the reconciliation of humanity with divinity through the Incarnation. The only verbal correspondence between our hymn and the complex architectural image in Ephesians is the single word “cornerstone” (ἀκρογωνναῖος; Ephesians 2,20). Paul’s μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ (“the middle wall of partition”) refers to the actual structure in Herod’s Temple beyond which Gentiles dared not venture under threat of death.⁵⁸ The very next phrase,

(55) The only New Testament occurrence of this verbal root is at Luke 23,53, where it describes Christ’s tomb having been hewn out of rock. The connection between the intact seals of Christ’s tomb (Matthew 27,66) and the intact virginity of his Mother was seen at least as early as Ephrem the Syrian († 373), *Hymns on the Nativity* 10.

(56) This typology, of course, is based in the verbal correspondence with Luke 1,35: “the power of the Most High will overshadow (ἐπισκιάσει) you.” As is often the case the LXX have translated the Hebrew placename Paran etymologically; the distinctive LXX reading will not be found in modern translations from the Masoretic text.

(57) Thus for convenience. Much of modern scholarship denies actual Pauline authorship of Ephesians and if, in fact, it was written after 70AD the image of the broken “middle wall of partition” would be all the more compelling.

(58) The existence of such a partition in Herod’s Temple is confirmed by Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*, 15.417.

however, "in his flesh," (Ephesians 2,15) invites expanding the antithesis from Jew/Gentile to God/man, a shift further encouraged by what might politely be called a diminished urgency in Jewish evangelization in the patristic period. The incarnational interpretation is further supported later in verse 15 by the evocation of "one new man." In the vision of Ephesians, a new temple rises out of the rubble of this broken middle wall:

For he is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end. And he came and preached peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near; for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father. So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone, in whom the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit. (Ephesians 2, 14–22; RSV)

Ephesians anticipates 1 Peter 2 in its evocation of the Church as a new temple built of living stones with Christ as the cornerstone. The concept has its roots in the visions of Ezekiel (40 ff), appears already developed in the Pauline letters (1 Corinthians 3,16–17; 6,19) and finds its most vivid expression in John's vision of the new and heavenly Jerusalem (Revelation 21). In the life of Israel, the Temple accomplished two important functions: there sins were expiated and God was encountered. The expiation now accomplished once and for all through sacrificial death of the Incarnate Christ has reconciled Jew and Gentile — the whole of humanity — to each other and to God. The union of divine and human natures in the Incarnation of Christ is necessary to the argument in Ephesians, and the union of other humans with God is likewise sketched in Paul's list of consequences: peace, access to God and incorporation into His household. As befits an orthodox reader of the NT after Nicaea, Ephesus and Chalcedon, the hymnographer merely foregrounds the ontological dimension of what the apostle had described economically, noting as well the role of the Theotokos in the Incarnation. The hymn is a dogmatic interpretation of Ephesians 2,14.

The mere mention of the “cornerstone” — the poet does not even need to specify the building! — reminds us that the body of the incarnate Christ is itself the ultimate Temple (John 2,17–21; Hebrews 10, 5.10.20; Revelation 21,22), while the allusive, visual approach leaves open the possibility for association with still more images, such as the chosen stone with seven facets in the royal and priestly messianic prophecies of Zechariah (3,9; 4,10).

Dramatizing Devices

Apostrophe, the figure of turning aside from the audience to address an absent historical figure or imagined opponent, was well established in classical and later Greek rhetoric and remained a mainstay of the diatribe style which informs and enlivens so much patristic preaching.⁵⁹ Often enough apostrophe serves as a dramatic means for citing an Old Testament text as a prophecy fulfilled in a New Testament event. Especially at feasts of the Theotokos, for which the New Testament offers little in the way of direct narrative, recourse must be made to the Old Testament. A hymn for Matins of the Dormition of the Mother of God (August 15), asks,

“Cry out, David what is this present feast? He said, ‘The one I of which I sang in the book of Psalms. Since she is daughter, child of God and virgin, Christ, born of her without seed, transferred her . . .’”

While the use of the title “daughter” in this particular stanza might suggest LXX Psalm 44, the rest of the office of the Dormition returns again and again to LXX Psalm 131,8: “Go up Lord to the place of your rest, you and the Ark of your strength” (LXX Psalm 131,8).

Two interpretive steps are presumed in this little stanza: first, the broad identification of the Theotokos with the Temple and secondly, her specific identification with the Ark. Both emerge out of the model of “containment” which became prominent in the Theotokos controversy and both typologies are found in 5th century Marian homilies and in the Akathist Hymn.⁶⁰ By the 6th century, the description of the Tent of Meeting (Hebrews 9,1–7) had become the standard lection for

(59) R. DEAN ANDERSON JR., *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms* (Leuven, 2000) (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology, 24) 25.

(60) See, for example *Akathistos* stanza 23; R. CARO, *La Homiletica Mariana Griega en el Siglo V* (Dayton OH, 1971–1973) (Marian Library Studies, new series, 3–5).

Marian feasts in Jerusalem.⁶¹ This Marian typology can be understood as a particular application of the repeated Pauline insistence that both the individual believer and the universal church become temples through incorporation into Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit (Romans 12,4–5; 1 Corinthians 6,19–20; 10,16–17; 12,13–27; Ephesians 2,16; 4,4–16; 5,23–30; Colossians 1,18–24).

The Bible itself provides a precedent for the device of **personification**. Describing the Israelites' passage across the Jordan under Joshua, the Psalmist ascribes human characteristics to the entire landscape: river, sea, mountains and hills and addresses each in a brief apostrophe (LXX Psalm 113,1–6). LXX Psalm 76,17 recounts another occasion when "the waters saw you and were afraid." Such personification of the Jordan recurs in a number of hymns for the Theophany, the revelation of the Trinity at Jesus' baptism in the Jordan: "The Jordan River turned back, not daring to serve you. How could the one who had stood in awe of Joshua, son of Nun, not have cause to fear his maker?"⁶² At the second kathisma⁶³ of Matins, personification is paired with apostrophe so that the river can narrate:

"Jordan River, why are you astounded at what you see? 'I saw the invisible one naked and I shuddered. For how would I not shudder and shrink at that? The angels shuddered at the sight of him, heaven was beside itself and the earth shook and the sea drew back along with every visible and invisible thing.' Christ is revealed in the Jordan to sanctify the waters."

The liturgical cycle includes distinct sets of hymns celebrating the resurrection of Christ in each of the eight tones of Byzantine chant. The biblical raw material for this extensive poetic corpus is drawn from the Gospel accounts of the empty tomb and the appearances of the risen Christ, the single New Testament reference to his descent into Hades (1 Peter 3,19) and a variety of Old Testament texts. "Hades," the Greek mythological name by which the LXX translated the Hebrew *Sheol*, is often personified by liturgical poets, most notably Romanus the Melodist.⁶⁴

(61) A. KNIAZEFF, *Mariologie biblique et liturgie byzantine, Irénikon* 28 (1955) 269–289.

(62) Fourth Sticheron at the Litija of Great Compline for Theophany.

(63) A poetic interlude between readings of the Psalter at Matins.

(64) See Romanus' kontakia on the raising of Lazarus (SC, # 26; MAAS, TRYPANIS, # 14), the victory of the Cross (SC, # 38; MAAS, TRYPANIS, # 22), on

Remaining (ὑπάρχων) King of heaven and earth,
 Incomprehensible One,
 you were willingly crucified out of love for mankind.
 Hades was embittered when it encountered you below,
 and the souls of the righteous held there rejoiced.
 Seeing you, the creator, in the underworld, Adam arose.
 O the wonder!
 How has the life of all tasted death?
 Only because you have willed to enlighten the world,
 which cries out and says,
 O Lord, risen from the dead, glory to you.
 (Alphabetic apostichon, Saturday Vespers, tone 1)

The entire stanza is structured in pairs of antitheses. While eternally remaining the incomprehensible King of heaven and earth (Daniel 4,34), the Lord accepts the limits of the incarnation and willingly submits to death. His descent embitters Hades but delights the righteous souls. Christ descends and Adam rises; the source of life tastes death. The whole is framed between the bitterness of the personified Hades and the exultation of the redeemed world. The whole trajectory of the hymn mirrors the parabola of condescension and glorification traced in Philippians 2,6–9.

Along with the title from Daniel, the hymnographer reproduces phrases from two other Old Testament texts. Hades was first personified as bitter by Isaiah (14,9) in a mocking dirge for the king of Babylon:

ὁ ἄδης κάτωθεν ἐπικράνθη⁶⁵ συναντήσας σοι συνηγέρθησαν
 σοι πάντες οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς οἱ ἐγείραντες ἐκ τῶν
 θρόνων αὐτῶν πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν.

This evocation of embitterment became identified with Christ's descent into Hades primarily thanks to the famous Paschal homily of St John Chrysostom, which includes this anaphora:

Ἐπικράνεν αὐτὸν γευσάμενον τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ· καὶ τοῦτο
 προλαβὼν Ἡσαΐας ἐβόησεν· Ὁ ἄδης, φησίν, ἐπικράνθη, συν-
 αντήσας σοι κάτω. Ἐπικράνθη, καὶ γὰρ κατηργήθη. Ἐπικράνθη,
 καὶ γὰρ ἐνεπαίχθη. Ἐπικράνθη, καὶ γὰρ ἐνεκρώθη. Ἐπικράνθη,
 καὶ γὰρ καθηρέθη. Ἐπικράνθη, καὶ γὰρ ἐδεσμεύθη.

the Resurrection (SC, # 42; MAAS, TRYPANIS, # 25), another on the Resurrection (MAAS, TRYPANIS, # 26; SC, # 44), etc.

(65) Most modern translations translate as “was astir,” or “was provoked” reflecting the Hebrew *rogzah*.

The hymnographer has clearly considered the prophetic text for himself because he applies the text to Christ's descent into Hades more completely than "Chrysostom" had. Where Isaiah envisions other dead gentile kings standing up in mock respect for the new arrival from Babylon, the hymnographer has Adam "arise," changing Isaiah's verb to one more directly evocative of resurrection (ἀνέστη).

The exultant welcome accorded Christ by the souls of the righteous (δικαίων ψυχαὶ ἠγαλλιάσαντο) paraphrases LXX Psalm 131,9: οἱ ὄσιοι σου ἀγαλλιάσονται.

The psalm celebrates David's recapture of the Ark of the Covenant from the Philistines and its festive transportation Jerusalem. The hymnographer surely intends us to recall the verse just prior to the one he quotes: "arise (ἀνάστηθι) O Lord to your rest (ἀνάπαυσιν)." Here (as in the frequent citation of this verse in the office of the Dormition of the Theotokos), "arise" comes to mean "resurrect" and "rest" is identified with death. This is most appropriate in the case of the Lord's "Sabbath rest" in the tomb for Saturday is the only full day he spent there. Isaiah's nameless Babylonian king is still dead, and the Ark of the Covenant irretrievably lost. The hymnographer's interpretation of these two texts continues to have immediate and profound meaning for the faithful who celebrate Christ's resurrection and anticipate their own Sunday after Sunday throughout the Church year.

Short of actual personification, it may be unnamed "rulers" of Hades who are confronted by Christ:

The one who granted resurrection to the human race
 was led like a sheep to the slaughter.
 Then the rulers of Hades trembled
 And the doleful gates were uplifted
 For Christ the King of Glory has entered
 Saying those in chains, "Go out"
 And to those in darkness, "Show yourselves."

(Second Sticheron at Psalm 140, Great Vespers, tone 5)

Here the hymnographer has succeeded in taking whole clauses from three Old Testament texts and weaving them together seamlessly. The fundamental exegetical insight that holds this pastiche of disparate texts together is that Jesus Christ is the true protagonist in each of them. The citation of the classic image of suffering servant as sacrificial victim (Isaiah 53,7) is justified here by the subsequent mention of the servant's grave (Isaiah 53,9). The arrival of Christ in the realm of the dead is transformed into the triumphant entry of the King

of Glory (LXX Psalm 23,7) but the “gates” which must be “uplifted” are not heavenly (as in citations of this psalm in Ascension hymnography) but infernal (Job 38,17; Isaiah 45,1; LXX Psalm 106,16). The last two lines of the hymn are a nearly literal quote of Isaiah 49,9.⁶⁶ In Isaiah, this imagery of imprisonment refers to the Babylonian exile and the prophet’s message is that Israel has been set free. But the end of the captivity proved to be anti-climactic and inconclusive for Israel and it happened, at any rate, a long time ago. The hymnographer takes one further interpretive step that we should not overlook: “we,” the singers of the hymn, assume the role of the liberated. Deutero-Isaiah described the return from Babylon as a new Exodus; the hymnographer carries this metaphorical trajectory forward to the ultimate Passover, Christ’s Passion and Resurrection.

Similar in its approach is:

The gates of death, O Lord, opened before you in fear,
and, at the sight of you, the gatekeepers of Hades cowered.
For you smashed the gates of bronze and crushed the bars of iron,
then you led us out of the darkness, away from the shadow of death,
bursting our chains asunder.

(Third anatolikon, Saturday Vespers, tone 2)

Nearly every word in this sticheron is a direct quotation of two texts: Job 38,17 and Psalm 106,14 and 16:

Job 38:17: ἀνοίγονται δὲ σοὶ φόβῳ πύλαι θανάτου, πυλωροὶ δὲ ἄδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν·	Ἡνοίγησάν σοι κύριε φόβῳ πύλαι θανάτου, πυλωροὶ δὲ ἄδου ἰδόντες σε ἔπτηξαν·
Psalm 106,16: συνέτριψεν πύλας χαλκᾶς καὶ μοχλοὺς σιδηροῦς συνέκλασεν Psalm 106,14: καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ σκότους, καὶ σκιᾶς θανάτου καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν διέρρηξεν	πύλας γὰρ χαλκᾶς συνέτριψας, καὶ μοχλοὺς σιδηροῦς συνέθλησας καὶ ἐξήγαγες ἡμᾶς ἐκ σκότους, καὶ σκιᾶς θανάτου, καὶ τοὺς δεσμοὺς ἡμῶν διέρρηξας.

On the literal level, each of these texts is somewhat problematic. In Job 38,17, the Lord challenges Job: “Do the gates of death open before you in fear, or do the gatekeepers of death see you and cower?”⁶⁷ The

(66) 2 Peter 2,4 also imagines chains in “Tartarus.”

(67) LXX includes the word φόβῳ (in fear), found neither in the Masoretic Hebrew nor in modern versions.

question poses a situation contrary to fact: the infernal gates do not respond to mere mortals in this manner. The implication is that they would respond this way to the Lord. In the original context of Job, the question remains rhetorical; whether or not God might confront death is not really considered. The application to Christ does more than merely appropriate Old Testament imagery to flesh out a critical Gospel moment about which the New Testament has precious little to say. Rather, it reclaims on the level of fact two sets of inspired words which, in their original context, could be overlooked as hypothetical or rhetorical but in any case less than real.

LXX Psalm 106 is unique among communal thanksgiving hymns in the way it calls upon a series of representative groups, each of which cried to the Lord in some specific need and each of which must now render thanks. One such group

... sat in darkness and the shadow of death, fettered in poverty and iron, for the words of God had caused bitterness⁶⁸ and they spurned the counsel of the Most High. Their hearts were humbled with hard labor; they grew weak, and there was no one to help. (Psalm 107 (106), 10–12; RSV)

The psalmist probably intended to describe the plight of exiles to Babylon, rightly punished for spurning repeated prophetic warnings and continuing in their rebellion against the Lord. Still, the literary form of the psalm itself suggests a typical pattern that invites ongoing application to specific circumstances. The images of 'darkness' and 'the shadow of death' look back to pre-exilic prophecy about an ideal king (Isaiah 9,1–7) and point forward to Zachary's prediction that such darkness would be dispelled by Christ (Luke 1,79; cf. LXX Psalm 87,6 and Job 28,3).

It is likely that "death" is metaphorical in the prophecy and the psalm but the consequences of rebellion against God are ultimately nothing less than death. By applying the language of imprisonment, darkness and death from Psalm 106 to the passion and resurrection of Christ, the hymnographer expands the range of the psalmist's "embitterment," and "spurning" to include every human sin from Adam onward, the wages of which were always death (Genesis 3,3; Romans 5–6).

(68) The Greek could also be read: "they had embittered the words of God;" the underlying Hebrew also lacks the second object that might clarify the issue.

Details of infernal imagery are what bring Job 38 and Psalm 106 together around the new common element of Christ's resurrection in the hymnographer's imagination, but the resultant new song responds to an exegetical need. Neither Job 38 nor Psalm 106 has an obvious real-time referent on the literal level, yet neither of these inspired words can be dismissed as superfluous, decorative, or void (Isaiah 55,11). Their fulfillment requires identifying their protagonist and their beneficiaries. This interpretive task the hymnographer realizes.

One final observation about the exegesis at work in these hymns is unavoidable. In their dramatization of the harrowing of Hades, the hymnographers we have quoted typically alter the raw material of their biblical citations in one striking way. Whether as actors in the biblical drama or as spectators who see and react, the hymns include "us" — the worshipping community which sings the hymns in the Church's liturgical "today." Thus, undergirding every other exegetical technique we have explored in Byzantine hymnography are two fundamental axioms: the "meaning" of the Old Testament is, even in its details, Christ. And whatever God has foreshadowed in the Old Testament or realized in the New Testament has been accomplished "for us and for our salvation."

SUMMARY

Like all authentic monuments of Christian culture, the liturgical hymnography of the Byzantine tradition springs from the Church's ongoing engagement with biblical revelation. Liturgical hymns, in particular, are deeply rooted in patristic preaching, whose interpretive strategies and conclusions they mirror and disseminate in a form accessible to the entire worshipping community. Along with the standard exegetical tools of the patristic era, the hymnographers exploit verbal, audial and visual relationships among inspired texts to unpack the drama inherent in sparse biblical narratives. Citation and allusion allow these inspired texts to weave rich intertextual celebrations of individual moments in the Christian mystery and to find the New Testament hidden in the Old.

LES PRIÈRES DE L'AMBON DE LA LITURGIE DE SAINT JACQUES

Dans un premier article prospectif sur les « prières de l'ambon » (ὀπιστάμβωνος) grecques et les prières de renvoi (*ganTeveba*) géorgiennes,¹ j'ai entrepris un premier tour de la question et risqué quelques hypothèses sur la datation de la *Vorlage* grecque de la collection géorgienne ; j'y reviendrai à propos du caractère « origéniste » d'une autre prière que celle examinée dans ce premier article ; mais je voudrais ici surtout 1°) expliquer l'évolution de la prière de renvoi dans la Liturgie de saint Jacques,² 2°) traduire les *incipit* des « prières de renvoi » du *sin.* géorgien 12,³ 3°) donner la liste des prières grecques correspondantes.⁴

A. Une rubrique de la Liturgie de saint Jacques

Alors que la description de la fin de la messe par Égérie⁵ se contente d'une allusion à une bénédiction de l'évêque (25, 3), deux rubriques de

(1) S. VERHELST, Prières géorgiennes de renvoi et prières grecques de l'ambon. Premières comparaisons, *BBGG* 2009, à paraître (plus loin = VERHELST, *BBGG*).

(2) Comme le rappelle S. PARENTI, *Testimoni sconosciuti di preghiere dell'ambone*, *OCP* 62 (1996) 197–205 (= PARENTI, *OCP* 1996), v. p. 204, Baumstark est le premier à avoir noté l'origine hagiopolite de la prière de l'ambon ; R. F. TAFT, *Toward the Origins of the Opisthambonos Prayer of the Byzantine Eucharistic Liturgies*, 1^e part., *OCP* 72 (2006) 5–39 ; 2^e part., *OCP* 72 (2006) 305–333 (= TAFT, *OCP* 2006), p. 311–331 a aussi développé ce point de vue.

(3) Et occasionnellement du *sin. gé.* 54 ; sur ces deux manuscrits, v. la brève description de Xevsuriani dans R. GVARAMIA, E. METREVELI, C. ÇANKIEVI, L. XEVURIANI, L. DJGHAMAIA, *Description des manuscrits géorgiens. Collection du Sinai*, t. III (Tbilisi, 1987) (en géo.) (= GVARAMIA *et al.*, 1987) 36–38 et 60.

(4) Je renonce par contre à publier mon répertoire des prières de l'ambon, puisque R. F. Taft a annoncé la publication du sien (R. F. TAFT, *Proper Slavonic Opisthambonos Prayers*, *Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano* 10/2 (2006) 133–149 (= TAFT, *SOC* 2006), p. 136) ; je le compléterai si nécessaire sur le site internet sur la liturgie de Jérusalem que j'espère pouvoir créer prochainement (comportant le nom *scholasate* dans son titre).

(5) P. MARAVAL, *Égérie. Journal de voyage (Itinéraire)* (Paris, 1982) (SC, 296).

la Liturgie de saint Jacques certainement très anciennes rappellent la fin de la Liturgie des Constitutions apostoliques (VIII, 15) : une prière d'action de grâces pour l'eucharisite suivie d'une prière sur les fidèles inclinés, soit, dans ma numérotation des rubriques de Saint-Jacques :⁶ n°145 (Ὁ Θεός ὁ διὰ πολλήν καὶ ἄφατον) et n°147 (Ὁ Θεός ὁ μέγας καὶ θαυμαστός).

Il est possible que cette dernière prière se disait face à l'assemblée ; d'abord parce qu'Égérie dit que l'évêque « bénit » les fidèles, ce qui se fait mieux avec le geste des mains élevées face au peuple ;⁷ ensuite parce que ce geste (et cette prière) rappelle étroitement un geste (et une prière) similaire à la fin des offices de la liturgie juive, accompagnant la *birkat kohanîm*, c'est-à-dire la lecture solennelle de Nb. 6, 24–26 par les *kohanîm* (à quoi font précisément allusion les *Constitutions apostoliques*, II, 57, 19) ;⁸ finalement parce que certains manuscrits ont conservé la mention du prêtre se tournant vers les fidèles à la fin de la Liturgie, même si ce n'est plus à l'occasion du n°147 (mais du n°155, v. ci-dessous).

Des rubriques se sont en effet ajoutées à la fin de la Liturgie (comme d'ailleurs au début), suivant cette loi de redondance aux extrêmes qui caractérise le développement de l'histoire de la liturgie.⁹ Les deux principaux ajouts sont le n°152 (Οὕς ἐκάλεσας) dans le texte géorgien seulement et le n°155 (Πεπληρώμεθα τῶν ἀγαθῶν¹⁰ / Ἐκ δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν), eux-mêmes suivis d'un passage dans le *diakonikon* qui a donné lieu à l'insertion de nouvelles rubriques. Il s'agit non seule-

(6) Voir *Liturgia ibero-graeca*, à paraître dans la collection *Jerusalem Theologisches Forum* (Münster).

(7) En toute rigueur, le texte d'Égérie, 24, 6–7 (ou celui des *Constitutions apostoliques*, VIII 37, 4–6; 39, 1–4; 41, 6–8) dit que la bénédiction épiscopale se donne après que les fidèles ont incliné la tête; il est donc possible qu'il y ait eu d'abord une prière (non mentionnée) *face* aux fidèles inclinés, sur eux, et une seconde, orientée vers le fond de l'église, correspondant à la "bénédiction" (ici le n°147).

(8) Sur la *birkat kohanîm*, v. I. ELBOGEN, *Jewish Liturgy. A Comprehensive History* (1^e éd. all. 1913, 2^e éd. héb. 1972, Jérusalem—New York, 1993) 54–57 (= § 9a).

(9) Ce qu'a montré en particulier J. HEINEMANN pour la tradition juive, *Prayer in the Talmud. Forms and Patterns* (St. Jud. IX) (1^e éd. héb. 1964, Berlin—New York, 1977) 163–164, 266–267.

(10) En italiques la rétroversion grecque du texte géorgien non attesté en grec.

ment de prières¹¹ mais d'une synaptie diaconale (= n°153). Celle-ci, tout comme les prières de renvoi géorgiennes, est l'objet d'une série de variantes regroupées dans une collection de l'euchologe de Jérusalem conservé en géorgien, une collection dont je ne reparlerai pas ici bien qu'elle se trouve dans les mêmes manuscrits que ceux qui ont conservé la collection de prières de renvoi.¹²

(1) Le n°152 (Οὗς ἐκάλεσας), absent de la vieille version géorgienne (*tbilisi* A 86), bien qu'il n'ait pas été conservé dans les manuscrits grecs de Saint-Jacques, est toutefois attesté en grec (notamment), et cela justement avec le titre « prière de l'ambon », dans l'euchologe *sin. grec* 961.¹³ Les trois manuscrits géorgiens sinaïtiques où elle est transcrite ne lui ont pas donné d'appellation particulière, mais elle fait partie de la collection des prières de renvoi des *sin.* 12 et 54 (v. plus loin n°62).

(2) Le n°155 (Πεπληρώμεθα τῶν ἀγαθῶν — texte géorgien / Ἐκ δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν — texte reçu) porte le titre « prière de renvoi » dans deux manuscrits géorgiens et, quant à lui, s'est transmis dans Saint-Jacques grec bien que certains manuscrits, en modifiant son *incipit*, en font une prière « de l'autel au *diakonikon* » (mss IE),¹⁴ ou, plus souvent, une prière à dire dans le *diakonikon* même (mss MHLKA).¹⁵

Les n°152 et 155 sont deux variantes d'une même rubrique.¹⁶ Un seul manuscrit de Saint-Jacques, celui de Jean Zosime édité par Tarxnišvili (G), possède les deux numéros et il n'y a pas lieu de distinguer une rubrique « prière de l'ambon » qui serait le n°152 d'une rubrique

(11) Comme le n°154 (Ἐδωκας δέσποτα) mais aussi, dans certains manuscrits, le n°155 lui-même ; rubrique connue aussi sous le nom « prière du *skeuophylakion* ».

(12) Aux trois manuscrits contenant la collection des prières de renvoi (*sin.* 12 et 54, *N/Sin* 26) s'ajoute, pour la collection de synapties diaconales dans le *diakonikon*, le *N/Sin* 53.

(13) A. JACOB, Les prières de l'ambon du Barb. gr. 336 et du Vat. gr. 1833, *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 37 (1966) 17–51 (= JACOB, *BIHBR* 1966 = JACOB, I) ; IDEM, Une prière du *skeuophylakion* de la Liturgie de saint Jacques et ses parallèles byzantins, *ibid.*, 53–80, v. p. 57.

(14) *PO* 26, p. 244, ad l. 20 (*skeuophylakion* E).

(15) Sigles de l'édition de MERCIER (C. MERCIER, La Liturgie de saint Jacques: édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine, *PO* 26 (1946) 115–256) auxquels s'ajoutent le *koutloumoussiou* 194, XIV^e s. (K) et le *sinaïticus* grec 1039, XIII^e s. (L).

(16) Comme on peut le conclure déjà de l'article de JACOB, I, p. 57 et 75.

« prière de renvoi » final qui serait le n°155. En réalité le titre « prière de l'ambon » n'apparaît pas en géorgien. Ce titre vient très probablement de Constantinople, où l'ambon, à Sainte-Sophie en particulier, avait des dimensions considérables,¹⁷ alors que ce type d'ambon n'est guère attesté en Palestine.¹⁸

Pourquoi s'est introduite cette rubrique en plus de la prière de renvoi habituelle, à savoir le n°147 (qui est en réalité une prière d'inclination) ? Le n°147 devait se dire à l'origine face au peuple et sans doute en avant du sanctuaire, le plus près possible des fidèles attendant du célébrant le geste de ses mains sur leur tête inclinée ; la prière de l'ambon a dû s'introduire au moment où le prêtre se retournant vers l'autel et se trouvant pratiquement hors du sanctuaire, est sur le point d'y retourner. La rubrique de IE pour le n°155 (« de l'autel au *diakonikon* ») y fait précisément allusion (v. note 14).

Est-ce à dire que toutes les prières de l'ambon soient palestiniennes ? Le plus ancien manuscrit grec, le *barb. grec* 336, attribue l'une d'entre elles à Germain, patriarche de Constantinople en 715–730. Il n'y a pas de raison de mettre en doute une datation au début du VIII^e s. de la pénétration de la rubrique palestinienne à Constantinople. Jérusalem étant désormais sous souveraineté arabe, la capitale byzantine se devait de jouer un rôle dans la conservation des traditions palestiniennes. Mais le fait que plusieurs manuscrits grecs de prières ὀπιστάμβωνος soient des manuscrits copiés en Italie méridionale, montre que, si la rubrique a pénétré dès cette époque à Constantinople, où elle aurait reçu son nom,¹⁹ c'est en Italie méridionale qu'elle s'est le mieux transmise. Reste à savoir si les prières grecques conservées sont anciennes (pré-arabes) ou au contraire le résultat d'une réforme post-iconoclaste²⁰. Des éléments de réponse se trouvent dans les prières géorgiennes.

(17) A. JACOB, Où était récitée la prière de l'ambon, *Byzantion*, 51 (1981) 306–315 (= JACOB, *Byz* 1981), p. 311, 313–314 ; TAFI, *OCP* 2006, p. 14–17 ; v. cependant la remarque plus loin (note 18).

(18) Le *stavrou* 43 montre qu'une telle structure existait dans l'église de l'Anastasis, mais la question est de savoir si elle y était avant sa destruction en 1009 (ainsi TAFI, *OCP* 2006, p. 318), ou dans le cadre de sa reconstruction au milieu du XI^e siècle.

(19) À vrai dire, puisque les ambons sont assez communs dans les églises d'Italie, on pourrait se demander si le titre « prière de l'ambon » ne vient pas d'Italie.

(20) Selon une thèse de Passarelli, démontée par JACOB, *Byzantion* (1981), p. 307–311.

B. Liste des prières de renvoi de la Liturgie de saint Jacques

Sur base de ces clarifications, continuons notre énumération des « prières de l'ambon / de renvoi » d'après la tradition manuscrite de la Liturgie de saint Jacques :

(3) PO 26, p. 244, 3–16 (n°160, mss KAL) :²¹ Ὁ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως. Cette prière porte le titre εὐχ(ή) ἀπολυτική (de renvoi) dans L et ὀπισθάμβωνος εὐχή dans AK.

(4) PO 26, p. 244, 18–25 (n°161a, ms. I) :²² Εὐχαῖς καὶ πρεσβείαις. Cette prière comme la suivante portent le titre ὀπισθάμβωνος et elles se disent toutes deux, au choix, avant le passage dans le *diakonikon*, indiqué par la rubrique du n°155 qui les suit.²³ Son contenu est en fait une prière diaconale, reliquat grec de la rubrique diaconale se disant dans le *diakonikon* (n°153 de SJ, v. ci-dessus note 12).

(5) n°161b : Δέσποτα ... ὁ καταξίωσας (PO 26, p. 244–246, ms. I)²⁴ / Δόξα σοι ... ὁ καταξίωσας (*barb. gr.* 336 n°2, de Germain patriarche)²⁵

(6) PO 26, p. 246, 9–13 (n°163, ms. I) : Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἄρτος.

La rubrique se dit après le n°155 comme « autre prière ». Bien que le n°155 (ci-dessus n°2) ne soit pas une « prière de l'ambon » dans le *vat. grec* 1970 (ms. I), elle en tient lieu (« de l'autel au *diakonikon* ») et mérite à ce titre de figurer dans le catalogue, même si, dans certains manuscrits, d'autres prières prennent aussi la place d'une prière de l'ambon.

(21) Aussi dans JACOB, I, p. 23–24; 40–41; IDEM, Nouveaux documents italo-grecs pour servir à l'histoire du texte des prières de l'ambon, *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 38 (1967) 109–144 (= JACOB, II), p. 112 ; IDEM, Les prières de l'ambon du Leningr. gr. 226, *ibid.* 42 (1972), 109–139 (= JACOB, III), p. 126–127.

(22) Rubrique similaire dans le seul manuscrit géorgien G (de Jean Zosime); M. TARCHNIŠVILI, *Liturgiæ Ibericæ antiquiores* (Louvain, 1950) (CSCO, 122, 123) (= TARCHNIŠVILI, 1950), p. 24 (trad.), n°35.

(23) Cette disposition des rubriques n'est pas indiquée clairement par MERCIER (malgré PO 26, p. 158) ; elle se voit seulement dans l'édition de C. A. SWAINSON, *The Greek Liturgies, chiefly from original authorities with an appendix containing the Coptic ordinary canon of the mass from two manuscripts in the British Museum* (Londres, 1884 ; réimpr. Hildesheim, 1971).

(24) Aussi dans JACOB, III, p. 123 et A. ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся в библиотеках Православного Востока. Вып. II: *Euchologia* (Киев, 1901 ; réimpr. Hildesheim, 1965) (= ДМИТРИЕВСКИЙ, II), p. 43.

(25) JACOB, I, p. 21–22.

C'est le cas du n°154 dans H.²⁶ Celle-ci est cependant à l'origine, comme le prouve le texte géorgien, non pas une « prière après la communion » (H) mais une prière à dire dans le *diakonikon*.²⁷

(7) PO 26, p. 246, 18–32 (n°165, mss KA) : Κύριε ... εὐπλαγχνε καὶ πολυέλεε.²⁸

Prière pour le carême ; μεταλήψεως dans le titre selon l'édition de Mercier du manuscrit A, *paris.* suppl. grec 476, (εὐχή ὀπισθάμβωνος λεγομένη τὰς κυριακὰς τῆς ἁγίας μεταλήψεως) est une faute de lecture de « M », « quarantaine ». Dans K, elle est déplacée après la Liturgie de saint Pierre. On la trouve aussi dans le *crypt.* grec Γβ X, avec dans le titre le même « M » pour « carême », et le mot ἁγίας (omis par contre par K).

Cette prière a la particularité d'énumérer des jeûnes bibliques : celui des Ninivites (Jon. 3, 5–10), de Daniel dans la fosse aux lions (Dn. 6),²⁹ de Moïse (Dt. 9, 9), d'Élie lors de son enlèvement par le char de feu (IV Rg. 2, rapproché de III Rg. 19, 8), du publicain (Lc 18),³⁰ de la pécheresse de Lc 7, 36–50,³¹ auxquels le manuscrit *crypt.* grec Γβ X ajoute Pierre dans l'épisode de Corneille, où il n'est pas question de jeûne (mais d'abstinence, v. Ac. 10, 14). La liste est ainsi portée à sept exemples de jeûne, et il y a tout lieu de penser que c'était son intention primitive, comme dans les homélies sur le jeûne.³²

(26) PO 26, p. 240, 12–18 : Ἐδωκας δέσποτα (v. ci-dessus note 11).

(27) Ceci rend caduques certaines observations de TAFT, OCP 2006, p. 322.

(28) Aussi dans JACOB, I, p. 24–25.

(29) Comme dans l'homélie sur le jeûne de Jean de Bolnisi, v. S. VERHELST, *Jean évêque de Bolnisi en Ibérie caucasienne au début du IX^e siècle. Homélies des dimanches de carême suivant la tradition de Jérusalem et autres homélies traduites et commentées, précédées d'une introduction sur l'auteur et le sujet. Texte géorgien de Sophio Sardjveladze et al.*, à paraître dans la collection des SC (Paris) (= VERHELST, SC), ch. 1 (avec le commentaire dans l'introduction); le jeûne de Daniel n'est en fait mentionné qu'en Dn. 10, 3.

(30) Comme dans l'homélie sur le pharisien et le publicain de Jean de Bolnisi, où l'on trouve d'ailleurs aussi une énumération de jeûnes bibliques, v. VERHELST, SC, ch. 7.

(31) Péricopes du huitième dimanche avant Pâques attestée par les sources géorgiennes (notamment la troisième homélie de Jean de Bolnisi) mais omise dans le lectionnaire.

(32) Voir mon commentaire cité note 29.

Alors que le texte de K ne contient aucune variante substantielle par rapport au texte édité, le *crypt.* grec Γβ X a les variantes suivantes : Κύριε (Χρίστε) I. 19; ἐν οὐρανῷ I. 22; ἐπὶ ἐνὶ (+ ἁμαρτωλῶ) μετανοοῦντι, ὁ ἐλεήμων Θεός I. 23; οἰκτεῖρον (+ τοὺς τοὺς (ditt.) φο[βου]μένους σε) I. 23; προσεδρείας (προσευχῆς) I. 24 ; (+ ἐν) ἄρματι I. 25; (+ προσευχῆς καὶ) μετανοίας I. 26 ; (+ διὰ νηστείας καὶ ἐλεημωσύνης καὶ προσευχῆς, διὰ Πέτρου τοῦ κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων, τὸν Κορινθίον ἐφωταγωγῆσας) ἔλεος I. 27; — καὶ νῦν I. 27–28; (+ ἡμᾶς) τοὺς δούλους I. 29; τοῦ φιλοχρίστου ἡμῶν βασιλέως I. 31; — εἶ I. 32; εὐλογητός (φιλάνθρωπος Θεὸς ὑπάρχεις καὶ σύ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπωμεν, σὺν τῷ ἀνάρχω σου πατρὶ καὶ τῷ παναγίῳ καὶ ἀγαθῷ καὶ ζωοποιῷ σου πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ) I. 32.

Dans le manuscrit H (*vat.* grec 2282), trois « prières de renvoi » plus *l'incipit* d'une quatrième (éditées par Cozza-Luzzi)³³ s'ajoutent comme des variantes à la « prière finale » n°158 (PO 26, p. 242, 2–6), après laquelle elles se trouvent. La rubrique du n°155 indique pourtant que l'on est déjà dans le *diakonikon*, signe probable que la rubrique n'était plus conservée que comme un reliquat de la rubrique primitive, tombée en désuétude à l'endroit (Damas) et à la date de la rédaction de ce manuscrit (au XI^e s.).³⁴ La première ne semble pas attestée ailleurs, les deux suivantes se trouvent dans les manuscrits édités par Minisci pour les dimanches ordinaires. Quant à *l'incipit* de la quatrième, on le retrouve dans une prière de l'ambon pour la fête de l'Exaltation de la Croix du *vat.* grec 2032, d'où elle a été éditée par Jacob.

(8) Τὸ ἀνταμιψόμεθα. Que pouvons-nous te répondre, ô Verbe très souverain du Père à qui appartient tout commencement, que pouvons-nous t'apporter en échange, à toi le donateur de tout culte

(9) Μεσίτα Θεοῦ. Médiateur de Dieu et des hommes, Christ notre Dieu, Artisan, Créateur et Rédempteur de notre nature (MINISCI, IV, p. 3–4)

Cette prière comporte à la fin une demande pour la victoire du roi contre les ennemis.

(33) G. COZZA-LUZZI, *De Vetusta Liturgia Antiochena ex rotulo membranaceo uncialibus characteribus descripto*, (Rome, 1905) (Novae Patrum Bibliothecæ ab Ang. Car. Maio collectæ, t. 10, pars secunda) (= COZZA-LUZZI, 1905), p. 105–110, la troisième est adressée au Père.

(34) Et non au IX^e comme le voulait MERCIER, PO 26, p. 134, v. S. VERHELST, *Les traditions judéo-chrétiennes dans la liturgie de Jérusalem, spécialement la Liturgie de saint Jacques frère de Dieu* (Leuven, 2003) (Textes et études liturgiques. Studies in Liturgy, 18) (= VERHELST, 2003), p. 14.

(10) *Αφατος. Ton amour pour nous est ineffable, immense est l'océan de ta bonté (MINISCI, IV, p. 5)³⁵

(11) Δέσποτα ... ὁ τὸ κεκρυμμένον. Maître Seigneur notre Dieu, toi qui manifestes à la fin, par la croix et la résurrection, le mystère caché depuis les générations et depuis les siècles, afin de forcer celui qui possède la puissance de la mort, c'est-à-dire le diable, et de libérer ta créature de son emprise (JACOB, II, p. 123–124)

Les nouveaux manuscrits grecs sinaïtiques de la Liturgie de saint Jacques conservent peut-être d'autres « prières de renvoi » ou « prières de l'ambon »,³⁶ ainsi que les versions arméenne (du nouveau fonds sinaïtique, inédite), arabe (*sin.* 247, inédite) et slavonne (éd. Syrku).³⁷

On peut terminer ce tour d'horizon des témoins directs de la messe de Jérusalem en grec par le rubricaire de la semaine sainte *stavrou* 43, qui contient plusieurs prières de renvoi ou d'ambon — les deux titres apparaissent — pour les jours de la Grande Semaine.³⁸ Seule la seconde est originale, les autres étant reproduites aussi ailleurs.

(12) Dimanche des Rameaux : Δέσποτα ... ὁ τὴν ἡμετέραν. Maître Christ notre Dieu, toi qui (...) as saisi l'axe (πόλον) du ciel en montant et t'installant sur les Chérubins, qui aujourd'hui pour tout axe as accepté d'être mis et installé sur l'ânon (πῶλω) d'un âne de bât.³⁹

(13) Grand jeudi : Δέσποτα ... ὁ τῶν Χερουβίμ. Maître Christ notre Dieu, toi qui chevauches les Chérubins et tiens les rênes des Séraphins, demiurge et maître du monde entier.

(14) Grand samedi⁴⁰ : Ὁ τὸ μέγα κῆτος. Ô Dieu, toi qui as soumis le grand monstre marin et qui dans le cœur de la terre as affronté le dragon révolté, le grand esprit des Assyriens, et qui lui as donné des ordres pour te moquer (dans le texte de Minisci : Ô Dieu, toi qui vas

(35) Aussi JACOB, I, p. 44–45; DMITRIEVSKIĬ, II, p. 43.

(36) Il s'agit des manuscrits suivants : M 151, X 156, E 23, E 79 (?) et X 277.

(37) P. SYRKU, *De historia correctionis librorum in Bulgaria saeculo XIV*, t. I (Saint-Petersbourg, 1890) 179–218 cité par Goussen dans OC (1913), p. 2–3, Hanssens dans OCP 4, p. 250–251 ou encore MERCIER, dans PO 26, p. 129.

(38) A. PΑΡΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-KERAMEUS, *Ανάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, τ. II (Saint-Peterbourg, 1894) (= PΑΡΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-KERAMEUS, II, 1894), respectivement p. 27–28 ; 107–108 ; 188–189 ; 202–203.

(39) Aussi dans JACOB, II, p. 127–128.

(40) Après la 2^e Liturgie mais avant l'*orthros*

soumettre le grand monstre marin et qui durant cette nuit relève de l'Hadès le grand berger des brebis spirituelles).⁴¹

(15) Pâques : Λάμπρα ἤμῶν. Brillante et salvatrice s'est levée pour nous aujourd'hui, frères, la résurrection de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ, et c'est pourquoi le temple du Seigneur est orné d'hommes divers ; voici en effet beaucoup de frères se sont rencontrés rendus joyeux par le jeûne.⁴²

C. Traductions des *incipit* des prières géorgiennes de renvoi et indication des parallèles

Références aux éditions des prières

CL = COZZA-LUZZI, 1905, p. 105–110 ; DM = DMITRIEVSKIJ, II, 1901 ; J I II III = JACOB, *BIHBR* 1966, 1967, 1972 ; KO = KOVALIV, 1960 ;⁴³ M II III IV = MINISCI, *BBGG* 1949–1951 ; PK = PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, II, 1894 ; PAR = PARENTI, *OCP* 1996 ; PAS = PASSARELLI, 1982 ;⁴⁴ VER = VERHELST, *BBGG*. Les chiffres à la suite des références renvoient toujours aux pages.

(16) 1. *Annonciation (35rv)*

Pour la même circonstance : n°91 (M III 7 ; J III 129), 156 (J II 136–137), 161 (J II 112–113)

= *sin.* 54, n°1 (f. 29rv)

≈ n°91

Prière de renvoi pour l'Annonciation. Toi qui as envoyé un ange de paix à la très-sainte Vierge et Génitrice de Dieu Marie⁴⁵

(17) 2. *Dimanche avant Noël (35v–37r)*

Pour la même circonstance : n°75 (M II 74), 143 (M III 192–193)

Prière de renvoi un dimanche avant la nativité du Christ. Tu es glorifié, ô Seigneur, et rien n'est accessible à ta richesse, tu es terrible,

(41) T. MINISCI, *Le preghiere opistamvoni dei codici criptensi*, *BBGG* 2 (1948) 65–75, 117–126 ; 3 (1949) 3–10, 61–66, 121–132 ; 4 (1950) 3–14 (= MINISCI, II, III, IV), III, p. 65.

(42) Aussi dans MINISCI, III, p. 121–123 (surtout d'après le ms. i) ; JACOB, II, p. 115 et III, p. 121.

(43) P. KOVALIV, *Prayer Book. A Monument of the XIV Century* (New York, 1960) (Scientific Theological Institute of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the U.S.A.) (en ukrainien).

(44) G. PASSARELLI, *L'eucologio cryptense Γ.β. VII (sec. X)* (Thessalonique, 1982) (Ανάλεκτα Βλατάδων, 36).

(45) Suite de la traduction dans *BBGG*.

ô notre Dieu, et rien n'est l'égal de ta sagesse, ô ineffable. Merveilleuses sont tes œuvres, ô notre sauveur, et il n'est pas possible de scruter l'immense miséricorde de tes bienfaits qui, dans ta merveille inépuisable, est apparue à la race des hommes.

(18) 3. Veille de Noël (37r–38v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°76 (M II 75)

Prière de renvoi le jour avant la nativité du Christ. Dieu sans commencement qui as envoyé ton Fils-Unique et Verbe au monde, Dieu de Dieu, lumière de lumière, coexistant et coéternel du Saint-Esprit incompréhensible et plus éminent que (toute) grandeur ; dans la pauvreté de ta divinité et la richesse de l'infirmité humaine, il est descendu du ciel comme une pluie de douceur sur une toison, et il a fait sa demeure dans le sein d'une vierge, comme dans un temple de sainteté, lui saint des saints

(19) 4. Noël, 25/12 (38v–39r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°77 (M II 117 ; J III 128–129), 138 (J I 46 ; III 123), 144 (M III 189), 163 (J II 116)

= *sin.* 54, n°2 (f. 29v–30r)

≈ n°163.

Renvoi pour la nativité du Christ, à l'eucharistie. Toi qui es grand dans le conseil de tes saints ô Dieu⁴⁶

(20) 5. David-Jacques, 26/12 (39r–40v)

De David-Jacques. Toi qui fus Verbe avant les siècles et Dieu de commun conseil que le Père, et qui à l'achèvement des temps, Verbe, pris chair de la très sainte Vierge

(21) 6. Stéphane, 27/12 (40v–41v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°78 (M II 118)

Renvoi de saint Stéphane. À chaque époque, en vision,⁴⁷ des bouches te glorifieront, (comme celle) de Moïse, premier prophète et premier légiste en Israël — mais lui, comme serviteur de la loi, s'est caché dans le creux d'un rocher. Stéphane quant à lui⁴⁸ témoigna comme diacre de la grâce après ta crucifixion et résurrection et dit : celui sur qui vous avez voulu mettre la main et que vous avez cloué sur le bois, lui, est ressuscité des morts. Et moi je témoigne et je (le) vois siégeant sur un trône à la droite du Père

(46) Suite de la traduction dans *BBGG*.

(47) + des deux ms.

(48) + lorsqu'il ms.

(22) 7. Jean et Jacques, 28/12 (41v–43r)

Renvoi des apôtres Jean (et Jacques). Depuis le commencement le Verbe était, et Dieu était le Verbe.⁴⁹ C'était depuis le commencement toi, avec Dieu et avec le Père en même temps que ton Esprit sans commencement et de la même existence, glorifié. Toutes les choses elles-mêmes de lui ont été faites,⁵⁰ éternelles, (lui) qui est l'éclat de (ta) gloire et l'image de ta puissance⁵¹

(23) 8. Commun des saints, 22/01 (43r–v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°110 (M III 194), 129 (J I 36), 130 (J I 36), 138 (J I 46 ; III 123), 153 (M III 193–194), 169 (M III 194)

≈ (*incipit*) n°153

= n°57

Renvoi des saints. Dieu saint qui reposes parmi les saints, toi qui as institué la mémoire des saints martyrs, qui ont donné leur corps pour un jugement

(24) 9. dimanche avant Épiphanie (43v–45r)

Renvoi un dimanche avant l'Épiphanie. Lumière véritable, Christ notre Dieu, Verbe du Père et du Saint-Esprit, de même existence et de même souveraineté, toi qui étais premier du sein éternel du Père, indiblement et insaisissablement Dieu engendré de Dieu, lumière émise d'une lumière, vie issue d'une vie. Nous te rendons grâces, tout-puissant et dispensateur de tout bien

(25) 10. Épiphanie, 6/01 (45r–46r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°81 (M II 121–122 ; J II 117, 118), 115 (M II 121), 146 (M III 189), 171 (PAR 198–199)

= *sin.* 54, n°4 (31v–32v)

Renvoi pour l'Épiphanie, à la messe. Tu t'es manifesté au monde dans la chair, comme tu es un Dieu, premier de toutes les créatures,⁵² avec le Père incorruptible et ton Esprit existant, véritable. Ô toi qui créas le monde du non-existant — et tu as conduit toutes les choses faites à l'existence —, fais visiter la lumière de la vie et la résurrection dans l'obscurité et les ombres de la mort ; fais descendre dans la rivière le créateur des mers et sur nous la lumière, toi qui créas notre race

(49) Jn 1, 1

(50) Col. 1, 16a

(51) Voir le commentaire dans *BGG*.

(52) Col. 1, 15

(26) 11. dimanche après Épiphanie (46v–47v)

Renvoi pour le dimanche après l'Épiphanie. Toi que louent des troupes nombreuses d'anges, ô roi des cieux, et qui es ouvertement glorifié par des puissances célestes, nous bénissons nous aussi, tes serviteurs humbles et indignes, ta bonté ineffable

(27) 12. Commun des saints pères, 28/01 (47v–49r)

Pour la même circonstance (?), commun des pieux, etc. : n°123 (M III 132), 154 (J II 129 ; M IV 3)

Renvoi pour les saints pères. Toi qui as appelé les élus par une voix bienheureuse

Remarque : La prière cite Élie et Jean-Baptiste, modèles des saints ascètes.

(28) 13. Hypapante (49r–50v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°82 (M II 122 ; J III 115), 147 (J II 125) = *sin.* 54, n°5 (32v–33v)⁵³

Renvoi pour l'Hypapante. Lumière véritable, coexistant avec le Père et coéternelle avec l'Esprit saint, toi qui avant les siècles es né du Père, qui inclinés les cieux et descendis sur la terre dans le sein d'une vierge et y habitas. Dans ta grande magnificence⁵⁴ tu t'appauvris toi-même (...). Toi qui ornas la terre de plante, de fleur de diverses espèces, tu fis resplendir une vierge plus qu'un paradis. Et dans le temple le vieillard Siméon te reçut.⁵⁵ Par (son) annonce de ta divinité dans les cieux sur les chérubins avec le Père tu étais glorifié et dans le temple assis dans les bras des prophètes comme un autre Dieu et un autre homme tu étais présenté au peuple

(29) 14. dimanche apokréô (dimanche VIII) (50v–52r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°84 (M II 124 ; J III 116), 108 (M II 124–125)

Renvoi pour l'abstinence de viande, le dimanche. Nous sommes comblés de tes biens Seigneur, par le saint mystère vivifiant

(30) 15. 1^{er} dimanche de carême (dimanche VII) (52rv)

Pour la même circonstance : n°85 (M II 125–126 ; J III 116–117) = *sin.* 54, entre n°5 et 6 ? (le microfilm omet les feuillets 33v–34r)

(53) D'après le microfilm ; le catalogue accuse ici une faute de typographie.

(54) *simdidrisa*, litt. "richesses", double jeu de mots: avec "grande" (*didì*) et "tu t'es appauvris" (*da-i-mcìre*).

(55) C'est le mot du ms. d'Adish (Lc 2, 28).

Renvoi pour le premier dimanche des saints jeûnes. Espoir des extrémités de la terre⁵⁶

(31) 16. 2^e dimanche de carême (dimanche VI) (52v–53v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°86 (M III 3 ; J III 117)

= *sin.* 54, entre n°5 et 6 ? (le microfilm omet les feuillets 33v–34r)

Renvoi pour le deuxième dimanche. Nous nous livrons à toi, Seigneur notre Dieu et nous supplions la longanimité de ta miséricorde, toi qui connais les choses cachées

(32) 17. 3^e dimanche de carême (dimanche V) (53v–54r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°87 (M III 4 ; J III 117–118)

= *sin.* 54, entre n°5 et 6 ? (le microfilm omet les feuillets 33v–34r)

Renvoi pour le troisième dimanche. Vers toi qui as une abondance de miséricordes, ô Père de miséricordes, nous accourons (...). Fais-moi revenir vers toi, Seigneur, comme autrefois le fils devenu étranger à qui tu fais⁵⁷ bon accueil.

(33) 18. 4^e dimanche de carême (dimanche IV) (54r–56r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°88 (M III 4–5 ; J III 118 ; DM 1015–1016)

= *sin.* 54, n°6 (34v–35r)

Renvoi pour le quatrième dimanche. Lorsque tu vis dans (ta) bonté le genre humain emmené par le démon (...) comme le pharisien (...) comme le publicain

(34) 19. 5^e dimanche de carême (dimanche III) (56r–57v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°89 (M III 5–6 ; J III 118–119)

= *sin.* 54, n°7 (35v–36r)

Renvoi pour le cinquième dimanche. Nous levons les yeux de notre cœur et avec l'inclination de nos nuques [et] nous te demandons (de faire) miséricorde, ô très bon, toi qui as bien voulu envoyer la miséricorde des commandements (...) Lorsqu'un prêtre, Aaron, qui était premier grand-prêtre, le vit, il passa au loin ; un lévite qui descendait par ce chemin le vit, et il passa au loin

(35) 20. 6^e dimanche de carême (dimanche II) (58r–59r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°90 (M III 6–7)

= *sin.* 54, n°8 (36v)

(56) Suite de la traduction dans BBGG.

(57) Litt. vous faites.

Renvoi pour le sixième dimanche. Toi qui par la Loi et les Prophètes enseignas l'espoir de la vie éternelle mais par les saints évangiles et les apôtres as révélé la béatitude ineffable, l'héritage de la Jérusalem céleste (...) Délivre-nous de la terrible géhenne, dans le feu inextinguible

(36) 21. Commun des hiérarques (59r–60v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°154 (J II 129 ; M IV 3)

= *sin.* 54, n°3 (30r–31v)

Renvoi pour les saints hiérarques. Toi qui devins grand-prêtre pour nous selon l'ordre de Melchisédeq, non par la loi du commandement de la chair mais par la force de la vie inéluctable

(37) 22. Samedi de Lazare (60v–61r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°92 (M III 8 ; J III 131)

= *sin.* 54, n°9 (37v–38r)

Renvoi pour la résurrection de Lazare. Toi qui as autorité sur la vie et la mort, ô Seigneur

(38) 23. Dimanche des Rameaux (61r–62v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°12 (PK 27–28 ; J II 127–128) ; 93 (M III 8–9 ; J II 113–114 ; PK 21–22) ; 122 (M III 9–10 ; J III 119–120) ; 178 (Ko 95r–96r)

= *sin.* 54, n°10 (38r–39r)

Renvoi pour les Rameaux. Les anges dans les cieus se prosternent devant toi, ô Seigneur, et sans attendre, que leur voix orne ton trône invisible ! Mais nous de la terre

(39) 24. Grand jeudi (62v–63v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°13 (PK 107–108), 94 (M III 61–62), 95 (M III 63–64 ; J II 114 ; III 122–123), 117 (M III 62–63 ; J III 120–121)

= *sin.* 54, n°11 (39r–40r)

Renvoi pour le grand jeudi. Ô roi éternel, Christ notre Dieu, toi qui as été éloigné du Père — et pour notre salut ton Verbe véritable a été envoyé⁵⁸ sur la terre, de la Vierge par l'annonce d'un ange tu as fait resplendir dans le monde le soleil de justice -, toi le donateur de la Loi et celui qui l'accomplit, qui [as célébré] ton mystère sur le siège⁵⁹ avec tes disciples lors de ton saint repas avec eux ...

(58) La terminaison du verbe est confuse, on lit un *a* (3e pers. sg.) corrigé en *e* (2e pers. sg.) ou inversement.

(59) Allusion au trône de Jacques conservé à Sion à l'époque byzantine, v. en dernier lieu VERHELST, 2003, p. 191 et IDEM, *Liturgia*, ch. 5, ad notes 260–261.

(40) 25. *grand samedi* (63v–64r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°14 (PK 188–189 ; M III 65), 96 (M III 65), 118 (M III 66), 160 (BBGG)

= *sin.* 54, n°12 (40r)

= M III 125–126 ; J I 28

Renvoi pour le Grand Samedi, le soir. Toi qui as brisé les portes d'airain et les barres de fer⁶⁰

(41) 26. *Pâques* (64r–65v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°15 (PK 202–203 ; M III 121–123 ; J II 115 ; III 121), 97 (M III 124–125 ; J I 30 ; III 133), 119 (M III 123–124 ; J I 29)

= *sin.* 54, n°13 (40v–41v)

Renvoi de l'assemblée (du jour) de l'accomplissement. Gloire à toi, ô Christ dispensateur de *la lumière* de connaissance⁶¹ *qui luit* (Jn 5, 35), trésor, *agneau de Dieu qui enlève les péchés du monde* (Jn 1, 29), *berger véritable qui donne ta vie pour tes brebis* (Jn 10, 11), toi qui pensais dans la loi à la vie de ceux qui t'espéraient, tu t'es tu devant des juges qui ne connaissaient pas ton trône

(42) 27. *Dimanche Nouveau* (65v–66v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°98 (M III 126 ; J I 30), 126 (J I 30–31), 157 (M IV, 9 ; J III 121–122)

= *sin.* 54, n°14 (41v–42v)

Renvoi pour le Dimanche Nouveau. Ô Dieu de lumière et source des biens, ton Fils-Unique et ton Esprit saint par lesquels tu as illuminé les créatures et tu as fait la vie au milieu des extrémités du monde, (...) car il est entré les portes closes chez les disciples

(43) 28. *Ascension* (66v–67v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°100 (M III 129 ; J I 34 ; III 129–130), 127 (J I 33–34), 162 (J II 115–116)

= *sin.* 54, n°15 (42v–43v)

Renvoi pour l'Ascension. Ô Dieu qui reçois la vénération de tous les saints, qui depuis le commencement dans la sainteté t'ont béni, et qui visites le lieu de ténèbre, pour lequel dans la désobéissance

(44) 29. *Pentecôte* (67v–68r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°100 (M III 129 ; J I 34 ; III 129–130), 101 (M III 130–131 ; J I 35 ; III 130), 128 (J I 34–35 ; II 116 ; III 135–136 ; M III 131)

(60) Suite de la traduction dans BBGG.

(61) Litt. *connue* ; traduction de λογικός (lumière *rationale*) ?

= *sin.* 54, n°16 (43v–44r)

= n°128

Pour la Pentecôte. Écoute-nous, ô Seigneur notre sauveur, espoir de toutes les extrémités de la terre et [de] ceux qui sont au milieu de la mer en ces saints jours de la cinquantaine, toi qui as accordé à la race des hommes la réjouissance et la grâce et as répandu la venue de l'Esprit saint de façon visible sous l'apparence de langues de feu sur les disciples, et ils apparaîtront comme évangélistes et ministres. Nous aussi tes serviteurs, conduis-nous par la grâce et la joie qui sont de toi

(45) 30. Nativité de Jean-Baptiste (68r–69r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°149 (J II 129 ; II 133–135)

= *sin.* 54, n°19 (46r–47v)

Pour la nativité de Jean. Ô Dieu sans commencement, Verbe du Père et coexistant au très-saint Esprit, toi qui par incommensurable amour-des-hommes es venu sur terre pour chercher les brebis perdues de la maison d'Israël (Mt. 15, 24) et qui as jugé acceptable d'habiter le sein d'une vierge

(46) 31. Athénagène, 7^e dimanche après la Pentecôte (69r–70v)

= *sin.* 54, n°18 (44v–46r)

Renvoi pour vardoba. Grand disciple et grand-prêtre, de même conseil, être, trône que ton père impérissable et sans commencement, Jésus, Verbe, Fils et Dieu avant les siècles, toi qui as désigné parmi tous les hommes tes saints apôtres pour servir dignement ta venue dans la chair

(47) 32. Transfiguration (70v–71v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°104 (M III 186–187; J I 37–38), 131 (J I 36–37)

= *sin.* 54, n°20 (47v–48v)

Pour la Transfiguration. Toi qui vois, tu es par divinité et indicible nature et existence immuable, image et éclat de la gloire du Père

(48) 33. Dormition (71v–72v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°105 (M III 190–192; J I 38), 132 (J I 39 ; J III 124–125 ; M III 187), 159 (J III 127–128)

= *sin.* 54, n°21 (48v–49r)

Pour mariamoba. Ô Dieu parfait et sans commencement, né de Dieu, Père, merveilleusement, Fils de même principat, et roi avec le Saint-Esprit, (...) tu n'as pas (été) corrompu à la naissance mais as conservé ineffablement le mystère, semblablement aujourd'hui tu as transféré sans altération l'arche, ton repos (v. Ps. 131, 8) et le lieu, la

tente (v. Ps. 131, 3) de ta gloire, dans les cieux sans destruction. Tu l'as conservée dans un royaume sans fin, par une connaissance plus haute que les pensées. Tu l'établis plus haut que toute créature pour être une lumière éclatante et qui ne passe pas, qu'aucun être humain n'a(vait jamais) vue, que tu réalises par une providence de ta divinité pour ceux qui errent

Remarque : Le Ps. 131, 8 est utilisé le 15 août dans la vieille version arménienne du lectionnaire de Jérusalem, avec station au Kathisme, alors que le canon du jour s'est modifié lors du déplacement de la station dans la fondation du roi Maurice (582–602) à Gethsémani (lectionnaire géorgien, n°1148). Cette prière est donc antérieure au VII^e siècle.

(49a) 34. Décollation de Jean-Baptiste, 29/08 (72v–74v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°102 (M III 188; J I 39)

Pour la Décollation. Ô Dieu, toi qui as été prophétisé à l'origine et annoncé à l'avance par tous tes saints prophètes pour venir sur terre dans la chair et chercher ton peuple dispersé,⁶² qui a été rendu semblable à toi et a été détourné des vilains péchés

(49b) Le *sin.* 54, n°22 (49r–50v), contient une autre prière pour cette fête, dont le premier mot est *Pirvel* (premier, ou avant).

(50) 35. Nativité de la Théotokos (74v–76r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°71 (M II 70–71), 105 (M III 190–192; J I 38), 180 (Ko 105v–106v)

= *sin.* 54, n°23 (50v–52r)

Pour la nativité de la Théotokos. Rendus dignes d'atteindre la maison immaculée de ton héritage non corrompu, la génitrice-de-Dieu, mère et vierge, nous tes indignes serviteurs, t'adorons, ô Christ, et glorifions la Demeure de gloire, car

(51) 36. Encénies, 13/09 (76r–v)

Remarque : Outre le n°53 ci-dessous, pour le 13 septembre, il existe une prière grecque pour toute dédicace d'église, le n°124 (PAS 166–167).

(Renvoi) de l'Encénie. Toi, saint Seigneur et sanctificateur de tes saintes Églises, que tu as acquises par ton sang précieux, nous le rassemblons tout entier, en elles, des croyants, te glorifions, t'adorons, car

(52) 37. Exaltation, 14/09 (76v–77v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°11 (J II 123–124) ; 53 (ci-dessous) ; 72 (M II 71–72) ; 181 (Ko 107r–108r)

(62) Sans doute *πλανώμενος*, errant

Pour l'exaltation des croix. *Bon berger* qui as donné ta vie pour tes brebis (Jn 10, 11),⁶³ toi qui es arrivé aux portes de l'enfer par ta croix et as fait resplendir une lumière de vie pour ceux qui étaient assis dans la ténèbre et les ombres de la mort, et tu as mis fin à⁶⁴ l'errance de l'arbre et dépouillé l'enfer et mis à mort la mort et relevé Adam et fait sortir ceux qui étaient reclus dans les ténèbres, oui Seigneur, vraiment puissant, donne-nous ta croix précieuse comme protection et refuge des âmes et des corps. En elle établis les saintes églises et par elle accorde la victoire à nos rois, (et) par elle accorde la paix au monde.

Remarque : La demande pour les rois, dans cette prière, est l'indication d'une recension très tardive, peut-être du X^e siècle.⁶⁵

(53) 38. *Encénies et exaltation de la croix (77v–78v) ; Encénies (sin. 54, n°24, 52r–53r)*⁶⁶

Pour la même circonstance : v. ci-dessus n°51

= sin. 54, n°24 (52r–53r)

Texte géorgien en appendice à cet article

Remarque 1 : Étant donné les difficultés de la traduction, j'ai exceptionnellement recensé le texte sur celui du sin. 54, qui présente une formulation parfois assez différente, que je reproduis à la suite de celle du sin. 12. Je traduis en mettant en évidence les difficultés du texte, qui est manifestement corrompu. Cela permet de voir que le texte du sin. 54 semble meilleur (plus ancien) que celui du sin. 12. Le copiste du sin. 12 a pu avoir devant les yeux le texte du sin. 54 où il aurait ajouté la formulation complète des catégories d'anges empruntées à Col. 1, 16, dont il aurait modifié le « en lui » en un curieux « à côté de lui » (v. note 67), et qui semble avoir réagi contre l'idée du sin. 54, du commencement des anges dans (litt. par) la nature divine.

sin. 12. **Pour la dédicace des églises et l'exaltation des croix.** Ô Dieu sans commencement, qui as engendré le Verbe sans commencement — Dieu de commun conseil — par qui tout fut créé, sur-et-sous les cieux (Col. 1, 15), et tout ce qui est à côté⁶⁷ de lui, trônes, dominations, principautés, pouvoirs et puissances (Col. 1, 16), classe ordonnée des an-

(63) Allusion à la lecture du jour dans LG : Jn 10, 22–37 / 42 (cf. Jn 10, 27).

(64) Litt. dissipé

(65) Voir BBGG.

(66) D'après le Catalogue (GVARAMIA *et al.*, p. 60, IV.1.24), la fin de la prière dit d'ajouter une partie « pour la Croix », qui est le texte n°17 de ce manuscrit (ci-dessous n°59).

(67) Zeda litt. sur, au-dessus

ges, innombrable et lumineuse et sans fin, éternelle et invisible, à qui tu n'as pas montré le commencement des hommes⁶⁸ dans (litt. selon) l'image et ressemblance de la nature⁶⁹ divine. Et tu as rendu manifeste le ciel avec un luminaire et sa terre éternelle. Tu as déterminé tout commencement et fin avec providence avant (la venue de) ton fils actuel véritable. D'abord tu as révélé la terre hors des eaux comme d'une vierge, par⁷⁰ l'incarnation — et au milieu, le paradis de vie revêtu de forces, de l'édification de l'arbre de la croix.

sin. 54. **Renvoi de l'assemblée des Encénies.** Ô Dieu sans commencement, qui as engendré le Verbe sans commencement — Dieu de commun conseil — par qui toutes les choses elles-mêmes ont été créées sur-et-sous les cieux et ce qui est en lui, trônes, dominations et les classes ordonnées des anges invisibles, dont tu n'as pas montré le commencement aux hommes dans (litt. à cause de) la nature de la divinité. Et eux aussi (sont) avec un corps céleste⁷¹, et tu as rendu manifeste le commencement de la terre éternelle, et la fin de tous tu l'as déterminée avec providence avant ta venue actuelle véritable. D'abord tu as révélé la terre hors des eaux comme d'une vierge, par l'incarnation. Et au milieu du paradis, était annoncée la force de la vie revêtue, l'édification de la croix.

Remarque 2 : La suite commune aux deux manuscrits est une exégèse de la vision de Jacob dans Gn. 28, avec la fondation de la « maison de la divinité » (Béth-el).

Remarque 3 : On peut interpréter le texte dans deux sens divergents : Dieu n'a pas révélé aux anges qu'il allait créer les hommes, dont la nature est divine, à son image et sa ressemblance (ces derniers mots étant propres au *sin.* 12)⁷² ; ou Dieu n'a pas révélé aux hommes la création des anges, dont la nature est divine. Ce dernier sens semble préférable d'après la suite où il est question de la nature angélique, éternelle et semblable à des corps célestes (?).

(68) Litt. par qui tu n'as pas montré le commencement aux hommes

(69) En corrigeant le nominatif en un génitif. Le copiste semble avoir compris les anges « par qui tu n'as pas manifesté aux hommes la nature de la divinité », mais les autres mots en deviennent (« le commencement », « à l'image et à la ressemblance ») incompréhensibles.

(70) hors de (génitif)

(71) Ou « luminaire ».

(72) On pourrait rapprocher ce thème de celui de la jalousie des anges au moment de la création des hommes, v. par exemple Jean de Bolnisi, V 20.

Remarque 4 : Dans le premier paragraphe de la prière, le *sin.* 12 dit explicitement des anges qu'ils sont *éternels*, comme dans la prière n°22 (« toutes les choses elles-mêmes de lui ont été faites, éternelles ») ; l'adjectif « sans commencement » dit de Dieu et du Verbe s'oppose au « commencement » dit des hommes. Les anges sont donc créés par le Verbe *et éternels*, donc, d'une certaine manière, *éternellement créés*. Ou encore : ils ont un commencement éternel. On notera aussi la création des anges *en lui* dans le *sin.* 54 (« tout ce qui est en lui »), avec la post-position *šina*, au lieu de *zeda* dans le *sin.* 12. On pressent à l'arrière-plan de ces difficultés de transmission textuelle des spéculations pro- ou anti-origénistes, ce que viendrait confirmer le curieux « corps céleste » (ou « lumineuse »), qui semble bien s'appliquer aux anges dans le *sin.* 54, ainsi que la « terre éternelle » .

(54) 39. Zacharie, mutisme (78v–80r)

Pour le mutisme de Zacharie. (Ô toi qui) as saisi, une fois, la sainteté intouchable par le voile de ta chair, (toi qui étais) grand prêtre dans la maison de Dieu, sans commencement en même temps que le Père et Seigneur en même temps que le Saint-Esprit, Dieu véritable et homme fidèle, à la consommation des temps (tu as) pris chair de la sainte Vierge

(55) 40. Archanges (80r–v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°74 (M II 73–74), 114 (M III 192 ; J III 127)

= *sin.* 54, n°25

Pour les saints archanges. Dieu des esprits et de toute chair, (de)⁷³ tous les chevaliers célestes, trônes, dominations, pouvoirs et puissances, ceux qui se tiennent au-dessus,⁷⁴ Séraphins aux six ailes et Chérubins aux yeux innombrables, ô toi qui fis tes anges en esprit et tes serviteurs en flamme de feu, bénis toutes les puissances lumineuses

(56) 41. Commun des martyrs (81r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°23 (ci-dessus), 110 (M III 194), 129 (J I 36), 130 (J I 36), 153 (M III 193–194), 169 (M III 194)

= *sin.* 54, n°26 (53rv)

Pour les saints témoins.⁷⁵ Dieu, fondateur du travail des saints et victorieux témoins, en bien

(73) Litt. dont

(74) Allusion aux vingt-quatre vieillards d'Ap. 4, 4 ?

(75) C'est-à-dire martyrs

(57) 42. *Commun des saints* (81r–v)

= n°23 (avec une variante dans l'*incipit* : Dieu *des saints*, qui etc.)

(58) 43. *Quarante martyrs* (81v–83r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°148 (J II 126–127)

Pour les saints Quarante. Toi qui as rendu le témoignage d'une bonne confession devant Ponce Pilate

(59) 44. *Croix* (83r–v)

= *sin.* 54, n°17 (44rv)

Remarque : La place de la prière dans le *sin.* 54, entre la Pentecôte (n°44) et Athénagène (n°46), montre qu'il s'agissait à l'origine d'une prière pour la fête de l'apparition de la Croix le 7 mai.⁷⁶ Ce manuscrit fait en outre un renvoi au n°17 à la fin du n°53 (v. note 66).

Renvoi de la Croix. Béni es-tu Dieu d'Israël

(60) 45. *Défunts* (83v–84v)

Pour la même circonstance : n°116 (M II 123)

Pour le salut de ceux qui se sont endormis. Toi qui as incliné les cieux et es descendu sur la terre

(61) 46. (1^{er}) *dimanche* (84v–85r)

Pour les dimanches ordinaires : n°9 (CL ; M IV 3–4), 10 (CL ; M IV 3–4 ; J I 44–45 ; DM 43), 109 (M IV 11 ; J I 22–23), 112 (M IV 8–9 ; J I 44, 47), 113 (M IV 6–7 ; J I 42), 166 (M IV 4), 167 (M IV 5), 168 (M IV 6)

Renvois pour les saints dimanches. Roi des rois et Seigneur des Seigneurs ... qu'aucun humain n'a jamais vu

(62) 47. 2^e *dimanche* (85r–v)

= n°1

= *sin.* 54, n°28 (54v)

Pour un dimanche 2. Ceux que tu as appelés, ceux que tu as sanctifiés, Seigneur

(63) 48. 3^e *dimanche* (85v–86v)

= *sin.* 54, n°29 (55rv)

Pour un dimanche 3. Roi des rois et Seigneur des Seigneurs ... tu as trouvé ton peuple

(64a) 49. 4^e *dimanche* (86v–87v)

= *sin.* 54, n°27, 1^{er} dimanche (54rv)

(76) PO 36, p. 333; CSCO, 204–205, n°957.

≈ n°168⁷⁷ (*incipit*, en italiques dans la traduction qui suit ; v. aussi n°66)

Pour un dimanche 4. Gardien de notre vie, Seigneur Dieu qui seul es sans péché, Dieu source de vie et de bienfaits, et roi de tes créatures, prends en pitié ton peuple et garde ton héritage

Remarque : L'*incipit* de la prière du 4^e dimanche dans le *sin.* 54, la dernière de la collection dans ce manuscrit, est omis dans le Catalogue. Traduction :

(64b) Renvoi de l'assemblée pour un 4^e dimanche. Seigneur de tous, souverain, Père de ton Christ, ceux qui ouvertement t'appellent, écoute-les ainsi que ceux qui en silence te vénèrent

(65) 50. 5^e dimanche (87v–88r)

Pour un dimanche 5. Béni sois-tu, Seigneur en tout temps, toi qui nous gardes de tout mal et gardes l'entrée de nos oreilles et la sortie de nos lèvres

(66) 51. 6^e dimanche (88r–89r)

Pour un dimanche 6. Gardien de notre vie, Seigneur sans péché, toi qui par la bouche des prophètes nous annonçais ta venue sur la terre

(67) 52. Ordinaire (89r)

Pour la même circonstance : n°1–6 (v. ci-dessus), 109 (M IV 11 ; J I 22–23), 121 (M IV 10), 136 (J I 43), 157 (J III 121–122 ; M IV 9)

Renvois de toujours. Tu es glorifié, Créateur et Roi de tout, et nous adorons ton saint nom ineffable digne d'être servi, que tu as révélé à nous tes serviteurs

(68) 53. Ordinaire b (89r–v)

De toujours 2. Seigneur notre espoir, asile, force, souverain, protecteur, tu es Dieu, nous te chantons

(69) 54. Ordinaire c (89v–90r)

De toujours 3. Seigneur tout-puissant, la source de tes bontés demeure toujours, profit des âmes, dans la grâce d'une bonne œuvre

(70) 55. Ordinaire d (90r)

De toujours 4. Nous te livrons nos âmes et de tout ton peuple à qui tu as répondu par le sang précieux de ton Christ

(77) MINISCI, IV, p. 6.

D. Conclusion

La présente étude ne porte pas sur l'ensemble des prières de renvoi géorgiennes, mais prend tout de même en compte tous les *incipit* (au minimum) des prières de la collection géorgienne des *sin.* 12 et 54. Sans revenir sur les conclusions de mon précédent article sur ce sujet,⁷⁸ elle a permis d'avancer, me semble-t-il, deux nouveaux éléments de datation confirmant ma conclusion précédente, à savoir que la *Vorlage* grecque de la collection géorgienne remonte au VI^e s.,⁷⁹ et même avant le milieu de ce siècle, et le tournant anti-origéniste de Justinien.

À propos de la Dormition d'abord (n°48), la référence au Ps. 131 indique un *prokiménon* qui est antérieur à la Fondation du roi Maurice à la fin du VI^e siècle.

D'autre part, et c'est ici la découverte la plus stimulante pour une recherche future, la prière pour les Encénies n°53 comporte des termes (« corps célestes », « terre éternelle », anges « créés *en lui* ») qu'il est difficile d'expliquer sans allusion aux spéculations origénistes, ce qui nous renvoie bien au VI^e siècle. La prière n°51 apparaît alors comme une nouvelle formulation du n°53, quand la prière ancienne, du fait d'une transmission chaotique, n'était plus comprise. De plus le fait que la prière pour l'Exaltation, le 14 septembre (n°52), paraît très récente à cause de la demande pour les rois, renvoie à une époque où, comme dans la vieille version arménienne du lectionnaire, le 14 septembre n'a pas encore pris les traits d'une fête spécifique de l'Exaltation de la Croix.⁸⁰

(78) Sur les cinquante-cinq prières de la collection géorgienne, trois prières ont un modèle grec identique ou pratiquement identique : n°30, 40 et 44. Deux prières (étudiées dans l'autre article) ont un modèle grec dont la forme conservée est assez éloignée de leur : n°16 et 19. Dans un cas, la similitude se limite à l'*incipit* pour la même circonstance : n°23.

(79) Les trois arguments que j'avais avancés sont : 1. la place de l'Annonciation au début de l'année liturgique ; 2. l'origénisme de la prière n°22 ; 3. l'absence du thème du lavement des pieds dans la prière du Grand Jeudi. On pourrait y ajouter le fait que le *sin.* 54, qui semble avoir une structure (et un texte) plus ancienne que celle du *sin.* 12 (v. ci-dessus n°53 rem. 1), ne comporte peut-être que sept prières de carême (seul un examen du manuscrit lui-même pourrait le dire, v. n°30 à 32) au lieu de huit dans le *sin.* 12 (v. le point 4 de mon argumentation dans *BGG*).

(80) *PO* 36, p. 363 : on vénère la relique de la Croix (comme le Vendredi saint) mais sans office propre (renvoi à l'office de la veille).

Aucun des éléments rassemblés ici ne se trouve, à plus ample informé, dans les prières grecques de l'ambon qui ont été transmises jusqu'à nous, ce qui montre l'importance primordiale de la collection géorgienne dans l'origine et l'histoire de ce genre euchologique.

Appendice. Texte géorgien du n°53

sin. 12, 77v–78v

სატფურებასა საკურთხეველისასა და ჯუართა აპერობასა. ღმერთო დაუსაბამო, რომელმან დაუსაბამოჲ ჰქუე სიტყუაჲ, შენი თანა-მზრახვალი ღმერთი, რომლისა-გან ყოველი დაჰბდე ზესკნელ ცათანი, და ყოველი რაჲ არს მას ზედა, საყდარნი, უფლებანი, მთავრობანი, ჰელ-მწიფებანი და ძალნი, განწესებული დასი ანგელოზთაჲ, აურაცხელი და ნათელი და უსრულებელი, საუკუნოდ და უხილავი, რომლითაჲ დასაბამი კაცთა არა გამოუცხადე ღმრთებისა ბუნებაჲ ხატად და მსგავსად. ხოლო ესე ცანი მნათობით-ურთ და ქუეყანაჲ ამის საუკუნოდსაჲ საცნაურ-ჰყავ. დასაბამი და აღსასრული ყოველივე გან(ა)გებულებით წინავე განსაზღვრე აწინდელისა ამის ჰეშმარიტისა ძისა შენისა.

sin. 54, 52r–53r

ერის განტევებაჲ ენკენისაჲ. ღმერთო დაოკსაბამო რომელმან დაუსაბამოჲ ჰქუე სიტყუაჲ, შენი თანა-მზრახვალი ღმერთი, რომელი მის-მიერ ყოველნივე დაებადნეს ზესკნელ ცანი და რაჲ არს მას შინა, საყდარნი, უფლებანი და განწესებულნი დასნი ანგელოზთანი, უხილავნი რომლისა დასაბამი კაცთაჲ არა გამოუცხადე ღმრთებისა ბუნებითა და ესენიცა მნათობით-ურთ, და ქუეყანისა მის საუკუნოდსა საც.....⁸¹ დასაბამი და აღსასრული ყოველითა განგებულებით წინა განსაზღვრე აწინდელისა მის ჰეშმარიტისა მოსლვისა შენისა.

(81) Illisible sur le microfilm, probablement საცნაურ-ჰყავ.

Bibliographie supplémentaire : A. RENOUX, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121, t. II. Édition comparée du texte et de deux autres manuscrits, introduction, textes, traduction et notes*, dans PO 36 (1971), 141–390 ; M. TARCHNIŠVILI, *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem (V^e–VIII^e siècle)*, I et II (Louvain, 1959 et 1960) (CSCO, 188–189 et 204–205) ; S. VERHELST *et al.*, *Liturgia ibero-graeca sancti Iacobi Dei fratris. Georgian Text edited and translated under the Authority of the Institute of Manuscripts in Tbilisi. Rétroversion grecque et commentaire*, à paraître dans la collection *Jerusalem Theologisches Forum* (Münster).

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article retrace la genèse de la prière de l'ambon dans la Liturgie de saint Jacques et établit ensuite la liste de ses variantes en grec et surtout en géorgien. Il comporte la traduction des *incipit* de 55 prières géorgiennes, faite directement sur le microfilm du *sinaiticus* 12. L'analyse plus rapprochée de l'une d'entre elles (n°53) apporte une nouvelle observation (par rapport à une première partie de cet article parue dans la revue *BBGG*) sur l'origénisme qui a marqué la tradition liturgique de Jérusalem avant Justinien. On y trouvera d'autres éléments de datation tendant à faire remonter la *Vorlage* grecque de la collection géorgienne (du moins de sa partie principale) avant le milieu du VI^e siècle.

Dmitrij F. Bumazhnov
Tübingen

DAS CHARISMA IN DER CHRISTLICHEN GNOSIS UND IM FRÜHEN ÄGYPTISCHEN MÖNCHTUM

Ein Beitrag zum typologischen Vergleich zweier frühchristlicher Bewegungen*

Die geschichtlichen und ideengeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen der christlichen Gnosis und dem frühen ägyptischen Mönchtum bleiben weitgehend ungeklärt. Zwischen den Höhepunkten der beiden Bewegungen — Mitte des 2. bzw. des 4. Jh. — liegen etwa zweihundert Jahre, aber noch in der zweiten Hälfte des 3. Jh., als die ersten Mönche bereits die ägyptische Wüste zu besiedeln begonnen haben, konnte in Ägypten eine längere gnostische Abhandlung „Pistis Sophia“ geschrieben werden, was ein frühes zeitliches Nebeneinander der Gnostiker und der Mönche in diesem Land voraussetzt. Punktuelle polemische Reaktionen auf gnostisch anmutende Gedankengänge finden sich in der sahidisch überlieferten Vita des hl. Pachomius¹ (wohl Mitte bis Ende des 4. Jh.) und in den Schriften, die mit dem Namen des oberägyptischen Archimandriten Schenute von Atripe verbunden sind und in die Mitte des 5. Jh. gehören.² Der spektakuläre Fund der mögli-

* Dem vorliegenden Aufsatz liegt mein Vortrag auf der Tagung Das Charisma. Funktionen und symbolische Repräsentationen. Tagung der Projektgruppe ‚Welterschließung‘ der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. 18.–20. November 2005, Heidelberg zugrunde.

(1) Siehe D. W. JOHNSON, *Coptic Reactions to Gnosticism and Manichaeism, Le Muséon* 100 (1987) 201. Von den persönlichen Gesprächen mit ägyptischen Gnostikern in seinen jüngeren Jahren (wohl gegen 330–335) berichtet hl. Epiphanius von Salamis, der zu jener Zeit zu den mönchischen Kreisen nahe gestanden hat, vgl. *Epiph. haer. XXVI* 17,4–9 (GCS Epiphanius I, 297,3–298,18 HOLL). Siehe auch Ch. HEDRICK, *Gnostic Proclivities in the Greek Life of Pachomius and the Sitz im Leben of the Nag Hammadi Library, NT* 22 (1980) 78–94.

(2) Siehe JOHNSON, *Coptic Reactions...*, 201–204 und A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche. Bd. 2/4. Die Kirche von Alexandrien mit Nubien und Äthiopien nach 451* (Freiburg—Berlin, 1990) 202–209.

cherweise pachomianischen Briefe in den Kartonagen der Kodizes aus der in Nag Hammadi entdeckten gnostischen Bibliothek³ hat zwar für eine Reihe kühner Hypothesen über gnostische Präsenz in den Klöstern des hl. Pachomius gesorgt, aber zu keiner wirklichen Einsicht in die gnostisch-mönchische Beziehungen im 4. Jh. geführt.⁴

Vor dem Hintergrund dieser in vielen Hinsichten ungeklärten historischen Situation sind die an den gnostisch-mönchischen Beziehungen interessierten Forscher auf „phänomenologische“ Vergleiche der gnostischen und monastischen Auffassungen von Welt, Materie, Leib, Askese, Arbeit⁵ u.ä. sowie auf vereinzelte Textbeobachtungen⁶

(3) Vgl. J. M. ROBINSON (ed.), *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices published under the auspices of the Department of the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization* (Leiden, 1979), und darin Preface von J. M. Robinson, p. VI–XXIII.

(4) Eine eingehende Behandlung des Problems samt einem ausführlichen Referat über die aufgestellten Hypothesen findet man bei A. VEILLEUX, *Monachisme et gnose. Première partie: le cénobitisme pachômien et la bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi*, *Laval théologique et philosophique* 40 (1984) 275–294, IDEM, *Monachisme et gnose. Deuxième partie: Contacts littéraires et doctrinaux entre monachisme et gnose*, *Laval théologique et philosophique* 41 (1985) 3–24 und A. KHOSROYEV, *Die Bibliothek von Nag Hammadi. Einige Probleme des Christentums in Ägypten während der ersten Jahrhunderte* (Altenberge, 1995) (Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten, 7) 61–135. Siehe auch J. E. GOEHRING, *The Provenance of the Nag Hammadi Codices once more*, *SP* 35 (2001) 234–253.

(5) Vgl. z.B. A. GUILLAUMONT, *Gnose et monachisme*, in: J. RIES et J.-M. SEVRIN (Hrsgg.), *Gnosticisme et monde hellénistique. Les objectifs du colloque de Louvain-la-Neuve (11–14 mars 1980)* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982) 97–100, J. DE SAVIGNAC, *Gnose et Monachisme. Rapport entre les deux*, in: *Ibid.*, 119, G. G. STROUMSA, *Ascèse et gnose: aux origines de la spiritualité monastique*, in: IDEM, *Savoir et Salut* (Paris, 1992) 145–162, K. KOSCHORKE, *Gnosis, Montanismus, Mönchtum. Zur Frage emanzipatorischer Bewegungen im Raum der Alten Kirche*, *Evangelische Theologie* 53 (1993) 216–231. Wertvolle Beobachtungen zum Thema sind außerdem verstreut zu finden in der Monographie von K. KOSCHORKE, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nag-Hammadi-Traktate „Apokalypse des Petrus“ (NHC VII,3) und „Testimonium Veritatis“ (NHC IX,3)* (Leiden, 1978) (Nag Hammadi Studies, 12), siehe Index, S. 274 unter „Mönchtum“.

(6) Siehe z.B. L. PAINCHAUD, J. WEES, *Connaître la différence entre les hommes mauvais et les bons: le charisme de clairvoyance d'Adam et Ève à Pachôme et Théodore*, in: H.-G. BETHGE u.a. (Hrsg.), *For the Children, Perfect Instruction*, FS H.-M. Schenke (Leiden—Boston, 2002) (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 54) 139–155, wo auf den Gebrauch der gleichen Formel „den

angewiesen, die – wie auch immer sie geartet sind – zu den historischen Fragestellungen erst hinführen, ohne solche in gebührender Weise zu beanspruchen. Im gleichen Licht sind auch die folgenden Ausführungen zu sehen: des weiteren wird versucht, kontrastierende und übereinstimmende Zugänge zum Begriff „Charisma“ an einem gnostischen und einem ägyptisch-monastischen Text punktuell herauszuarbeiten.

Der einzige gnostische Text, in dem das Thema der unterschiedlichen Charismen und der mit ihnen verknüpften Problemen ausführlich besprochen wird, ist die koptisch überlieferte „Auslegung der Erkenntnis“ (= Inter), NHC XI,1. Diese ursprünglich griechisch verfasste Schrift wurde von Uwe-Karsten Plisch eigens herausgegeben und kommentiert.⁷ Nach Plisch handelt es sich dabei um einen unstrittig gnostischen⁸ Text, für den er eine Frühdatierung (Mitte des 2. Jh.) für möglich hält⁹.

Unterschied zwischen den bösen und guten Menschen kennen“ in der Nag-Hammadi-Schrift „Vom Ursprung der Welt“ und in der pachomianischen Tradition hingewiesen wird. Weil die genannte Formel in UW im Kontext der Verführung Evas durch die Schlange vorkommt, müßte bei der Besprechung der möglichen Relationen zum pachomianischen Schrifttum berücksichtigt werden, daß der hl. Pachomius gegen die Vorstellung polemisiert, Eva sei durch den Teufel (= Schlange) zum Ehebruch verführt worden und habe von ihm den Kain geboren, vgl. Vit. Pach. S^{3c} (CSCO, 99–100, Copt. 9–10, 334a, 5–26 Lefort). Die letztgenannte Vorstellung findet sich im Evangelium nach Philippus, vgl. EvPhil 42a (61,5–10), das zusammen mit UW im 2. Nag-Hammadi-Kodex überliefert ist. Über die Geburt des Kain in den gnostischen Schriften siehe B. A. PEARSON, Cain and the Cainites, in: IDEM, Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity (Minneapolis, 1990) (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity) 99–103.

(7) U.-K. PLISCH (Hrsg., übersetz. und erkl.), *Die Auslegung der Erkenntnis (Nag-Hammadi-Kodex XI,1)* (Berlin, 1996) (Texte und Untersuchungen, 142). Die ältere, ebenfalls kommentierte Ausgabe wurde von John D. Turner und Elaine H. Pagels besorgt, siehe Ch. W. HEDRICK (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, XIII* (Leiden u.a., 1990) (Nag Hammadi Studies, 28).

(8) In seiner „Einleitung“ zur deutschen Übersetzung von Inter in H.-M. SCHENKE, H.-G. BETHGE, U. U. KAISER (Hrsgg.), *Nag Hammadi Deutsch, 2. Band: NHC V,2–XIII,1, BG 1 und 4* (Berlin–New York, 2003) (Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller, Neue Folge, 12) 738 stellt Plisch die allgemein angenommene valentinianische Provenienz von Inter in Frage.

(9) Siehe U.-K. PLISCH, Einleitung, in: IDEM, *Die Auslegung...*, 3.

Klaus Koschorke, der das Problem der Charismen in Inter untersucht hat,¹⁰ bezeichnet sie als eine „gnostische ‚Gemeindeordnung‘“, und zwar als eine solche, in der – „im Unterschied zu den Gemeindeordnungen des katholischen Raums“ – die „paulinische Konzeption einer Gemeindeordnung vom Charisma aus“ fortgeführt wird.¹¹ Koschorke erinnert in diesem Zusammenhang an die bekannte Tatsache, daß die antignostische Frontstellung im 2. Jh. katholischerseits zur Stärkung der Bedeutung des kirchlichen Amtes und zur „Aufgabe der paulinischen Gemeindekonzeption“ führte.¹² Zu den wichtigsten Merkmalen dieser letzteren zählten die Zugehörigkeit der Gemeindeglieder zum *einen* Leib Christi sowie ihre gegenseitige Vervollständigung in diesem Leib durch die unterschiedlichen Gaben des Heiligen

(10) K. KOSCHORKE, Eine neugefundene gnostische Gemeindeordnung. Zum Thema Geist und Amt im frühen Christentum, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 76 (1979) 30–60. Siehe auch DERS., Gnostic Instructions on the Organization of the Congregation: The Tractate Interpretation of Knowledge from CG XI, in: B. LAYTON (Hrsg.), *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, New Haven, Connecticut, March 28–31, 1978*, vol. 2: *Sethian Gnosticism* (Leiden, 1981) (Studies in the History of Religion, 41) 757–769. Die weiter unten vorgestellte Interpretation Koschorkes wurde kritisiert von S. EMMEL, Exploring the Pathway That Leads from Paul to Gnosticism. What Is the Genre of The Interpretation of Knowledge (NHC XI,1)?, in: M. FASSNACHT, A. LEINHÄUPT-WILKE, S. LÜCKING (Hrsgg.), *Die Weisheit – Ursprünge und Rezeption, FS K. Löning* (Münster, 2003) (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 44) 257–276. Emmel versteht Inter als „a philosophical epistle“ (a.a.O., 265), die an „a single individual“ (a.a.O., 273) gerichtet ist. Der Bezug auf paulinische und deuteropaulinische Konzepte und Termini ist nach Emmel rhetorischen Charakters und widerspiegelt nicht unbedingt eine reale Gemeindestruktur, a.a.O., 274. Zugleich gibt Emmel zu, daß der Text von Inter stark beschädigt ist und einer vielseitigen Neuinterpretation bedarf, die erst zu entscheiden vermögen wird, ob er oder Koschorke recht hat, a.a.O., 265–266, 274. Weil Emmel für sein Verständnis des Textes keine durchschlagenden Argumente bringt, gehen wir des weiteren von der Interpretation von Koschorke aus.

(11) KOSCHORKE, Eine neugefundene gnostische Gemeindeordnung..., 33. Zur komplizierten Problem der Paulusrezeption im Gnostizismus siehe K. KOSCHORKE, Paulus in den Nag-Hammadi-Texten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Paulusrezeption im frühen Christentum, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 78 (1981) 176–205.

(12) KOSCHORKE, Eine neugefundene gnostische Gemeindeordnung..., 45–46. Zum kirchlichen Amt im frühen Christentum siehe z.B. H. KRAFT, Die Anfänge des geistlichen Amtes, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 100/2 (1975) 81–98.

Geistes.¹³ Während nun die Entwicklung in den großkirchlichen Gemeinden eine zunehmende Stärkung der hierarchisierenden Tendenzen in der Gemeindestruktur mit sich brachte, demonstriert Inter ein deutliches Interesse an den beiden paulinischen Schwerpunkten ohne erkennbare Wahrnehmung der Idee des geistlichen Amtes. Die Einheit der Inter-Gemeinde existiert „allein als die Einheit des ‚einen‘ ‚Leibes‘, in dem jedes ‚Glied‘ Anteil an der Gabe des anderen hat.“ Koschorke resümiert: „Inter ist also das Dokument einer pneumatisch-charismatischen Gemeindeorganisation.“¹⁴

Die Struktur und das Aufbauprinzip der Inter-Gemeinde wurden uns dank den durch diese hervorgerufenen Mißständen sichtbar, auf die der Autor des Textes reagiert. Zwei Gruppen, die in dieser Gemeinde miteinander in Konflikt treten, werden von Koschorke und Plisch unterschiedlich bewertet.

Nach Koschorke handelt es sich dabei um eine Spannung zwischen den gnostischen Pneumatikern und den – aus der Sicht der Gnostiker – weniger geistlich begabten großkirchlichen Christen im Rahmen einer gemischten gnostisch-katholischen Gemeinde.¹⁵ Die Streitigkeiten in solchen gemischten Gruppen hat Koschorke in einem späteren Aufsatz als Sitz im Leben auch anderer Nag-Hammadi-Schriften vorausgesetzt, wobei sich nach seiner Meinung der kleinere gnostische Teil als eine pneumatische *ecclesiola* in der zahlenmäßig größeren, aber geistlich unterlegenen, in der Terminologie der Gnostiker „psychischen“ *ecclesia* fühlte.¹⁶ Dabei diente die Gemeinschaft mit katholischen Christen (in der gnostischen Terminologie „Psychikern“) nach den Ansichten der gnostischen Pneumatiker der Ausformung

(13) So H. FRHR. V. CAMPENHAUSEN, Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (Tübingen, ²1963) (Beiträge für historische Theologie, 14) 59–65, auf den sich Koschorke beruft, vgl. KOSCHORKE, Gemeindeordnung..., 37, 45–47.

(14) KOSCHORKE, Eine neugefundene gnostische Gemeindeordnung..., 45. Zur gnostischen Auffassung der großkirchlichen Amtsstruktur im Allgemeinen siehe E. H. PAGELS, „The Demiurge and his Archons“ – a Gnostic View of the Bishop and Presbyters?, *HTR* 69 (1976) 301–324.

(15) KOSCHORKE, Eine neugefundene gnostische Gemeindeordnung..., 43–45.

(16) Siehe K. KOSCHORKE, Einheit der Kirche als Problem der christlichen Gnosis, in: F. VON LILIENFELD, A. M. RITTER (Hrsgg.), *Einheit der Kirche in vor-konstantinischer Zeit. Vorträge, gehalten bei der Patristischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft, 2.–4. Januar 1985 in Bern* (Erlangen, 1989) (Oikonomia, 25) 68.

des pneumatischen Elements auf seinem Weg zurück ins Pleroma des himmlischen Vaters, war also primär soteriologisch und nicht etwa missionarisch oder taktisch bedingt.¹⁷

Plisch schließt dagegen nicht aus, daß der in Frage kommende Konflikt „zwischen Gnostikern unterschiedlichen Initiationsgrads“ auch „in einer rein gnostischen Gemeinde ausgebrochen sein“ könnte, weist aber zugleich auf die fließenden Übergänge zwischen frühkatholischen und christlich-gnostischen Gemeinden hin.¹⁸ Weiter unten werden wir zu dieser Frage zurückkommen.

Das Schlüsselwort des in der Inter-Gemeinde ausgebrochenen Konflikts ist Neid: ein Teil der minder charismatisch begabten Gemeindeglieder beneidet und bedrängt die anderen wegen der jenen zuteil gewordenen geistlichen Gaben.¹⁹ In den Ermahnungen des um den Erhalt der Einheit der Gemeinde besorgten Autors von Inter lassen sich zwei Ebenen unterscheiden, die man zeitlich festlegen kann. In bezug auf den *aktuellen Zustand* mahnt er zur Akzeptanz der vorliegenden Unterschiede. Dafür bedient er sich u.a. auch der paulinischen Metaphorik der Gemeinde als des Leibes Christi,²⁰ vgl. Inter 18, 28–38.²¹

(17) Vgl. Iren., haer. I 6,1 und KOSCHORKE, Einheit der Kirche..., 66–67: „die Einstellung der Valentinianer zu ihren kirchlichen Mitchristen ist durch das Bewußtsein bestimmt, demselben Leib Christi anzugehören wie jene. Dies zumindest ist die Auskunft, die uns ein Text wie Excerpta ex Theodoto 58,1 gibt ... Der Leib Christi wird also nicht als uniforme Größe verstanden, sondern als eine *Größe in zwei Stufen*, dem pneumatischen Element – welches das gnostische Christentum repräsentiert –, und dem psychischen, welches für die Psychiker, die Masse des Kirchenvolkes steht ... Dabei sind sich die valentinianischen Pneumatiker des Unterschiedes gegenüber ihren psychischen Mitchristen sehr wohl bewusst: Sie wissen ihren Ursprung bei der Achamoth ... und beanspruchen für sich selbst Teilhabe an jenem ‚pneumatischen Samen‘, den sie jenen (d.h. die Psychiker, D.B.) absprechen. Aber dieser ‚pneumatische Samen‘ ist für sie zunächst nicht mehr als ein Vermögen, das der ... ‚Formung‘ bedarf, und zwar der Formung im psychischen Element ...“ Die gnostischen Pneumatiker brauchen „den Mutterboden des psychischen Christentums ...“, um ihre eigene gnostische Identität entwickeln ... zu können. Gerade auch um seiner selbst willen – und keineswegs nur aus taktischen Erwägungen – gilt dem Gnostiker also die Gemeinschaft mit den Kirchenchristen als unverzichtbar.“

(18) Siehe U.-K. PLISCH, Einleitung, in: IDEM, *Die Auslegung...*, 3.

(19) Vgl. Inter 15, 19–38; 17, 28–38; 18, 30–32.

(20) Vgl. KOSCHORKE, Eine neugefundene gnostische Gemeindeordnung..., 32.

(21) Übersetzung überall nach U.-K. PLISCH in: *Die Auslegung...*

Klage nicht dein Haupt an, daß es dich nicht zum Auge bestimmt hat, sondern daß es dich zum Finger bestimmt hat! Sei auch nicht neidisch dem gegenüber, der jeweils bestimmt ist zum Auge oder zur Hand oder zum Fuß! Danke aber dafür, daß du nicht außerhalb des Leibes existierst ...

Diese Ermahnung zur friedlichen Koexistenz innerhalb eines gemeinsamen Leibes wird vertieft mit dem Gedanken der geistlichen Teilhabe der weniger Begabten an den Charismen ihrer Mitbrüder, wobei diese Teilhabe auch als ein gewisses Charisma verstanden wird, vgl. Inter 16, 22–25; 31–38:²²

Bete für jenen (d.h. für den Charismatiker, D.B.), [damit] du an der Gnade teilhabest, die in ihm [ist]! Achte [es] nicht als etwas dir Fremdes, sondern als etwas, das dir gehört ... Da macht aber einer Fortschritte in der Rede. Nimm keinen Anstoß daran! Sage nicht: „Warum kann dieser reden, ich aber kann nicht reden?“ Das, was dieser nämlich sagt, ist etwas, das (auch) dir gehört. Und der, der die Rede versteht, und der, der redet — ein und dieselbe Kraft ist es.

Es ist aber nicht so, daß mit der Idee der Teilhabe an den Gnadengaben der anderen die Rangunterschiede in der Gemeinde für immer besiegelt würden. Denn die Ebene der synchronistischen Bewertung des vorliegenden Konflikts bleibt nicht die einzige: der Verfasser tröstet einerseits seine neidischen Mitbrüder mit der Möglichkeit künftiger persönlicher Erlangung von allen in der Gemeinde zur Zeit präsenten Charismen, vgl. Inter 16, 26–28:²³

Das, was jedes deiner Mit-Glieder empfangen hat, wirst (auch) du [empfangen].

Von der anderen Seite — und hier verläßt der Verfasser das paulinische Leibesbild — wird die Überzeugung formuliert, daß sich die Gemeindeglieder im protologischen Zustand in vollkommener Einheit und Gleichheit gewesen sind, vgl. Inter 18, 22–27:

(22) Vgl. auch Inter 15, 33–38: „Es ziemt sich für ihn (d.h. für den minder charismatisch Begabten, D.B.), sich zu freuen [und zu] frohlocken und teilzuhaben an der Gnade und dem Geschenk. Da hat einer prophetische Gabe. Habe teil an ihr ohne zu zweifeln! Bedränge nicht deinen Bruder in Neid ...“

(23) Siehe auch Inter 17, 31–34: „Es ziemt sich für dich, zu danken für die Glieder und zu [bitten], daß auch dir die Gnade gegeben werde, die jenen gegeben wurde.“

Wenn nun die, die der Harmonie entgegenstehen, ... fähig sind teilzuhaben an der Gleichstimmigkeit, um wie viel mehr müssen sich [die, die] aus der [alleinigen] Einheit stammen, miteinander in Übereinstimmung bringen!

In Inter 19, 31–37 wird unter Verwendung einer pflanzlichen Metapher ausgeführt, daß die Erwählten Früchte der in harmonischen Verbindung befindlichen, wohl himmlischen Wurzeln sind, deren Gleichheit und ungestörte Zugehörigkeit sie nachzuahmen haben:

Weil die Wurzeln eine Verbindung zueinander haben, sind auch ihre Früchte ungeteilt, die (pl.) von jedem, der erwählt ist. Sie haben sie so, daß sie ihnen miteinander gehören. Laßt uns den Wurzeln ähnlich werden, die wir gleich sind.

Bezieht sich dieses Stück immer noch auf die oben dargestellte Konfliktsituation, so kann man auf seiner Grundlage annehmen, daß es bei der betreffenden Gemeinde höchstwahrscheinlich um eine rein gnostische geht. Darauf weisen sowohl die auf *alle* Beteiligten ohne Unterschied bezogene Bezeichnung „Erwählte“ als auch die Vorstellung, daß *alle* in den Konflikt Verwickelten sich an den himmlischen Wurzeln zu orientieren haben.²⁴

Unsere zweite Beobachtung an dem oben zitierten Text betrifft das Verständnis der Charismen. Die Betonung der protologischen Einheit und Gleichheit macht die Annahme wahrscheinlich, daß der Verfasser von Inter in der Übereinstimmung mit gnostischer Mythologie an die Rückkehr ins Pleroma und die Wiederherstellung des Urzustandes geglaubt haben sollte. Insofern müßte ihm die aktuelle, durch die unterschiedlichen Charismen bedingte Ungleichheit als vorübergehend erscheinen. In die gleiche Richtung weisen u.E. die für die minder Begabten vorausgesetzte Möglichkeit, *alle* Gnadengaben der anderen zu erlangen,²⁵ sowie die die bestehenden Unterschiede nivellierende Überzeugung, daß das Lehren und das Verstehen von der gleichen charismatischen Kraft verursacht werden.²⁶

(24) In der Z. 22 auf der gleichen Seite wird „Pleroma“ erwähnt. Die Deutung auf den himmlischen Ort der Fülle und der Bezug auf die „Wurzeln“ sind aber nicht sicher, vgl. U.-K. PLISCH, Exegetischer Kommentar, in: IDEM, *Die Auslegung...*, 150. Vgl. auch die Vorstellung von der gemeinsamen Herkunft aus der Einheit in Inter 18, 22–27.

(25) Vgl. oben Inter 16, 26–28.

(26) Vgl. oben Inter 16, 31–38.

Aufs Ganze gesehen läßt sich das erstaunliche Ergebnis festhalten, daß der Autor von Inter von der *grundsätzlichen*, protologisch bedingten Gleichheit aller am Streit Beteiligten ausgeht, während er im Blick auf den *aktuellen Zustand* eine vorübergehende Autoritätsgefälle anzuerkennen bereit ist, die in der Praxis aus der ungleichmäßigen Ausstattung mit Charismen resultiert. Vorausgesetzte protologische Gleichheit bei praktischer, durch Unterschiede in der Begabung mit Charismen bedingter Ungleichheit der Gemeindeglieder der Gemeinde von Inter ist — neben dem Prinzip der Gemeindeaufbau vom Charisma her — eines der markantesten Merkmale dieses Dokuments.

Wohl im Zusammenhang mit der vorausgesetzten theoretischen Gleichheit aller Erwählten der Inter-Gemeinde ist die Polemik gegen die Benutzung des Vatertitels in unserer Schrift zu sehen. Die Botschaft des „Lehrers der Unsterblichkeit“ (= Christus) beläuft sich nämlich nach der Auskunft des Autors im Wesentlichen auf das Verbot, jemand auf der Erde Vater zu nennen.²⁷ Nur dieses Gebot wird im erhaltenen Teilen des Textes zusätzlich expliziert, vgl. Inter 9, 35–38:

Denn als wir in der Finsternis waren, nannten wir viele „Vater“, während wir unwissend waren über den wahren Vater, und das ist die größte [aller] Sünden.

In seinem Kommentar erklärt Plisch diese Stelle primär in bezug auf leibliche Väter.²⁸ Nach unserer Meinung ist es jedoch nicht unwahrscheinlich, daß damit auch die geistlichen Väter (mit)gemeint werden können.²⁹ Schwingt dieses Motiv mit, dann haben wir bei dieser Stelle mit der gnostischen Polemik gegen die dem Herrenwort in Mt 23,9 widersprechende Benutzung des Vatertitels in den katholischen Kreisen zu tun. Die Aversion der Gnostiker gegen die Übertragung des Gott allein zustehenden Vatertitels auf Menschen wäre dann im Kontext

(27) Inter 9, 27–35.

(28) Siehe U.-K. PLISCH, Exegetischer Kommentar, in: IDEM, *Die Auslegung...*, 107.

(29) Das legt u.E. die Erwähnung von „vielen“, die in der Zeit der „Finsternis“ „Vater“ genannt worden sind, nahe. Die „Finsternis“ würde dann die Verehrung des Demiurgen (nach gnostischem Verständnis, des Gottes des Alten Testaments) anstelle des „wahren Vaters“ bedeuten. Zur Relativierung der Rolle der spirituellen Vaterschaft nach dem Philippusevangelium siehe C. TRAUTMANN, *La parenté dans l'évangile selon Philippe*, in: B. BARC (Hrsg.), *Colloque International sur les textes de Nag Hammadi (Québec, 22–25 août 1978)* (Louvain, 1981) (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, Études, 1) 267–278, besonders 274–277.

ihres oben angesprochenen grundsätzlich ahierarchischen Ansatzes zu sehen.

Eine genau entgegengesetzte Auffassung des Vatertitels finden wir im frühen ägyptischen Mönchtum. Der Verfasser der 3. sahidischen Vita des hl. Pachomius sah sich z.B. genötigt, seine Anwendung auf den Apa Pachomius theologisch zu begründen, und dies gegenüber den Kritikern, die das Verbot in Mt 23,9 ins Feld führten.³⁰ Während der Zusammenhang der Bezeichnung des hl. Pachomius als Vater mit seinem Charismatikertum nicht zu hinterfragen ist,³¹ sehen wir uns vor dem Problem gestellt, warum die Gnadenbegabung im gnostischen und mönchischen Milieu mit so unterschiedlichen Bewertungen des auf Menschen bezogenen Vatertitels gepaart waren. Diese Fragestellung gewinnt noch an Gewicht, wenn man sich vergegenwärtigt, daß sich das frühe ägyptische Mönchtum – und die Klöster des hl. Pachomius bilden keine Ausnahme – zunächst als eine sich von der kirchlichen Hierarchie distanzierende Bewegung entwickelt hat. Hier liegt eine gewisse Parallele zu den christlichen gnostischen Bewegungen des 2. Jh. vor, die allerdings darin auf ihre Grenzen stößt, daß die Mönche auf der einen Seite zur grundsätzlichen Anerkennung der Hierarchie immer bereit waren, und auf der anderen Seite sehr schnell ihre eigene innermönchische Hierarchie aufgebaut haben. Darin, daß diese nicht auf kirchlich sanktionierten Ämtern, sondern auf Charismen ruhte, liegt wiederum eine Analogie zur Gemeindestruktur, die wir durch Inter kennen gelernt haben. Der Unterschied in den Auffassungen des Vatertitels in Inter und in der Vita des hl. Pachomius läßt nach den Grenzen auch dieser Parallele fragen.

Beim Vergleich der Benutzung des Vaternamens im pachomianischen Mönchtum mit der Situation in der Gnosis ist die bereits erwähnte Begründung der Anwendung des Vatertitels auf den hl. Pachomius aus seiner dritten sahidischen Vita hilfreich.³² Diese hebt

(30) Die Anrede der Apostel mit „Väter“ mußte bereits in der Epistula apostolorum 31–33 begründet werden.

(31) H. BACHT, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs. Studien zum frühen Mönchtum I* (Würzburg, 1972) (Studien zur Theologie des geistlichen Lebens, 5) 214.

(32) Aus der umfangreichen Fachliteratur zur spirituellen Vaterschaft im ägyptischen Mönchtum seien genannt J. DUPONT, *Le nom d'Abbé chez les solitaires d'Égypte, La vie spirituelle* 320 (1947) 217–230 und F. VON LILIENTHAL, *Anthropos Pneumatikos – Pater Pneumatophoros. Neues Testament und Apophthegmata Patrum*, in: EADEM, *Spiritualität des frühen Wüstenmönchtums*.

zwei Gründe hervor, die den Verstoß gegen das Herrenwort in Mt 23,9 rechtfertigen. Zunächst wird auf die prinzipielle Möglichkeit geistiger Vaterschaft hingewiesen:³³

Der Mensch, der einen anderen Menschen im Werk Gottes gebiert, ist sein Vater <auf der zweiten Stelle> nach Gott sei es in diesem Äon, sei es im anderen.

Unmittelbar darauf wird als Bestätigung dieser These 1 Kor 4,15 zitiert:³⁴ „Wenn ihr auch zehntausend Lehrer in Christus habt, so habt ihr doch nicht viele Väter. Denn ich habe euch geboren in Christus Jesus durchs Evangelium.“ Meint Apostel Paulus mit seiner väterlichen „Zeugung“ der Korinther ihre Bekehrung zum christlichen Glauben, so bedeutet das Gebären „im Werk Gottes“³⁵ der *Vita Pachomii* wohl die entscheidende Rolle des Heiligen bei der Absage seiner Mönchsbrüder an die Welt und bei ihrem Übertritt zur monastischen Lebensweise.³⁶

Der zweite Grund verdeutlicht den ersten. Zweimal wird betont, daß Pachomius es verdient, Vater genannt zu werden, weil „der Himmlische Vater“ und „der Heilige Geist“ in ihm wohnen³⁷. Dieses

Gesammelte Aufsätze 1962 bis 1971. Hrsg. von R. ALBRECHT und F. MÜLLER (Erlangen, 1983) (Oikonomia, 18) 1–13. Eine allgemeine Übersicht über frühchristliche Zeit bietet I. HAUSHERR, „Père spirituel“, in: IDEM, *Direction spirituelle en orient autrefois* (Roma, 1955) (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 144) 17–55.

(33) Vit. Pach. S^{3a} (CSCO 99–100, Copt. 9–10, 254a, 14–21 Lefort).

(34) Vit. Pach. S^{3a} (CSCO 99–100, Copt. 9–10, 254a, 22–30 Lefort).

(35) Koptisch $\chi\pi\omicron$... $\zeta\bar{\mu}\pi\tau\zeta\omega\beta$ $\bar{\mu}\pi\pi\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$, Vit. Pach. S^{3a} (CSCO, 99–100, Copt. 9–10, 254a, 16–18 Lefort).

(36) Der sakramentale, mit der (zweiten) Taufe vergleichbare Charakter des Mönchwerdens ist im geistlichen Testament des zweiten Nachfolgers des hl. Pachomius Horsiesi († 380/390) deutlich: Vater Pachomius erscheint hier als Vermittler der „magna gratia“ Gottes, die seine künftigen Mönche zur Absage an die Welt geführt hat, vgl. Orsies., doct. 21 (Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 7) 122,23–26 BooM : Vigilemus attentius, et sciamus quod magnam nobis Deus praestiterit gratiam per patrem nostrum Pachomium ut renuntiaremus saeculo, et omnem sollicitudinem mundi et curas rerum saecularium pro nihilo poneremus.

(37) Vit. Pach. S^{3a} (CSCO, 99–100, Copt. 9–10, 254b, 14–18 Lefort): „Wah[rhaftig so ist es mit] un[serem Vater Pachom]. Denn er verdient es, „der Vater“ ge[nannt zu werden], weil der Himmlische Vater in ihm wohnt.“ Zum Einwohnen des Heiligen Geistes siehe den gleichen Abschnitt weiter unten. Zu dem ganzen Fragekomplex siehe M. S. BURROWS, *On the Visibility of God in the Holy Man: A Reconsideration of the Role of the Apa in the Pachomian Vitae*, VC 41 (1987) 11–33 und P. DESEILLE, *Lo spirito del monachesimo pa-*

Einwohnen Gottes berechtigt eine Vermittlungsposition des hl. Pachomius, die schon im ersten Zitat klar angesprochen war. Auch in diesem Fall wird sie mit einem Zitat aus Apostel Paulus untermauert: „Mach euch mir gleich, wie auch ich mich Christus gleich gemacht habe“ (1 Kor 11,1). Danach folgt die Bilanz:³⁸

Also alle, die den Apostel in ihrem Tun nachahmen, sind würdig, „Vater“ genannt zu werden, wegen des Heiligen Geistes, Der in ihnen wohnt.

Diesen charismatischen Aspekt macht die erste griechische Vita mit schlichtesten Worten anschaulich:³⁹ die Menschenliebe und Barmherzigkeit des Pachomius bestärkten die Menschen in ihrem Wunsch, Christen und Gläubige zu bleiben. „Und oft,“ – fährt die Vita fort, „weinte er beim Anblick der Menschen, die Gott nicht kennen, Der sie geschaffen hat. Denn er wollte nach Möglichkeit alle erretten.“ Die Vaterschaft des hl. Pachomius ist somit vor allem die eines Vermittlers, der die Menschen zu dem durch ihn und in ihm wirkenden himmlischen Vater bringt.⁴⁰

Diese zentrale Stellung eines menschlichen Vermittlers ist dem christlichen Gnostizismus mit seiner programmatischen Betonung der individuellen Erkenntnis im Großen und Ganzen fremd. Nach der Auslegung des Valentinianers Herakleon glaubt die als das Sinnbild eines Gnostikers aufzufassende samaritanische Frau (Joh 4) unmittelbar aufgrund des Gesprächs mit dem Erlöser. Die Samariter, die Herakleon als Psychiker – d.h. katholische Christen – deutet, können zwar durch sie auf den Weg zu Christus gebracht werden, letztlich aber müssen auch sie ohne menschliche Vermittlung, „durch die Wahrheit allein glauben“.⁴¹

Fragt man nun nach dem Grund, weshalb die Charismen in der Inter-Gemeinde im Unterschied zum pachomianischen Mönchtum

comiano, in: IDEM und E. BIANCHI, *Pacomio e la vita comunitaria* (Comunità di Bose, 1998) 53–70 (Abschnitt: Paternità spirituale e vita comune).

(38) Vit. Pach. S^{3a} (CSCO, 99–100, Copt. 9–10, 254b, 30–35 Lefort).

(39) Vita Pach. G¹ 29 (SH, 19, 19,18–23 Halkin).

(40) Daß Pachomius Gott durch seine Person zur Erscheinung bringt, konnte hier nicht ausgeführt werden, vgl. dazu Vita Pach. G¹ 45 (SH, 19, 29,15 Halkin) ὁ μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν εἰς πάντα.

(41) Siehe Heracleon Fr. 37 (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, 5, 79,20–25 VÖLKER) und Heracleon Fr. 39 (ibid., 80,6–14 VÖLKER).

zwar als solche wahrgenommen und festgehalten, aber doch nicht zu bleibenden, die Gemeinde stiftenden Strukturen erhoben wurden, so ist zunächst mit Klaus Koschorke eine „bewußte Entscheidung gegen die Gemeindeämter der frühkatholischen Gemeindeordnung“ auszuschließen.⁴² Viel näher kommt man zu einer Erklärung, wenn man sich vergegenwärtigt, daß die eigentliche Kirche der Gnostiker eine überweltliche Gemeinschaft im Pleroma ist, während der irdischen Versammlung eine weitaus geringere Bedeutung als bei den katholischen Christen zukommt.⁴³ Ferner scheint das Charisma des anderen nach dem Zeugnis von Inter nicht heilsrelevant. Die Begründung dazu mag sein, daß sich Gott nach der grundsätzlichen gnostischen Überzeugung nicht durch menschliche Vermittlung, sondern unmittelbar in dem mit ihm als wesensgleich gedachten Pneuma des Gnostikers offenbart, was die geistliche Vaterschaft eines Menschen eigentlich ausschließt. Insofern sind die durch Charismen bedingten Unterschiede der Gläubigen nach der gnostischen Auffassung — zumindest inwieweit sie sich aufgrund von Inter rekonstruieren läßt — für das Heil eher unwichtig.

Die frühmonastische Gemeinschaft strukturiert sich dagegen um einen Charismatiker, der in bezug auf die Jünger als Vater gilt. Seine Vaterschaft entspringt seiner entscheidenden Rolle bei der Bekehrung der Jünger zum mönchischen Leben, die als zweite⁴⁴ Geburt empfunden wird. Gleichzeitig führt er die Jünger zum himmlischen Vater hin, Der in ihm und durch ihn wirkt. Das Charisma eines anderen

(42) Vgl. K. KOSCHORKE, Eine neugefundene gnostische Gemeindeordnung..., 47. Koschorke betont grundsätzliches Desinteresse von Inter „an der organisatorischen Außenseite der christlichen Gemeinde“, ebd.

(43) Vgl. KOSCHORKE, *Die Polemik der Gnostiker...*, 77–78: „Die ‚Kirche‘, der sich die Gnostiker zugehörig wissen, ist eine unweltliche Gemeinschaft, nämlich die Gemeinschaft der geistigen Wesen des Pleroma. ... Es ist diese *rein geistig zu definierende Ekklesia* ... der das ganze Interesse der Gnostiker gilt. ... Der Fehler der Katholiken in gnostischer Sicht ist nun der, daß sie ihre menschliche Versammlung für die ‚Kirche‘ selbst halten“, hervorgehoben von uns, und U.-K. PLISCH, Exegetischer Kommentar, in: IDEM, *Die Auslegung...*, 148: „Der irdischen ἐκκλησία“ wird in Inter „gar kein Wert an sich zugestanden. Vielmehr [wird] konsequent deren Vorläufigkeit als Durchgangsstation zur himmlischen Heimat behauptet. Wie sehr dem Verf. von Inter auch immer an der Beilegung des in seiner Gemeinde schwelenden Konfliktes gelegen ist, primär geht es in seinem Verstehenshorizont um Erlösung, nicht um Erhalt und Verfestigung des Vorläufigen.“

(44) Bzw. dritte — nach der natürlichen Geburt und der Taufe.

ist somit bestimmend für den Fortschritt auf dem geistigen Weg. Daß die Wirkung Gottes auf die Gläubigen durch andere Menschen im Mönchtum als möglich gedacht wird, hängt letztlich mit der in der Gnosis fehlenden positiven Bewertung der Welt, Materie und Inkarnation zusammen.⁴⁵

SUMMARY

The contribution focuses on the different understandings of charismata in the Gnostic text, *The Interpretation of Knowledge* and in the 3rd Sahidic Vita of St. Pachomius. The Gnostic text develops further an aspect of Apostle Paul's notion of community structure according to which the charismata of the community members are understood as supplementing each other. This notion is completed with the idea of the primordial and post mortem equality of all members as far as they are Gnostic pneumatics. One of the consequences of this ecclesiology is the prohibition to name someone "father" (cf. Mt 23,9). The Sahidic vita of St. Pachomius, on the contrary, argues for the application of this title to a Christian charismatic leader, a difference which witnesses a fundamental gap between the notion of a spiritual mediator in Gnostic and Catholic thought.

(45) Siehe hierzu G. G. STROUMSA, *La gnose et le désenchantement chrétien du monde*, in: *IDEM, Savoir et salut* (Paris, 1992) 163–181, besonders 179–180.

L'USAGE DU TERME « NOTRE PÈRE (ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ) » DANS LA LITTÉRATURE PACHÔMIENNE

Peu étudiée sérieusement à notre connaissance, l'expression « notre père (ΠΕΝΕΙΩΤ) » a, pourtant, une place non négligeable dans la tradition littéraire de la bibliothèque pachômiennne dont les sources sont variées.¹ La transmission de ce terme et son importance sémantique n'est pas facile à discerner, d'une part à cause d'un problème de la priorité parmi des oeuvres parvenues jusqu'à nous, et d'autre part

(1) Elles sont en plusieurs langues : arabe (E. AMÉLINEAU, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne au IV^e siècle. Histoire de saint Pachôme et de ses communautés*. Edition et traduction des documents coptes et arabe inédits (Paris, 1889) (ADMG, 17)), copte (L.-Th. LEFORT, *Les Vies coptes de saint Pachôme et de ses premiers successeurs*, introduction et traduction d'une vingtaine Vies coptes de Pachôme (Louvain, 1943) (Bibliothèques du Muséon, 16) ; IDEM (éd. et trad.), *Vies sahidiques*, édition et traduction (CSCO, 99 et 100) (Louvain, 1954) ; IDEM (éd. et trad.), *Oeuvres de s. Pachôme et de ses disciples*, édition et traduction (Louvain, 1956) (CSCO, 159 et 160) ; A. VEILLEUX, *La Vie de saint Pachôme (SBo)*, traduction de la vie bohairique (CSCO, 89) complétée par les vies sahidiques (Bellevue, 1984) (Spiritualité Orientale, 38) ; IDEM, *The Life of Saint Pachomius and his disciples, Pachomian Koinonia*, volume one, traduction anglaise des quelques Vies de Pachôme (Kalamazoo, 1980)), grecque (F. HALKIN, *Sancti Pachomii Vitae Graecae*, édition des six Vies grecques (Bruxelles, 1932) (SH, 19) ; A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE, *La Première Vie grecque de saint Pachôme*, introduction critique et traduction, dans : *Les Moines d'Orient*, t. IV/2 (Paris, 1965) ; H. QUECKE, *Die Briefe Pachoms*, édition des lettres de Pachôme (Regensburg, 1975) (Textus patristici et liturgici, 11) ; F. HALKIN (éd.), A.-J. FESTUGIÈRE (trad.), *Le Corpus athénien de saint Pachôme*, édition du *codex 1015 de la Bibliothèque nationale d'Athènes* (Genève, 1982) ; J. GOEHRING, *The letter of Ammon and Pachomian monasticism*, édition, traduction de la lettre d'Ammon et notes (Berlin—New York, 1986) (PTS, 27)) et latine (J. S. BOON (ed.), *Pachomiana Latina*, version latine de Jérôme des oeuvres pachômiennes (Louvain, 1932) ; P. DESEILLE, *L'esprit du monachisme pachômien*, introduction et traduction française de la version latine de Jérôme des oeuvres pachômiennne (Bellevue, 1968) (Spiritualité Orientale, 2) ; H. VAN CRANENBURGH, *La Vie latine de saint Pachôme*, édition avec présentation de la deuxième Vie grecque de Pachôme (Bruxelles, 1969) (SH, 46)).

à cause d'une complexité des traditions orale et littéraire du terme. Laissant à côté la question de la priorité des sources variées, car il nous faut tout le moins un volume pour l'éclairer,² on est, dans cette étude, obligé de se contenter d'un processus herméneutique où le terme « notre père » sera examiné par la méthodologie qui s'intéresse à des plusieurs étapes de la transmission de ce terme.

* * *

En premier lieu, il est préférable d'aborder les oeuvres de deux successeurs de Pachôme,³ Théodore et Horsière, étant donné que leurs appellations du fondateur du cénobitisme peut se distinguer l'une de l'autre ; Théodore préfère en gros à l'expression « apa (ΑΠΑ) », tandis que Horsière est plutôt attaché à la formule « notre père ». Je voudrais expliquer d'abord en détail l'usage théodorien. Théodore applique en tout dix fois au fondateur le terme d'« ΑΠΑ »,⁴ à côté de l'expression

(2) On peut classer en gros les sources pachômiennes catégoriquement en trois : *Vies*, *Règles* et *Oeuvres* des disciples de Pachôme. La plupart d'études du siècle dernier considèrent, parmi ces trois catégories, les *Vies* comme repère important pour discerner l'histoire du monachisme pachômien. Néanmoins il serait téméraire de donner, sans réserve, la priorité aux *Vies*, puisque celles-ci ne représentent pas toujours les mêmes traditions.

(3) LEFORT, *Oeuvres de s. Pachôme...*

(4) En ce qui concerne le terme d'« apa », il est d'origine sémitique. Il a trois références bibliques très connues : Mc 14, 36 ; Rm 8, 15 ; Ga 4, 6. il semble que les deux références de l'apôtre Paul remontent à la prière de Jésus à travers la transmission par une communauté primitive. La langue maternelle de Jésus était l'araméen et, selon l'Évangile de Marc, Jésus se servait de la forme araméen *Abba*, lorsqu'il s'adressait à Dieu en l'appelant « mon père » à Gethsémani. J. Jérémias a essayé de voir dans la prière de Jésus la nouveauté et l'exclusivité de l'invocation *Abba*. Selon lui, « dans l'invocation *Abba* adressée à Dieu s'exprime le mystère ultime de la mission de Jésus. Il se savait mandaté pour faire part de la Révélation de Dieu, parce que Dieu s'était fait connaître à lui comme Père » (J. JÉRÉMIAS, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1996) 87-88). Mais cette interprétation piétiste de J. Jérémias, qui a obtenu un large assentiment a été contesté justement en 2001 par Marc Philonenko. Celui-ci a montré le fait que la formule du *Psaume* 89, 27 « mon Père et mon Dieu », est à l'origine, à travers de l'évènement du baptême au Jourdain, de la conscience filiale de Jésus à Dieu (M. PHILONENKO, *Le NOTRE PÈRE, De la prière de Jésus à la prière des disciples* (Paris, 2001) 53-68).

Le mot *Abba* qui était primitivement un nom divin chez Jésus acquiert un sens très différent dans la tradition monastique : un supérieur d'une demeure communautaire ou solitaire, et un ancien qui a une autorité spirituelle à

de « cet homme » (trois fois) avec des adjectifs. Son terme technique d'« apa » peut être classé en quatre catégories : le titre d'« apa » sans suivant nom propre (*Catéchèses* = *Cat.* 40, 11 ; 40, 15 ; 48, 7 ; 50, 14 ; 51, 1 ; 61, 10) ; « apa, le père de la Koinonia » (*Cat.* 53, 8) ; « apa Pachôme » (*Cat.* 41, 24 ; 57, 21) ; « notre père apa » (*Cat.* 51, 29). Son expression d'« apa Pachôme » ne doit pas être considérée comme un terme spécifique, parce qu'on trouve parfois dans les catéchèses le titre d'« apa » avec d'autres noms propres comme « apa Horsière »

l'égard des frères (L. REGNAULT, *La Vie quotidienne des Pères du désert en Egypte au IV^e siècle* (Paris, 1990) 11), s'appellent *Abba*. En effet, il n'est pas possible de dater exactement depuis quand les milieux monastiques empruntèrent le mot en changeant le sens sémitique et biblique de ce terme. Il est curieux que la *Vie d'Antoine* d'Athanase ne se sert pas une seule fois de l'appellation d'« abba » à Antoine.

Chitty a pensé que ce terme « apa » aurait été réservé « pour désigner un supérieur monastique (ce qui n'implique pas nécessairement qu'il soit prêtre comme le suppose Bell) » (D. CHITTY, *Et le désert devint une cité* (Paris, 1997) 38). Mais il ne nous faut pas imaginer que le titre « apa » désigne forcément, dans un usage des milieux anachorétiques ou cénobitiques, un supérieur d'une demeure monastique. La littérature pachômienne l'attribue à des anciens qui ne sont pas des supérieurs (*Vie bohairique* = *Bo* 30 apa Péchos ; *Bo* 96 apa Zachée), un prêtre (*Bo* 41 apa Deny) ou un évêque (*Bo* 28 apa Sarapion, évêque de Nitentori) et même Athanase, archevêque d'Alexandrie (*Bo* 28 apa Athanase). Chenoute le fait à l'archevêque Athanase (Athanase, *Lettrres festales et pastorale*. Trad. L. -Th. LEFORT (Louvain, 1955) (CSCO, 151) 86 : apa Athanase). Dans l'Orient, le terme « apa » n'était pas ainsi exclusivement réservé pour un supérieur, bien qu'il l'eût désigné dans beaucoup de cas. Le terme principal oriental pour le supérieur était « ἡγούμενος ». Dans les milieux pachômiens, le mot « higoumène » est utilisé pour désigner des supérieurs des monastères de la Congrégation par rapport au supérieur général (« princeps » en traduction latine de Jérôme). Par contre, dans l'Occident, le mot « Apa » est devenu durant le V^e siècle un titre régulier d'un supérieur d'un monastère. Jean Cassien se sert de ce terme pour désigner un supérieur dans ses *Institutions cénobitiques* (voir l'expression *Abbas coenobii* dans l'index des mots principaux, Jean Cassien, *Institutions cénobitiques*. Ed. et trad. J.-C. GUY (Paris, 1965) (SC, 109) 509). Cet usage devient universel depuis qu'il est reçu en ce sens par saint Benoît dans la première moitié du VI^e siècle. Voir J. CHAPMAN, Abbot, dans : *Encyclopaedia of religion and ethics*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1908) 8.

En ce qui concerne deux formes **ΑΠΑ** et **ΑΒΒΑ**, la première appartient, en général, à un usage de la Basse Egypte, alors que la deuxième constitue un coutume de la Haute Egypte (W. VYICHL, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la langue copte* (Louvain, 1983) 3-4 et W. SPIEGELBERG, *Koptische Miscellen, Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 62. (1927) 47-48).

(*Cat.* 61, 16), « apa Théodore » (*Cat.* 62, 3). Au surplus, on sait que le terme *apa* était un terme choisi pour exprimer normalement un respect spirituel des moines avancés en vertu dans les milieux monastiques. En ce qui concerne le quatrième titre « notre père », il est probable qu'il était courant aux premiers pachômiens à côté de celui d'« Apa », mais il constitue pour Théodore un emploi marginal par rapport à son autre appellation « Apa ».⁵ Seul le premier cas, terme d'« apa » sans nom propre suivant est, pour Théodore, un majeure usage pour désigner Pachôme (nous allons traiter plus tard l'expression « apa, le père de la Koinonia »).⁶ L'appellation de Théodore n'est pas, dans son ensemble, aussi cohérente que celle d'Horsièse, dans la mesure où il se sert d'un pronom de troisième personne, « cet homme » pour désigner Pachôme : « cet homme » (*Cat.* 42, 16) ; « ce si grand homme » (*Cat.* 40, 16) ; « cet excellent homme » (*Cat.* 40, 17). Cette appellation ne se trouve dans tout le dossier pachômien que dans les catéchèses de Théodore. A notre connaissance, les auteurs de la biographie de Pachôme n'appliquent pas même une seule fois au fondateur cette formule « cet homme ».

Par contre, l'appellation pour Pachôme d'Horsièse se distingue certainement de celle de Théodore. Pour lui, le fondateur du cénobitisme est « notre père » (vingt et une fois). Le terme de « notre père » se présente sous plusieurs formes : le plus fréquemment, « notre père » sans nom propre (dix-huit fois),⁷ puis « notre père Pachôme » (une fois

(5) On observe cinq fois l'expression « notre père » dans la *Lettre* de Théodore : trois fois dans l'édition de Boon (Boon, *Pachomiana Latina...*), « Apostolus et pater noster » (105, 15) ; « termini patris nostri » (106, 7) ; « pater noster » (106, 18) et deux fois dans la traduction d'Adalbert de Vogüé (T. ORLANDI, A. DE VOGÜÉ, *Nuovi Testi Copti Pacomiani, Epîtres inédites d'Horsièse et de Théodore, Studia Anselmiana* 70 (1976) 241–257), « les commandements de notre père » (255, 50), « afin que notre père dans l'autre monde témoigne pour nous » (257, 81–82).

(6) Le titre « Apa » sans nom propre suivant était un des noms par lesquels les premiers disciples de Pachôme désignaient leur maître (voir, LEFORT, *Oeuvres de s. Pachôme...*, 40, n. 6 ; IDEM, *Les Vies coptes de saint Pachôme...*, 375, n. 1). W. Crum rapporte que ce titre n'était pas exclusivement réservé pour désigner Pachôme (W. CRUM, *Theological texts from coptic papyri* (Oxford, 1913) 187, n. 3). En effet, ni Lefort ni Crum n'arrivent à distinguer la différence entre « **ΑΠΑ** » et « notre père ».

(7) *Lib. Or.* (= *Liber Orsiesii*) 5 ; 9 ; 10 ; 11 ; 13 ; 16 ; 22 ; 28 ; 30 ; 35 ; 46 (deux fois) ; 47 (deux fois) ; 51 et *Lettre* d'Horsièse dans la traduction d'Adalbert de Vogüé (ORLANDI, DE VOGÜÉ, *Nuovi Testi Copti Pacomiani...*), 246, 34 ; 246, 37 ; 252, 36 ; 254, 20.

dans le *Liber Orsiesii*⁸ = *Lib. Or.* 21), « notre saint père apa Pachôme » (une fois dans le *Cat.* 68,3), « notre père béni et juste, apa Pachôme » (une fois dans le *Cat.* 71, 3). En effet, « notre père Pachôme » qu'utilisent les *Vies* n'est pas une formule réservée pour appeler uniquement Pachôme, parce que le titre « notre père » peut servir, dans la littérature pachômienne, à désigner d'autres personnes avec un nom propre. Nous pouvons relever des exemples comme « notre père Cornélios » de la première *Vie* Sahidique (=S^{1a})⁹ et « notre père Jonas de Thmousons » (*Cat.* de Théodore 61, 9–10). Quant à l'expression de « notre saint père apa Pachôme » et « notre père béni et juste apa Pachôme » qui se trouvent dans les catéchèses d'Horsière, nous les trouvons une seule fois dans tout le dossier pachômien copte. Nous pouvons donc les attribuer au jeu de mot d'Horsière, qui consiste en une composition des expressions pouvant désigner avec respect le fondateur. En tout cas, pour Horsière, le terme de « notre père » est la racine pour l'appellation de Pachôme, et d'autres épithètes ne sont que des particules auxiliaires. Et l'usage principale du terme d' « apa » est, pour Théodore, semblable à celui de « notre père » d'Horsière.

La question suivante est de savoir d'où cette divergence de l'appellation du fondateur provient. Il est assez probable qu'elle puisse concerner le problème de l'orthodoxie pachômienne.¹⁰ Il semble qu'Horsière essaye d'éviter intentionnellement l'emploi théodorien, en se mettant à l'écart de la préférence de l'école théodorienne dans l'appellation de Pachôme.

Le contraste de l'appellation de Pachôme, « apa » / « notre père », dans les œuvres de Théodore et d'Horsière, peut être un reflet d'un

(8) Cf. *CPG* 2367.

(9) LEFORT, *Les Vies coptes de saint Pachôme...*, 376, 21.

(10) La mort de Pachôme survenue en 346 suscite assez tôt la question de l'orthodoxie pachômienne dont la problématique se concentre sur comment interpréter l'esprit cénobitique de Pachôme, fondateur du cénobitisme. Je pense qu'il y avait deux écoles qui interprétaient, d'une façon différente, son esprit essentiel et dont les représentants principaux sont, pour chaque côté, Théodore et Horsière. Il est très probable que la démission d'Horsière de l'année 352 était un événement provenant des conflits de ces deux groupes et que l'intérêt important de la partie qui traite, dans les *Vitae Pachomii*, du gouvernement des successeurs du fondateur, consiste à cacher un tel conflit réel ou falsifier l'histoire déshonorable pour glorifier les premiers moines cénobitiques. Voir ma thèse de doctorat soutenue le 14 mai 2004 à Strasbourg, S. H. NAM, *Les cénobitismes primitifs de Pachôme et de Basile de Césarée* (Thèse de doctorat présentée à Strasbourg, 2004) 35–149.

conflit des deux premiers successeurs ou un résultat de leur différence herméneutique quant à l'interprétation du fondateur. Par ailleurs, il est intéressant d'examiner des contextes où « apa » et « notre père » sont utilisés. Dans le cas d'Horsièse, l'appellation de « notre père » et quelques formes variées sont utilisées dans la plupart des cas où il veut évoquer l'enseignement spirituel de Pachôme, ses traditions et ses préceptes cénobitiques.¹¹ Si Horsièse évoque à travers le terme « notre père » l'existence du fondateur du cénobitisme, il veut le faire dans la mesure où Pachôme donne des enseignements évangéliques comme le fondement de la vie commune. Horsièse s'intéresse principalement à une image évangélique de Pachôme comme maître du cénobitisme mais non à ses actions concrètes. En revanche, l'emploi de Théodore reste incohérent, contrairement à l'application horsienne rigoureuse. Dans quelques cas (trois fois), Théodore utilise certes le terme « apa » dans le sens horsien.¹² Pourtant, beaucoup plus souvent (six fois), le terme « apa » est utilisé dans des contextes hors de l'esprit cénobitique ou l'enseignement de Pachôme.¹³ D'ailleurs, Théodore se sert d'un

(11) « Selon l'ordre de notre saint père apa Pachôme » (*Cat.* 68, 3) ; « grâce aux enseignement de notre père béni et juste, apa Pachôme » (*Cat.* 71, 3) ; « chacun des préceptes de notre père » (*Lib. Or.* 5) ; « ce que notre père a formellement interdit... » (*Lib. Or.* 9) ; « les traditions de notre père » (*Lib. Or.* 11) ; «...Car si quelqu'un vient à périr à cause de nous, notre âme sera coupable pour son âme. Cela même, notre père avait coutume de nous le faire entendre sans relâche » (*Lib. Or.* 13) ; « ce que notre père de sainte mémoire ne cessait jamais de nous redire » (*Lib. Or.* 16) ; « Dieu nous a accordé une grande grâce par (l'enseignement) de notre père Pachôme en nous faisant renoncer au monde » (*Lib. Or.* 21) ; « les traditions de notre père » (*Lib. Or.* 22) ; « les préceptes qui nous ont été transmis par notre père » (*Lib. Or.* 28) ; « les instructions de notre père » (*Lib. Or.* 30) ; « les préceptes de ses saints et de notre père » (*Lib. Or.* 35) ; « la loi de Dieu que notre père a reçue de lui » (*Lib. Or.* 46) ; « l'enseignement par lequel notre père nous a formés tandis qu'il était encore en vie » (*Lib. Or.* 47) ; « Et fêtons... que notre père a dites, lui qui est Apa » (*Lettre d'Horsièse, ORLANDI, DE VOGÜÉ, Nuovi Testi Copti Pacomiani...*, 246, 34–35) ; « Et souvenons-nous aussi de ce que notre père nous ordonna de ne pas changer » (*Lettre d'Horsièse*, 246, 37–38) ; « notre père qui nous a réunis par Dieu est juste » (*Lettre d'Horsièse*, 252, 36) ; « réunios (?) qui nous a été fixée par notre père juste » (*Lettre d'Horsièse*, 254, 20).

(12) « La loi de la Koinonia sainte et vraie ; celle dont l'auteur, après les apôtres, est Apa Pachôme » (*Cat.* 41, 24) ; « les préceptes que Dieu a donnés à Apa » (*Cat.* 50, 14) ; « la législation établie par Apa » (*Cat.* 51, 1).

(13) « Apa et apa Horsièse ; 'qu'il (Dieu) forma par des épreuves secrtes et des maladies : il les fit critiquer par des gens moins estimables » (*Cat.* 40,

nom démonstratif étranger aux *Vies* — « cet homme » — pour désigner dans le sens non horsien Pachôme (trois fois), dans des anecdotes où ce dernier est mentionné.¹⁴ Comme la fréquence nous le montre, l'emploi majoritaire de Théodore dans l'appellation de Pachôme est évidemment loin de l'usage horsien. L'existence de Pachôme, par Théodore, est évoqué, tantôt dans une perspective de pouvoir être nommé 'l'éducation des ennuis', laquelle était un des cadres d'interprétation de Pachôme pour l'école théodorienne (*Cat.* 40, 11–12 ; 40, 16 ; 40, 18 ; 42, 16–18 ; 48, 6–7), tantôt dans les cas généraux (*Cat.* 40, 15 ; 57, 21 ; 51, 28–29 ; 61, 10). L'usage du sens horsien, pour Théodore, reste marginal. Ce que nous supposons par nos argumentations, c'est que le contraste entre « notre père » d'Horsière et « apa » de Théodore ne se produit pas accidentellement mais qu'il résulte de la différence interprétative des deux successeurs à l'égard de leur maître. Horsière essaye d'éviter rigoureusement l'emploi théodorien et de fixer un autre usage pour désigner Pachôme, non forcément nouveau. En bref, nous voudrions attribuer à Horsière le titre de « notre père » sans nom propre et à Théodore le terme d'« apa » sans nom propre, en considérant que les autres formes variées, exclusivement basées sur la racine respective sans nom de Pachôme, sont secondaires.

En effet, il nous faut ouvrir une parenthèse concernant le terme technique pour appeler le fondateur du cénobitisme thébain ; il y en a une formule diachronique, hors les deux usages synchroniques, commune aux successeurs de Pachôme : « Apa, le père de la Koinonia ». Cette formule reste, à travers Théodore, dans les œuvres à Horsière (*Cat.* de Théodore 53, 8 ; *Règlements* d'Horsière 91, 4 ; 95, 16 ; 98, 7).¹⁵ Une seule exception se trouve au chapitre 12 de *Lib. Or.* : « le père qui le premier, institua ces *coenobia* ». Le mot de « pater », traduit par Jérôme, serait

11–12) ; « les frères du temps d'Apa » (*Cat.* 40, 15) ; « c'est ainsi qu'agirent les pères par laquelle il (Dieu) a formé les saints, ... Apa et apa Horsière » (*Cat.* 48, 6–7) ; « la vie d'apa Pachôme » (*Cat.* 57, 21) ; « à l'attente des promesses que Dieu a faites à notre père Apa » (*Cat.* 51, 28–29) ; « cet homme qu'Apa tenait pour une célébrité » (*Cat.* 61, 10).

(14) « Ce si grand homme eut recours à des séculiers pour une question de pains ; cet excellent homme voyait, de ses yeux, ses fils tourner de petites meules et lécher de la farine avec leur langue, par suite de leur grande faim (*Cat.* 40, 16–18) ». « Songeons aux maux et aux peines causées à cet homme et à tous les saints » (*Cat.* 42, 16).

(15) Cf. « Et fêtons... que notre père a dites, lui qui est Apa » (*Lettre* d'Horsière, ORLANDI, DE VOGÜÉ, *Nuovi Testi Copti Pacomiani...*, 246, 34–35)

certes « ὁ πατήρ » du grec : c'est dans les autres cas que Jérôme utilise strictement « *pater noster* ». Cependant, cette exception peut être utilisée comme exemple qui nous confirme l'emploi diachronique de la formule d'« Apa, le père de la Koinonia ». Jérôme traduit « pater qui primus instituit coenobia ». Si la traduction de Jérôme reflète l'original copte d'Horsisèe — nous le pensons —, Horsisèe ne changea que formellement la formule, qui était courante déjà depuis à l'époque du généralat de Théodore. A savoir, Horsisèe, dans son *Liber*, explique de manière indicative la formule, « Apa, le père de la Koinonia » : selon son explication, 'le père de la Koinonia' est celui qui 'le premier institua la Koinonia'.

Il semble que cette formule ait été originairement utilisée chez les frères pachômiens dans un contexte précis. Son emploi originaire est lié à une idée testamentaire.¹⁶ *Règlements* d'Horsisèe 91, 4 conserverait un usage primitif de cette formule : « le Dieu d'Abraham d'Isaac et de Jacob, et le Dieu d'Apa (le père de la Koinonia) ». Les moines pachômiens veulent, par leur formule « Apa, le père de la Koinonia », confirmer que le Dieu qui conduit Pachôme à fonder le cénobitisme est le même que le Dieu des ancêtres de l'Ancien Testament. C'est par cette formule que Pachôme continue, dans la tradition cénobitique, des pères de l'Ancien Testament. Théodore utilise cette tradition de la même manière qu'Horsisèe : «...la voie de la vie éternelle ; voie qui fut recommandée à Apa, père de la Koinonia, par le Dieu d'Abraham, d'Isaac et de Jacob » (*Cat.* 53, 7–9). Dans un cas, Horsisèe augmente dans cette formule la liste des pères de l'Ancien Testament, et dans un autre cas il la supprime.¹⁷ Pourtant, nous pensons qu'il est probable que ces variations convergent vers la forme originale des *Règlements* d'Horsisèe 91, 4, basée sur la référence biblique Ex. 3, 6 et Mc 12, 26.

Nous allons également étudier l'histoire de la transmission du terme technique de « notre père ». L'Ancien Testament attribue le terme de « notre père » à Dieu.¹⁸ Pour Jésus aussi, « notre père » n'est accordé qu'à Dieu.¹⁹ Par contre, Pachôme n'aurait pas pu être appelé faci-

(16) Ex. 3, 6 ; cf. Mc 12, 26.

(17) « La prostérité d'Abraham, d'Isaac, de Jacob, de Joseph, de David et d'Apa, le père de la Koinonia » (*Règlements* d'Horsisèe, 98, 7) ; « conformément à la façon fixée dès le début par le père de la Koinonia, Apa, auquel fut confiée par Dieu cette grande vocation » (*Règlements* d'Horsisèe 95, 15–17).

(18) Is 63,16 ; 64,8. Le *Lib. Or.* 43 et la *Cat.* de Théodore 42, 6–7 ont une résonance provenant de ces phrases.

(19) Mt. 6, 9.

lement, du son vivant, comme « notre père » sans nom propre, d'une part, à cause des exemples précédents bibliques réservés strictement à Dieu et de la tradition exégétique des pères de l'église qui cherchaient plusieurs significations dans le « Pater Noster »,²⁰ d'autre part, à cause de la tradition anachorétique ou semi-anachorétique qui n'applique pas le terme aux anciens.²¹

Tout d'abord, Pachôme était appelé par son nom. La *Vie* bohairique (= *Bo*) 42 conserve une anecdote où un frère qui demande une promotion, l'appelle simplement « Pachôme ». ²² Il est possible que Pachôme puisse être appelé comme « Apa » ou « apa Pachôme ». Les *Vies* coptes n'appliquent pas ce terme à Pachôme dans le style du discours. En revanche, la première *Vie* grecque (= *G*¹) conserve un cas où Théodore appelle Pachôme comme « abbâs » (*G*¹ 93). Lorsqu'on considère l'usage de Théodore dans ses catéchèses dont nous avons déjà parlé, nous pouvons penser assez vraisemblablement que l'« abbâs » de *G*¹ 93 remonte directement à Théodore mais non à la tradition littéraire.²³

D'autre part, il est assez probable que le titre de « notre père » ait été accordé, dans un sens limité, à Pachôme du son vivant par les frères. Si Pachôme était appelé comme « notre père (ΠΑΤΕΡΙΩΤ) », l'usage original de ce terme se serait borné à appeler le supérieur général de la Congrégation, soit parmi les frères, soit envers les gens extérieurs. *Bo* 59 (équivalent *G*¹ 61) conserve le premier emploi du titre. « Apa Cornelios interrogea les frères arrivés par la barque : 'Qu'a fait notre père pendant ces jours ?' ». Nous trouvons un exemple pour le deuxième usage dans *Bo* 185. Le duc Artemios qui est venu à Phbôou pour arrêter l'archevêque Athanase dit aux frères : « Amenez-moi votre père ». Dans ce contexte, « notre père » comme réponse de l'ordre d'Artemios n'est qu'un chef de la Congrégation. Plus loin dans le même chapitre, quand le duc demanda aux frères de prier pour lui avant son départ, ils disent : « Notre père nous a défendu de prier avec personne jusqu'à ce que l'Eglise soit de nouveau en paix, en raison des Ariens ». Ici, « notre père » (c'est-à-dire Théodore) est mentionné comme tête

(20) Concernant la tradition exégétique des pères, voir A. SOLIGNAC, *Pater Noster*, dans : *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, t. XII.1 (Paris, 1984) 383–413.

(21) Les maîtres spirituels des milieux anachorétiques sont appelés normalement comme « vieillard », « père » ou « abba ». REGNAULT, *La Vie quotidienne des Pères...*, 140. Ainsi Palamon, maître de Pachôme est appelé « le vieillard Apa Palamon » (*Bo* 16).

(22) « Descends, et prouve-moi mon péché, ô Pachôme le menteur ».

(23) Ce terme n'apparaît pas dans *Bo* 83, qui correspond à *G*¹ 93^a.

de la communauté pachômienne envers l'homme extérieur, mais il ne désigne pas Pachôme. Ces deux exemples nous montrent que l'usage primitif de ce terme est destiné au chef de la Congrégation, soit Pachôme, soit Théodore. Les expressions, « notre père Pachôme », « notre père Théodore », « notre père Horsière » et « notre père Petronios », conservées dans les *Vies* et les *oeuvres* pachômiennes, constituent des explications complémentaires pour montrer que le terme de « notre père » a été employé généralement dans ce contexte.²⁴ Donc, l'utilisation du terme « notre père » n'a pas d'autre raison que d'exprimer un meilleur respect pour les supérieurs généraux de la Congrégation. Cet emploi est trouvé hors des milieux pachômiens, mais son apparition est extrêmement rare par rapport à sa fréquence dans la littérature pachômienne.²⁵

(24) Des cas où le terme « notre père » applique à d'autres personnes que Pachôme et ses deux successeurs principaux appartiennent à un emploi marginal dans le milieu pachômien. Nous rencontrons une seule fois la formule « notre père Jonas de Thmousons » (*Cat. de Théodore*, 61, 9-10) et « notre père Cornélios » (S^{1a}). En revanche, on rencontre souvent l'expression de « notre père Théodore » et relativement moins souvent « notre père Horsière ».

A ma connaissance, on ne voit qu'une seule occurrence l'expression de « notre père Petronios » dans toute la bibliothèque pachômienne (*lettre d'Horsière* dans la traduction d'Adalbert de Vogüé, 253, 3). Le culte de Petronios, successeur immédiat de Pachôme, était célèbre dans la région du Panopolite et il y avait là une église consacrée à son nom selon *P.Cair. Masp.* I 67021 daté de 567. Voir J. GASCOU, *Les Pachômiens à Aphrodité*, dans : J.-L. FOURNET (éd.), *Les archives de Dioscore d'Aphrodité cent ans après leur découverte. Histoire et culture dans l'Égypte byzantine* (Paris, 2008) (Études d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne) 275-282. Pour trois monastères pachômiens dont le premier directeur était Petronios, voir S. H. NAM, « Traces Historiques des Onze Monastères fondés par Pachôme, Père du Coenobium, un essai de synthèse des sources variées », *Korea Journal of Christian Studies* 51 (2007) 177-202, v. 187-195.

(25) Tout d'abord, le terme fut utilisé pour désigner les archevêques d'Alexandrie. Athanase d'Alexandrie appelle son prédécesseur Alexandre (313-328) comme « notre père Alexandre » (Athanase, *Lettrres festales...*, 72, 20). Apa Moïse utilise une appellation basée sur le terme « notre père » pour désigner Athanase l'archevêque dans une lettre envoyée à ses moniales : « notre saint père apa Athanase » (Ibid., p. 87, 5). Dans le milieu anachorétique, cet usage était très limité. Nous ne trouvons ni chez Cassien ni chez Pallade le titre de « notre père » ou « notre père » avec nom propre. C'est dans les *Apophtegmes* que nous voyons très rarement le titre avec nom propre : « Lui, notre père Macaire... » (L. REGNAULT, *Les sentences des pères du désert, troisième recueil et table* (Solesmes, 1975) 159, Am 139,13).

Le terme de « notre père » qui n'était utilisé originellement, avec ou sans nom propre, que pour désigner le supérieur général dans la communauté pachômienne, est pronominalisé, après la mort du fondateur, grâce à l'idée d'Horsisè, en particulier son *Liber*. Pour Horsisè, « notre père » n'était pas un terme pour appeler le supérieur général de la Congrégation. L'expression « notre père » sans nom propre, pour lui, est un personnage dont l'autorité spirituelle fournit la raison d'être du cénobitisme. Ce terme est employé par Horsisè pour désigner exclusivement le fondateur du cénobitisme, Pachôme. Quand Horsisè reçoit la formule d'« Apa, le père de la Koinonia », il voit dans cette formule de transmission un sens commentaire du terme de « notre père » : « notre père » signifie, pour lui, 'le père' de la Congrégation, c'est-à-dire le pionnier du cénobitisme.

En effet, la divergence « Apa » / « notre père » de l'appellation de Pachôme, que conservent les œuvres de successeurs nous fournit un point de vue critique pour les *Vies* de Pachôme. Les *Vies* coptes qui prolongent leurs récits jusqu'aux premiers successeurs sont attribuées à l'école théodorienne, puisqu'après la mort de Pachôme, le héros est Théodore, mais non pas Horsisè. Il est donc curieux de trouver que l'usage horsien du terme « notre père » éclipse, dans les *Vies* de Pachôme, l'emploi théodorien de l'appellation d'« Apa » sans nom de Pachôme. Théodore n'applique pas « Apa » à Pachôme dans les *Appendices coptes*,²⁶ *Appendices* correspondant à la partie qui prolonge, après la mort de celui-ci, le récit jusqu'aux ses premiers successeurs. Il en va de même avec l'*Appendice* grecque. Selon G¹ 125, 131, 142, Théodore se sert de l'appellation de « notre père » pour désigner le fondateur

D'autre part, il est intéressant d'observer le fait que l'auteur ou le rédacteur de G¹ se sert du terme ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν pour désigner Antoine et Athanase. Psarphios, vice-supérieur général, appelle l'archevêque Athanase ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν (G¹ 138). Antoine est appelé ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν Αντώνιος (G¹ 2), ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν ὁ μακάριος Αντώνιος (G¹ 120) — dans le ms *Atheniensis*, ὁ μακάριος πατήρ ἡμῶν Αντώνιος. L'application du terme « notre père » à Athanase dans G¹ ainsi que dans son équivalent Bo 185 n'est pas étonnante, parce que le terme était une marque d'un meilleur respect pour évêque. En revanche, le cas d'Antoine est totalement différent. Les sources sahidiques n'attribuent pas une seule fois, l'appellation de « notre père » à Antoine. Il n'y a que deux formes pour Antoine dans la cinquième *Vie* sahidique = S⁵ : « le bienheureux apa Antoine » (S⁵ 122) et « apa Antoine » (S⁵ 123).

(26) Bo 194 ; S⁶ 322, 13 ; 323, 1 ; 326, 24 ; 330, 20 ; 330, 30. Dans ces endroits, Pachôme s'appelle comme « notre père » ou « feu notre père ».

du cénobitisme : « Je ne sais rien, pour autant que j'ai offensé Dieu et notre père... » (G¹ 125) ; «...afin que l'Ennemi ne dissipe pas tout le travail de notre père..., du temps de notre père » (G¹ 131) ; «...nous avons entendue de la bouche de notre père » (G¹ 142). En revanche, on ne peut pas y trouver l'appellation d'« Apa », typique aux catéchèses de Théodore. Outre le terme d'« Apa » sans nom propre,²⁷ il n'y a pas, dans toute la *Vie* grecque, de transformations d'appellation variées, figurées dans les *Catéchèses* de Théodore, basées sur la racine d'appellation d'« Apa », lesquelles ont déjà été remarquées.²⁸ Par contre, dans tous les *Appendices*, Pachôme est appelé toujours comme « notre père » dans les discours d'Horsière.²⁹ Un repère qui nous permet de mesurer l'authenticité de cette régularisation de l'appellation de Pachôme auprès des premiers supérieurs généraux, que conservent les *Appendices*, doit être trouvé hors des *Vies*, c'est-à-dire dans les œuvres de Théodore et Horsière. La divergence « Apa » / « notre père » de l'appellation qui se manifeste dans leurs œuvres est régularisée dans les *Appendices* à travers la convergence de leurs appellations de « notre père ». Pour quelle raison les auteurs des *Appendices* essayent-ils d'unifier le titre de Pachôme ?

Outre la convergence à travers la bouche d'Horsière et Théodore dans les *Appendices*, ce qui ne doit pas échapper à notre observation, c'est que l'appellation régularisée de Pachôme par le titre de « notre père », qui ne remonte qu'aux auteurs, devient un phénomène caractéristique qui couvre presque toutes les *Vies* coptes, tandis que le titre d'« Apa » sans nom propre pour appeler Pachôme apparaît beaucoup plus limité.³⁰ Il faut donc se demander pourquoi les auteurs des *Vies*

(27) L'auteur de G¹ applique souvent l'expression « abbas » à Pachôme (G¹ 61 ; 93 ; 99 ; 102 ; 110 ; 114).

(28) La première *Vie* grecque s'appuie sur les diverses formes pour désigner Pachôme. Outre *ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν* ou *ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν Παχούμιος*, elle utilise *ὁ θεῖος Παχούμιος* (G¹ 39), *ὁ μέγας Παχούμιος* (G¹ 41), *ὁ μέγας* (G¹ 42), *ὁ γέρον* (G¹ 42, 51), *ὁ πατήρ* (G¹ 50), et *ὁ ἀββᾶς Παχούμιος* (G¹ 61).

(29) *Bo* 209 et G¹ 126.

(30) Le terme « Apa » n'apparaît que dans les *Cat.* de Théodore, *Carour*, S^{1a}, la quinzième *Vie* sahidique. Cf. Pour un seul cas d'Horsière : « Et fêtons... que notre père a dites, lui qui est Apa » (*Lettre* d'Horsière, ORLANDI, DE VOGÜÉ, *Nuovi Testi Copti Pacomiani...*, 246, 34–35). Il est intéressant de constater que la quinzième *Vie* sahidique provenant de l'école horsienne utilise ce terme. Cependant, il ne faut pas trop exagérer cet aspect, parce qu'elle applique déjà à l'image d'Horsière la préférence copte pour le merveilleux.

coptes prennent l'emploi horsien à la place de l'usage de Théodore. Pour répondre à ces deux questions, nous devons tourner notre attention vers des usages anachorétiques. Concernant le terme de « notre père » dans la littérature d'origine anachorétique, nous cherchons en vain des cas où le titre « notre père » sans nom propre s'applique à un père spirituel, de façon constante même après sa mort. Par contre, il semble que le terme d'« apa » soit d'origine anachorétique : ce terme est utilisé dans la plupart des cas avec nom propre. C'est par cette observation que notre argumentation obtient un fondement plus renforcé.

* * *

Si le terme technique de « notre père » est choisi par les auteurs des *Vies* coptes, c'est parce qu'ils veulent distinguer le fondateur du cénobitisme d'autres anciens pères anachorétiques. Si l'anachorétisme emprunte, d'un usage sémitique, le terme d'« apa » pour représenter l'autorité spirituelle de ses pères anciens, le cénobitisme pachômien emploie, quelques temps après son début, un nouveau terme pour désigner leur fondateur d'une façon indépendante de la tradition anachorétique. Les auteurs de *Vies* visent dans l'expression de « notre père » une différenciation du cénobitisme et de l'anachorétisme. Ils suivent l'intention horsienne qui veut représenter Pachôme comme symbole du cénobitisme par le titre de « notre père ». Le terme technique de « notre père » joue le rôle d'un instrument de différenciation, qui sépare « les fils de Pachôme » des anachorètes. Par une notion de collectivité qui s'exprime dans la perspective de la première personne de 'le père de nous', le monde extérieur anachorétique est objectivé en présence du cénobitisme thébain. La persistance de l'appellation de « notre père » par les auteurs des *Vies* s'explique bien par cette compréhension. Tous les efforts des frères pachômiens, qui ne cessèrent pas de se distinguer des anachorètes sont condensés dans ce titre de « notre père ». C'est pour cette raison que les *Vies* coptes abandonnent le titre d'« Apa » sans nom propre, usage théodorien, en choisissant celui de « notre père », malgré leur tendance théodorienne de biographie d'ensemble. Le titre de « notre père » est une expression d'une subjectivité du cénobitisme pachômien par rapport à l'anachorétisme et d'autres locales traditions monastiques. En conclusion, cette argumentation s'établit par le discernement de la tradition littéraire post-horsienne, conservée dans les *Vies*, en prenant comme point de départ les œuvres des successeurs de Pachôme.

SUMMARY

The expression of “our father” which is used to indicate the founder of the cenobitism in the Pachomian literature represents a notion of cenobite collectivity of the pachomian monks in comparison to the outside world. In order to describe the complicated historical process of the formation of this technical term, we must first of all distinguish the locutions of two successors of Pachomius ; one is the term of Horsiesius “our father,” the other that of Theodore “apa”. In this hermeneutic effort, an analysis of the works of Horsiesius and Theodorus is prior, whereas the Lives are complementary.

Dragoş A. Giulea
Milwaukee, WI

THE HEAVENLY FIRE WORKING THE EARTH OF THE HEART: ORIGEN, ANTONY, PSEUDO-MACARIUS, AND THE INTERNALIZATION OF THE IMAGE OF DIVINE FIRE

One of the texts belonging to both the Ps.-Macarian collections B and H commences with the following fragment:

That celestial fire (τὸ πῦρ τὸ οὐράνιον) of the Godhead (τῆς θεότητος), which Christians receive now in this life within themselves (ἐντὸς αὐτῶν) in the heart (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ), and serves (διακονοῦν) internally in their hearts (ἐντὸς τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν), will manifest itself externally after the dissolution of the body, will join again the bodily members and engender resurrection to the dismembered parts (ποιεῖ ἀνάστασιν τῶν λελυμένων μελῶν). For just as the fire which served at the altar in Jerusalem (τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις πῦρ τὸ διακονοῦν ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ) at the time of the captivity was buried in a hole, and that same fire, when peace came and the captives returned, was renewed to its original condition and served according to the old practice (ἀνεκαινίσθη καὶ συνήθως διηκόνει), likewise the heavenly fire refashions and renews (ἐργάζεται τὸ οὐράνιον πῦρ καὶ ἀνακαινίζει) this immediate body – which after its decomposition turns to mire – and raises up the corrupted bodies. For that internal fire which inhabits our hearts (τὸ ἐσώτερον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἐνοικοῦν πῦρ) emerges then externally and engenders resurrection of the bodies (ποιεῖ ἀνάστασιν τῶν σωμάτων).¹

(1) B 53.1–2.1–12 and H 11.1.1–13. The differences between the two texts are minor and not significant for the present argument. For the Greek text I will make use of the *Sermones 64 (collectio B)* edited by H. BERTHOLD, *Makarios/Symeon Reden und Briefe*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1973); *Homiliae spirituales 50 (collectio H)* edited by H. DÖRRIES, E. KLOSTERMANN, and M. KRÜGER, *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964) (CPG 2411, PTS, 4); and *Sermones 1–22, 24–27 (collection C)* edited by H. BERTHOLD, and E. KLOSTERMANN, *Neue Homilien des Makarios/Symeon* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1961) (Texte und Untersuchungen, 72). English translations are mine. For a comprehensive English translation of the H collection, see G. A. MALONEY'S

The author seems to be an inspired knower of the eschatological “mechanisms” which, at the end of time, will bring together the scattered parts of our decomposed bodies. The key active principle of the whole scenario, which echoes Ezekiel 37.1–10, will be “the heavenly fire,” an agent which has the ability to recreate the decomposed body into a new human being. Usually a symbol of destruction, the fire becomes for Ps.-Macarius the way of expressing the cathartic and creating operations of the Holy Spirit.

The fragment displays three parallel images, which may be arranged in two columns of three items each. While the first column points to some elements of the sacred service held at the reconstructed Second Temple, the second denotes the elements of a liturgy that takes place within the human being and rebuilds it:

(a) the altar (τὸ θυσιαστήριον)	(a) the human heart (ἡ καρδιά)
(b) the fire ministering on the altar in Jerusalem (τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις πῦρ τὸ διακονοῦν ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ)	(b) the heavenly fire ministering in the human heart (τὸ πῦρ τὸ οὐράνιον ... τὸ ἐντὸς τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν διακονοῦν)
(c) the post-exilic reconstruction of the altar	(c) the eschatological reconstruction of the human being.

Employing the rhetorical device of an internalized analogy, the text portrays human beings as temples and their hearts as altars able to receive the heavenly fire of the Godhead. The liturgical language entails the specific note that the space where the liturgy takes place is internalized within the human soul. Another liturgical element that should also be taken into account is the repetition of the verb διακονέω (“to serve,” “to minister”). In all instances of this fragment, the verb is associated with the function of the fire which, as a minister to the altar, performs a priestly role.²

Pseudo-Macarius: The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter (New York: Paulist Press, 1992).

(2) Compare also with B 4.15.7 and H 50.3, where Ps.-Macarius affirms that the Spirit operated (ἐνήργει) and ministered (διηκόνει) within the souls of the prophets; cf. *Epistola Magna* 7.10–11. The idea of an internal worship of God in Macarius appears in Dörries’s first book (see note 3), *Symeon*, 310: “Alles, was Gott gefällt, und der rechte Dienst Gottes ist innerlich in den Gedanken.” For more information on the internalized liturgy in Ps.-Macarius, see A. GOLITZIN, *A Testimony to Christianity as Transfiguration: The Macarian Homilies and Orthodox Spirituality*, in: S. T. KIMBROUGH (ed.), *Orthodox and Wesleyan Spirituality*

But the present study will search the evolution of the image of heavenly fire from its early biblical representations to the way (Ps?-) Antony and Ps.-Macarius internalized this image. To that end, the next three sub-chapters will investigate the biblical image of the divine fire (which is predominantly external), the Jeremian tradition of the internal fire produced by the words of Scripture, and a few Christian contexts of the internalized image of the divine fire, such as Paul, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. Origen's view is the most elaborate, and to a certain extent prefigures the future Macarian elaboration. Likewise, for Origen and Ps.-Macarius, the internal fire seems to be the Holy Spirit which works as a divine tool guided by Christ, the Logos. The last three sub-chapters will focus on Ps.-Macarius's vision while also

tuality, (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002) 129–156 and M. PLESTED, *The Macarian Legacy: The Place of Macarius-Symeon in the Eastern Christian Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004) 109–111. The internalized liturgical language has been a common presence in Jewish and Christian theology, since it is a biblical theme as one can see in Ps 51:17, or Rom 12:1. See also C. R. A. MORRAY-JONES, *The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and Its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Jewish and Christian Sources*, *SBLSP* 37 (1998) 400–431. Being present in Greek theology as well, the internalization of liturgical language seems to be a Syrian particularity; see, e.g., S. BROCK, *Spirituality in the Syriac Tradition* (Kerala, India: St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute, 1989); S. BEGGIANI, *Introduction to Eastern Christian Spirituality: The Syriac Tradition* (London: Associated University Presses, 1991); S. BROCK, *The Luminous Eye: The Spiritual World Vision of Saint Ephrem* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1992); IDEM, *Studies in Syriac Christianity: History, Literature and Theology* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1992). However, the image of the internalized fire is rare in Syrian texts, most likely because the Syrians used the image of fire primarily in Christological and sacramental contexts without the internalized facet. While the fire denotes as well the Holy Spirit, there is no much emphasis on internalization; e.g., Ephrem the Syrian, *H. de Fide* 40.10, in S. BROCK, *Fire from Heaven: From Abel's Sacrifice to the Eucharist. A Theme in Syriac Christianity*, *SP* 25 (1993) 234: "The fire is the symbol of the Spirit, it is a type of the Holy Spirit...". Fire is present everywhere Christ is present—in the womb of the Virgin, in the Jordan, or in the Eucharist; e.g., Ephrem, *H. de Fide* 10.17: "See, the Fire and Spirit are in the womb of her who bore you, see Fire and Spirit are in the river in which you were baptized. Fire and Spirit are in our baptismal fount, in the bread and Cup are Fire and Holy Spirit" (in BROCK, *Fire from Heaven...*, 238). Cf. *H. de Fide* 10.8: "In your Bread there is hidden the Spirit who is not consumed, in your wine there dwells the Fire that is not drunk: the Spirit is in your Bread, the Fire in your Wine, a manifest wonder, that our lips have received." See also J. B. GLENTHOJ, *Cain and Abel in Syriac and Greek Writers: 4th–6th Centuries* (Louvain: Peeters, 1997).

mentioning (Ps?-)Antony.³ In general terms, the study traces the gen-

(3) For previous scholarship devoted to the the Macarian spiritual doctrines, see for example H. DÖRRIES, *Symeon von Mesopotamien: Die Überlieferung der messalianischen "Makarios" Schriften* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1941); W. W. JAEGER, *Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1954); A. BAKER, Ps.-Macarius and Gregory of Nyssa, *VC* 20 (1966) 227–234; P. MIQUEL, Les caractères de l'expérience spirituelle selon le Pseudo-Macaire, *Irénikon* 39:4 (1966) 497–513. R. STAATS, *Gregor von Nyssa und die Messalianer: Die Frage der Priorität zweier altkirchlicher Schriften* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1968); E. A. DAVIDS, *Das Bild vom "Neuen Menschen." Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Corpus Macarianum* (Salzburg—München: Pustet, 1968); A. BAKER, Syriac and the Scriptural Quotations of Ps.-Macarius, *JTS* 20 (1969) 133–149; M. J. LE GUILLOU, Remarques sur la notion macarienne de "subtilité," *Istina* 19 (1974) 339–342; R. GOULET, La théologie de Makarios Magnès, *Mélanges de science religieuse* 34 (1977) 45–69 and 145–150; H. DÖRRIES, *Die Theologie des Makarios/Symeon* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978); Makarios-Symeon, *Epistola magna: Eine messalianische Mönchsregel und ihre Umschrift in Gregors von Nyssa „De instituto christiano.“* Ed. R. STAATS (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984); S. TUGWELL, Evagrius and Macarius, in: C. JONES, G. WAINWRIGHT, E. YARNOLD, SJ (eds.), *Study of Spirituality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986) 168–175; C. STEWART, *Working the Earth of the Heart: The Messalian Controversy in History, Texts, and Language to AD 431* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); O. HESSE, Vom Paradies der Kirche und vom Paradies im Herzen: Zur Deutung der Paradiesesgeschichte bei Makarios/Symeon und Markos Eremiten, in: K. FITSCHEN, R. STAATS (eds.), *Grundbegriffe christlicher Ästhetik : Beiträge des V. Makarios-Symposium Preetz 1995*, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997) 23–26; R. STAATS, Die Metamorphose des Christen: Die Wandlungslehre des Makarios-Symeon im Zusammenhang seiner Anthropologie, Christologie und Eucharistielehre, in: FITSCHEN, STAATS, *Grundbegriffe...*, 16–22; U. SCHULZE, Die "geistigen Sinne" der Seele: Eine kurze Skizze zur Anthropologie des Makarios/Symeon, in: FITSCHEN, STAATS, *Grundbegriffe...*, 12–15; T. VIVIAN, The Good God, the Holy Power, and the Paraclete: "To the Sons of God" (Ad filios Dei) by Saint Macarius the Great, *Anglican Theological Review* 30 (1998) 338–365; K. FITSCHEN (Intro., tr., notes), *Pseudo-Makarios: Reden und Briefe* (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 2000); M. PLESTED, The Christology of Macarius-Symeon, *SP* 37 (2001) 593–596; E. M. ATKINS, "And Immediately He Received His Sight": St Macarius and the Miracle of the Hyena, *SP* 35 (2001) 3–9; S. BURNS, Cappadocian Enkratism and the Macarian Community, *SP* 37 (2001) 27–32; A. GOLITZIN, A. ORLOV, "Many Lamps are Lightened from the One": Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in Macarian Homilies, *VC* 55 (2001) 281–298; A. GOLITZIN, Recovering the "Glory of Adam": "Divine Light" Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia, in: J. R. DAVILA (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2003)

eral lines of the tradition of internal divine fire from its biblical roots to the monastic Pneumatology of the fourth century.

God's Fire Manifested in the Visible Universe

The image of the external fire of God represents a common image in Scripture. It may be linked with ritual sacrifices,⁴ divine punishments,⁵ or theophanies.⁶ It is, therefore, a common symbol for the divine presence or manifestation in the visible universe.⁷ Nonetheless, the image of the divine fire remains external to the human soul.

It is also worth noting the speculations on the divine fire produced by the early Christian Hellenistic theologians. As W. C. van Unnik argues in one of his articles, Christian theologians took over and employed the Stoic image of "wise fire."⁸ The nature of this fire is divine

(STDJ, 46) 275–308; A. V. MURAVIEV, *Macarian or Evagrian: The Problem of Origenist Legacy in Eastern Syriac Mystical Literature, Origeniana octava II* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003) 1185–1191; M. GHATTAS, *Die Seelenlehre des Origenes in den sogenannten 50 geistlichen Homilien des "Makarius des Agypters," Origeniana octava II...*, 1003–1008; M. PLESTED, *The Macarian Legacy...*

(4) E.g., Lev 9:23–24, 1 Kgs 18:38, 1 Chr 21:26 or Judg 6:21; 2 Chr 7:1; 2 Chr 7:3.

(5) Generally, fire is a symbol of purification for a new future creation, as one can see for example in M. Girard, *Les Symboles dans la Bible* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1991), 111–232. The image of the divine fire as punishment occurs, e.g., in Gen 19:24; Exod 9:23–24; Lev 10:2; Num 11:1; 16:35; 21:28; 26:10; Deut 32:22; Judg 9:20; 2 Kgs 1:10; 1:12; 1:14; Job 1:16; Ps 11:6; Ps 21:9. See also Matt 3:12; 25:41; Luke 9:54 or Jude 1:7 for the New Testament.

(6) The fire (ⲡⲨ) of theophanies occurs for example in Exod 3:2; 13:21–22 (pillar of fire); 14:24; 19:18; 24:17 (the glory of Yahweh as a consuming fire); 40:38; Num 9:15–16; 14:14; Deut 1:33; 4:11; 4:12 ("Then the LORD spoke to you out of the fire"); 4:15; 4:24; 4:33; 4:36; 5:4; 5:22; 5:23–26; 9:3; 9:10; 9:15; 10:4; 2 Sam 22:9 ("Smoke went up from his nostrils, and devouring fire from his mouth"); 22:13; 2 Kgs 2:11; 6:17; Neh 9:12; Job 41:19; Ps 18:8; 18:12; 18:13; 29:7; Isa 30:27. The image also appears in the New Testament: 1 Cor 3:13; 2 Thess 1:7; Heb 1:7; Heb 12:29 ("our God is a consuming fire"); Rev 1:14; 2:18; see especially the baptism with the Spirit and fire (Matt 3:11; Luke 3:16) and the fire as the Spirit that comes down at Pentecost (Acts 2:3). Unless otherwise noted, all biblical citations are from the NRSV.

(7) For a more detailed classification, see for instance J. GAILLARD's article "Feu," in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1964) 247–273.

(8) W. C. VAN UNNIK, *The "Wise Fire" in a Gnostic Eschatological Vision, Kyriakon. Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, v. 1 (Munster Westfalen: Verlag Aschendorff, 1970) 277–288.

and it has the capacity to distinguish between good and evil as well as to purify corruption.⁹ However, the speculations on the “wise fire” do not appear to portray this fire as operating within the human soul.

The Internal Fire Produced by the Words of Scripture

The first mention of the image of the internalized divine fire most likely appears in a verse ascribed to the prophet Jeremiah:

If I say, ‘I will not mention him, or speak any more in his name’ (שם), then within me (lit. “within my heart:” לביב) there is something like a burning fire (אש) shut up in my bones; I am weary with holding it in, and I cannot.¹⁰

The prophetic oracle testifies therefore that theological circles linked to Jeremiah, or at least the Jeremian tradition, envisaged the idea that the Name (שם) of God, which means God’s presence or manifestation, causes a fire in the human heart (לב).¹¹ Likewise, it was alleged that the divine words (דבריים) of God were similar to fire (אש).¹² The latter idea finds a very interesting echo in Luke 24:32, a passage where Christ explains the Scriptures to two of his disciples on the road to Emmaus: “They said to each other, ‘Were not our hearts burning within us while

(9) As van Unnik shows, the expression φρόνιμον πῦρ does not appear in the Stoic texts as Augustine supposed (*De civitate Dei* 8.5: *Stoici ignem...sapientem*); the expression used by Chrysippus, for instance, was πῦρ νοερόν (cf. Arnim. *SVF* II p.146, 18; p.223, 2.9). φρόνιμον πῦρ will appear in Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* III 8.44.2; *Str.* VII 6.34.4; *Ecl. Proph.* 25,4; and *Protr.* IV 53.2). Compare: Tertullian, *Scorpiace* 3 (*sapiens ignis*), Origen, *Peri Euch.* 25.15, *Hom. in Ezech.* I.3 (*ignis sapiens*), Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 35.3 (*sapiens ignis*), and Jerome, *In Dan.* 3 (*sapiens ignis*).

(10) Jer 20:9.

(11) See, for instance, T. N. D. METTINGER, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Uppsala, Sweden: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1982); J. E. FOSSUM, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985); S. R. A. STARBUCK, *Shem YHWH: The Presence, Power, and Hypostatic Warrior of Yhwh: An Investigation of the Idiom in the Old Testament and Israelite Religion within the Ancient Near Eastern Context* (M. Div. Thesis: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1988).

(12) E.g., Jer 5:14: “Therefore thus says the Lord, the God of hosts: Because they have spoken this word (דבר), I am now making my words (דבריים) in your mouth a fire (אש), and this people wood, and the fire shall devour them.” Cf. Jer 23:29: “Is not my word (דבר) like fire (אש), says the Lord, and like a hammer that breaks a rock in pieces?”

he was talking to us on the road, while he was opening the scriptures to us?" Furthermore, ancient Christian theologians made clear connections between these passages—namely Jer 5:14, Jer 20:9, and Luke 24:32—as one can see in Origen, who associates them in his *Commentary on John*, and places them under the idea that the fire of Scripture can be internalized in the soul:

But let us, by means of the boiling spirit (τῷ ζέοντι πνεύματι) and the fiery words (διαπύροις λόγοις) given by God, such as Jeremiah received from the one who said to him, "Behold I have placed my words (τοὺς λόγους μου) in your mouth as fire (πῦρ)," (Jer 5:14) roast the meat of the lamb so that those who partake of it say, as Christ speaks in us, "Our heart was burning (καιομένη) in the way as he opened the Scriptures to us" (Luke 24:32). But we will have to roast the meat of the lamb in order to seek such a goal. We must compare the confession of what Jeremiah had suffered for the words of God when he said, "And it was as a fire burning (ὡς πῦρ καιόμενον), blazing in my bones (φλέγον ἐν τοῖς ὀστέοις μου), and I am weak from every side and am not able to bear it" (Jer 20:9).¹³

Rabbinic exegesis also preserved and developed the tradition of the burning effect of the divine words, as one of the sayings about rabbi Ben Azzai confirms:

Once, as Ben Azzai sat expounding Scripture, fire was flashing around him. They went and told R. Akiva, "Master, Ben Azzai sits and expounds, while fire flashes around him." R. Akiva went to Ben Azzai and said, "I hear that while you have been expounding, fire was flashing around you." Ben Azzai: "Yes." R. Akiva: "Were you perhaps discussing the innermost secrets of the divine chariot?" Ben Azzai: "No. But I was sitting and stringing words of Torah with one another, and words of Torah with words of the Prophets, and words of the Prophets with words of the Writings, and the words were as full of joy as when they were given at Sinai, as sweet as at the time of their first utterance, and were they not at their first utterance uttered in fire?"¹⁴

(13) Origen, *Commentary on John* X.105 (C. BLANC (ed.), *Origene: Commentaire sur Saint Jean* (Paris: Cerf, 1970) (SC, 157) 444–446). For the English text I will follow R. E. HEINE's translation, *Commentary on the Gospel according to John. Books 1–10* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989) 277–278.

(14) H. N. BIALIK, Y. H. RAVNITZKY, *The Book of Legends [Sefer Ha-Aggadah]: Legends from Talmud and Midrash* (New York: Schocken Books, 1992) 412 (95).

A different saying portrays the Torah verbatim as fire conveyed in the process of education from a certain rabbi to his disciple. The saying begins with an exhortatory sentence—“Warm yourself...”—while the tools of this warming, the words of Torah, are depicted as “coals of fire.”¹⁵ In a different saying it is expressly asserted that the “Torah is all fire.”¹⁶

As a matter of consequence, these texts constitute witnesses for an old biblical tradition about an interior fire caused by the divine words of Scripture, a Jeremian tradition preserved both in Christian and rabbinic milieus.

The Internalized Image of the Divine Fire in Clement, Origen, and (Ps?-)Antony

In general terms, the idea of internalization emerges in Christian documents most likely in the Pauline discourse where the apostle conceives of the human being as a temple of God or of the Holy Spirit.¹⁷ The thought is worth noting since early Christianity used to identify the Holy Spirit with the ancient Jewish concept of the glory (*kabod* or, later, *shekinah*) of God. Generally, biblical and extra-biblical language represented the *kabod* as a divine fire or light inhabiting either the Temple in Jerusalem, or the heavenly Temple.¹⁸ Several images of the internal fire also occur in the second century AD, but they do not talk about an internalized heavenly or divine fire. To the contrary, they referred to certain positive or negative human passions such as love or anger.¹⁹

(15) BIALIK, RAVNITZKY, *The Book...*, 428 (260).

(16) *Ibid.*, 429 (271).

(17) See e.g. 1 Cor 3:16 (οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν;), 1 Cor 6:19 (οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός ἐστιν, οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ), or 2 Cor 6:16 (ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἔσμεν ζῶντος). Cf. for example, Ps.-Macarius, C 22.3.4.

(18) See n. 11.

(19) E.g., *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans* 7 (LCL 24:279): “My passion has been crucified and there is no burning love within me for material things (πῦρ φιλόῦλον); instead there is living water, which is speaking in me, saying to me from within: Come to the Father!” Cf. Justin Martyr’s *Discourse to the Greeks* 5: “... the power to perform such deeds [of virtue] is transmitted to the soul through the Word ... O weapon that drives away dangerous passions! O precept that extinguishes the natural fire of the soul!” (See *Writings of Saint Justin Martyr*, tr. T. B. FALLS (New York: Christian Heritage, 1948) 436). See also *The Clementine Homilies* 10.3 (ANF 8:285): “If, therefore, ye have not righteous fire, I mean indignation, against evil lusts...” Cf. *The First Epistle of Pope Urban*

But the first image of the internalized heavenly fire appears in Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata* as the fire of the divine wisdom, which sanctifies the soul alone and not the flesh: "But we say that the fire sanctifies not flesh, but sinful souls; meaning not the all-devouring vulgar fire but that of wisdom, which pervades the soul passing through the fire."²⁰ However, unlike Clement, such authors as Origen, Antony, and Ps.-Macarius will conceive of the divine fire ingressing and purifying both soul and flesh.

Origen's passages expounding his doctrine of baptism articulate a theory about the interior divine fire which comes closest to the Macarian reflection. According to the Origenian perspective, baptism occurs in a variety of forms: with water, with the Holy Spirit and fire, and with blood.²¹ While the first two are mentioned in the Matthean text in the words of John the Baptist (Matt 3:11), the third category points, of course, to martyrdom.²² The remarkable aspect of Origen's position consists in the fact that all three forms of baptism represent three different manifestations of the divine Logos.²³ The whole interpretation of the Alexandrian theologian is, therefore, Christological. At the linguistic level, Origen ascribes to the Logos a variety of metaphorical names, such as "blood," "water," "fire," "living bread," "way," "door," "spiritual word," and many others. At the same time, from an ontological perspective, these names denote the various ways in which the Logos interrelates and manifests itself towards human beings.²⁴

In this Christological context, Origen advances the idea that the Logos granted to his prophets the gift of baptizing with water, and reserved for itself the baptism with Holy Spirit and fire, which indi-

I7 (ANF 8:621): "We receive of the Holy Spirit in order that, fired with the love of life and the ardour of glory, we may be able to raise our mind from things earthly to things heavenly and divine."

(20) See Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* VII 6 (ANF 2:535).

(21) Origen, *Commentary on John* VI.223–224 (BLANC, 298–300).

(22) The idea of the baptism of blood, according to Origen (*Commentary on John* VI 224) originates in Luke 12:50, where Christ speaks about his passion as a baptism.

(23) Origen, *Commentary on John* VI.223 (BLANC, 298): "[T]he same one [the Word of God (ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος)] is a baptism of water, and of spirit, and of fire, and for some, even of blood" (HEINE, 229).

(24) *Ibid.*, VI.222–225.

cates a higher and divine cathartic operation.²⁵ It is emblematic that, in Origen's view, the Spirit seems to be an economic instrument of the Logos, a tool able to permeate the body and soul and purify them of earthly and sinful things. In addition, the cathartic operation of the Fire-Spirit can expand from, and through, the purified person to those who receive instruction from the purified:

For his baptism is not corporeal (οὐ σωματικόν), since the Holy Spirit fills (πληροῦντος ἁγίου πνεύματος) the one who repents, and a more divine fire (θειοτέρου πυρός) removes everything material (πάν ὑλικόν ἀφανίζοντος), and utterly destroys everything earthly (πάν γεώδες ἐξανάλισκοντος), not only from the one who contains it (τοῦ χωρήσαντος) but also from the one who hears those who possess it.²⁶

Origen expresses the cathartic operations of the divine fire in the human soul through the image of a wise divine fire able to purify the thorns of the soul without setting on fire the threshing floors of the fields or grain:

That fire which discovers thorns, and which, because of its own divinity (διὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θεϊότητα), will stop them and not in addition set the threshing floors or fields of grain on fire, will need to be sent to such a [thorn-producing] soul (ἐπι τὴν τοιαύτην ψυχὴν).²⁷

The same biblical context, receiving a similar spiritual-ascetical interpretation and also encompassing the doctrine of the internalized divine fire, can be found in a document of Origenian persuasion known under the title *The Letters of St. Antony*:

Be prepared, yourselves, while we still have some who pray for us, that the fire, which Jesus came to send on the earth, may be kindled also into your hearts, so that you may strain your hearts and your faculties to discriminate between good and evil, right and left, the eternal and the passing.²⁸

(25) Origen, *Commentary on John* VI.125 (BLANC, 226; HEINE, 204): "He reserves for himself the act of baptizing with the Holy Spirit and with fire."

(26) *Ibid.*, VI.162 (BLANC, 252; HEINE, 214–5).

(27) *Ibid.*, VI.298 (BLANC 356; HEINE, 249). See the whole context of discussion in VI 297–300.

(28) Letter III.43–44, S. RUBENSON (ed. and tr.), *The Letters of St. Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995) 208. For the Origenian influence on the letters, see RUBENSON, *The Letters...*, 60–80.

Moreover, another passage of the same document seems to convey the same idea that this fire which Christ sends in the human heart is identical with the Holy Spirit: "...God will have mercy because of his labour, and grant him the invisible fire, which burns up all impurity from him and purifies his mind. Then the Holy Spirit will dwell in us..."²⁹

**Pseudo-Macarius, (Ps?-)Antony,
and the Internalization of the Divine Fire
that Descended on Elijah's Altar**

In the same Macarian collection H, one encounters a different passage that describes the image of a biblical altar. Yet this time it is not the altar of Jerusalem, but that from the narrative about the contest between Elijah and the priests of Baal (1 Kgs 18). 1 Kgs 18:38 offers the following report of the descent of the divine fire: "Then the fire of the Lord [שֵׁן הוֹרִי] fell and consumed the burnt-offering, the wood, the stones, and the dust, and even licked up the water that was in the trench." Once again, one may see in the following Macarian fragment that the author construes an internalized discourse as his interpretation of the biblical account. However, probably the most remarkable point is that the same biblical passage and the same internalized interpretation appears in the *Letters of St. Antony*:

The Letters of St. Antony VI.73–7

"Lift up your body (*corpus*) in which you are clothed and make it an altar (*altare*) and lay upon it all your thoughts (*cogitationes*) and leave all evil counsels (*consilia*) before God, and lift up the hands of your heart to him, that is to the Creator of the mind (*intellectus*), and pray to God that he gives you the great invisible fire (*invisibilis ignus magnus*), that it may descend from above and consume the altar and all upon it, as well as all the priests of Baal, who are the hostile works of the enemy (*inimici adversa opera*), that they may fear and flee before

Ps.-Macarius H 31.5.55–63

"Let us, therefore, take this body (*σῶμα*) and make it an altar of sacrifice, and let us place on it every thought (*ἐνθύμησιν*) of ours and pray to the Lord to send down from Heaven the invisible and mighty fire (*τὸ ἀόρατον καὶ μέγα πῦρ*) to consume the altar and everything on it. And may all the priests of Baal fall, which are the opposing powers (*ἐνέργειαι*). And then we shall see the spiritual rain (*πνευματικός ὑετός*), like a man's footprint (*ἶχνος ἀνθρώπου*) (1 Kgs 18.44) coming into the soul, so that it may become in us the promise of

(29) Letter V.33–35 (RUBENSON, *The Letters...*, 214).

you as before the prophet Elijah. Then you will see as it were the track of a man (*vestigium hominis*) over the sea, who will bring you the spiritual rain (*spirituale imbrem*), which is the comfort of the Spirit of comfort."³⁰

God, as it is said in the Prophet: "I will raise up and build again the tabernacle of David which has fallen and I will build again the ruins of it" (Amos 9.11), so that the Lord, with his very own kindness, may shine (ἐπιλάμψη) upon the soul that dwells in night and ignorance...."³¹

The two documents disclose therefore not only the same mystical-ascetic exegesis of 1 Kgs. 18, but display almost identical elements: the human body is the altar on which human thoughts or desires should be sacrificed, and the mystic as a priest of his internal liturgy should pray to God to send him the invisible fire which destroys the priests of Baal, i.e., the invisible enemies.³² It is also thought that the destruction of the works of the invisible enemies should be followed by the appearance of a spiritual rain and a footprint of a man. The latter element refers to the verse 1 Kgs 18:44 of the same story: "At the seventh time he said, 'Look, a little cloud [ענב] no bigger than a person's hand [ככר איש] is rising out of the sea.'" It is also interesting to note that the connection between rain and the divine Presence/Face of Yahweh or spirit is already part of the biblical imagery. Psalm 68:8–9 is a significant expression of it:

O God (אלהים), when you went out before your people, when you marched through the wilderness, *Selah* the earth quaked, the heavens poured down rain at the presence (פניו) of God, the God of Sinai, at the presence (פניו) of God, the God of Israel. Rain [גשם] in abundance, O God, you showered abroad; you restored your heritage when it languished.³³

(30) Letter VI.73–77 (RUBENSON, *The Letters...*, 221). G. GARITTE (ed. and tr.), Cf. *Lettres de S. Antoine: Version géorgienne et fragments Coptes IV.73–77* (Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1955).

(31) Ps.-Macarius, H 31.5.55–64. ἐνθύμησις also means "consideration," "reflection," "idea," "conception" (LIDDELL—SCOTT, 1:567); cf. Matt. 9:4.

(32) For the imagery of internal and unseen warfare in the Macarian corpus, see PLESTED, *The Macarian Legacy...*, 36–38. See also note 41 for Stewart's investigation of the theme. Cf. C. STEWART, *The Inner War in the Ascetic Experience of the Fourth Century: Saint Macarius the Great and Evagrius of Pontus* [in Greek], *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 7:2–3 (1988) 149–183.

(33) On the cloud seen by Elijah in 1 Kgs 18:44, see also Ephrem's hymn *De Res.* 3.17.

Although the two final images of Antony and Ps.-Macarius (i.e., the comfort of the Spirit and the light of the tabernacle of the body) are different in their form, they are very close in their meaning. On the one hand, the Antonian text ends in a clear Pneumatological key by identifying the spiritual rain with the comfort that comes from the Paraclete-Spirit, the heavenly palm. Again, the Spirit is sent by God, perhaps the Father, and is strongly linked with the fire and comfort fire and comfort which operate within the human soul.

On the other hand, the Macarian text is more visual and advances a theophanic dimension in an internalized way. One can find here the spiritual rain identified with the man's footprint or palm (ἵχνος ἀνθρώπου) and both of them inserted within the human soul.³⁴ In addition, Ps.-Macarius construes a parallel image by interpreting Amos 9:11 in an internalized form: the soul becomes a new Davidic tabernacle illumined by the theophany of the Lord.³⁵ According to this parallel imagery (or a chiasmic scheme of images) the theophany of the Lord is identical with the man's footprint and the spiritual rain, all of them expressions of the light manifested in the tabernacle of the human body. As Christ, the Lord, brings the spiritual rain, once again the Spirit as light seems to be an economic divine instrument of the Son in the Macarian text.

In a partial conclusion, the two authors possibly had access to a common source of information, either a document or an oral exegetical tradition of the episode of the contest between Elijah and the priests of Baal. Thus, it may be claimed that the idea of internal divine fire was present in the Syrian and Egyptian monastic milieu of the fourth century AD, and that the Antonian and Macarian documents represent important vestiges for the circulation of this idea. Moreover, the monastic Spirit-Christology may have connections with, and even roots in, Origen's theology.

(34) Most likely the expression (ἵχνος ἀνθρώπου) (man's "track," "trace," "footstep," "palm of hand;" see Liddell-Scott, 1:846) warrants a Pneumatological interpretation. It is typical in biblical and rabbinic traditions that the hand of God (טף) signifies God's power (the same טף) or Spirit. See M. BAR-ILAN, *The Hand of God: A Chapter in Rabbinic Anthropomorphism*, in: G. SED-RAJNA (ed.), *Rashi 1040–1990: Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach, Congrès européen des Études juives* (Paris: CERF, 1993) 321–335. See also E. J. WOODS, *The "Finger of God" and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

(35) See the same Macarian idea, with reference to Moses' face, analyzed by Golitzin and Orlov in "Many Lamps" and Golitzin in "Recovering the 'Glory of Adam.'"

Ps.-Macarius and the Nature and Function of the Fire of Grace Ingressed in Flesh

The Ps.-Macarian corpus is richer in speculating on the image of the heavenly fire and allows further questions on its nature and function. In the eighth homily of the second collection, this fire is identified with grace, as in the formula “the lamp of grace.” For Ps.-Macarius, grace as divine fire represents a concrete, not abstract or metaphorical, presence in the human being. It is something similar to a substance (ὡς φυσικόν [B]; ὡς μία οὐσία [H]) implanted (ἐρρίζωται) and fermented/leavened (ἐζύμωται) in humans from an early age (ἐκ νέας ἡλικίας); it is also a substance which is constantly (ἀδιαλείπτως) present.³⁶ This fire operates at different intensities as a larger or smaller flame, according to the human cooperation.³⁷

Starting with a terminological note, Ps.-Macarius employs the notions of “grace,” “heavenly fire of the Godhead,” and “Holy Spirit” interchangeably. An illustration of this idea may be encountered in the following passage:

But only spirit from Spirit and fire from Fire remove the power of the evil darkness. ... The baptism of the Law is the shadow of the true things given through the new Law. For the baptism of the Law washed the body, but now a baptism of Fire and Spirit purifies and washes the impure mind.³⁸

The passage introduces us to the problem of the function of the heavenly fire or spirit. Its main role is purification, or the catharsis of the human being, and commonly the image of fire involves purification and removal of transgression.³⁹ To the contrary, water has a constructive role in creation, being the sign of all potentiality and a

(36) Ps.-Macarius, B 4.9.1; H 8.2.

(37) Idem, B 4.9.1.17–8; H 8.2.18–20: “On the other hand, although being one, the grace operates in various ways in a human being, depending on one’s cooperation (πολυτρόπως ὡς θέλει πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ οἰκονομεῖ).”

(38) Ps.-Macarius H 32.4. Cf. n. 50. Heavenly fire is identified as well with the Spirit in C 7.1; 26.4; 27.5. See also Davids who observes the cathartic power of the heavenly fire: “Wenn sie [die Seele] der Welt absagt und nur den Herrn sucht und das himmlische Feuer der Gottheit und der Liebe des Geistes in sich aufnimmt, verwandelt sie sich und verliert von ihrer Sündenhärte, die als ihr natürlicher Zustand bezeichnet wird.” (DAVIDS, *Das Bild...*, 59–60).

(39) See notes 4 and 5 and the Origenian theorization on the image of the divine fire.

building power in the universe.⁴⁰ From ancient Mesopotamia to Egypt, the heavenly water is the element which gives existence and life to every particle of the universe. In a similar way, biblical sapiential literature symbolizes the divine wisdom through the water that pours out from the mouth of God (e.g., Sir 1:8; 24:3–4). The divine wisdom is the instrument through which God created the universe (e.g., Ps 104:24; Prov 3:14, Jer 10:12; 51:15; Sir 1:4) and keeps it in existence (e.g., Wis 7:24–27).

The same meaning may be found in Ps.-Macarius. For instance, two facets of the progression of the soul may be observed in the aforementioned episode of the cloud and the spiritual rain: while the first facet may be that of purification of evil thoughts and desires, the second is that of perfection and the coming of the Spirit. This might be the explanation for why Ps.-Macarius and Anthony use primarily the image of fire with its sacrificial and cathartic qualities, and secondly the image of water after the liberation from the invisible enemies' hostile operations. While the first facet is one of an invisible warfare, the second is the stage of a peaceful grace.⁴¹ The divine water of grace pours and operates internally the perfection of the mystic.

However, there is a paradoxical usage of the image of the divine fire in Ps.-Macarius, since he portrays the fire with the creative virtues of the water. Thus, the divine fire is at the same time cathartic and con-

(40) M. ELIADE, *Traité d'histoire des religions* (Paris: Payot, 1953) 168: "Principe de l'indifférentiel et du virtuel, fondement de toute manifestation cosmique, réceptacle de tous les germes, les eaux symbolisent la substance primordiale dont naissent toutes les formes et dans lesquelles elles reviennent, par régression ou par cataclysme. Elles ont été au commencement, elles reviennent à la fin de tout cycle historique ou cosmique; elles existeront toujours — bien que jamais seules, parce que les eaux sont toujours germinatives, renfermant dans leur unité non fragmentée les virtualités de toutes les formes. Dans la cosmogonie, dans le mythe, dans le rituel, dans l'iconographie, les Eaux remplissent la même fonction, quelle que soit la structure des ensembles culturels dans lesquelles elles se trouvent: elles *précèdent* toute forme et *supportent* toute création."

(41) See C. Stewart's interesting connection between the internal warfare, the spiritual progression of the soul, and the Holy Spirit: "In his view, the goal of Christian life is victory in the battle waged within the 'inner person'. The progression is from a heart possessed by evil (because of Adam's disobedience), to a heart indwelt by both sin and grace, and then finally to a heart from which sin has been cast out by the co-operative triumph of human will and divine Spirit." (STEWART, *Working...*, 74). Cf. IDEM, *The Inner War...*, 149–183.

structive. In one of the most suggestive passages on this concept, the fire performs the paradoxical function of “washing” the human heart: “Similarly, Christians have that celestial and holy fire as their food and their rest. That fire purifies, washes, sanctifies their hearts, and helps them to grow. It is the air of their life.”⁴²

Another aspect of the internal operations of the Spirit may be observed in the following passage. Here the author explains how the pneumatic activity of God’s grace works within the human soul with the greatest patience, wisdom, and hidden governance of the mind:

Ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ πνευματικὴ τῆς χάριτος ἐνέργεια ἐν ψυχῇ γιγνομένη μετὰ πολλῆς μακροθυμίας καὶ σοφίας καὶ οἰκονομίας νοῦς μυστικῆς κατεργάζεται.⁴³

One of the most exploited terminologies that expresses the presence of God or of the Spirit in the human being in the Greek and Syriac texts is that of the “mingling” between grace and human nature. The language of “mingling” is characteristic for Ps.-Macarius as well.⁴⁴ He sometimes explains the constructive function of the Spirit-Fire through the image of the power (δύναμις) which the grace infuses within the human being. In C 16.2.3 the wings of grace (αἱ τῆς χάριτος πτέρυγες) are identified with the power of the Spirit (δύναμις τοῦ πνεύματος). However, C 22.3 connects δύναμις and the fire and light of the Spirit,

(42) B 14.32.8–10; H 14.7.59–62. See also the text of notes 26 and 38. A similar paradoxical creative function of the divine fire may be found in Syriac theology; see, for example, Ephrem, *H. de Fide* 10.9: “When the Lord came down to earth to mortal men he created them again, a new creation, like the angels, mingling within them fire and spirit, so that in a hidden manner they might be of fire and spirit” (in Brock, “Fire from Heaven,” 235). Cf. *H. de Fide* 40.10: “In fire is the symbol of the Spirit, it is a type of the Holy Spirit who is mixed in the baptismal water so that it may be for absolution, and in the bread, so that it may be an offering” (in Brock, “Fire from Heaven,” 234). Antony, in his turn, speaks in similar terms about the “communion with the Spirit” (I.48), which recreates, purifies, and strengthens every element of the human being: eyes, ears, tongue, mind (I.56), hands’ movement, belly, feet, the entire body, and the afflictions of the soul (I), or the faculties of the mind (II.4).

(43) Ps.-Macarius H 9.1. For the idea that the Spirit guides the soul, see: H 1.3; 1.9; 11.2.

(44) For a detailed discussion on the theme of “mixing” and “blending” vocabulary in Ps.-Macarius, see STEWART, *Working...*, esp. 173–78. Stewart describes in the following terms the Macarian view of the soul cleansed from evil: “It is ready to be ‘mixed’ or ‘mingled’ with the divine Spirit, so that they become ‘one Spirit’ and the soul is changed into Spirit” (Ibid., 75).

and the author urges his audience to become as a piece of wood put on the fire of the Spirit in order to acquire His cathartic and transforming divine power.⁴⁵

In addition, Ps.-Macarius is concerned with an epistemological question, namely about the possibility of knowing these operations of the Spirit. In one of his homilies he advances the idea that there is a special knowledge of the way this power operates within the human soul:

Before the crucifixion, the Apostles themselves saw great miracles while staying with the Lord, namely how lepers were cleansed and the dead raised to life. However, they did not yet know how the divine power turns back and serves in the heart (οὐκ ᾔδεισαν δὲ πῶς ἀναστρέφεται θεία δύναμις καὶ διακονεῖ ἐν καρδίᾳ). ... And then the Spirit, the Comforter, entered and mingled (εἰσήλθε καὶ συνεκεράσθη) with their souls. ... For the Lord appears to their souls and teaches them about the return of the Holy Spirit (τὴν ἀναστροφὴν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος).⁴⁶

Pneumatology again plays the instrumental role within the human interiority. Christ appears and teaches human beings one of the highest mysteries of creation, unknown even to the apostles until the appearance of the Lord in their souls, namely the activity of the Spirit within the human heart. If not a contradiction in his doctrine, one may perhaps understand even the following passage through this instrumental role of the Spirit, a passage which depicts Christ as all in all:

When Christ first sees your seeking him and how you constantly have an unconditioned expectation of him, he then teaches and gives you true prayer and true love, which is himself made all things in you:

(45) The term δύναμις seems to be quasi-synonymous with ἐνέργεια (“activity,” “operation”) as in B 4.30.4 and C 7.3 and 7.6, as powers of the Holy Spirit. Cf. C. 7.5, 12.1 (the Apostles receive power at the Pentecost), 16.2, 17.2. Ps.-Macarius also talks about the “activity of the divine power (δυνάμεως θείας ἐνέργεια)” in C 18.1 (cf. B 9.2.4 [καθαίρει αὐτὴν τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ] and C 7.6, 22.3), and perhaps there is a slight distinction between the two, the power denoting the divine agent in the soul, while the *energeiai* referring to its operations. See also n. 54. Likewise, while Macarius talks about the weakened powers, he uses *energeiai* to refer to their operations (cf. B 3.5, 8.3; C 5.1, 16.9, 25.4).

(46) H 12.17.235–245. In C 16.3.27 he even affirms that the one born in the Holy Spirit is able to know the things of the Spirit through an experiential knowledge (εἰδέναι ἐν πείρᾳ γνώσεως τῶν τοῦ πνεύματος).

paradise, tree of life, pearl, crown, builder, husbandman, sufferer, one beyond passion, man, God, wine, living water, lamb, bridegroom, warrior, armor, all in all Christ.⁴⁷

The Fire of Grace Fashions the Image of God in Human Flesh

In the passage where Ps.-Macarius explains the apostles' lack of knowledge about the operation of the Spirit in the human heart, he also mentions a second thing the apostles did not know: the fact that they had to be spiritually reborn and become a new creature (καινή κτίσις). One of the key terminologies through which Ps.-Macarius describes the goal of this constructive process is the renewal of the divine image which Adam lost.⁴⁸ The activity which the heavenly fire performs is the fashioning of the divine image in the human being:

As the three young men, therefore, having a righteous purpose in their mind, received within themselves the fire of God (ἐδέξαντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πῦρ) and adored the Lord in truth, so also faithful souls receive in a secret way (ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ) that divine and heavenly fire (τὸ θεϊκὸν καὶ ἐπουράνιον πῦρ) now in this present life, and that fire forms a heavenly image upon their human nature (μορφοῖ εἰκόνα ἐπουράνιον εἰς τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα).⁴⁹

(47) Ps.-Macarius H.31.4. A similar thought occurs in H 4.12.184–5: “All things are yielding and effortless for him who can transform himself into any form which he wants for the good of the souls who are worthy of and faithful to him.” Cf. H 4.13. For a short investigation of the Macarian Christology, see PLESTED, *The Christology of Macarius-Symeon...*, 593–596. See also IDEM, *The Macarian Legacy...*, 42–46 for the common work of the Trinity in the process of salvation. E. A. DAVIDS himself, although uses the title “Heil durch Christus” (*Das Bild...*, 55–72), employs many Pneumatological passages, both in defining Adam’s prelapsarian luminous garments of glory and spirit and the reconstruction of this ontological status, which Ps.-Macarius calls either the “heavenly image of Christ” or the “image of the Spirit.”

(48) See DAVIDS, *Das Bild...*, especially 35–42 for Adam’s luminous image of glory or spirit.

(49) H 11.2.28–32; B 53.1.5. In one of the passages of the *collectio C*, in a sort of abridged salvation history, Ps.-Macarius explains how the risen Lord went up to heaven where he is glorified and sends the luminous and divine image of the Holy Spirit, the heavenly man, to the human souls. This image is further imprinted and mingled with human souls. See C 19.32–4: ἄνωθεν ἀποστέλλει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φωτεινὴν καὶ θεϊαν τοῦ πνεύματος εἰκόνα, τὸν ἐπουράνιον ἄνθρωπον, ἵνα ἐντυπωθέντος καὶ κραθέντος ἐν αὐταῖς.

For Ps.-Macarius, the heavenly image imprinted in the human soul is deeply connected to the eschatological human image. One can thus understand why he joined in the passage reproduced at the beginning of this paper the internalized heavenly fire with the resurrected human constitution. The Macarian text given in the introduction recalls a similar episode from Ezekiel 37:1–14, which depicts the eschatological event of the resurrection. The significant fact is that the prophetic passage associates the process of resurrection and the Creator-Spirit (רוח) of Yahweh. While verses 5 and 14 express the idea that the רוח gives life, verses 7 to 10 depict a mechanism of resurrection which mirrors the two-stage creation of the human being in the Genesis 2:7 narrative. First, bones, flesh, etc. come together (verses 7–8), and second the *ruach* permeates them and gives them life (verses 9–10). As verse 14 expresses it unambiguously, the prophetic author envisions the resurrection as a new moment of creation, in which Yahweh says (יחַרְבֵד) and fulfills (יִתְשַׁעַן), sends his spirit (רוּחִי) and gives life (מַחְיֶהוּ).

For Ps.-Macarius as well, resurrection represents a new creation and the Holy Spirit performs this unordinary activity. In addition to this, the text also points out that, while the heavenly image which the divine fire fashions is merely an interior presence during the earthly human existence, in the heavenly life that image will also be outwardly manifested.⁵⁰ Since the image created by the divine fire is the luminous image of Christ, it is highly reasonable to maintain as well that the human image in the kingdom will also be luminous and glorious, a true imitation of the luminous Christ.⁵¹

(50) Ps.-Macarius affirms in B 58.2.4 that the resurrected body will share with the soul the same “incorruptible image of the heavenly light” (τῷ ἐπουρανίῳ τῆς ἀφθάρτου εἰκόνοσ φωτί), and will be considered worthy to reign in the heavenly kingdom with Christ and the soul. Similarly, in B 58.3.2 he mentions that the deified and heavenly image of the Spirit, now imprinted in the soul of the saints (τῶν μὲν ἁγίων ἢ θεοειδῆς τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ ἐπουράνιος εἰκὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἔνδον τυπωθεῖσα), will be extended in the eschatological times to the body as well (τὸ σῶμα θεοειδὲς καὶ φωτοειδὲς καὶ οὐράνιον ἔξω ἀπεργάζεται τότε).

(51) See for this ORLOV, GOLITZIN, “Many Lamps;” J. MARTIKAINEN, “Dein Kleid ist dein Licht – dein Gewand ist dein Glanz: Die Perle als ästhetisches und theologisches Symbol bei Aphrahat dem persischen Weisen, Ephraem der Syrer und Makarios/Symeon, in: *Religion und Wahrheit* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998) 117–126; and GOLITZIN, Recovering the “Glory of Adam...”

In C 20.2 Macarius describes the reconstruction of the divine image in the human being as the process of painting in the heart a heavenly icon which is identical with the life-giving power of God and the heavenly and divine signum.⁵² As Davids already expressed the Macarian doctrine of Spirit-Christology, Christ as a great artist, recreates the human soul as an icon of his divine image through the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit:

Chistus als ζωγράφος malt mit seinem Geist und seiner Lichtnatur nach seinem Bilde den himmlischen Menschen. Seine eigene Eikon übergibt er der Seele, und somit gibt er ihr ewiges Leben und den himmlischen Bräutigam (H 30, 4). Ohne das Bild des himmlischen Geistes ist die Seele tot für Got.⁵³

Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, this study has tried to trace the main lines of the tradition of internalized heavenly fire from its biblical roots to the monastic Pneumatology of the fourth century. The idea of the internalized heavenly fire most likely appeared in some Jewish mystical circles having as their central figure the prophet Jeremiah. However, the idea circulated later in Christian and rabbinic milieus and it was present in various areas among the Christian mystics of the third and fourth centuries. In particular, the analysis of the Origenian, Antonian, and Macarian texts reveals a strong connection between the image of internalized divine fire and the Holy Spirit. The Spirit-Fire is not a fire of punishment or the sacrificial fire of the temple in Jerusalem. It is not an external fire any longer, but the Spirit of Christ, permeating and operating within the human being. For Ps.-Macarius, interior and creative activity is an essential attribute of this fire. Its presence purifies, strengthens, recreates, resurrects, perfects, and builds the heavenly image of Christ in the human being.

A certain interest in Pneumatology seems to appear in the Syrian and Egyptian monastic communities of the fourth century, and the Macarian corpus reasonably represents the acme of this Pneumatological interest. Most likely, this internalized Pneumatology was congruent

(52) ἡ εἰκὼν ἡ ἐπουράνιος καὶ ἡ ζῶσα δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ σίγνον τὸ ἐπουράνιον καὶ θεῖον, ἐὰν ζωγραφηθῆ ἔν ταῖς καρδίαις.

(53) DAVIDS, *Das Bild...*, 68. See especially pages 67–72 for the idea that Christ is the painter of the human soul as an icon of his image through the work of the Spirit.

with, and an expression of, the experience of monastic communities of the fourth century.⁵⁴

SUMMARY:

This study represents an investigation of the image of heavenly fire from its incipient biblical representations as external sacrificial fire, fire of punishment, or theophanic fire to the elaborated images of internalized heavenly fire encountered in Origen, (Ps?-) Antony, and especially Ps.-Macarius. These authors purposely connect this internalized image of the divine fire with the Holy Spirit operating internally under the guidance of the Son. This study will also refer to a particular tradition of the inner fire produced by the words of Scripture present in the Jeremian corpus, the New Testament, and several rabbinic documents, and to a few Christian contexts of the internalized image of the divine fire, such as Paul and Clement of Alexandria. However, Ps.-Macarius entitles the heavenly fire with cathartic and demiurgic functions, and, according to the author, the way the divine fire operates in the human soul represents one of the greatest mysteries, hidden even to the Apostles until Christ himself unveiled it to them.

(54) Cf. FITSCHEN, *Pseudo-Makarios...*, 25: "Ps.-Makarios steht hier im breiteren Strom einer Erfahrungstheologie, die im ausgehenden 4. Jahrhundert die Funktion und theologische Position des Heiligen Geistes nicht spekulativ, sondern in Deutung seiner Wirkungen beschreibt."

Nestor Kavvadas
Tübingen

THEOLOGY OF LANGUAGE AND LITURGICAL PRAYER IN ISAAC OF NINEVEH

In his extensive treatises dedicated to the hermit's prayer Isaac of Nineveh refers in a number of cases to the validity and bearing of the Canon Law prescriptions regulating the liturgical order for the solitary. The Office of the Hours had been sanctioned by the 54th canon of the Pseudo-Nicene canons collection, which enjoyed a remarkable authority among East Syriac ascetics.¹ A more precise definition of the number and order of the Psalms one had to recite was apparently at the disposal of the spiritual father of each brotherhood, or — in the case of hermits living in almost absolute isolation — of the solitary himself.²

Isaac stresses more than once his obedience to the liturgical order that Canon Law prescribed for the hermits: every monk is obliged to “*unfailing observance of the seven Offices, ordered for our chaste mode of life by the holy Church at the hands of the Fathers who were assembled by the*

(1) S. A. VööBUS (ed.), *The Canons Ascribed to Mārūtā of Maipherqaṭ and Related Sources* (CSCO Syr., 192) 82: “*The service, moreover, shall be accomplished at seven times during the day: one in the morning, and the third, the sixth, and the ninth hour, at (the time of) table, in the evening and in the night in order that (the monks) fulfill that which the blessed David said: ‘Seven times in the day do I praise Thee because of Thy judgements, O Righteous!’*”.

(2) Thanks to a notice given to us by Dadisho Qatraya, we know Babai the Great as Abbot of the Great Monastery on Mount Izla had prescribed (in his lost treatise “On the Discipline of the Novices”) for his monks’ prayer of the Hours a relatively small number of Psalms (ten ܡܝܨܡܝܢ), a short hymn (ܟܘܨܘܪܐܝܢ; on the exact meaning of this liturgical terms see J. MATEOS, *Lelya-Sapra: les offices chaldéens de la nuit et du matin* (OCA 156), Rom 1972, 491 and 500–501) and the Sanctus (ܟܘܨܘܪܐܝܢ); just for the nightly prayer of the Hours an additional long hymn was prescribed. In the influential Monastery of Rabban Shapur, these same rules were valid — here, even for the festal offices [see DADISHO QATRAYA, *Commentaire du livre d’Abba Isaïe — logoi I–XV*, ed. R. DRAGUET (CSCO, 326, Syr. 144) (Louvain, 1972) 183–184; cf. F. JULLIEN, Rabban-Sapur. Un monastère au rayonnement exceptionnel, *OCP* 72 (2006) 333–348, here: 340sq.].

a silent amazement at God's self-revelation. Isaac defends his opinion against the (quite usual, it seems) accusation of messalianism.⁹

In this short article we shall attempt to present in its main lines the theological gnoseology of language which underlies Isaac's — presumably controversial — opinions regarding the limits of the canonical prescriptions' validity concerning the order of liturgical prayer.

Theological Gnoseology and Theology of Language

The notion of knowledge is the centre of Isaac of Nineveh's concept of ascetical life. This fact, which also applies to the majority of East Syriac ascetical authors, goes back — at least as far as processes of provable literary reception are concerned — to his "dependence" on Evagrius Ponticus.

Consequently, this notion of knowledge is subdivided into several levels, which correspond to specific cognitive objects as well as to different "states of mind" of the human subject, whereby in Isaac's "idealism" the object of cognition coincides, up to a certain point, with its subject. Nevertheless, the most fundamental gnoseological distinction is the one between knowledge conveyed to humans through the mediation of signs, on the one hand, and "knowledge" given to humans directly by God without any mediation at all on the other.¹⁰ Of course, the former kind of knowledge also comes ultimately from God, even if it is being conveyed through the medium of creatures, namely, either through visible natural beings or through invisible, incorporeal angels. The latter form of "knowledge" is defined by the strict exclusion of all kinds of mediation; not even angels are capable of conveying it to humans, since they are themselves recipients of it.¹¹ Only God Himself gives this "knowledge" to both angels and humans, equating thus the latter to the former. This fundamental gnoseological distinction corresponds not only to the ontological distinction, equally central in almost all Christian systems of thought, between created and uncreated, but also to a soteriological distinction, typical of Isaac's Theodoran conception of the history of salvation, between "this world" and the "world-to-come": While knowledge as mediated through signs belongs to this world, immediate God-given knowledge is proper to the

(9) See B.14.7 (Brock 58), and B.14.47 (Brock 72).

(10) B.3.3.55–60 (MS syr.e.7, 69^v–72^r).

(11) S. B.3.3.57 (MS syr.e.7, 70^r–71^r).

This fundamental gnoseological distinction between immediate and mediated knowledge has, as already said, an exact correspondence in Isaac's equally fundamental soteriological distinction between this world and the world to come, which is based on the "two-worlds-doctrine" of Theodore of Mopsuestia. This present world being a divine school, and all creatures being but signs indicating (i.e., mediating) the future world's true (i.e., immediate) knowledge of God, words indicating creatures are signs of signs, separated by a "double" distance from the last object of all reference. Isaac draws from this concept, where gnoseology is strongly dependent on the deployment of salvation history, the consequence that all words, names and numbers shall become obsolete and vanish in the world-to-come.¹⁹

From this clear assertion Isaac draws at least two further conclusions that make clear, even at first sight, how "uncomfortable" this aspect of his teaching could become for the official Church: This eschatological sublation of all forms of verbally mediated knowledge clearly makes no exception for the Holy Scriptures or for the texts of the liturgical prayers.²⁰ This becomes all the more significant and potentially provocative as the eschatological state of an immediate knowledge of things divine described above may be temporarily experienced (as God's gift, to be sure, since it exceeds by far all natural human capacities) already in this life. As a matter of fact, it is exactly this experience that constitutes the final goal — and the only source of meaning — of Eremitical Anachoretism. That is, already in this life humans may be temporarily endowed with a form of divine knowledge qualitatively superior to that formulated in the Holy Scripture, the Patristic tradition, Canon law and liturgical prayer!²¹

Forms of Prayer and the Function of Language

Before taking a closer look at the implications of this gnoseology of language for Isaac's understanding of liturgical prayer, a preliminary account on his general understanding of prayer is needed. For Isaac,

(19) This does not apply only to such "second class" signs (namely signs of signs), but also to all visible or rationally perceptible Creation: only the invisible creatures, which are only perceptible through the intellect (as opposed to the discursive rationality) and are at the same time in possession of an intellect shall continue to exist in the new world.

(20) See e.g. B.3.3.1–10 (MS syr.e.7, 59^r–60^r).

(21) B.3.3.56 (MS syr.e.7, 69^v–70^r).

prayer is, in the broadest sense of the word, a conscious act of directing all thoughts (emotions, wishes a.s.o.) towards God and is thus intermingled with every single action of ascetical life²² — and should be practiced, furthermore, in all “ups and downs” of Christian life.²³ This broad sense of the word “prayer” is a traditional product of interpretation on the Pauline precept to “pray without ceasing”. In a second, more specific sense, prayer is one of the three major constitutive elements of Eremitical life, the other two being study of the Holy Scriptures and “meditation”²⁴ on God’s providence for His creation.

Even in this narrower sense, prayer is nevertheless not identical with “liturgical prayer”, which is regulated by Canon law and consists of the loud reciting of prescribed prayer texts (prominently Psalms). As already said, freely formulated prayer, as well as reciting of prayer texts others than those prescribed by the liturgical canons, like those composed by Isaac himself, is also recommended. However, on the beginner’s level of ascetical life, the “somatic” level, one should primarily restrict himself to assiduous reciting of numerous Psalms combined with numerous prostrations, all this being a necessary means for bringing bodily passions under control.²⁵ It is not until the second, “psychic” stage of ascetical life has been reached that an insight into the deeper meaning of liturgical prayer becomes possible; according to Isaac, progress in ascetical life consists in breaking the external and accessing the internal.²⁶ To be sure, this distinction between external/superficial and internal/deeper aspects of all forms of ascetical labour is a specific application of the more general distinction between knowledge that is mediated, i.e. accessible to language, and knowledge that is immediate and thus inaccessible to language. In the case of a prayer — in its “narrow” sense — the external aspect is apparently not only liturgical prayer, as defined by Canon law, and its standard

(22) See A.63 (BEDJAN [= Mar Isaacus Ninivita, *De perfectione religiosa*, ed. P. BEDJAN (Paris—Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 439–440): All ascetical labours on the second, intermediary level, including the reading of the Scriptures, the contemplation on God’s providence as well as the prostrations, “are [included] in the definition/framework of prayer and are being thought of as [going] under the name of prayer, and stand within the limits of this name (sc. prayer)” (ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܠܝܩܘܝܐ ܕܒܝܗܘܘܢ ܕܚܝܒܝܢ ܕܘܚܪܝܩܝܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܢ ܕܡܬܘܕܝܩܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ : ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܠܝܩܘܝܐ ܕܒܝܗܘܘܢ ܕܚܝܒܝܢ ܕܘܚܪܝܩܝܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܢ ܕܡܬܘܕܝܩܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܕܡܠܘܚܘܬܝܢ); cf. B.10.3 (BROCK 31).

(23) See B.3.4.46 (MS syr.e.7, 91^v–92^r).

(24) B.3.2.87 (MS syr.e.7, 57^r); cf. B.3.2.84 (56^{r-v}).

(25) See B.22 (BROCK 106f.).

(26) B.22.4 (BROCK 106).

prayer texts, but also improvised verbal prayers.²⁷ Taken together with Isaac's understanding of language as a system of signs indicating further signs — an understanding which makes language the epitome, so to speak, of this present world's symbolic structure —, the fact that prayer is always a specific usage of language implies that prayer as formulation is the external aspect of something deeper.

This deeper, internal aspect begins to show itself, as already said, on the second ("psychic") level of ascetical life. The Psalms and the other standard prayer texts prescribed by Canon law consist predominantly of various supplications; this applies also to most of the improvised prayers.²⁸ The advanced ascetic shall realise, though, that these supplications are not intended to let God know what we need or wish, because the omniscient God knows of our needs better than we ourselves do. The real goal of supplication is to give us inner consolation and support us when we are spiritually "weakened", and thus help us overcome our weakness, gain full consciousness of the fact that the requests of our supplication — inasmuch as they are requests appropriate to true prayer, namely requests pertaining to our salvation — have already been satisfied in God's eternal providential plan, and consequently reduce our various requests to the one simple request: "Thy will be done"²⁹.

Isaac can describe this same process as a concentration on and a deepening, an immersion in the words (mostly taken from Psalms) of the supplication, a deepening that leads to a theoria of God's providence for all Creation, including the praying person. This insight leads in turn to the aforementioned identification of the human subject's will with God's will, as expressed in the request "Thy will be done".³⁰

(27) Words are the „external form“ of prayer (B.14.43, BROCK 70–71), since they are the „external form“ of thoughts in general (B.14.6, BROCK 57); the liturgical order consists of the „external forms“ of God's worship (B.14.22, BROCK 62sq.).

(28) See Isaac's own prayer, e.g. B.1.83–95 (17^v–19^v); cf. A.22 (BEDJAN 167).

(29) B.3.3.91 (MS syr.e.7, 80^{r-v}). This is what we mean, says Isaac, when we say, that God hears the saints's prayers: God does not adapt, so to speak, His eternal plan to their petitions; they learn, instead, to pray in accordance with God's almighty will.

(30) Cf. Evagrius Ponticus, *De oratione* 32 (PG 79, 1173): "Do not pray that your own wishes may come true, for they do not always agree with God's will. But rather pray, like you have been taught, by saying: Thy will be done in me." (Mῆ)

The *theoria* of God's providence, which emerges out of prayer as its goal and fulfillment, causes the normal (i.e., consisting of a specific — traditional or improvised — text, defined in advance) prayer to cease: the light of the *theoria* breaks forth out of a single verse and prevents the intellect from moving on to the next verses, i.e. from continuing to pray as planned. Nevertheless, the prayer goes on, carried through now by "inner motions", motions of the intellect contemplating now in silence on God's providence for the entire Creation and for the praying soul itself. As already said, this is the content of all *theoria*.

Already on the level of prayer in *theoria*, the monk cannot — and must not — observe the usual order of liturgical prayer, the prayer in *theoria* being the fulfillment of all forms of pre-formulated prayer. On this first, "lower" level of *theoria*, the inner prayer carried through by inner motions of the intellect is still a conscious activity of the human subject, the content of which can be described by means of human speech, even if the prayer itself is not being expressed verbally.

On the second level of *theoria* though, clearly distinct from the first, the activity of the Holy Spirit reveals itself to the praying intellect and makes its verbally describable, consciously activated and guided "inner motions" of contemplation on divine providence completely stop.³¹ The eschatological "truth" about God, which is then revealed by the Spirit, makes all cognitive contents of the praying intellect, either stemming from sense perception or from discursive thought, disappear — without being really annihilated — and gives a temporary end to all volitional, conscious self-control of the human soul over its own "inner motions".³² That is why this state-of-existence cannot be properly called "prayer", since prayer is a) a conscious activity of the self-controlled ("free") intellect and b) has specific contents that can be described by words, if they are not themselves expressed verbally.³³

προσεύχου τὰ σὰ θελήματα γενέσθαι οὐδὲ γὰρ πάντως συμφωνοῦσι τῷ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καθὼς ἐδιδάχθης προσεύχου, λέγων· Γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ἐν ἐμοί).

(31) On the "crossover" from the former level to the latter, prayer functions as a mediator between psychic and pneumatic state-of-being (A.22, BEDJAN 163–175).

(32) See A. 22 (BEDJAN 170).

(33) On this interruption of prayer see E. KHALIFÉ-HACHEM, *La prière pure et la prière spirituelle selon Isaac de Ninive*, in: *Mémorial Mgr. Gabriel Khouri-*

In conclusion, one could say that it is this utmost divine self-revelation enacted by the Holy Spirit, superior to the creaturely capacity of expression represented by human language, which constitutes the theological basis of Isaac's positions concerning the validity and bearing of canonically prescribed liturgical prayer, and its limits. This "possible" experience of an utmost "knowledge" above language, which interrupts in its coming all verbally structured prayer, relativizes all verbally structured forms of prayer — inasmuch as it makes their "meaningfulness" dependent on itself, being itself their final goal and fulfillment.

The possibility of interrupting liturgical prayer already on the "lower" level of a still verbally structured and consciously guided *theoria*, as well as the "freedom" to improvise personal prayers inspired by the traditional ones (Psalms a.s.o.) already before reaching this lower level of *theoria* and, further, the hermit's "right" to define his own liturgical order according to the "law of freedom" — i.e., all of Isaac's liberal positions concerning the concrete character of the obedience a monk owes to the canonically prescribed liturgical order — derive lastly from this ultimate experience. The latter justifies them as necessities inherent in the way that leads to itself, namely in the ascetical way of increasingly internalized prayer cracking the nutshell of words.

Sarkis (Louvain, 1969) 157–173, esp. 163 (identification of interrupted prayer with the life of the new world); cf. L. ABRAMOWSKI, „Der Stupor, der das Gebet unterbricht“ — Evagrius, Cent. Suppl. 30, in Übersetzung, Original (?) und Interpretation, in: M. TAMCKE, A. HEINZ (eds.), *Zu Geschichte, Theologie, Liturgie und Gegenwartslage der syrischen Kirche (... Vorträge des deutschen Syrologen-Symposiums vom 2–4 Oktober in Hermannsburg)* (Hamburg, 2000) 15–32, esp. 25–28; R. BEULAY, *L'enseignement spirituelle de Jean de Dalyatha. Mystique Syro-oriental du VIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1990) 217 (on the same teaching in John of Dalyatha and Joseph Hazzaya).

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

An mehreren Stellen seiner Schriften zieht Isaak von Ninive der Verbindlichkeit kirchenrechtlicher liturgischer Vorschriften für das Gebet des Einsiedlers klare Grenzen, indem er Letzterem weitgehende Freiheiten bei der Gestaltung des eigenen liturgischen ordo einräumt. Diese Freiheiten reichen bis zur völligen, wenn auch vorläufigen, Entbindung von der Observanzpflicht beim Eintreten der „Theoria“ oder der Offenbarung des Geistes. Hinter dieser nicht unumstrittenen These steckt eine explizite gebetstheologische Begründung, die ihrerseits, wie dieser Artikel erweisen will, auf der Grundlage einer tiefergehenden theologischen Gnoseologie der Sprache steht. Diese verbindet in sich die grundsätzliche Verneinung der Möglichkeit der Erlangung der höchsten einem Menschen mitteilbaren Gotteserkenntnis (und somit eines der Wahrheit Gottes genau entsprechenden Gebets) durch das medium geschöpflicher Vernunft, die ihrem Wesen nach sprachlich verfasst ist, mit einer nachdrücklichen Bejahung der gottgeschenkten Möglichkeit einer über Vernunft und Sprache erhabenen Erkenntnis Gottes und eines ihr zugeordneten „Gebets“, welches jenseits der natürlichen Möglichkeiten des sprechenden Menschen angesiedelt ist

ROLE OF THE VIRGIN MARY AT THE SIEGE OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN 626*

According to an eyewitness, in the battle for Constantinople in August 626 the Virgin Mary “put flight with a single blow the military force of both enemies”,¹ namely, Khagan, the king of Avars, and his Persian ally. The miracle of the Theotokos is the main point of the homily that was delivered after the liberation of the Constantinopolitans from the terror, caused by the siege and attacks by the troops tenfold superior in force. Bearing in mind, what Norman Baynes emphasized,² I will, neglecting the problem of how to understand Mary’s power, concentrate on her role as it is described in the text to be quoted. This approach offers by itself, for the the aim of the paper is to show that the famous prooemium of the Akathistos Hymn, Τῆ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῶ,³ is a product of “the ten days when the defenders of the

* This article is written in the framework of the project, “Origins of the Byzantine Cult of Mary”, financed by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), No. P20242-G02.

(1) L. STERNBACH, Περὶ τῆς τῶν ἀθέων Βαρβάρων καὶ Περσῶν κατὰ τῆς θεοφυλάκτου ταύτης πόλεως μανιώδους κινήσεως καὶ τῆς φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς Θεοτόκου μετ’ αἰσχύνης ἐκεῖνῶν ἀναχωρήσεως [On the foolish attack of the godless barbars and Persians against this city, protected by God, and of their shameful retreat which the divine love brought about for mankind by the intervention of the Theotokos], in: IDEM (ed.), *Analecta Avarica* (Cracoviae, 1900) 298–320, here 314.1–3: αὐτόπται γὰρ καὶ θεωροὶ γεγόναμεν ἅπαντες, ὡς μιᾶ ὀρμῇ τὴν ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἢ παρθένος καὶ Θεοτόκος ἰσχὺν ἐτροπώσατο.

(2) “Modern writers on East Rome, convinced that ‘miracles do not happen’, have quite banished miracles from their histories and have thereby falsified the picture, for there can be no doubt that the Byzantine lived in a world where miracle could happen and did happen, and that belief in miracle is itself a fact of history which the student ignores at his peril”, N. H. BAYNES, *The Supernatural Defenders of Constantinople*, in: IDEM, *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955, repr. 1960) 248–260, here 248.

(3) That is the second prooemium in the edition by C. A. TRYPANIS, *The Akathistos Hymn*, in: IDEM, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica* (Wien, 1968)

city withstood all that was thrown against them" — as it is called today — "in the last great war of antiquity".⁴ The question of the original context, which the prooemium refers to, has long been an issue in research on the Akathistos Hymn.⁵ The homily, which will be examined

(Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, 5) 17–39. On the significance of the Τῆ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῶ, see p. 21.

(4) J. D. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, The siege of Constantinople in 626, in: C. MANGO, G. DAGRON (eds.), *Constantinople and its Hinterland* (Aldershot, 1995) (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, 3) 131–142, here 131. This article considers, in the first place, the position of the defenders. From the Avars' point of view, see W. POHL, *Die Awaren. Ein Steppenvolk in Mitteleuropa 567–822 n. Chr.* (München, 2002) 248–255. Best approach to the whole period is provided by the study of W. E. KAEGI, *Heraclius. Emperor of Byzantium* (Cambridge, 2003). Besides the homily, there are two other eyewitness documents on the siege in 626, a chronicle and a poem. The *Chronicon Paschale*, composed by an anonymous author, supplies the fullest account of the siege of 626, in: L. DINDENDORFIUS, *Chronicon Paschale* (Bonnae, 1832) (Corpus Scriptorum Byzantinae) 716–726; translation in: Michael WHITBY, Mary WHITBY (eds.), *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD* (Liverpool, 1989) (Translated Texts for Historians). The rhetorical poem, called *Bellum Avaricum*, is one of the six works of George of Pisidia, focussing on the period of Heraclius, in: A. PERTUSI, *Bellum Avaricum di Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi*, vol. 1. Panegirici Epici (Ettal, 1959) (Studia Patristica et Byzantina, 7) 176–224.

(5) A summary of the opposite viewpoints up to the end of the 1960's is presented by J. L. VAN DIETEN, Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI. (610–715), in: J. L. VAN DIETEN, C. MANGO, P. WIRTH (eds.), *Geschichte der griechischen Patriarchen von Konstantinopel*, part 4 (Amsterdam, 1972) (Enzyklopädie der Byzantinistik, 24) 18–21. Obviously from the 1980's onwards Paul Speck's elaborate hypothesis, according to which it was the Patriarch Germanos himself who composed the prooemium, has been under discussion. The reasoning is found in P. SPECK, *Artabasdos, der rechtgläubige Vorkämpfer der göttlichen Lehren* (Bonn, 1981) (Poikila Byzantina, 2), 169–171; IDEM, *Kaiser Leon III., die Geschichtswerke des Nikephoros und des Theophanes und der Liber Pontificalis. Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung*, Teil 1 (Bonn, 2002) (Poikila Byzantina, 19) 295–298. The *status questionis* seems to be so that, while the majority associates the prooemium with the siege of 626, the possibility that it could be from the time when Constantinople was saved from the siege by Arabs in 717–718 is still considered, see, e.g., the abstract of the article by M. HURBANIČ, The so-called Feast of Akathistos and the tradition of the Avar Siege of Constantinople in 626, in: M. KULHÁNKOVÁ, K. LOUDOVÁ (eds.), *Epea pteroenta. Růženě Dostálové k narozeninám. (Epea pteroenta. Festschrift in Honour of Růžena Dostálová.)* (Brno, 2009) 140–141.

here, is attributed to Theodore Syncellus.⁶ This is the first time when this text is introduced as an evidence of the mutual relationship between the siege of 626 and the Akathistos and its prooemium, though the homily is well known amongst Byzantinists.⁷ The fundamental historical commentary on the homily, day by day, with all parallel sources is given by F. Barišić.⁸ The French translation by Ferenc Makk provides a modest commentary, with the focus on Biblical references.⁹ Paul Speck, in his analysis of the poem *Bellum Avaricum* by George of Pisidia, refers repeatedly to the homily of Theodore Syncellus, taking also the Akathistos into consideration,¹⁰ but his remarks confine just to the passages which relate directly to the lines in the poem of George of Pisidia. From this it is clear that the essential part of the homily, the miracle of the Theotokos in Byzantine understanding, would need a thoroughgoing investigation, but this paper is concerned only with the dating of Prooemium Τῆ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ.

The homily on the siege is rather long, having in printed form a length of 904 lines. The composition is highly rhetorical and extravagantly panegyric. Distinguishing all the intertwined threads and

(6) The extant manuscripts give no author, but the authorship of Theodore Syncellus is considered most likely by modern scholarship. So it is given also in CPG (9736) and BHG (1061): Theodorus Syncellus, *De obsidione Constantinopolitana sub Heraclio imperatore*. From now on, in this paper the homily is given under Theod. Sync. only. Justification for the authorship to Theodore Syncellus (*syncellus* or cell-mate of the patriarch) is found in a passage in which the preacher is supposed to be referring to himself (Theod. Sync. 306.23–24), on the attribution of scholars, see S. SZÁDECZKY-KARDOSS, *Zur Textüberlieferung der „Homilia de obsidione avarica Constantinopolis auctore ut videtur Theodoro Syncello“*, in: IDEM (ed.), *Über die Awarengeschichte und ihre Quellen* (Szeged, 1986) (*Acta Antiqua et Archaeologica*, 24) 173–184, here 299–300.

(7) J. KARAYANNOPULOS, G. WEISS, *Quellenkunde zur Geschichte von Byzanz* (324–1453), Zweite Halbband. (Wiesbaden, 1982) 312.

(8) F. BARIŠIĆ, *Le siège de Constantinople par les Avars et les Slaves en 626*, *Byzantion* 24 (1954) 371–395. It is noteworthy that in comparison with all other sources, according to Barišić, the homily of Theodore Syncellus is „le document le plus complet et sans doute le plus pittoresque sur le siège“, p. 375.

(9) F. MAKK, *Traduction et commentaire de l'homélie écrite probablement par Theodore le Syncelle sur le siège de Constantinople en 626* (Szeged, 1975) (*Acta Antiqua et Archaeologia*, 19).

(10) P. SPECK, *Zufälliges zum Bellum avaricum des Georgios Pisides* (München, 1980) (*Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia*, 24).

strands — typological or allegorical interpretation of the OT prophecies, figures, names and places, dogmatics, numerological consideration and political reflection — all this, related to the recent events, the city of Constantinople and the Eastern Roman Empire would require an extensive research. For our purpose such basic work is not necessary, for in this paper the *narrative* by Syncellus is examined only in relation to the Akathistos hymn. References to Mary are found throughout the text, altogether more than seventy times, but they are also accumulated around certain themes. Our focus is laid on some of them. Theodore Syncellus uses seven times the word “Mother of God” (Θεομήτωρ), wherefore, to avoid confusion, the established usage of rendering Mother of God for the Theotokos is relinquished here. The word Theotokos shall serve a compromise, instead of the “God-bearer” or “Birthgiver of God”.

Following the author’s train of thought from beginning to end, we can see that it is first of all the prophet Isaiah who provides the divine perspective for explaining the siege and its outcome.¹¹ Thus the point of departure is found in a prophecy of Isaiah: “Get you up to a high mountain, / O herald of good tidings to Zion; / lift up your voice with strength, / O herald of good tidings to Jerusalem. / Lift it up, do not fear; / say to the cities of Judah. / ‘Here is your God!’ / See, the Lord God comes with might, / and his arm rules for him.”¹² This triumphant exclamation “from afar” is now to make evident “the benevolence of God and the Father, regarding the Incarnation and the birth of God the Word from the Theotokos”.¹³ That the authors of the homily and the Akathistos present the subject of the Incarnation in the same way is of course significant,¹⁴ considering the question of an influence. The homilist points out frequently that everything has its origins in

(11) See references to Isaiah, ΜΑΚΚ, Traduction..., 49–59.

(12) Is. 40:9–10, *The Holy Bible*. New Revised Standard Version. Anglicized Edition (OUP, 1995). This is a reading variant for “O Zion, herald of good tidings” and for “O Jerusalem, herald of good tidings”.

(13) Theod. Sync. 298.1–3: Πόρῳθεν ὁρῶν τῆ προφητικῆ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος χάριτι τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἐκ τῆς Θεοτόκου τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σάρκωσίν τε καὶ γέννησιν. The English translation, partly modified, is from www.tertullian.org/fathers by R. PEARSE (ed.), *Early Church Fathers — Additional Texts* (Ipswich, UK, 2007).

(14) On the christology in the Akathistos, see L. M. PELTOMAA, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn* (Leiden—Boston—Köln, 2001) (The Medieval Mediterranean, 35) 85–101, 203.

the philanthropy of God, accordingly, also the miracle: “Since there are, here and now, such things to tell which, so to say, by miracle exceeding even the celestial spheres, resulted from the goodness of God towards us, amidst manifold suffering...”¹⁵

The miracle how the Incarnation occurred through the Virgin is explained only in the introductory part. The homilist invokes Isaiah, who had “predicted the glory of the only-begotten God and the mystery of the Virgin”, to paint for him the current miracle and to assist him to see, as prefigured in the old Jerusalem, all the “miracles and signs that the Theotokos accomplished for this city through the philanthropy of God.”¹⁶ The sequel makes it clear that the “mystery of the Virgin” is a reference to the prophecy of Isaiah 7:14. This prophecy belongs to a story about king Ahaz.¹⁷ Thereby Syncellus contrasts the Old Testament king Ahaz, who reigned Jerusalem, with “his” emperor who reigns Constantinople. So, king Ahaz from the house David “did not accept the teaching of the divine mystery of the Virgin, though he was invited by God, by the prophet, to ask that He grant to him a sign on the divine incarnation”.¹⁸ Syncellus does not say it explicitly — but it is evident from the Isaiah passage which he refers to — that in his view the best defence of the city is concerned with firm faith,¹⁹ undoubt-

(15) Theod. Sync. 298.15–17: Ἐπεὶ τοίνυν κἀνταῦθα πρόκειται λόγος, αὐτάς, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τὰς οὐρανίους ὑπερβαίνων ἀψίδας τῷ θαύματι <διὰ> τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ περὶ ἡμᾶς ὠδίνων πολυτρόπων ἀγαθότητα.

(16) Theod. Sync. 298.19–27: Δεῦρο δὴ οὖν Ἡσαΐα θεσπέσιε, ἄτε μέγας ὑπάρχων νοῦς τὰ μεγάλα προθεώμενός τε καὶ προφθεγγόμενος, σὺ μοι τὸν λόγον τῷ καλᾶμῳ τῆς προφητικῆς προδιαχάραξον χάριτος· δεῦρό μοι σὺ ὁ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ μονογενοῦς Θεοῦ καὶ τὸ τῆς παρθένου προδιαγράψας μυστήριον... σὺ καὶ τὸ παρόν μοι θαῦμα διαζωγράφησον καὶ δὸς (25) ἰδεῖν ὡς ἐν σκιᾷ καὶ τύπῳ τῆς πάλαι Ἱερουσαλήμ, ὅσα νῦν φιλανθρωπία Θεοῦ ἢ Θεοτόκος ἐνεδείξατο ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης θαυμάσιά τε καὶ τέρατα. (Τέρας, *A sign, wonder, marvel*, of any appearance or event, in which men believed that they could see the finger of God, and read the future, see LIDDELL—SCOTT.)

(17) Is. 7:3–14.

(18) Theod. Sync. 298.31–34: Ἐβασίλευε πάλαι τοῦ οἴκου Δαβίδ Ἀχαζ ὁ βασιλεύς... ὅθεν οὐδὲ τὸ θεῖον δέχεται διδαχθῆναι τῆς παρθένου μυστήριον, καίπερ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ προφήτου κελεύσαντος εἰς βάθος ἢ εἰς ὕψος αἰτήσαι· τὸ σημεῖον αὐτῷ τῆς θείας δοθῆναι σαρκώσεως, cf. LXX, Is. 7:10.

(19) In the story about Ahaz, the Lord says through Isaiah, Is. 7:9: “If you do not stand firm in faith, you shall not stand at all” (καὶ ἐὰν ἂν μὴ πιστεύετε, οὐδέ μὴ συνήτε).

edly in the sense of correct, orthodox, belief. Accordingly, he states that even though Ahaz remained the image of disobedience, the sign was given to the house of David and was fulfilled, "because the Virgin gave birth to God and was preserved virgin".²⁰ At the end of the exordium, once more the significance of the Theotokos is affirmed. "All that the prophet said and wrote, a history and parable, happened to those of the Jews who then lived in Jerusalem, as a figure and example, but was used also as a prediction for us, to whom God spread the grace of his love with the aid of the Theotokos."²¹

The abundancy of numerous comparisons, to inter-relate the Old Testament and present time, do not obscure the homilist's message that the Incarnation signifies victory. So being his juxtaposition of the prophetic words with the Incarnation reflects the early Christian and Byzantine standard view of the Incarnation as victory. In this respect, the Akathistos, forms its own category: it is a hymn on Incarnation, as to its contents, and a hymn on victory, as to its history.²² The homily as well as the Akathistos proclaims that the dogma of the Theotokos is prerequisite for victory. They also confess this dogma on the same ground. The sign on the Incarnation, which Syncellus pronounces, is thought to be the Virgin who gave birth to God and was preserved virgin. This evidence differs radically from the sign given by Isaiah: "Look, the virgin is with child and shall bear a son."²³ Now, it is known that since Nestorian controversy, characteristically in the teaching of Proclus of Constantinople, the virginity of Mary was interpreted as virginity *post partum*. It was this miracle or mystery that was presented by Proclus as the proof for the divine nature of Christ.²⁴ The Akathistos reflects Proclus' thought of the Virgin who remained a virgin as a

(20) Theod. Sync. 298.35–36: Καὶ τὸ μὲν σημεῖον τῷ οἴκῳ Δαβὶδ δέδοται ἅμα καὶ τετελειώται· τέτοκε γὰρ ἡ παρθένος Θεὸν καὶ παρθένος πεφύλακται.

(21) Theod. Sync. 299.26–29: Καὶ ἃ μὲν ὁ προφήτης ἱστορικῶς ἅμα καὶ τυπικῶς εἶρηκέν τε καὶ γέγραφεν, ταῦτά ἐστιν τοῖς μὲν ἐξ Ἰουδα τότε τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ οἰκοῦσιν ὡς ἐν σκιᾷ καὶ τύπῳ συμβαίνοντα, δι' ἡμᾶς δὲ προφητευόμενα, ἐφ' οὓς ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τῆς Θεοτόκου τὸν ἅπαντα τῆς ἰδίας φιλανθρωπίας ἐξέχεεν ἔλεον.

(22) I. e., the victory over the Nestorian heresy, consult PELTOMAA, *The Image...*, esp. 85–101.

(23) Is. 7:14: ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν.

(24) Proclus of Constantinople as a Marian Preacher, see PELTOMAA, *The Image...*, 101–113, esp. 103.

result of the protection of God as follows: "From the seedles womb he came, / preserving it chaste as it was before, / so that, beholding the miracle, we might sing her praise, crying..."²⁵

Although the influence of the Akathistos does not reveal itself as direct citations in the homily, its introduction is in full harmony with the text of the Akathistos. In other words, the point of departure of Syncellus is certainly identical with the Akathistos. The Akathistos celebrates the mystery of the Incarnation of God the Word which takes place through the Virgin for the redemption of humankind out of the philanthropy of God. The homilist constructs an analogue: the recent rescue of the Constantinopolitans from death is a miracle which, on account of the philanthropy of God, became possible through the Virgin from whom God the Word became incarnated.

What follows next is a report "on the great things that the Lord of powers has done through the Theotokos."²⁶ Among many other historical facts, the audience is informed that the "mighty" emperor, Heraclius, before leaving for the Persian front, "entrusted the throne to his son, the imperial prince."²⁷ At the same time the city was entrusted to the guardianship of God and the Virgin.²⁸ In spite of an old peace treaty between the Avar king and the emperor, as soon as Heraclius was out of his way, Khagan, "this wild beast" (θήρ) started the preparations for the assault upon the city. The enemies devised all kinds of tricks, "even manufactured engines, to make the town of God, protected by

(25) Ak. 13.3–5: ἐξ ἀσπόρου βλαστήσας γαστρὸς / καὶ φυλάξας ταύτην, ὡσπερ ἦν, ἄφθορον, / ἵνα τὸ θαῦμα βλέποντες ὑμνήσωμεν αὐτὴν βοῶντες, see, ΠΕΛΤΟΜΑΑ, *The Image...*, 103, on the teaching of Proclus of Constantinople, 176.

(26) Theod. Sync. 300.3–4: δεῦτε τοίνυν ἀκούσατε, καὶ διηγῆσομαι ὑμῖν [ὅσα ἐποίησεν] διὰ τῆς Θεοτόκου μεγαλεῖα ὁ τῶν δυνάμεων κύριος. On the lacuna, see S. SZÁDECZKY-KARDOSS, Eine unkollationierte Handschrift der Homilie über die persisch-awarische Belagerung von Konstantinopel (Codex Athous Batopedi 84, Fol. 63^r–68^r), in: IDEM, *AVARICA. Über die Awarengeschichte und ihre Quellen* (Szeged, 1986) (Acta Antiqua et Archaeologica, 24) 187–195, here 88–89, "Bestätigung einer Konjunktur".

(27) Consult W. E. KÄEGLI, *Heraclius. Emperor of Byzantium* (Cambridge, 2003).

(28) Theod. Sync. 300.24–27: Βασιλεὺς τοίνυν ὁ μέγας ἀπῆν, ὑῖω βασιλεῖ τὴν πατρικὴν ζηλοῦντι πραότητα καὶ εὐσέβειαν τὸν θρόνον (25) λιπῶν τὸν βασιλείον, τοῦτον δὲ Θεῶ καὶ τῇ παρθένω σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ τῇ πόλει πιστεύσας καὶ παραθέμενος; 302.11–12: Θεῶ μὲν καὶ τῇ παρθένω πόλιν καὶ παῖδας βασιλεῖς παρέθετο.

the Virgin, the booty of this deer.”²⁹ Here the expression “protected by the Virgin” demands attention, for the translation does not render the meaning of the Greek sentence, “ἡ παρθένος τετείχηκε”. The Greek verb has the same root as the word τεῖχος, a ‘wall’, especially a ‘city-wall’.³⁰ The ἡ παρθένος τετείχηκε, “the virgin has built a wall”, suggests that the Virgin had erected another — spiritual — wall of the city. It is more than likely that Syncellus echoes the emphatical acclaim at the end of the Akathistos: “Hail, impregnable wall of the kingdom.”³¹ The other passage, in which the word “wall” appears in the Akathistos, is associated with virginity: “For virgins and all who flee to you / you are a wall, O Virgin Theotokos,”³² but also this idea is relevant in Syncellus, as we will see below.

According to Syncellus, having heard the news from the home-front, the emperor raised his hands towards the sky and cried: “You Lord, all-observing and knowing all, you know that I entrusted to you and to the one, who gave you seedless birth (τῆ ἀσπόρως τεκούση σε), my children, the city and your people living their.”³³ Here may suffice to remark that the “seedless birth” is found in three passages in the Akathistos. The prayer of the emperor to God is finished with the following plea: “So keep now, according to your own law, safe and well, the city which I entrusted to the force of your power and the Theotokos, the mother of your goodness.”³⁴

The account continues with the happenings in the city. The children of the emperor were praying in a small chapel of the Mother of God, attached to the palace. In the light of the Akathistos it is quite interesting what Syncellus puts into words in this context. So, the chil-

(29) Theod. Sync. 302.24–25: καὶ πᾶς ἐπενοεῖτο τρόπος καὶ μηχαναὶ ἐτεκταίνοντο, ὥστε τὴν πόλιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣν ἡ παρθένος τετείχηκε, γενέσθαι τῷ θηρὶ δοριάλωτον.

(30) Cf. LIDDELL—SCOTT, τεῖχος.

(31) Ak. 23.13: χαῖρε, τῆς βασιλείς ἀπόρρητον τεῖχος.

(32) Ak. 19.1–2: Τεῖχος εἶ τῶν παρθένων, θεοτόκε παρθένε, / καὶ παντῶν τῶν εἰς σὲ προσφευγόντων.

(33) Theod. Sync. 302.30–33: τὰς δὲ χεῖρας ἀνίσχων εἰς οὐρανὸν ἐβόα πρὸς κύριον: σὺν δέσποτα, παντεπόπτα καὶ γνῶστα πάντων, ἐπίστασαι, ὡς σοὶ καὶ τῆ ἀσπόρως τεκούση σε τέκνα παρεθέμην καὶ πόλιν καὶ τὸν λαόν σου τὸν ταύτης οἰκίτορα.

(34) Theod. Sync. 303.2–4: σύ μοι τοίνυν κατὰ τὸν σὸν νόμον φύλαξον ἀπαθῆ καὶ ἀνάλωτον τὴν πόλιν, ἣν παρεθέμην τῆ ἰσχύϊ τοῦ κράτους σου καὶ τῆ Θεοτόκῳ μητρὶ τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος!

dren “offered their innocence of children and their heart, just as the virginity and the purity of their bodies, as an supplication and sweet-smelling incense.”³⁵ And they “exclaimed all in tears: “All-Powerful Lady! our father entrusted to you your city and us, your servants who are still children, as you see it, All-Holy, and he had given us to you... So deliver (ῥῦσαι) us and the city and its inhabitants, deliver (ῥῦσαι) us from the snake who attacks us.”³⁶ This passage reflects a strong influence from the Akathistos. Picturing to himself the imperial children, the author presents both the ideal of virginity and the thought of virginity as an offering. This is precisely that kind of ascetic idealism that the Akathistos advocates.³⁷ Besides, virginity as an offering to the Theotokos is explicit in the last strophe: “O Mother hymned by all, / you who gave birth to the Word, the holiest of all holies: / accepting this present offering, deliver (ῥῦσαι) from every evil...”³⁸ It is conspicuous that Syncellus uses in this context the word ῥῦσαι twice.³⁹ On the whole, the Akathistos seems to have been in the author’s mind.

Sergius, the patriarch of Constantinople, was the main actor of the siege drama in the view of Theodore Syncellus.⁴⁰ Sergius the “wor-

(35) Theod. Syncellus 303.7–9: Τὰ βασιλέως δὲ τέκνα ἐν τῷ κατὰ βασιλεία εὐκτηρίῳ τῆς Θεομήτορος τὴν παιδικὴν ἀκακίαν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἄμα καὶ τῶν σωμάτων παρθενίαν καὶ καθαρότητα ἀνθ’ ἰκετηρίας καὶ θυμιάματος εἰώδους προῦβάλλοντο.

(36) Theod. Sync. 303.10–14: βοῶντα σὺν δάκρυσι· ‘δέσποινα παντοδύναμε, σοὶ καὶ πόλιν τὴν σὴν καὶ τοὺς σοὺς οἰκέτας ἡμᾶς νηπίους, ὡς ὄρας παναγία, ὑπάρχοντας πατήρ ὁ ἡμέτερος ἐπίστευσε καὶ παρέθετο... ῥῦσαι τοίνυν ἡμᾶς τε καὶ πόλιν καὶ τοὺς οἰκήτορας. ῥῦσαι ἐκ τοῦ προσερχύζοντος ἡμῖν ὄφρα.’

(37) On the ideal of virginity, esp. strophes 17, 18, 19, see PELTOMAA, *The Image...*, 185–199.

(38) Ak. 24.1–4: Ὡ πανύμνητε μήτερ, ἢ τεκοῦσα τὸν πάντων / ἀγίων ἀγιώτατον Λόγον, / δεξαμένη τὴν νῦν προσφοράν, / ἀπὸ πάσης ῥῦσαι συμφορᾶς...

(39) The verb is found elsewhere only once, Theod. Sync. 307.3–38: δέσποτα, ... ῥῦσαι πόλιν κληρονομίας σου καὶ σώσον λαὸν σὴν κεκλημένον ὄνοματι, μήποτε εἰπωσι, ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ γνώτωσαν ἔθνη, ὅτι ἀνθρωποὶ εἰσὶν’. (“Lord, ... deliver the city of your heritage and save the people who are called by your name, so that they would never say, ‘Where is their God?’ but let those people (ἔθνη) know that they are only human!”)

(40) So also in the eyes of George of Pisidia, but the *Chronicon Paschale* is silent about Sergius. The view of modern scholarship is presented by, e.g.

thy archpriest, our Isaiah",⁴¹ gathered everyone, if he were a priest or clerk, living as a monk or among the people, of the men of any age, from the child to the old man. He harangued them to be brave and not discouraged: "The enemy attacks us on horse and with war engines, with an enormous multitude, but we will overcome by the holy name of our Lord God. Because the Lord himself fights for us, and because the Virgin Theotokos will also be the champion (ὑπέρμαχον) for this city, if we ourselves turn all our heart toward them with all our heart and a devoted soul."⁴² In this same context we find also the following assertion of Syncellus: "The fact that they raised their hands to God and asked the Virgin for assistance and protection (ὑπέρμαχον), was a weapon, sabre and shield for all the inhabitants of the city."⁴³ The repeated appearance of the word ὑπέρμαχος here is highly suggestive — as if Mary's role as the defender or protector of Constantinople had been established already before the siege. This may have been the case. Anyhow, the epithet ὑπέρμαχος for saints seems to have become popular in hagiography during the sixth century,⁴⁴ although as a Marian epithet it is actually known from the Akathistos' prooemium (Τῇ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ). An extraordinary interesting parallel is found in the Life of Saint Theodosius, composed by Cyril of Scythopolis (ob. c. 558), saying: "Theodosius, worthily called blessed and citizen of heaven, the great glory of Palestine and boast of the desert, the stay of the monastic order, the general and champion (ὁ στρατηγὸς

VAN DIETEN, *Geschichte der Patriarchen...*, 12–19. "Den Höhepunkt der politischen Tätigkeit Sergios' bildet ohne Zweifel die and erster Stelle (d.h. nach Gott und der Theotokos) ihm zugeschriebene Rettung der Stadt aus der Avarnbelagerung" (p. 12).

(41) Theod. Sync. 303.16–17: τὸν καθ' ἡμᾶς Ἡσαίαν, τὸν ἱεράρχην τὸν τίμιον.

(42) Theod. Sync. 303. 26–30: ἐχθροὶ ἐν ἵπποις καὶ ἄρμασι καὶ ὄχλῳ βαρεῖ καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπανίστανται, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Θεοῦ ἡμῶν μεγαλυνθησόμεθα· κύριος γὰρ αὐτὸς πολεμήσει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ παρθένος ἡ Θεοτόκος ὑπέρμαχος ἔσται τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως, εἴπερ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καρδιάπλήρει καὶ ψυχῇ θελούση προσδράμωμεν'.

(43) Theod. Sync. 303.17–19: Καὶ τοῦτο ἦν ὄπλον καὶ ὄμοφαία καὶ θυρεὸς τοῖς τῆς πόλεως πάσης οἰκίητορσι τὸ αἶρειν πρὸς Θεὸν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν παρθένον ἐξαιτεῖν εἰς βοήθον καὶ ὑπέρμαχον.

(44) On the ὑπέρμαχος as the epithet of Saint Demetrios in the context of the siege of Thessalonike, J. KODER, Anmerkungen zu den Miracula Santi Demetrii, in: *BYZANTIUM. Tribute to Andreas N. Stratos*, vol. 2 (Athens, 1986) 523–538, esp. 527–528.

καὶ ὑπέρμαχος) of the correct doctrines...⁴⁵ — It is apparent that the whole section of the homily (Theod. Sync. 303.7–32), dedicated to the prayers of the imperial children and the patriarch is deep and full of resonance of the Akathistos.

The story about Sergius continues. He used icons in defence. This passage of icons includes an intellectual link to the Akathistos, embedded in the story of Sergius' actions. Therefore it is best to quote the relevant lines of the Akathistos at first, for this is not the only place where Syncellus alludes the Theotokos, having this image in mind: "Shining upon Egypt the light of truth / you dispelled the darkness of falsehood, / for her idols, O Saviour, / fell down unable to endure your power, / and those who were saved from them cried to the Theotokos: / ... Hail, downfall of demons / ... Hail, sea that drowned the spiritual Pharaoh."⁴⁶ Following Syncellus, the icons were hung at all the western doors of the city. They pictured the Virgin, "carrying in her arms the Lord, to whom she had given birth". These icons were "like the most brilliant sun, driving out the darkness by its rays" (Ak. "Shining upon Egypt the light of truth / you dispelled the darkness of falsehood"). Then Sergius shouted to the masses of barbarians and the demons leading them (Ak. "Hail, downfall of demons"): "Oh foreign people and diabolical hordes, you have undertaken the whole war against these. But the woman Theotokos will put an end to all your boldness and pride by its only call, because she is really the mother of the One who drowned Pharaoh and all his army in the middle of the Red Sea (Ak. "Hail, sea that drowned the spiritual Pharaoh"), and discouraged and weakened all the diabolical horde."⁴⁷ The idea that

(45) TLG from E. SCHWARTZ, *Kyrrillos von Sykthopolis* (Leipzig, 1939) (Texte und Untersuchungen, 49.2) 235.24: Θεοδόσιος ὁ ἀξιομακάριστος καὶ οὐρανοπολίτης, τὸ μέγα κλέος τῆς Παλαιστίνης καὶ τῆς ἐρήμου τὸ καύχημα καὶ τοῦ μοναχικοῦ σχήματος τὸ στήριγμα καὶ τῶν ὀρθῶν δογμάτων ὁ στρατηγὸς καὶ ὑπέρμαχος; Translation by R. M. PRICE, *Cyril of Scythopolis, The Lives of the Monks of Palestine* (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1991) 262.

(46) Ak. 11.1–10: Λάμψας ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ φωτισμόν ἀληθείας / ἐδίωξας τοῦ ψεύδους τὸ σκότος / τὰ γάρ εἶδωλα ταύτης, σωτήρ, / μὴ ἐνέγκαντά σου τὴν ἰσχὺν πέπτωκαν / οἱ τούτων δὲ ὀυσηθέντες ἀνεβρών πρὸς τὴν Θεοτόκον / ... χαίρει, κατάπτωσις τῶν δαιμόνων / ... χαίρει, θαλάσσα ποντίσσα Φαραῶ τὸν νοητόν. On this strophe, ΠΕΛΤΟΜΑΑ, *The Image...*, 167–173.

(47) Theod. Sync. 304.4–13: ὁ δὲ ἱεράρχης ὁ ὄσιος πάσαις ταῖς πρὸς δύσιν πύλαις τῆς πόλεως, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ τοῦ σκότους ἤρχετο γέννημα, οἷα ἦλιον ἀπλανέστατον ταῖς ἀκτίσι τὸ σκότος διώκοντα τοὺς τῆς παρθένου ἱεροῦς τύπους ἐν εἰκόσιν ἐνέγραψεν, φεροῦσης ἐν ἀγκάλαις ὄν τέ-

Pharaoh was drowned (in the final end) through the Theotokos (since she is the mother) is the striking common feature between the Akathistos and the homily. Likewise, in both of them, the contrast between the powers of darkness and the power of the Sun is pointed out. According to the Byzantines' Christian understanding of the order of the world, it is all about the Incarnation, understood as liberation, prefigured by the crossing of the Red Sea by Israelis and realized through Mary. This theme is of greatest symbolic importance to Syncellus, because he refers to it altogether four times.⁴⁸

At this stage we can state that there are in the homily no further examples that as clearly as those presented above would demonstrate that the Akathistos is reflected in Syncellus' text. This fact is to be regarded as the main piece of evidence for dating the prooemium to the siege of 626.⁴⁹ Yet, to be accurate, the word στρατηγός appears neither in the homily nor in the twenty four strophes of the Akathistos. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that the function of the στρατηγός is ascribed to Mary by Syncellus, e.g. in his report on the fight at the church of the Pege (Theod. Sync. 305.37–306.12): "The Virgin was present everywhere, overcame without being overcome, spread fear and horror on the enemy, while giving strength to her servants. She preserved her subjects safe and sound, and devastated the enemy masses."⁵⁰

The strategy the Theotokos used in the decisive sea battle is described in detail (Theod. Sync. 311.17–40). Syncellus, maintaining that the Theotokos made the *monoxyla* with their men sink, assures that the Virgin herself won the fight and this victory: "Those who fought

τοκε κύριον, μονονουχί βοῶν νοερά τῇ φωνῇ τοῖς τῶν βαρβάρων πλήθει καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνους ἄγουσι δαίμοσιν· ἑπρὸς τοῦτους ὑμῖν, ὧ ἔθνη ἀλλόφυλα καὶ φύλα δαιμόνια ὁ πᾶς ἐξήρτυται πόλεμος· ἅπαν ὑμῶν τὸ θράσος καὶ τὰ φρυάγματα γυνῆ Θεοτόκος μόνῳ διώξει κελεύσματος, μήτηρ ὑπάρχουσα κατ' ἀλήθειαν τοῦ τὸν Φαραὼ πανστρατιᾶ ἐν Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ βυθίσαντος καὶ τὸ πᾶν δαιμόνιον φύλον δείξαντος ἀδρανῆς καὶ ἀνίσχυρον'.

(48) Theod. Sync. 308.10–15; 311.17–40; 317.40–318.8.

(49) Contra SPECK, *Zufälliges zum Bellum avaricum...*, 140: „Das spricht weder für noch gegen die Annahme, dass 626 aus Dank der Akathistos Hymnos gesungen wurde... da wir zwar in einer Predigt am ehesten eine solche Anspielung erwarten dürften, Theod. Synk. sich aber auf die Bibel beschränkt.“

(50) Theod. Sync. 306.8–1: καὶ πανταχοῦ παρῆν ἢ παρθένος, νικῶσα νίκην ἀνανταγώνιστον, καὶ δεῖμα μὲν καὶ φόβον τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐμβάλλουσα, ἰσχὺν δὲ δούλοις παρέχουσα καὶ ἀπαθὲς φυλάττουσα τὸ ὑπήκοον, ἀναιροῦσα δὲ πλήθος πολέμιον.

on the sea, on our vessels, turn around at the first attack of the enemy force and they failed to beat a retreat, and by that they would have made almost possible attacks by the enemy, if the pity (φιλόανθρωπον) of the Virgin had not prevented this misfortune, refusing to endure such a spectacle. She put in action her own force and power. Not like Moses, dividing and uniting again the floods of the Red Sea by his staff, but only by her gesture and her pure will she made the chariots of Pharaoh and his army to sink... Some say that ours were not withdrawn from the fear of the enemy, but that it is the Virgin herself who wanted to demonstrate the *oikonomia* of the miracle. In consequence of that, the barbarians sank completely, in front of her holy church, in the bridge of our rescue, our easily accessible (εὐδίου) harbour, because all that was the church of the Mother of God in Blachernae."⁵¹

The siege was the extreme experience of a crisis to the Constantinopolitans.⁵² There is no doubt that they were praying days and nights, without rest (ἀκαταπαύστον).⁵³ "The enemy tribes thus encircled the city on the East and on the West, by sea and on the North. But the city begged in tears the Virgin by the words of the inspired mouth of the archpriest: 'Save me, oh Lady, save me, because I will perish. Do not remain dumb, inactive, silent any longer, because I know that you are powerful'."⁵⁴ When the siege was over, and they were delivered, they

(51) Theod. Sync. 311.20–35: δέδεικται δὲ φανερώτατα, ὡς ἡ παρθένος μόνη τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦτον ἠγώνισται καὶ τὴν νίκην νενίκηκεν, ἐξ ὧν οἱ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις ἀγωνιζόμενοι σκάφεσιν ἐκ μόνης τῆς ὀρμῆς τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ὑπεναντίων ἐτράπησαν καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν πρῶμναν ἐκρούσαντο καὶ δεδώκασιν παρ' ὀλίγον τοῖς ἐχθροῖς εὐχερῆ (25) τὴν ἐπίβασιν, εἰ μὴ προφθάσαν τὸ τῆς παρθένου φιλόανθρωπον οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον ἰδεῖν ἐκαρτέρησεν· τὴν γὰρ ἰδίαν ἐξεγείρασα ἰσχύν τε καὶ δύναμιν, οὐ καθάπερ Μωσῆς ῥάβδῳ τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν διέστησε καὶ αὐθις ἐπέκλυσε θάλασσαν, ἀλλὰ νύματι καὶ μόνῳ βουλήματι ἄρματα Φαραῶ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ... Φασὶ δὲ (30) τινες, ὡς οὐ φόβῳ τῶν ἐχθρῶν πρὸς ὑποχώρησιν ἐκλιναν οἱ ἡμέτεροι, ἀλλ' ἡ παρθένος αὐτὴ τὴν οἰκονομίαν δεῖξαι βουλομένη τοῦ θαύματος, τὴν ὑποχώρησιν τοῖς ἡμετέροις ἐκέλευσε προσποιήσασθαι, ὥστε τοὺς βαρβάρους κατὰ τὸν θεῖον ναὸν αὐτῆς, ἤγουν τὸν ὄρμον ἡμῶν τὸν σωτήριον καὶ τὸν λιμένα τὸν εὐδίου — ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ὁ ἐν Βλαχέρναις ναὸς ὑπάρχει τῆς Θεομήτορος — τὸ παντελὲς ὑποστῆναι ναυάγιον.

(52) E.g., Theod. Sync. 304.27–30.

(53) Theod. Sync. 303.30.

(54) Theod. Sync. 304. 19–22: Τὰ δὲ πολέμια ἔθνη τὴν πόλιν ἐκύκλωσαν, ἐξ ἀνατολῶν, ἐκ δυσμῶν, ἐκ θαλάσσης καὶ τοῦ βορρῶ. ἡ δὲ πόλις ἐβόα

sang, praised and glorified the Lord as the church of God.⁵⁵ They ran to Blachernae, which Syncellus calls the holy house of the Mother of God, the “invincible guard of the city and its inhabitants.”⁵⁶ In such context Theodore Syncellus puts the question: “But now, that the Lord saved us of all these dangers, what thanksgiving do we owe, in exchange for what they did for us, to the Lord and the Virgin Mother of God? What praise and what glorification should we sing for the benefits in which we have taken part?”⁵⁷ Syncellus makes only a rhetorical question, because people, his audience, knew what they had sung. To us an answer is transmitted by the manuscript tradition which connects the Akathistos Hymn and the following prooemium:⁵⁸

To you, our leader in battle and defender,
O Theotokos, I, your city, delivered from sufferings,
ascribe hymns of victory and thanksgiving.
Since you are invincible in power,
free me from all kind of dangers,
that I may cry to you:
“Hail, bride unwedded.”⁵⁹

There is no doubt that the contents of these lines, the refrain included, corresponds both to the narrative of Syncellus and its ethos. It is clear that the refrain comes from the Akathistos Hymn, in which it is repeated twelve times. “The refrain ‘Hail, bride unwedded’, with which the series of salutations to Mary conclude, leaves its stamp on

πρὸς τὴν παρθένον δακρύνουσα, στόματι χρωμένη νοερῶ τοῦ ἱεράρχου τῷ πνεύματι· ὡσον, ὧ δέσποινα, σῶσον· ἀπόλλυμαι· μὴ σιγήσης μηδὲ καταπραΰνης· οἶδα γὰρ, ὅτι δύνασαι.

(55) Theod. Sync. 318.21–39.

(56) Theod. Sync. 308.11–12: φύλακα ἢ πόλις ἀκαταμάχητον κέκτηται τὸν ἐν Βλαχέρναις ἅγιον οἶκον τῆς Θεομήτορος.

(57) Theod. Sync. 319.18–21: Τούτων τοίνυν ἀπάντων ὑπὸ κυρίου λελυτρωμένοι, τίνα πρὸς εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Θεῶ καὶ τῆ παρθένῳ τῆ Θεομήτορι, ἀνθ’ ὧν πεπόνθαμεν, προσησώμεθα; τίνα πρὸς αἶνον καὶ δόξαν, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀναξίως εὐεργετήθημεν, προβαλώμεθα;

(58) Consult TRYPANIS, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica...*, 9–21 with bibliography.

(59) TRYPANIS, *THE AKATHISTOS HYMN...*, 28–29: Τῇ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ τὰ νικητήρια / ὡς λυτρωθεῖσα τῶν δεινῶν εὐχαριστήρια / ἀναγράφω σοι ἡ πόλις σου, θεοτόκε· / ἀλλ’ ὡς ἔχουσα τὸ κράτος ἀπροσμάχητον / ἐκ παντοίων με κινδύνων ἐλευθέρωσον, / ἵνα κράζω σοι· / Χαῖρε, νύμφη ἀνύμφευτε.

the whole hymn, as well as on the image of Mary.⁶⁰ It can be added that the image of Mary in Syncellus' homily, too, represents that one of the Virgin. The word παρθένος appears 43 times, whereas the Theotokos only 17 times. (In the Akathistos the ratio is 70 to 34.)

As to the proof by the word στρατηγός, we have to admit that this evidence alone is not sufficient for claiming that the Τῆ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ dates back to the siege of 626. Fortunately, the poem of George of Pisidia, *On the Attack of the Barbars and Their Failure*, 61 supplies us with the missing link. This work was composed probably rather soon after the siege, presenting, in principle, the same account as the homily of Syncellus. It is striking that George of Pisidia calls the Theotokos στρατηγός, even repeatedly:

χαῖρε, στρατηγὲ πρακτικῆς ἀγρυπνίας / Hail, Leader of the practice of vigilance (137),

χαῖρε, στρατηγὲ τῶν ἐνόπλων δακρῶν / Hail, General of the tears of the armed (141),

τοῦ στρατηγοῦ, τῆς ἀτρέπτου Παρθένου / the General, the unchangeable Virgin (405),

ἡ στρατηγὸς Παρθένος / the General Virgin (445).

Of course, it is not only the epithet στρατηγός that attracts our attention here but the word χαῖρε, the very characteristic of the Akathistos Hymn.⁶² Thus the question, to which siege the Τῆ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῷ has to be associated, is answered to, but at the same time a new intriguing question arises for further research: Could the author of the proemium of the Akathistos be George of Pisidia?

(60) PELTOMAA, *The Image...*, 205.

(61) Εἰς τὴν γενομένην ἐφοδὸν τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν ἀστοχίαν, in: L. TARTAGLIA (ed.), *Carmi di Georgio di Pisidia* (Torino, 1998) (Classici Greci collezione. Autori della tarda antichità e dell'età bizantina) 156–191.

(62) I thank cordially Wolfram Hörandner, Vienna, for his reading and commenting the texts of Theodore Syncellus and George of Pisidia.

SUMMARY

The paper concerns dating the prooemium of the Akathistos Hymn, the Τῆ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῶ. It introduces a homily, attributed to Theodore Syncellus, as an evidence of the mutual relationship between the siege of Constantinople in 626 and the Akathistos Hymn and its prooemium. Dogmatical, ideological and linguistic parallels demonstrate that the Akathistos is reflected in Syncellus' text. Further it is shown that in Syncellus' homily Mary has both the role of the defender (ὑπέρομαχος) and the function of the general (στρατηγός), though the latter word is not employed explicitly. As a contemporary text, the poem by George of Pisidia on the siege of 626, includes the word στρατηγός, even together with the word χαίρει, the very characteristic of the Akathistos, it provides the piece of evidence whereby the dating of the Τῆ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῶ to the first siege of Constantinople is justified.

TO THE PROBLEM OF THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EARLY STAGES OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH SLAVONIC TRANSLATION OF THE AKATHISTOS HYMN

The *Akathistos Hymnos* — one of the greatest masterpieces of Byzantine hymnography — from the earliest times managed to pass the borders of the culture, where it had originated. Among the cultures, which were influenced to the greatest extent by this hymn the Slavonic culture should probably be mentioned first, due to the great popularity of the text among Slavs through all the history of the Slavonic Orthodoxy from the 10th century until nowadays, as well as due to the specific tradition of original Slavonic hymns — “*akathist*” — composed by the model of the hymn.

Being the part of the Orthodox Church year service (it is the only *kondak* which is still read completely in church), the text of the Akathistos should be involved into the set of books necessary for the performance of the liturgical service. These books had to be translated in the first years of Christianization of Slavs. Though no Slavonic manuscript containing the text of the hymn has reached us to prove this suggestion, most of the researchers¹ tend to believe that the translation of the Akathistos happened in the 9th century, and the translation was made by the adapts of Kurillos and Methodios. However, it should be mentioned, that it remains unknown in the content of which liturgical book the Akathistos was originally translated. The researches who

(1) See, for example, С. Ю. Темчин, *Этапы становления славянской гимнографии (863 – около 1097 г.)*. Часть первая, *Славяноведение* 2 (2004) 18–55, esp. 42.; А. А. Турилов, *Акафист Богородице. Источники*, in: *Православная энциклопедия*, т. 1 (Москва, 2000) 372; Б. Н. Флоря, А. А. Турилов, С. А. Иванов, *Судьбы Кирилло-Мефодиевской традиции после Кирилла и Мефодия* (Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя, 2000) 10–14.

claim that the hymn was translated inside the *Triodion*,² seem not to take into account the fact, that Akathistos had changed its liturgical place in the services of the Greek Orthodox Church — as one can easily see from the Greek manuscripts, up to the 10th century it had been generally read on the fest of Annunciation (25th of March), and only later it was moved to its present place — the Saturday of the 5th week of the Great Lent.³ So up to the 10th century the hymn had been the part of the other liturgical book — the *Minaia*, and it seems logical to suppose that the first acquaintance of Slavs with the *Akathistos* happened in the content of this book, and only lately (10th–12th century) the Slavonic text of the hymn was transferred to the *Triodion*, following the example of the new type of corresponding Greek liturgical books. However though the earliest manuscripts of *Minaia* of March dates back to the 13th century, the only manuscripts that contain the hymn up to the 14th century, are *Triodia* as well as a few West Slavonic *Kondakaria*, from which only one, namely the oldest one named *Typografsky*, presents the full text of the *Akathistos*.

It has been noticed in literature⁴ that two South Slavonic *Triodion*: the Bulgarian one named *Shafarikovskaia* (F. n. I. 74 from the National Public Library of Saint-Petersburg) and the Serbian one (F. n. I. 68 from the National Public Library of Saint-Petersburg) contain the other version of the hymn, which will be called below *version A*, quite different from the one of the other South Slavonic and East Slavonic manuscripts. The main peculiarity of the version A appears to be the attempt of the translator to organize the Slavonic text in such a way as to hold in the translation the acrostic principle of the original, which happened to result in the significant changes both in the content and in the form of the hymn. Besides in this Slavonic text one can see a plenty of mistakes, inaccurate translations, as well as phrases which sound ambiguous or even mean-

(2) М. А. МОМИНА, Греческие разночтения в славянских гимнографических текстах, *ВВ* 44 (1983) 127; ТУРИЛОВ, Акафист..., 372.

(3) E. WELLESZ, The Akathistos Hymn, in: *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae. Transcripta*, vol. 9 (Copenhagen, 1957) 14; С. А. ТРУПАНИС, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica* (Vienna, 1968) 17; Ν. Τομαδάκης, *Εισαγωγή εις την βυζαντινήν φιλολογίαν*, τ. 2 (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1993) 156.

(4) В. МОШИН, *Кирилски рукописи Југославенске Академије* (Загреб, 1955) 212–213; М. А. МОМИНА, Постная и Цветная Триоди. Содержание Триоди (состав служб), in: *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*, vol. 2 (Москва, 1976) 389–418, esp. 417.

ingless. Naturally, the number of such mistakes has been increasing after each re-writing of the text, so that in the manuscripts of 13th–14th century one can hardly recognize in the jumbled separate incomprehensible Slavonic strophes their harmonic Greek original. However there do exist both paleographic and linguistic evidences that make us, as well as the other researchers⁵ to believe that this was the first Slavonic translation of the hymn and to attribute it to one of the adapts of Kurillos and Methodius, namely to Konstantin Preslavsky or to Kliment Okhridsky. It is worth mentioning, that the very principle of acrostic can be considered as an indication on these persons as the possible translators, since in their original hymns both Konstantin Preslavski and Kliment Okhridski generally use the acrostics, both alphabetical and thematic.

This Slavonic text being so imperfect, that in fact it could not function as a liturgical unit, it seems no wonder that sooner or later the attempts would happen to replace it by a better one. In such way one can explain the appearance of the other version of the translation, the one on which all the later versions of the Slavonic text up to the modern one are based (below *version B*). Let us stress that the new version appeared to be not a revision of the first translation, but another translation performed from another Greek manuscript. One can see from the comparison of one arbitrary chosen strophe — *oikos* (oikos 8) of two versions that the differences between them, which are underlined, exceed 50 %.

Greek text	Version A — Triodium <i>Shafarikovskaja</i>	Version B — Kontakario <i>Typografsky</i>
Θεοδρόμον ἀστέρα	<u>мыслѣно вѣи пжтъ</u>	БОГОТЕЧНОЮ ЗВѢЗДѸ
θεωρήσαντες μάγοι	ВИДѢВШЕ ВЛѢХЕН	ВИДѢВШЕ ВЛѢСЕН
τῆ τούτου ἠκολού-	<u>ЗВѢЗДОЖ ВЪСЛѢ ЕЖ</u>	ПО ТОН ВЪСЛѢДОВАША
θησαν αἶγλη·	ПОСЛѢДОВАВШЕ	ЗАРН И ПΑΚΟ
καὶ ὡς λύχνον	ΠΑΚΟ СВѢТЛННΙΚΑ	СВѢТЛНННКА ДРЖАЩЕ
κρατοῦντες αὐτόν,	<u>ЗРАШЕ И ЗАНЪ</u>	Ю ТОЮ ПЫТАХЪ
δι' αὐτοῦ ἠρεῦνων	<u>ВЪПРАШАХЪ</u>	КРѢПЪКАГО ЦЕСАРΑ
κραταιὸν ἀνακτα·	<u>ДРЖАЩАГО</u>	И ПОСТНГШЕ
καὶ φθάσαντες	<u>ВЪСБѢЧСКАА</u>	НЕПОСТНЖИΜΑΓΟ
τὸν ἀφθαστον	И ПОСТНГШЕ	<u>РАΔОВАШАСА ΕΜЪ</u>
ἐχάρησαν αὐτῶ	<u>НЕПОСТНΖΑΕΜΑΓΟ</u>	ВЪПНЮЩЕ
βο-ῶντες·	<u>ΧΒΑΛΛΩЩЕ ВЪПΝΑΧЪ</u>	ΑΛΛ' ὕΓΑ
ἀλληλοῦία.	ΑΛΛΗ	

(5) See, for example, М. А. МОМИНА, Типы славянской Триоди, in: *Язык и письменность среднеболгарского периода* (Москва, 1982) 102–122, esp. 114.

One can also notice from the comparison that while the text of the version A is in fact a very “free” translation of the original, the version B presents a really true translation, which follows the Greek text with word after word preciseness and, though it does not manage to represent some poetical figures of the original, including the acrostic, and has a number of “clumsy” Slavonic words and phrases, as well as several mistakes, results in a satisfactory equivalent of the Greek hymn.

The problem of the determination of the time and the place of composition of this version still remains open. Let us mention, that the determination of the origin of the text by the analyses of the language of manuscripts is proved to be a wrong way,⁶ though, as it has been shown in recent studies, the local graphical, phonetic, morphological and lexical variants could have been brought into the text later by the scribes who didn't hesitate to alter the text in order to adapt it to one of the regional variants — the so-called *izvod* of Church Slavonic. The only valid judgment about the translation's origin should be based on a critical analysis of the complete codicological and textual tradition.

In modern slavistics, in particular among representatives of Russian school, the answer is usually believed to be provided by the speculations of M. Momina⁷ about the so-called “general revision” of all the books used in the liturgical practice which happened, according to the scholar, in the 11th century Kiev Rus'. The opinion of M. Momina is based on the impressing fact, that the East Slavonic tradition of liturgical books up to the 14th century is quite different from the South Slavonic one. First, in the Kiev Rus' existed several types of books, namely the *Kontakaria* and the *Hymnologia* that have never been found in the oldest South Slavonic tradition. Second, the other liturgical books of the East Slavonic origin provide the revised version of the South Slavonic ones, the significant differences between the versions showing the systematic editor's work over the text. Thus, for *Triodion* — the liturgical book of a particular interest for our research — the separate

(6) Г. Г. ЛАНТ, Еще раз о мнимых переводах в Древней Руси, *ТОДРЛ* 51 (1999) 435–441; Fr. J. THOMSON, “Made in Russia”: A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia, in: *Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre Christliches Russland 988–1988: Vorträge des Symposiums anlässlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands* (Köln, 1993) 295–354, esp. 298–302.

(7) М. А. МОМИНА, Проблема правки славянских богослужебных гимнаграфических книг на Руси в 11 в., *ТОДРЛ* 45 (1992) 200–219.

type *Gimovsky* is distinguished for the East Slavonic region. The scholar claims, that this type stayed unknown in the South Slavonic tradition, which used the other types *Shaforikovsky* and *Orbelsky*, according to her own classification.⁸ These facts were interpreted as evidence of the systematic revision of South Slavonic liturgical books in the Kiev Rus', which was performed due to translation and adoption of the other type of the Typicon (namely the *Typicon of Alexej Studit*) directly from the Byzantium without the Bulgarian mediation. It is worth mentioning, that since the performance of such a large volume of translators' and editors' work should necessary involve the efforts of a group of qualified scholars with excellent knowledge of both Greek and Slavonic language, the speculations of M. Momina could be considered in the context of the long-term discussion of the so-called Kiev Rus' translation school.⁹

According to the opinion of M. Momina¹⁰ the second version of the Slavonic text of the Akathistos was composed in the process of this revision, i. e. in the Kiev Rus' in the end of the 11th century. Let us stress that this fact if proved with sufficient data from the manuscripts has to play the critical role in the argumentation in support of the whole speculation. In fact, besides of the Triodium of the East Slavonic version, the full text of the Akathistos is included in the oldest Slavonic Kontakario *Tipografsky* (the end of the 11th – the beginning of the 12th century), which written together with the oldest copy of the Slavonic translation of the new Typicon, is believed to be the most authentic text resulted from the hypothetic revision. Thus, if the revision described by M. Momina really took place, it should certainly include the revision of the Akathistos. On the contrary, if it turns out, that the composition of the second version of Akathistos has nothing to do with the Kiev Rus' of the 11th century, it would be a serious argument against the whole speculation.

The greatest difficulty of the study is the absence of any manuscript representing the South Slavonic tradition of the Akathistos up to the very end of the 12th century. Thus we can only suppose what happened

(8) М. А. МОМИНА, Вопросы классификации славянской Триоди, *ТОДРЛ* 37 (1983) 25–37, esp. 31.

(9) See, for example, А. И. СОБОЛЕВСКИЙ, Особенности русских переводов домонгольского периода, *Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности* 88 (1910) 162–177; А. А. АЛЕКСЕЕВ, К истории русской переводческой школы 12 в., *ТОДРЛ* 41 (1988) 154–196.

(10) МОМИНА, Проблема правки..., 218.

with the text in the whole period of 9th–12th centuries in this region. The number of Bulgarian, Macedonian and Serbian manuscripts that reached us from the period of the 13th – beginning of the 14th century is also very small and has such a great variety of versions of the text, that it seems really very difficult to reconstruct the relations between them, as well the initial text's versions. Besides the acrostic translation, there exists the version of translation with the same order of oikoi as in the Greek text, which significantly differs however from the East Slavonic version B – the version contained, for example, in the Serbian Triodion *Kopitarova*,¹¹ which we will call later *version C*. These two South Slavonic traditions (versions A and C) were mixed in the number of ways, making almost every manuscript unique. On the contrary, the East Slavonic tradition of the 11th–14th century is represented by the relatively large number of manuscripts with a similarity among the texts, that definitely proves that they all descend from one source.¹² All the differences between the East Slavonic manuscripts could be explained as mistakes of the scribes, and up the 15th century no conscious change had been made in the text. The fact that the full text of this type hasn't been found in the South Slavonic manuscripts seems at the first glance to support the opinion of the East Slavonic origin of the version B.

However the more careful revision of the South Slavonic versions of the Akathistos has to be based on the more detailed analyses of the whole text of the hymn in order to examine the possible mutual influences of different versions. And this analysis reveals some interesting facts.

The first interesting remark appears after the detailed comparison of the text of the version B with the text of the manuscripts F. n. I. 68 and F. n. I. 74 containing the acrostic version A. As it was stated above, generally the differences between the versions exceed 50 % of the whole text. However in the certain fragments of the text, namely in the koukoulion and in the oikoi 1, 2 and 3 the differences between the versions are less than 5 %, and all of them do not involve the systematic editor's work over the text, but rather seem to have originated from the mistakes of the scribes, as one can easily see comparing the texts of koukoulion in two manuscripts:

(11) A. FILONOV-GOVE, *The Slavic Akathistos Hymn. Poetic Elements of the Byzantine Text and its Old Church Slavonic Translation* (Munich, 1988) 223–275; Т. С. БОРИСОВА, К истории ранних редакций церковнославянского перевода акафиста Богоматери, in: *Τέχνη γραμματική 1* (Новосибирск, 2004) 40–57, esp. 44–46.

(12) БОРИСОВА, К истории..., 55–56.

F. n. I. 68

ВЪЗБРАННОМУ ВОЕВОДѢ ПОБѢДНАМ
 ТАКО ИЗВЫВШУ Ꙗ ЗОЛЪ БЛАГОДАРЕНІЕ
 ВЪСПИСАЕТЬ ТИ ГРАДЪ ТВОИ БЦЕ
 НО ТАКО ИМУЩИИ ДРЪЖАВУ
 НЕПОБѢДИМУ Ꙗ ВСѢХЪ МА БДЪ
 СВОБОДИ ДА ЗОВУ ТИ
 РАИСА НЕВѢСТО ВЕЗНЕВѢСТНАМ

Kondakarion *Typografsky*

ВЪЗБРАННОМУ ВОЕВОДѢ ПОБѢДНАМ
 ТАКО ИЗВЫВЪ Ꙗ ЗЪЛЪ БЛАГОДАРЕНИИ
 ВЪСПИСАЕТЬ ТИ ГРАДЪ ТВОИ БЦЕ
 НЪ ТАКО ИМУЩИИ ДРЪЖАВУ
 НЕПОБѢДИМУ Ꙗ ВСѢХЪ МА БѢДЪ
 СВОБОДИ ДА ЗОВУ ТИ
 РАДЪИСА НЕВѢСТО НЕНЕВѢСТНАМ

Such similarity could not be a coincidence. It seems quite clear that these fragments, in the opposition to the rest of the text, have the same origin. In fact two explanations of this phenomenon could be offered. First, a translator of the version B could use the certain fragment of the version A instead of making his own translation. Second, these fragments in their present form are not the ones which the version A originally contained. In this case we have to admit that for some reasons the certain parts of the initial text were substituted lately by the corresponding ones from the version B.

The analysis of the texts provides us with the facts which tend us to believe in the second explanation. Let us stress that due to the changed order of oikoi in version A, caused by the need to form acrostic, the certain oikos as well as the koukoulion are in the different parts of the hymn and do not form one fragment as it happens in version B. Thus if we assume that the translator of the version B used this fragments of the version A, then he would have to refer to the whole text, and the fact that he used only these parts and neglected the others finds no logical explanation. On the contrary, the certain strophes form the very beginning of the hymn in the version B and so could be easily separated from the rest of the text and for some reasons unknown to us used in the revision of the version A. Moreover, the very style of these strophes with the word for word translation, exactness and relatively small amount of mistakes and inadequate translations is similar to the one of the version B and indicates their common origin.

The further reason to believe that the certain strophes are not the ones which the version A originally contained, but appeared in the text later under the influence of the version B is provided by the analyses of another South Slavonic manuscript — the so called Zagreb Macedonian Triodion of the beginning of the 14th century (Zagreb Macedonian Archive, IV d 107, below ZMT).¹³ Though the manuscript was

(13) I would like to thank Prof. Horace G. Lunt for the copy of the manuscript.

written one century later than the Triodium *Shafarikovskaja*, it is commonly believed to reflect the earliest stages of the history of the Slavonic Triodium. In fact, some researchers tend to consider it the earliest version of the Triodium that reached us.¹⁴

A mere glance on the text of Akathistos of ZMT reveals that it doesn't belong to any of the versions mentioned above, neither to the other South Slavonic versions of the Akathistos. In fact, the very order of oikoi of the Akathistos in this particular manuscript is unique. This fact made M. Momina to believe that the text presents the separate version of Akathistos, which had appeared as initial text revision according to the Greek origin.¹⁵ This speculation however doesn't explain the strange structure of the hymn, which has nothing to do either with the following of the structure of the Greek text, nor with an attempt of its conscious change for poetical purpose, as it had happened in version A. On the contrary, at the first glance it seems to lack any system at all (see Picture 1).

Picture 1. Comparison of the Structure of The Zagreb Macedonian Triodium with the Structures of Versions A and B

B	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
ZMT	1 6 11	12 5 2	3 4 7 8 9 10 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
A	1 6 11	2 7 4	13 20 3 22 5 14 19 8 9 10 23 24 15 18 17 16 2 12
	<i>part I</i>	<i>part II</i>	<i>part III</i>

In order to understand this structure we should examine it from another aspect. Basing on the order of oikoi the whole text could be easily divided into three parts. The very beginning of the text excluding the koukoulion follows the same order of oikoi as in the version A, in other words the first three oikoi are oikoi 1, 6 and 11 according to their order in the Greek text. The second part doesn't seem to follow the order of oikoi either of the version A, nor of the version B. This part contains oikoi 12, 5 and 2, i. e. the oikoi, which form pairs with the oikoi of the first part of the text. It is obvious that the text's composer added this part in order to complete the pairs of oikoi of the first part and thus in some way to unite the sources he used. In the third part the order of oikoi follows the one of the Greek origin (and the version B as well), omitting naturally the oikoi which were used in the first two parts. This unique order of oikoi has the only one logical

(14) Л. СЛАВЕВА, Структурната еволуција на јужнословенските триоди, in: Т. СТАМАТОСКИ (eds.), *Климент Охридски: Студии* (Скопје, 1986) 87–88.

(15) МОМИНА, Греческие разночтения..., 127.

explanation — this text is a compilation composed from two Slavonic versions of text of different origin. The first source of this compilation seems to represent the version A with its acrostic structure, while the second has the same order of oikoi as in the Greek Akathistos.

Let us mention that phenomena of such kind are quite a common event in Slavonic manuscript tradition.¹⁶ Compilation of various sources or various versions of the same text was not considered as forbidden or negative in the cultural sense practice. On the contrary, the choice between different sources and their combination in the new more or less original structure was the only way in which the scribes could express their own cultural preferences and act as co-creators of the text. The compiler's work doesn't require the knowledge of Greek language, which not many even educated Slavs possessed that time, nor the philological abilities, necessary for performing translations or revisions. In fact the only thing necessary for compilation is the co-existence of at least two different versions of the same text. It is no wonder that wherever the different versions of the Akathistos co-existed in the same time and place, they were united in the compilations of different kind.

It should be stressed that compilation as a literature phenomenon has been almost neglected in the philological studies. As far as the full description of this type of Old Slavonic texts has not been made, compilations are often confused with the new systematic text's revisions¹⁷. However, the compilations provide the most valuable material for the researcher, including the information on the versions of the text which co-existed in the certain territory over the certain period of time. It is quite a common event, that versions, which have not saved "in full" could be found in the content of compilation. Moreover, the researchers that analyze the text basing on the manuscripts which were written several centuries later after the text's translation or composition — a situation quite common in the Old Slavonic studies — are to keep in mind that in reality they have to do not with the separate versions of the text, but with their later composed compilations.

The compilation we have to do with in the Akathistos of ZMT is a rather mechanical one. The compiler started his text copying one of the versions of the Slavonic Akathistos — namely the one with the

(16) Т. С. БОРИСОВА, К определению понятия текстологической компиляции (на материале рукописной истории церковнославянского перевода Акафиста Богородицы), in: *Τέχνη γραμματικῆ* 3 (Новосибирск, 2008) 80–99.

(17) See, for example, МОМИНА, Греческие разночтения..., 127.

acrostic, and finished it following another source — the version without the acrostic. The second part seems to be a rather clumsy attempt to harmonize these mutually incompatible parts and to give some image of system to this by all means chaotic structure.

Since the source of the first part of the compilation appears to be the acrostic version of the Akathistos, it seems logical to expect the text of this part to coincide with the beginning of the text of the version A. Indeed, in oikoi 6 and 11 the texts are almost the same; the minimal differences are likely to originate from the scribes' mistakes. In the text of oikos 1, however, the differences are so significant that they reveal another version, or even translation of this fragment. Let us stress that the version of oikos 1 of ZMT has not been found in any other manuscript, nor could it be explained by the influence of any other Slavonic or Greek source. Comparing the texts of oikos 1 of ZMT with the one of F. n. I. 74, one can easily see that the style of the former text is similar to the style of the version A in general, in other words it has a number of mistakes, inadequate translations and incomprehensible Slavonic phrases (see Table 1), while the second text, as we stated above, seems to show greater similarity with the version B.

Table 1. Two versions of Slavonic translations of oikos 1 of the Akathistos (from the manuscripts F. n. I. 74 (Triodion Shafarikovskaja) and IV d 107 (Zagreb Macedonian Triodion) — the differences between the versions are underlined.

Line	Greek text	F. n. I. 74.	Zagreb Macedonian Triodion
1	Ἄγγελος πρωτοστάτης οὐρανόθεν ἐπέμφθη	анґлаз прѣдѣстатель сѣ небесе посланъ бы	анґла прѣстатель сѣ небѣ <u>ниспослаа</u>
2	εἰπεῖν τῇ Θεοτόκῳ τὸ «χαῖρε»:	рещи бѣи рѣиса	рещи бѣи рѣиса
3	καὶ σὺν τῇ ἀσωμάτῳ φωνῇ	<u>н</u> сѣ бесплѣтнымы гламь	сѣ бесплѣтнн(м) гладомз
4	σωματούμενον σε θεωρών, κύριε,	<u>бѣплѣщшасѣ</u> виждѣ те їи	<u>бѣплѣщена та</u> вижда їи
5	ἐξίστατο καὶ ἴστατο κραυγάζων πρὸς αὐτὴν τοιαῦτα·	днблшесѣ и стоимше бѣпиа кѣ неи <u>такобѣа</u>	днбижесѣ и стоимше бѣпиа к неи <u>шце</u>
6	χαῖρε, δι' ἧς ἡ χαρὰ ἐκλάμψει·	рѣиса ею же бѣсїа радость	рѣиса ма же радѣтъ бѣснѣеть
7	χαῖρε, δι' ἧς ἡ ἀρὰ ἐκλείψει·	рѣиса ею же клѣтва шчезнетъ	рѣиса еа же клѣтва шчезе

Line	Greek text	F. n. I. 74.	Zagreb Macedonian Triodion
8	χαῖρε, τοῦ πεσόντος Ἀδάμ ἀνάστασις·	рѣнсѧ падышаго адама възстаніе	рѣнсѧ падышаго ада(м) въскрѣшеніе
9	χαῖρε, τῶν δακρύων τῆς Εὐας ἢ λύτρω- σις·	рѣнсѧ сльзъ еѡжинъ избавленіе	рѣнсѧ сльзъ неѡзъѣ избавленіе
10	χαῖρε, ὕψος δυσανάβατον ἀνθρωπίνους λογισμοῖς·	рѣнсѧ высоѡ дѡвѡхѡднѧ члѣчскѡмъ пѡмыслѡмъ	рѣнсѧ высоѡ дѡвѡхѡднѧ члѡмъ мыслѧнѧ
11	χαῖρε, βάθος δυσθεώρητον καὶ ἀγγέλων ὀφθαλμοῖς·	рѣнсѧ глѡбнѡ дѡвѡиднѧ н дѡгльскнѧ ѡчнѧ	рѣнсѧ глѡбнѡ дѡвѡиднѧ дѡгльскнѧ разѡмнѧ
12	χαῖρε, ὅτι ὑπάρχεις βασιλέως καθέδρα·	рѣнсѧ ꙗѡ еси црѡво сѣдѡлицѡ	рѣнсѧ црѡво сѣдѡлицѡ
13	χαῖρε, ὅτι βαστά- ζεις τὸν βαστάζο- ντα πάντα·	рѣнсѧ ꙗѡ носнши носѡщего всѣчѡсѡ	рѣнсѧ носѡщнѡ носѡщего всѣчѡсѡ
14	χαῖρε, ἀστὴρ ἐμφαινὼν τὸν ἥλιον·	рѣнсѧ звѣздо ꙗѡяꙗщнѡ снѡ	рѣнсѧ звѣздо ꙗѡснѡяꙗщнѡ снѡ
15	χαῖρε, γαστήρ ἐνθέου σαρκώσεως·	рѣнсѧ ѡтѡрѡѡ ѡжстѡнѡго въꙗꙗщнѡ	рѣнсѧ чрѡѡ ѡжнѡ ꙗѡꙗꙗщнѡ
16	χαῖρε, δι' ἧς νεοουργεῖται ἡ κτίσις·	рѣнсѧ ѡ ꙗѡ же ѡнѡѡлѡетъ сѧ тѡѡрѡ	рѣнсѧ ѡ ꙗѡ же ѡнѡѡлѡетъ сѧ тѡѡрѡ
17	χαῖρε, δι' ἧς προσκυνεῖται ὁ πλάστης·	рѣнсѡ ѡ ꙗѡ же ꙗѡклѡнѡемъ сѧ тѡѡрѡщнѡ	рѣнсѡ ꙗѡ ꙗѡ клѡнѡнѡемъ тѡѡнѡ
18	χαῖρε, νύμφη ἀνύμφευτε.	рѣнсѡ неѡѡстѡ ѡзнеѡѡстнѡ	рѣнсѡ неѡѡстѡ ѡзнеѡѡстнѡ

All these facts put together make us to believe that the compilation of ZMT saves the initial variant of the first oikos of version A, which in the other manuscripts had been changed under the influence of another source. Unfortunately, oikoi 2 and 3 are in the other parts of the compilation of ZMT, and so they were probably of another origin. That's why we couldn't reconstruct their initial form in the acrostic version. However in these strophes we do have several variants, which could have originated from the initial acrostic version. They are:

oikos 2, line 2 — the Greek θαρσαλέως is translated сѡ дѡрзновеніемъ, while the other versions have крѡꙗꙗщнѡ,

oikos 3, line 4 — the Greek πῶς ἐστὶ τεχθῆναι δυνατόν instead of како есть родити мѣшо of the other versions is translated како възможно есть родити,

oikos 3, line 9 — τῶν δογμάτων instead of велѣнїи has повелѣнїемъ,

oikos 3, line 15 — τὸ «πῶς» μηδένα διδάξασα instead of никакo же нїединаго научши is translated како никакoже никoгoже побучила еси,

and finally

oikos 3, line 17 — φρένας instead of смыслаъ presents the variant разумни мисль.

These facts give us another strong argument in support of our speculation about the version B origin of oikoi 1, 2 and 3 of the manuscripts F. n. I. 74 and F. n. I. 68, which for some reasons unknown to us have been put into place of the initial ones which saved only in part in the compilation of ZMT. Let us stress, that in this case the manuscripts F. n. I. 68 and F. n. I. 74 don't present the authentic type of the acrostic version, but its compilation with the version B.

Let us return to the analyses of the Akathistos of ZMT, which will reveal the other interesting facts concerning the version B. As we stated above, one of the sources of this compilation was the acrostic version of the Akathistos. In order to determine the other source, let us examine more closely the third part of the hymn, which according to our speculations was taken from it. The analysis of the structure of the text has revealed that in this version the order of oikoi of the hymn was the same as in the Greek origin. Thus we have to search the origin of the third part among the versions without acrostic. Our investigations on the topic have shown, that up to the 14th century there existed only two such versions. The first one was the version B described above. Let us remember, that this version is found "in full" only in the East Slavonic manuscripts. The second version (version C) is the one found only in the South Slavonic manuscripts, either "in full" (the version of Triodium *Kopitarova*), either in compilation with the acrostic version A (Triodium *Orbelskaja*).¹⁸ Since the compilation of ZMT was definitely composed in the South Slavonic territory, it would seem logical to expect it to use the South Slavonic version as its source. However, the comparison of the most significant differences between the versions B and C with the variants of ZMT shows definitely, that the compilation used the version B.

(18) БОРИСОВА, К истории..., 53–54.

Table 2. Comparison of the main differences between the versions B and C with the variants from the third part of compilation of Zagreb Macedonian Triodium

Oikos – line	Greek text	Version B	Version C	ZMT
4. 3.	ἔγκαρπον / εὐκαρπον	ПОДОБИТЪ	БЛАГОПОДЪНЪ	ПОДОБИТЪ
5. 10.	ἄρουρα	НИВО	БРАДО	НИВО
5. 12.	λειμῶνα	ЦЪБЪТЪ	РАИ	ЦЪБЪТЪ
7. 14.	ἔρεισμα	ВРЪТЪРЖЕНІЕ	ОСНОВАНІЕ	ОСНОВАНІЕ
7. 15.	γνώρισμα	СЪКАЗАНІЕ	ПОЗНАНІЕ	СЪКАЗАНІЕ
8. 2.	ἠκολούθησαν	БЪСЛЪДОБЪША	ПОСЛЪДОБЪШИ	БЪСЛЪДОБЪША
8. 5.	φθάσαντες	ПОСТИГЪШЕ	ДОСТИГОША	ПОСТИГЪШЕ
9. 8.	παύσασα / σβέσασα	ПРЕСТАВЛАЮЩИ	ВРЪТАШИ	ПРЕСТАВЛАЮЩИ
9. 11.	κύριον	ГОСПОДА	БЪДА	ГЪДА
9. 12.	πολυθέου	МЪНОГОБЪСЪТЪБНАГО	ИДОЛЬСКАГО	МЪНОГОБЪСЪТЪБНАГО
9. 14.	σβέσασα / παύσασα	ВРЪТАСЪШИ	СЪСТАВЪШИ	ВРЪТАСЪШИ
10. 11.	θεοφόροι	БЪНОСИВИ	БЪНОСНИ	БЪНОСНИ
18. 4.	καθ' ἡμῶς πρόβατον / καθ' ἡμῶς ὅμοιος	ПО НАСЪ ИАКО ОБЪЧА	НАМЪ ПОДОБЕНЪ	ПО НАСЪ ИАКО ОБЪЧА
18. 5.	ὅμοιοι γὰρ τὸ ὅμοιοι	ПОДОБЕНЪВЪМЪ	ПОДОБНИКЪ	ПОДОБНОМЪ
18. 5.	ἵνα βοῶμεν* / ἠθέλησεν ἀκούειν	ДА БЪПНЕМЪ	БЪСХУГЪ СЪМЪЛАТИ	ДА БЪПНЕМЪ ТИ
19. 4.	κατασκευάσε	ВРЪРАСИ	СЪВЪРШИ	ВРЪРАСИ

Oikos — line	Greek text	Version B	Version C	ZMT
19. 4.	ἄχραυτε	чистага	прѣчистага	чистага
19. 5.	πάντας προσφωνεῖν σοι διδάξας	намичьзъ приглагошти сице	намичи бьса приглагошти ти	и намичи проглагошти сице
19. 9.	χορηγῆ	податльнице	податлю	податльнице
19.10.	ὅτι ἐνέδυσας τοὺς γυμνο- θέντας τῆς ζωῆς / οὐ γὰρ ἐνουθέτησας τοὺς συλη- θέντας τὸν νοῦν	ѡко ты одѣла еси жywота обнаженыа	ты бо наказала еси окраденне ѡмоль	ѡко ты одѣла еси жywота обнажила еси
19.12.	ἢ τὸν φθορέα τῶν φρενῶν καταργούσα	гwмвнтела ѡмzмz разарлющи	гwмвнтела санслоь ѡразннбъши	гwмвнтела ѡмzмz ѡзарѣщи
19.13.	τεκοῦσα	рожши	порождшти	рожши
19.14.	παστὰς	ложнице	чрьтоже	ложнице
19.15.	ἀρμόζουσα	обрмчлющи	счгтабши	обрччлющи
19.17.	ἀγίων	сѣи	сѣбти	сѣи
20. 1.	ἤττάται	повнмреть сa	повѣждает сж	повнмреть сa
20. 1.	συνεκτείνεσθαι	распростърети	прострѣти	распрострѣти
20. 5.	δέδοκας	далъ еси	даровала еси	далъ еси
21. 4.	ὀδηγῆ	наводитъ	наставадеть	наводитъ
21. 8.	καταλάμπουσα / κατα- γάζουσα	освлющи	облистажшти	освлющи
21.12.	ζωογραφούσα	присмлющи	присмлюшти	присмлющиѣ

Let us stress that the similarity of the East Slavonic texts of Akathistos of the version B with the text of the third part of ZMT is so striking, that any possibility of coincidence should be excluded. The differences between the texts could all be explained as the scribes' mistakes (the text of ZMT has a large number of them); no systematic text's revision definitely wasn't performed.

Thus we have found the certain parts of the version B in two South Slavonic compilations. First, the koukoulion and oikoi 1, 2 and 3 are found in the content of the compilation of manuscripts F. n. I. 68 and F. n. I. 74. Second, the large part of the text (excluding oikoi 1, 6 and 11) was used in the compilation of ZMT. The linguistic analysis of the manuscripts, containing these compilations,¹⁹ as well as the results of our investigation show that these texts were composed relatively early — surely not later than the end of the 11th century. So we could definitely prove that though the full text of version B has never been found in the South Slavonic manuscripts it undoubtedly existed on the South Slavic territory, and from earliest times (not later than 11th century). The last remark excludes the possibility of the later East Slavonic influence on the Southern tradition, which could have happened only later — not earlier than the end of 12th century. Thus the presence of the version B in the South Slavic area in the 11th century could be explained only in one way — the version B was not composed in Kiev Rus', as the certain researchers believe, but it was transported there from the South Slavic region, which was the real place of its composition.

Since almost no evidence about the literary activities in Bulgaria in the period of interest (10th–11th century) is left, it seems extremely difficult to determine the concrete place, time and person, who performed the new translation of Akathistos. However let us make some suppositions on the topic, which though are impossible yet to be proved, could be regarded as a possible explanation of the facts the manuscripts present us. The analysis of the manuscripts made us to believe, that the second translation of Akathistos (version B) was composed in the East Bulgarian Kingdom in the time of Tsar Peter (927–969). Let us mention that this speculation is supported by the recent publications which claim the possibility of the system-

(19) See МОШИН, Кирилски рукописи..., 212–213; СЛАВЕВА, Структурната еволуција..., 112–113; МОМИНА, Вопросы классификации..., 31.

atic revision of all liturgical books in the time of Tsar Peter.²⁰ According to the researchers, it was an attempt of systematic revision of all the great volume of Slavonic hymnographic material, both translated and original, from the point of view of its correspondence with the Byzantine liturgical tradition. If we assume that the version B was composed in the process of this revision, than we could explain many facts we found analyzing the manuscripts. As far as the East Bulgarian Kingdom in that time was separated politically as well as culturally from the West Bulgarian, Bulgaria of Okhrid, which after the end of the East Bulgarian Kingdom represented the whole South Slavonic tradition continued to use the former version of Akathistos influenced only to the small extent by the revised one. On the other hand, the new version was borrowed and widely used by Russians, who, as it is definitely proved in the modern literature,²¹ took their liturgical books after their Christianization in 998 from the East Bulgarian Kingdom.

Let us sum up the main results of our investigation. As we have found out, the version of the Akathistos of the Kondakarion *Typograf-sky*, as well as of all of the East Slavonic Triodium of the 12th–14th century presents remarkable similarity with the parts of the hymn, used in the South Slavonic compilations composed not later than the 11th century. The minimal differences had originated from the scribes' mistakes and the slight text accommodation to the East Slavonic variant of the Church Slavonic language. The texts' similarity definitely reveals, that no systematic text revision was performed over the text. Thus, it is proved, that no revision of the Akathistos was performed in the Kiev Rus' in the 11th century (and up to the 14th century as well), the text of the hymn the East Slavs used was composed in the South Slavic territory. We suppose that it happened in the East Bulgarian Kingdom over the time of Tsar Peter.

(20) А. А. Турилов, Б. Н. Флоря, *Христианская литература у славян в середине 9 – середине 11 в. и межславянские культурные связи*, in: *Христианство в странах Восточной, Юго-Восточной и Центральной Европы на пороге второго тысячелетия* (Москва, 2002) 415–425.

(21) В. Мошин, *О периодизации русско-южнославянских литературных связей 9–15 вв.*, *ТОДРЛ* 19 (1963) 28–106, esp. 60–65; Г. А. Хабургаев, *Первые столетия славянской культуры: Истоки древнерусской книжности* (Москва, 1994) 156–159.

SUMMARY

The paper deals with the early stages of the history of the Old Church Slavonic translation of the Akathistos Hymn. The Greek Akathistos is stated to be translated twice into Slavonic in the 9th–11th centuries. The problems of the time and place of these translations, as well as of the relations between them are discussed. The second translation is proved to be performed in Bulgaria in the middle of the 10th century.

Tatiana A. Sénina (moniale Kassia)
Saint Pétersbourg

REMARQUES SUR LE CANON DES DÉFUNTS ÉCRIT PAR S. CASSIA DE CONSTANTINOPE

Parmi les œuvres hymnographiques de la célèbre poétesse byzantine S. Cassia qui nous sont parvenues il y a un canon des défunts. Il a été édité par K. Krumbacher d'après le manuscrit *Cod. Crypt. Г. β. V* fol. 1^v-6,¹ et traduit en anglais par A. Tripolitis ;² récemment, j'ai fait une traduction du canon en slavon et en russe, avec des commentaires.³

Je voudrais ici faire quelques remarques sur les théotokions de ce canon. Ces tropaires ne s'inscrivent pas dans l'acrostiche et ne sont pas originales : Cassia les a pris tous, à l'exception du théotokion de la 9^{ème} ode, des canons différents qui se trouvent même à présent dans les livres liturgiques. I. Rochow l'a déjà noté mais elle a estimé faussement que le théotokion de la 5^{ème} ode est né sous la plume de Cassia ;⁴ en fait il coïncide presque entièrement avec celui de la 5^{ème} ode du 2^{ème} canon (du 8^{ème} ton, ainsi que le canon écrit par Cassia) à l'archistratège Michel, le 8 novembre aux matines. Comparons :⁵

(1) K. KRUMBACHER, *Kasia, Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und der historischen Classe der k.b. Academie der Wissenschaften* (1887) Heft. 1. 347-356. Ici je cite le canon d'après cette édition.

(2) A. TRIPOLITIS, *Kassia: the Legend, the Woman, and her Work* (New York—London, 1992) (Garland Library of Medieval Literature. Serie A, 84) 88-105.

(3) Монахиня Кассия (Т. А. СЕНИНА), Канон об упокоении усопших, творение св. Кассии Константинопольской, dans : *История и теория культуры в вузовском образовании*, вып. 4 (Новосибирск, 2008) 211-226.

(4) I. ROCHOW, *Studien zu der Person, den Werken und dem Nachleben der Dichterin Kassia* (Berlin, 1967) (Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten, 36).

(5) Les divergences sont en italique.

Canon des défunts

Ἐν δυσὶ *τελείαις* ἕνα σε γινώσκομεν *φύσει κύριον*, ἐνεργείαις ἄμφω καὶ θελήσεσιν ὄντα ἀσύγχυτον, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκ γυναικὸς λαβόντα σάρκα, ἧς τὴν θέαν τιμῶμεν τοῖς πίναξιν.⁶

Canon à l'archistratège Michel

Ἐν δυσὶ *ταῖς οὐσίαις*, ἕνα σε γινώσκομεν *Θεὸν τῆς κτίσεως*, ἐνεργείας ἄμφω, καὶ θελήσεσιν ὄντα ἀσύγχυτον, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκ γυναικὸς σάρκα λαβόντα, ἧς τὴν θέαν τιμῶμεν τοῖς πίναξιν.⁷

Les ménées grec et slavon indiquent que le canon à l'archistratège Michel a été écrit par le moine Jean,⁸ mais l'acrostiche de ses théotokions donne le nom Κλήμεντος, ce qui est noté dans le ménée grec et n'est pas noté dans le ménée slavon. En réalité, ce canon est sorti tout entier de la plume de S. Clément l'Hymnographe qui vivait à l'époque des deux périodes de l'iconoclasme.⁹ Le canon contient des mentions de la veneration des icônes (par exemple, les théotokia des odes 4, 6 et 7), de « l'union des églises et la chute de toute hérésie résistante » (ode 1, tropaire 3). A. Kazhdan a montré que le canon des archanges avait été écrit par S. Clément, évidemment après la restauration des icônes au VII Concile œcuménique.¹⁰ Cet emprunt du tropaire n'a été remarqué ni par I. Rochow, ni par A. Tripolitis, car celle-ci suit en tout celle-là, et Rochow s'appuie sur E. Follieri qui cite les tropaires de S. Clément et de S. Cassia comme des œuvre différentes.¹¹ N. Tsironis a bien fait attention à ce théotokion, à son contenu christologique et à la mention directe des icônes, mais elle ne s'est pas aperçue non plus de la parallèle avec le théotokion de S. Clément.¹²

(6) KRUMBACHER, Kasia..., 351, l. 110–116.

(7) *Μηναῖα τοῦ ὄλου ἐνιαυτοῦ*. Τόμος Β', περιέχον τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν Νοεμβρίου καὶ Δεκεμβρίου μηνῶν (Ἐν Ρώμῃ, 1889) 84.

(8) Ibid., 81; *Минія (Вѣвз, ꙗвѣг; répr.: Москва, 1997) Мѣсѣцъ ноѣмвриѣ*. 139.

(9) Cf. A. P. KAZHDAN, *A history of Byzantine literature (650–850)* (Athens, 1999) Pt. 2, ch. 5, avec la bibliographie ; je cite cet ouvrage dans la traduction russe : A. П. КАЖДАН, *История византийской литературы (650–850 гг.)*. Пер. с англ. А. А. Белозеровой и др. (Санкт-Петербург, 2002) (Византийская библиотека: исследования) 337–348.

(10) КАЖДАН, *История византийской литературы...*, 338–339.

(11) Cf. H. FOLLIERI, *Initia hymnorum ecclesiae graecae*, vol. 1 (Vatican, 1960) (Studi e Testi, 211) 437.

(12) N. TSIRONIS, *The Body and the Senses in the Work of Cassia the Hymnographer : literary Trends in the Iconoclastic Period*, *ΣΥΜΜΕΙΚΤΑ* 16 (2003) 151.

Apparemment, S. Cassia a emprunté ce théotokion comme significatif dans le contexte de la polémique anti-iconoclaste et accentué un peu son orientation : elle substitue ἐν δυοῖ τελεΐαις φύσει à ἐν δυοῖ ταῖς οὐσίαις. Cette précision correspond à la position des iconophiles qui insistaient que si le Christ est devenu, dans son incarnation, l'homme parfait, il peut et doit être circonscriptible comme chaque homme, et ce sujet était discuté surtout pendant le second iconoclasme, justement à l'époque de S. Cassia : les iconoclastes traitaient les iconophiles comme néstorien, et les iconophiles accusaient leurs adversaires de monophysisme parce que, d'après la doctrine iconoclaste, l'humanité du Christ est d'une nature commune, ses idiomes physiques sont accidentels, et la nature humaine du Christ est invisible.¹³

A. Kazhdan n'a pas fait attention à ce que les théotokia du canon ne font pas partie de l'acrostiche ; en examinant le contenu du dernier théotokion, il fait une réserve : « Cassia, si elle est l'auteur de cette partie du canon (les *theotokia*, s'ils n'étaient pas "signés", pouvaient passer d'un auteur à l'autre, comme montre le cas de Clément), change subitement de sujet... ». ¹⁴ Mais nous voyons, sur l'exemple de S. Cassia, que les hymnographes byzantins employaient et remaniaient les théotokia anonymes comme "signés".

N. Tsironis pense que le théotokion cité « offers us a *terminus post quem* for the date the author composed the poem, which must have been after 843, since such an open assertion of the veneration of the images could not have circulated prior to the Triumph of Orthodoxy ». ¹⁵ Cet argument me semble assez faible. En premier lieu, Cassia écrivait ses œuvres hymnographiques avant tout pour chanter dans son propre monastère, ce que montre son fameux hirmos pour la 1^{ère} ode du canon du Grand Samedi écrit de la part des jeunes filles : ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ὡς αἱ νεάνιδες τῷ Κυρίῳ ἄσωμεν. Des œuvres pareilles pouvaient rester entre les murs du couvent pendant des années ou ne se répandre que dans un cercle d'intimes, et pour Cassia c'étaient sans doute les iconophiles. En deuxième lieu, attendre le Triomphe de l'Orthodoxie pour parler ouvertement de la vénération des images n'était pas

(13) Cf., par ex., B. LOURIE, Le second iconoclasme en recherche de la vraie doctrine, *SP* 34 (2001) 150–153 ; sur la théologie des iconophiles et des iconoclastes en VIII–IX siècles cf. В. М. ЛУРЬЕ, В. А. БАРАНОВ, *История византийской философии. Формативный период* (Санкт-Петербург, 2006) 430–486, surtout 441, 471–485.

(14) КАЖДАН, *История византийской литературы...*, 411.

(15) TSIRONIS, *The Body and the Senses in the Work of Cassia...*, 151, n. 53.

propre aux iconophiles¹⁶ et d'autant plus à S. Cassia qui a été même flagellée pour son iconophilie. On peut aussi se rappeler une de ses épigrammes qui montre bien le caractère de la poétesse : « Je hais celui qui se tait quand il est temps de parler ». ¹⁷ Toutefois, il y a d'autres raisons pour dater son canon d'un temps beaucoup postérieur à 843, et j'en parlerai plus bas.

Je dois aussi noter qu'il est impossible de partager l'opinion de Tsironis que le théotokion de la 5^{ème} ode du canon de défunts « is perhaps the most direct reference to the veneration of image in the entire homiletic and hymnographical corpus of the middle Byzantine period ». ¹⁸ On peut trouver beaucoup de mentions des icônes et même d'invectives contre les iconoclastes, par exemple, dans les œuvres d'un autre fameux hymnographe, contemporain de Cassia, S. Théophane le Graptos. Voici quelques citations :

Σοὶ ἔμψυχος εἰκὼν, τῷ Σωτῆρι προσάγεται, τιμήσασα τὴν εἰκόνα,
τῆς ἀχράντου σαρκός σου, καὶ τύπον τὸν τοῦ σώματος.

(Canon en l'honneur de S. Euthyme de Sardes, ¹⁹
le 26 décembre, ode 5, tropaire 1.)

Ἐφηπλωμένος σανίδι κατεκεντήθης, ὡς προσκυνῶν Θεόδωρε,
Χριστοῦ τὴν εἰκόνα καὶ τῆς Θεομήτορος, θρακὸς ἀγριότητι καὶ
βαρβαρικῇ ἰταμότητι.

(Canon en l'honneur de S. Théodore le Graptos, ²⁰
le 27 décembre, ode 4, tr. 1.)

(16) Par exemple, S. Théodore le Stoudite répétait constamment que les orthodoxes ne devaient pas garder le silence pendant les persécutions, même si l'empereur interdit de parler des icônes, parce que c'est une vraie trahison de la foi ; cf. G. ΦΑΤΟΥΡΟΣ (rec.), *Theodori Studitae epistulae*, vol. II (Berlin—New York, 1992) (CFHB, 31) Ep. 149, l. 1–46; 312, l. 9–18; 425, l. 10–32. Voir aussi plus bas quelques observations sur les canons écrits par S. Théophane le Graptos.

(17) Μισῶ σιωπὴν, ὅτε καιρὸς τοῦ λέγειν (KRUMBACHER, *Kasia...*, 360, l. 90).

(18) TSIRONIS, *The Body and the Senses in the Work of Cassia...*, 151.

(19) S. Euthyme a été martyrisé en 831, et S. Théophane a écrit ce canon avant le Triomphe de l'Orthodoxie, cf. pour les détails T. A. СЕНИНА (монахиня Кассия), Несколько замечаний по поводу Жития св. Евфимия Сардского, *Scr 2* (2006) 411–417. Dans ce canon l'empereur iconoclaste Léon l'Arménien est nommé δυσσεβής (ode 3, tr. 2) et θεοσυγής (ode 8, tr. 2).

(20) Le frère de S. Théophane ayant subi les souffrances avec celui-ci sous l'empereur Théophile est mort en 841. La vénération des icônes est mentionnée aussi dans le 3^{ème} tropaire de l'ode 7 ; dans quelques tropaires il y a des invectives contre les empereurs iconoclastes (1^{er} et 3^{ème} de l'ode 3, 1^{er} de l'ode 8).

Τὸ θεῖον εἰκόνημα μορφῆς, τρισμάκαρ, τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης Χριστοῦ προσκυνῶν διετέλεις, τοῖς θεομάχοις ἀντιπαττόμενος μέχρι θανάτου, καὶ ψάλλων, Θεόδωρε· Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.

(Canon en l'honneur de S. Théodore le Stoudite,²¹
le 11 novembre, ode 7, tr. 2.)²²

Ainsi, nous voyons que S. Cassia n'était point la seule à faire la démonstration de ses convictions iconophiles dans les œuvres hymnographiques.

Dans le théotokion de la 9^{ème} ode, apparemment le seul de la plume de Cassia, la poétesse prie Dieu de « couronner l'empereur croyant » et d'« exterminer la force des ennemis » :

Υἱὲ θεοῦ καὶ λόγε μονογενῆ / τὸν πιστὸν βασιλέα στεφάνωσον /
τῇ πανσθενεῖ, δέσποτα, χειρὶ σου, ὡς ἀγαθός· / καὶ δυσμενῶν τὸ
κράτος νῦν / ὄλεσον τῷ ὄπλῳ τῷ τοῦ στρατοῦ / διὰ τῆς Θεοτόκου /
καὶ σῶσον τὸν λαόν σου / ἐν τῇ ἀγήρῳ βασιλείᾳ σου.

Évidemment il s'agit de la guerre avec les Arabes, et ὁ πιστὸς βασιλεύς ne peut être autre que Michel III. Peut-être Cassia a en vue les conflits des années 860^e :²³ le 3^e tropaire de la dernière ode, où Cassia prie les « pères, frères, parents, amis et les unanimes » décédés de prier Dieu pour elle, montre que le canon a été écrit par la poétesse probablement à un âge avancé, peut-être vers 860 quand beaucoup de ses parents et amis²⁴ était déjà morts et quand elle-même réfléchissait sur son passage à l'autre monde. Le théotokion de la 5^{ème} ode orienté contre les iconoclastes n'y change rien parce que la polémi-

(21) S. Théodore est mort en 826 ; cf. dans ce canon encore les mentions des images sacrées dans les odes 1 (tr. 3) et 8 (tr. 1).

(22) On peut multiplier les exemples. Je me propose de consacrer un article particulier aux sujets liés avec la lutte contre l'iconoclasme dans les œuvres de S. Théophane le Graptos.

(23) Pour les détails des guerres entre les Byzantins et les Arabes sous Michel III cf. A. A. ВАСИЛЬЕВ, *Византия и арабы. Политические отношения Византии и арабов за время Аморийской династии* (Санкт-Петербург, 1900) 153–210 ; sur les batailles des années soixante cf. p. 189–210. Cf. aussi H. GRÉGOIRE, *Études sur le neuvième siècle, Byzantion 8* (1933) 515–538, sur les batailles de 853, 863 et 866.

(24) Parmi lesquels était, par exemple, le fameux S. Théodore le Stoudite († 826), avec qui Cassia était en correspondance dans sa jeunesse ; sûrement, Cassia connaissait aussi ses disciples, y compris S. Naukratios († 848) et d'autres stoudites dont plusieurs étaient déjà morts vers 860.

que sur la veneration des images restait actuelle à Byzance longtemps après 843.²⁵

SUMMARY

The article contains an analysis of the hymnographic canon for the deaths written by Kassia of Constantinople. It is shown that all its theotokia (apart from the last one) are taken from earlier canons, including the theotokion of the fifth ode that was previously considered as written by Kassia herself. Concluding from its contents, the canon is to be dated to the 860s.

(25) Même jusqu'à la période du patriarcat de S. Photios ; cf., par exemple, Ф. М. РОССЕЙКИН, *Первое правление Фотия, патриарха Константинопольского* (Сергиев Посад, 1915) 143, 474–475; А. П. ЛЕБЕДЕВ, *История Константинопольских соборов IX века* (Санкт-Петербург, 2001 [Москва, 1888]) (Византийская библиотека: исследования) 166–169 ; F. DVORNIK, *The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm*, *DOP* 7 (1953) 69–97 ; J. GOUILLARD, *Deux figures mal connues du second iconoclasmе*, *Byzantion* 31.2 (1961) 387–401 ; C. MANGO, *The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photios*, dans : A. BRYER, J. HERRIN (eds.), *Iconoclasm. Papers given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. University of Birmingham. March 1975* (Birmingham, 1977) 133–140 ; D. STRATOUDAKI-WHITE, *Patriarch Photios and the Conclusion of Iconoclasm*, *GOTR* 44 (1999) 341–355.

Youhanna Nessim Youssef
Virginia, Australia

THE PSALIS FOR THE CONSECRATION OF THE CHURCH (REVISITED)

The manuscript

The description of the manuscript according to the Catalogue of Mingana is as follows:

239×164 mm. 259 leaves. Nineteen lines to the page. The ritual of the Consecration of a new church and a new altar, according to the ritual of the Coptic Church. The MS is divided into two columns, the first of which is in Coptic and the second in Arabic, as is usual in the MSS. Written after the Arab invasion.

A. Ff. 4a–201: The ritual of the Consecration of a church

B. Ff. 204–255b The ritual of the Consecration of the Altar

Ff. 256a–257b contain a long colophon in which we are informed that the MS was written by the priest-monk in the monastery of St. George of Tūrā on Thursday, the 5th of the month of Hatūr, in the year 1024 of the Martyrs (AD 1308) in the time of John (spelt Yowannes), the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria.¹

On fol. 203a is an inscription in Arabic by the Coptic Patriarch Cyril,² presenting the Ms. to John, bishop of Salisbury, on the 4th of the month of Bābah, of the year 1615 of the Martyrs (A.D. 1899). Below the inscription is the seal of the Patriarch, dated 1613, probably of the Martyrs (A.D. 1897). On the opposite page (fol. 202b) a similar statement is found in English.

On fol. 8a is a not very clear note in which it is stated that the Ms came to the possession of a spiritual son of the above-mentioned Patriarch John (spelt Yowannes), who was also called John (spelt Yūhanna).

On fol. 255b s an inscription by the son of the last John, who was called Farj-Allah, who gave the Ms. was *wakf* to a man whose name has been partly obliterated and cannot be deciphered with safety.

(1) See below.

(2) Cyril V (1874–1927AD) is meant, cf. M. SHOUKRI, Cyril V, in: A. S. ATIYA (ed.), Coptic Encyclopedia, vol. 3 (New York: MacMilan, 1991)

Fol. 3b is occupied with a representation of the Cross in black, yellow and red, and on the margins of many leaves is a representation of a bird holding a flower or a fruit in its beak. Many geometrical patterns are also found before the main divisions of the work. The pattern on fol. 203b fills the whole page.

The Coptic part of the Ms is written in a bold and clear hand, and the Arabic part in a handsome Egyptian Naskhi. Headings in red. The first Coptic words of a new section are in thick black characters.

The rubrics, unlike those found in MS. 24 [9] (which is only in Arabic) are in both Coptic and Arabic. [Mingana Chr. Arab. 61.] [Coptic-Arabic 2.]³

We give here in full the colophon

ΣΕΗ ΦΡΑΝ ΗΦΩΤ ΝΕΗ ΠΩΗ	بسم الاب والابن
ΡΙ ΝΕΗ ΠΙΠ̄Π̄Δ̄ ΕΘΟΥΑΒ †ΤΡΙ	والروح القدس الثالث
ΑΣ ΕΘΟΥΑΒ ΝΟΜΟΥΣΙΟΣ ΦΑΙ	المقدس المساوي هذا
ΠΕ ΠΕΝΝΟΥ† ΔΝΟΗ ΣΑΝ ΝΙΧΡΗΣ	لهنا نحن النصارى
ΤΙΑΝΟΣ	كان هذا التذكار
ΑΥΦΩΠΗ ΗΧΕ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΝ ΗΧΩΗ	الصالح الذي هو
ΝΑΓΙΑΣΝΟΣ ΝΑΓΑΘΟΝ ΗΨΕΝ	كتاب تكريز الكنايس
ΕΡΦΗΕΥΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΖΙΤΟΤϚ Η	من جهة
ΠΙΑΓΙΟΤΑΤΟΣ ΗΩΤ ΠΙ	الاب الفاضل
ΜΑΝΕΣΩΟΥ ΕΤΕΝΖΟΤ ΦΗ	الراعى الامين
ΕΤΑ ΠΧ̄Σ ΤΑΖΟϚ ΕΧΕΝ ΝΕϚΕ	الذي اقامه المسيح
ΣΩΟΥ ΕΤΤΟΥΒΗΟΥΤ ΦΗΕ	على خرافه الطاهرة
ΤΑϚΩΠΟΥ ΣΕΗ ΠΕϚΣΝΟϚ	الذي اشتراهم بدمه
ΕΤΤΑΗΟΥΤ ΕΘΡΕϚΑΜΟΗ Η	الكريم ليرعاهم في
ΗΩΟΥ ΣΕΗ ΟΥΝΑ ΕϚΚΕΝΙΟΥΩΤ	المرج الحصب
ΟΥΟΖ ΕΨΑΗΟΥΨ ΤΟΥ†ΥΧΗ	ويقوت نفوسهم
ΣΕΗ ΖΑΝΣΩ ΟΥΙ ΕΥΕΝΖΟΤ	بالتعاليم الصادقة
ΟΥΟΖ ΕΤΑΖΟ ΝΗ†ΥΧΗ ΕΤ	ويقيم الانفس
ΖΙΩΟΥΤ ΠΡΕϚ†ΣΩ ΗΡΕϚ	الساقطة المعلم
ΔΗΩΗΤ ΠΡΕϚΣΩΟΥΤΕΗ	المرشد المستقيم

Fol. 253v

ΖΙ ΝΕϚΜΩΗΤ ΠΙΣΟΒΤ ΕΤΤΑΧ	طرقه السور
ΡΗΟΥΤ ΦΗΕΤΤΕΝΝΟ ΝΗΗ	ساس [

(3) A. MINGANA, *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts now in the possession of the trustees of the Woodbrooke settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham*, vol. II, *Christian Arabic Manuscripts and Additional Syriac Manuscripts* (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, 1936) 26–29.

ΕΤΖΕΝΚΗΟΥΤ ΦΡΕΨΩΨΕΝ
 ̀ΝΗΙΣΟΘΗΕΨ ΕΤΖΕΡΗΟΥΤ
 ΦΡΕΨΟΛΩΣΕΛ ΗΗΙΖΗΤ ΠΙ
 ΝΑΗΤ ̀ΝΨΑΝΘΕΜΑΣΤ ΠΙ
 ΗΨΨ ΜΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΗΣ ΑΒΒΑ
 ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ Π ΠΙΤΡΙΑΡΧΟΥ
 ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΙΑ ΦΨ ΝΤΕ ΤΦΕ
 ΤΑΧΡΟΥ ΖΙΧΕΝ ΠΕΨΦΡΟΝΟΣ
 ΗΖΑΝΗΨ ΠΡΟΜΠΙ ΝΕΝ ΖΑΝ
 ΧΡΟΝΟΣ ΝΤΕ ΠΕΨΛΑΟΣ ΨΩ
 ΠΙ ΞΕΝ ΟΥΖΙΡΗΗΗ ΝΕΝ ΟΥ
 ΜΕΤΣΕΜΝΟΣ ΝΤΟΥΨΩΠΙ
 ΕΥΤΑΧΡΗΟΥΤ ΞΕΝ ΠΙΝΑΖΨ
 ̀ΝΟΡΘΟΛΟΖΟΣ ΝΤΕ ΠΧ̅
 ΟΠΟΥ ΝΕΝ ΗΙΘΗΗΗ ΝΕΝ ΗΙΔΙ
 ΚΕΟΣ ΕΤΟΥΨΑΨΗ ΕΨΗΜΕΤΟΥ
 ΡΟ ΕΘΗΕΣΟΣ ΑΜΗΗ
 ΚΕ ΑΡΙΠΑΜΕΥΙ ΗΠΙΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΟΣ

[في
 السهام المتوقدة
 معزي القلوب
 الرووف الخنون
 العظيم في البطاركة
 انبا يونس بطريرك
 الاسكندرية اله السماء
 يشته على كرسيه
 سنين كثيرة
 وازمنة ويكون
 شعبه في سلامة
 واطمانيه ويكونوا
 ثابتين في الامانة
 الارثوذكسية ومحبيهم
 المسيح ابراره
 وصديقيه الذين
 فازوا بملكوته امين
 اذكروا الحقير

Fol. 254r

ΨΔΕΛΗΣ ΝΧΩΒ ΝΤΑΛΕ
 ΠΨΡΟΣ ΝΑΜΑΡΤΑΛΟΣ ΦΗ ΕΤΕ
 ΝΨΨΨΨ ΕΘΡΟΥΗΟΥΨ
 ΕΡΟΥ ΞΕ ΡΩΗΗ ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ ΜΟΝΑ
 ΧΟΣ ΕΨΖΙ ΠΙΜΟΝΣΤΗΡΙΟΗ
 ΝΤΕ ΠΙΤΕΤΡΩΔΣ ΕΨΨΖΟ
 ΕΟΥΟΗ ΗΙΒΕΝ ΕΘΝΑΨΨ ΨΨΗΨΨ
 ΞΕΝ ΟΥΑΓΑΠΗ ΝΤΕ ΦΨΗΨΕΨ
 ΤΩΒΖ ΕΘΡΗΨΨ ΖΑ ΠΧ̅ ΕΘΡΕΨ
 ΧΩ ΝΑΨ ̀ΗΗΕΨΗΟΒΙ ̀ΕΤΟΥ
 ΝΕΝ ΗΕΨΨΟΥΨ ΟΥΟΖ ΝΤΕΨ
 Ψ ΝΑΨ ̀ΗΟΥΗΑΙ ΞΕΝ ΠΕΖΟΟΥ
 ̀ΗΠΨΨΕΒΙΩ ΟΥΟΖ ΟΥΟΗ
 ΗΙΒΕΝ ΕΘΝΑΞΕ ΟΥΣΑΧΙ ̀ΗΖΑΙ
 ̀ΗΝΤΕ ΠΧ̅ ΨΨΕΒΙΩ ΝΑΨ ̀Η
 ΖΑΗΗΗΨ ̀ΗΚΩΒ
 ΔΨΨΩΚ ΕΒΟΛΞΕΝ ΟΥΖΙΡΗΗΗ
 ̀ΗΝΤΕ ΦΨ ΞΕΝ ΠΙΜΟΝΑΣΤΗ
 ΡΙΟΗ ̀ΗΝΤΕ ΠΙΤΕΤΡΩΔΣ ΞΕΝ
 ΠΙΕΖΟΟΥ ΗΠ̅ ΗΠΙΑΒΩΤ ΔΘΨ

العطل الضعيف
 الشقى الخاطى
 غير المستحق ان يدعا
 انسانا لاسيما اسم
 الرهبنة بدير القديس
 مار جرجس بطرا وهو
 يسال كلمن قرا فيه
 بحمجة الله ان يدعوا
 للمسيح من اجله ليففر
 له خطاياہ الكثرية
 وغلطاته ويعطيه
 رحمة في يوم
 المجازاة وكلمن
 قال شيا
 يجازيه المسيح عوضه
 اضعاف كثيرة
 بسلام من الله
 في دسر طرا في
 يوم الخميس الخامس
 من شهر هاتور

his many sins, and his mistakes and to grant him mercy on the day of reward. And everyone who will say something, Christ reward him nay times. It was finished with the peace of God in the monastery of Tura on the 5th day of the month of Hatur (254v). In the year 1024 of the Martyrs, (=1307 AD) in the seventh year of the closing down of the churches and the Christians were force to wear the blue turbans. We pray Christ our God to have pity upon his people and to open the gates of the churches and make to return as they were for He is a pitiful and merciful God. Glory be to Him with His Good Father and Holy Spirit forever Amen.

The importance of this manuscript is that it was copied while the churches were closed for seven years however the patriarch John Ibn Qiddis hoped that the churches will be opened and even more churches will be built which necessitated the copying of the book of consecration of the “new” churches.

The psalis

The psalis are hymns special hymn recited on different occasions.⁷ Ibn Kabar⁸ (+ 1324AD) in his encyclopaedia “*Lamp of Darkness*”⁹ mentions that there are new paslis which are not known to everybody and he gave a list of daily psalis.¹⁰ It is important to mention that the all the psalis mentioned by Ibn Kabar were anonymous. The psalis attributed to an author (such as Sarkis, Nicodemus, Hermina, Christolodus) appeared later.¹¹

(7) Yassa ‘ABD AL-MASIH, Remarks on the Psalis of the Coptic Church, *Bulletin de l’Institut des Études Coptes* 1 (1958) 85–100.

(8) For the works of Ibn Kabar, cf. S. KHALIL, L’Encyclopédie liturgique d’Ibn Kabar +1324 et son apologie d’usages coptes, in: H.-J. FEULNER, E. VELKOVSKA, R. F. TAFT (eds.), *Crosswords of Cultures Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler* (Roma, 2000) 619–655.

(9) This book had never been scholarly published, for the different editions cf. A. WADI, Abu al-Barakat Ibn Kabar, Misbah al-Zulmah, *Studia Orientalia Christiana Collectanea* 34 (2001) 243.

(10) L. VILLECOURT, Les observances Liturgiques et la discipline du Jeûne dans l’Église Copte, *Le Muséon* 37 (1924) 201–280 and especially 228–229.

(11) Y. NESSIM YOUSSEF, Nicodème auteur des psalies, *OCP* 60 (1994) 625–633; IDEM, Recherches d’hymnographie copte: Nicodème et Sarkis, *OCP* 64 (1998) 383–402; IDEM, The Psalis of Saint John Kame, *Bulletin de la Société d’archéologie copte* 39 (2000) 257–265; IDEM, Jean évêque d’Assiut, de Manfalut et d’Abu Tig et ses activités littéraires, in: C. CANNUYER (ed.), *Études Coptes VIII (Dixième Journée d’études, Lille 14–16 Juin 2001)* (Paris—Lille, 2003) (Cahiers de

As our psalis are anonymous and short (only 13 stanzas for the psali Adam and 8 satanzas for the psali Watos) we may assume that we composed early.

The incipit of these psalis are mentioned by Ibn Kabar¹² without giving the complete text. Horner gives the Coptic and the Arabic text.¹³ We consider that an edition of the entire text Coptic Arabic is needed especially that after the first edition many studies had been done.

Text I

Psali for the *Virgin Adam*¹⁴

†ΑΛΙ ΘΘΒΕ †Π̄Α^ο̄Π̄ ΔΛΛΗ

مدیحة للسيدة ادم

ΑΡΙΒΕΡΙ ΖΑΡΟΙ ΝΙΝΗCOC ΑΡΙΒΕΡΙ
ΚΑΤΑ ΤCΜΗ ΝΗCΑΝΑC ΠΙΝΗ†
ΜΠΡΟΦΗΤΗC

تجددوا ايها الجزائر تجددوا كصوت اشعيا
النبي العظيم

CΩΤΕΝ ἘCΟΛΟΝΩΗ
ΠΙΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑΤΗC ΕCΨΩ ἠΠΤΑΙΟ
ἠΜΑΡΙΑ †Π̄Α^ο̄Π̄

اسمعوا سليمان الكنايسي ينطق بكرامة
العذراء مريم

ΕCΨΟΥ† ΕΡΟC ΞΕΝ ΠΙΧΩ ἠΝΤΕ
ΝΙΧΩ ΧΕ ΤΑCΩΝΙ ΤΨΦΗΡΙ¹⁵
ΘΗΕΤΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ

يدعوها في نشيد الانشاد احني ورفيقي
الكاملة

la Bibliothèque Copte, 13) 311–318; IDEM, Recherches d’Hymnographie Copte (2) Hermina et Christodule, in: A. BOUD’HORS, J. GASCOU, D. VAILLANCOURT (éds.), *Études Coptes IX* (Paris, 2006) (Cahiers de la Bibliothèque Copte, 14) 381–397.

(12) S. KHALIL, *مصباح الظلمة في إيضاح الخدمة للقس شمس الرياضة أبو البركات المعروف بابن كمر* [*the lamp of Darkness for the explanation of the Service*], vol. 1 (Cairo, 1971) 346.

(13) G. HORNER, *The Service for the Consecration of a Church and Altar according to the Coptic Rite, edited with translation from a Coptic and Arabic Manuscript of A.D. 1307* (London, 1902) 391–396 (text), 12–13 (translation) and for a summary of the rite cf. O. H. E. BURMESTER, *The Egyptian or Coptic Church, A detailed description of her liturgical services and the rites and ceremonies observed in the administration of her sacraments* (Textes et Documents) (Le Caire: Société d’Archéologie Copte, 1967) 236–250.

(14) The tone to which hymns are sung on Sundays, Mondays and Tuesdays. The name is taken from the first word of the first stanza of the Theotokia of Monday: “Adam was yet sorrowful of heart.” Cf. *Catalogue of the Coptic and Christian Arabic Mss preserved in the library of the Church of the All-Holy Virgin Mary known as Qasriat Ar-Rihan at Old Cairo* (Cairo: Société d’Archéologie Copte, 1973) xii.

(15) Read ΤΨΦΕΡΙ cf. W. E. CRUM, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1937) 553a.

ΕΤΕ ΘΑΙ ΤΕ ΤΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ ΙΑΗΗ ΗΒΕΡΙ
ΕΤΑ ΠΧ̄C ΠΕΝΗΝΟΥΤ ΤΑΧΡΟC
ΖΙΧΕΝ ΤΠΕΤΡΑ

ΑΥΧΩ ΣΕΝ ΤΕCΜΗΤ ΉΡΑΝ ΉΩΝΗ
ΕΥΤΑΙΝΟΥΤ ΗCΩΤΠ ΉΧΩΧ ΉΛΑΚΖ
ΕΥΕΡΟΥΩΝΗ ΉΡΟC*

ΕΤΕ ΑΘΑΝΑCΙΟC
ΠΑΠΟCΤΟΛΙΚΟC ΝΕΝ ΚΥΡΙΑΛΟC
ΠΗΑC ΉΝΗΟΥΙ ΕΤΧΟΡ

ΠΙΧΡΗCΟCΤΟΝΟC ΝΕΝ ΒΑCΙΑΙΟC
ΝΗΠΥΡΓΟC ΕΤΧΟΡ ΗΤΕ
ΤΟΡΘΟΛΟΖΙΑ

ΝΕΝ ΔΙΟCΚΟΡΟC ΠΙΟΜΟΛΙΓΗΤΗC
ΦΗΕΤΑΥΟ¹⁶ΕΞΡΗΗ ΗΠΤΟΝΟC
ΗΛΕΘΗ

ΥΤΟΝΗ ΉΡΩΟΥ ΉΧΕ ΑΒΒΑ
ΘΕΟΔΟCΙΟC ΠΗΝΩΤ ΗΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥC
ΉΤΕ ΡΑΚΟΤ ΤΒΑΚΙ

ΦΗΕΤΑΥΦΗΡΙ ΉΒΟΛΖΙΧΕΝ ΠΘ-
ΡΟΝΟC Η ΉΑΡΚΟC ΕΩΩΤ ΕΒΟΛ
ΉΠCΑΧΙ ΉΤΗΕΘΗΗΗ* ΣΕΝ ΟΥC-
ΩΟΥΤΕΝ

ΕΥΤΕΝΘΩΗΤ ΗΝΟΥ ΉΠΗΘΕCΠΕ-
CΙΟΥC ΠΑΥΛΟC ΦΛΑC ΉΠ-
ΙCΘΟΙΝΟΥCΙ ΦΛΩΒΩ ΉΤΕ ΤΕΚΚΛ-
ΗCΙΑ

ΦΗΕΤΑΥΤΑΧΡΟ ΉΠΠΗΑΖΤ ΉΤΕ
ΠΙΤΙΗ ΕΤΑΥΘΩΟΥΤ ΣΕΝ ΗΙΚΕΑ

ΚΩΤ ΉCΙΩΗ Ω ΠΑΜΑΝ ΉCΩΟΥ
ΑΡΙΨΑΙ ΉΣΗΗΗΤC CΑΧΙ ΣΕΝ ΗΕC-
ΠΥΡΓΟC

ΧΕ ΥΧΗ ΣΕΝ ΤΕCΜΗΤ ΉΧΕ ΠΧ̄C
ΠΕΝΗΝΟΥΤ ΕΥΟΙ ΉΟΥCΩΒΤ ΉΡΟC
ΉΗΕCΚΗ ΠΑ ΉΗΕΖ

ΔΗΟΗ ΖΩΗ ΤΕΝΤΩΒΖ*

التي هي الكنيسة اورشليم المجددة التي
ثبتها المسيح الهنا على الصخرة

ووضع في وسطها حجارة مكربة مختارة
في اول البناء يضي فيها*

الذي هو اثنا سيوس الرسولي وكيرلص
شبل اليت الضاري

وفم الذهب وباسيليوس الحصون المنيعه
للارثدكسيين

وديسقرس المعترف الذي نقض طومس
لاوون

ووافقهم انبا تاووا سيوس العظيم في
البطاركة

الذي ازهر على كرسي مرقس يقطع
بكلمة الحق* باستقامة

متشبهها بالمهذب بولس لسان العطر فخر
الكنيسة

الذي ثبت الامانة الارثدكسية التي
للاثماية ومثنية عشر المجتمعين في نيقية

طوفوا في صهيون ايها الرعاة وعيدوا فيها
وتكلمة في بروجها

لان المسيح الالهنا في وسطها وهو حصنا
لها فلا تزول الى الابد

ونحن نسال*

Translation I

Renew for me, o *islands*, renew, according to the voice of the great prophet Isaiah.¹⁷

Hear to Solomon the *ecclesiastes*¹⁸ speaking about the honour of the *Virgin*:

Calling her in the book Song of Songs: "My sister, my friend (she who is) perfect."

Which is the *Church*, the new Jerusalem, which *Christ* our God has established on the *rock*.¹⁹

He put in its midst, honoured stones, chosen chief corner stone shining in it,*

Who are Athanasius the *Apostolic* and Cyril the mighty young of lion.

Chrysostom and Basil the mighty *towers* of the *Orthodoxy*.

And Dioscorus the *confessor* who contradicted the *tome* of Leo,

Abba Theodosius the great *Archpriest* of the city Alexandria joined them.

Who flourished on the *throne* of Mark rightly handling the word of Truth.

He resembled to the *holy* Paul, the tongue of perfume, the crown of the *Church*.

He (Theodosius) established the faith of the 318 who assembled in Nicaea

Go round in Sion, o my shepherds, rejoice in it and talk in their *towers*.

For *Christ*, our God is its midst, (Church) as a surrounding wall so it will never be shaken²⁰ forever.

We also, we pray...

Commentary I

Stanza 1

It seems that the scribe in Coptic repeat the second verb while it should be "Listen $\omega\tau\epsilon\mu$ " the Arabic followed the Coptic.

The Arabic version of the second stanza render $\pi\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$ as الكنايسي "ecclesiastic"

The third stanza resembles to the yearly doxology of the Virgin:

(17) Is. 41:1.

(18) G. W. H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961) 433b.

(19) Mt. 16:18.

(20) Lit. "It will never move."

“ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝ ΗΟΥ† ΕΡΟΣ ΒΕΗ ΠΙΧΩ ΝΤΕ ΝΙΧΩ ΧΕ ΤΑΣΩΗ ΟΥΟΖ ΤΑΦΦΕΡΙ
ΤΑΠΟΛΙΣ ΗΗΗΙ ̄̄̄̄”

“Solomon has called her, in the Song of Songs: “My sister and my friend, my true city Jerusalem”²¹

This stanza is inspired by the Song of Songs 4:7.

Stanza 3

the Arabic rendered ̄̄̄̄̄ ΗΒΕΡΙ “The new Jerusalem” by “الجددة اورشليم” the renewed Jerusalem”

Stanza 4

While the Coptic has ΝΧΩΧ ἠΛΛΑΚΖ “corner Stone” the Arabic rendered by البناء ‘the beginning of the building’ (i.e. the foundation).

The title of Apostolic for Athanasius is very well attested in Coptic Liturgical books such as in the absolution of the ministers²² or the *memento sanctorum*²³ as well as in the *memento sanctorum* of the Psalmodia²⁴

The title of Cyril occurs in the Ms 23 in fol. Fol. ̄̄̄̄ r (the actual fol. 3)

ΑΜΟΥ ΨΑΡΟΗ ΗΦΟΟΥ Ω ΠΙΠΑΗΣΟΦΟΣ ΠΙΜΑΣΜΟΥΙ ΕΤΧΟΡ ΠΕΗΩΤ ΔΒΒΑ
ΚΥΡΙΑΛΟΣ

Come to us today, O *all-wise man*, the mighty cub, our father Cyril,²⁵

And also in the same Ms. Fol. ̄̄̄̄v

(21) Nahdat ‘I-KANAIS, ΠΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ††ΑΛΗΘΙΑ ΕΘΟΥΑΒ ΝΤΕ ΗΡΟΠΗ ΗΦΗ† ΕΤΑΥΘΑΩΣ ΗΧΕ ΝΕΠΟ† Ν†ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ ΗΡΕΜΗΧΗΗΗ ΗΟΡΘΟΔΟΖΟΣ [*The book of the holy Psalmodia of the year according to what the Fathers of the Coptic Orthodox Church had established*] (Cairo, 1949) 326–327.

(22) We refer to the edition of Abd al-Masih which is considered as the best edition of the Euchologion cf. U. ZANETTI, *Esquisse d’une typologie des Euchologes Coptes Bohairiques*, *Le Muséon* 100 (1987) 407–418. Abd al-MASIH SALIB, ΠΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ΠΙΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΗ ΕΘΟΥΑΒ ΕΤΕ ΦΑΙ ΠΕ ΠΙΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ †ΨΟΗ† ΗΔΗΑΦΟΡΑ ΝΤΕ ΠΙΔΓΙΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΟΣ ΝΕΗ ΠΙΔΓΙΟΣ ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΣ ΝΕΗ ΠΙΔΓΙΟΣ ΚΥΡΙΑΛΟΣ ΝΕΗ ΖΑΗΚΕΕΥΧΗ ΕΥΟΥΑΒ, [*The book of the Holy Euchologion which is the book of the three anaphorae of St. Basil, St. Gregory and St. Cyril and other holy prayers*] (Cairo, 1902) 232 (hereafter Euch. 1902).

(23) Euch. 1902, p. 354.

(24) Nahdat ‘I-KANAIS, ΠΧΩΗ..., 77.

(25) DE LACY O’LEARY, *The Coptic Theotokia, from Vatican Cod. Copt. XXXVIII Bibli. Nat. Copte 22, 23, 35, 69 aand other Mss.* (London: Luzac & Co, 1923) 17a.

+ ΝΕΝ ΟΥΚΥΗΛΙΟΝ ΗΤΕ ΠΙΝΑΖ† ΝΟΡΘΟΔΟΞΟΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΠΑΧΙ ΜΠΙΜΔ-
ΜΟΥΙ ΠΕΝΙΩΤ ΔΒΒΑ ΚΥΡΙΑΛΟΣ

+ and a vessel of orthodox faith according to the word of the young lion, our father Abba Cyril.

Stanza 5

We find that the two saints mentioned are from Asia Minor and they are remembered especially that they composed two liturgies.

Stanza 6

The scribe wrote the verb σο only o this verb is not attested with the preposition εσρηι²⁶ The Arabic rendered with *نقض* "contradict"

Stanza 7

The Arabic has *ووافقهم* meaning "he agreed with them" while it should be rendered "*ورافقهم*"

The Coptic has "Archpriest" while in Arabic it has "patriarch" as title for Theodosius.

Stanza 8

The second part of this stanza corresponds to the litany for the patriarch

εϛϣωτ εβολ ἠπϛαχι ἠτε †ηεθμηι βεν οϣωωϣτεν .²⁷

Stanza 9

The Arabic translator did not understand *θεσπεσιος*²⁸ which is rare in Coptic liturgical text and translated as the "Instructor" the word *λωρω* "crown" was rendered as "pride."

Stanza 10

It is amazing to find that there are three stanzas (8–10) mainly about Theodosius.

Stanza 11

This stanza is inspired from

psalm 48[47]: 12 [10]	Psalm
κω† εϛιων οϣορ ηατακτο ερος αχι ησρηι βεν νεσπυργος.	κω† εϛιων ω ναιμαν εσωου αριω- αι ἠσρηιτϛ αχι βεν νεσπυργος

(26) CRUM, *A Coptic Dictionary...*, 752–753.

(27) Euch 1902, p. 283

(28) LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon...*, 646.

Stanza 12

The author shifts from Sion of the Old Testament to the Church the new Sion.

Stanza 13

The only few words are mentioned in the last stanza, which means that the author or the scribe assumed that it was known to everybody.

The complete stanza is

ΑΝΘΗ ΖΩΗ ΤΕΝΤΩΒΖ ΕΘΡΕΝΩΑΩΗ ΕΥΗΑΙ ΖΙΤΕΗ ΝΕΟΡΕΣΒΙΑ ΝΤΟΤΩ
 ΗΠΗΗΑΙΡΩΗΗ

And we also pray to win mercy, through your *intercession*, with the Lover of mankind.²⁹

Text II

In Arabic

And if it was a Watos³⁰ day, they say this psalm

وان اتفق ان يكون يوم الواطس فتقال هذه المديحة
 مديحة واطس

†ΑΛΙ ΉΧΟΣ ΒΑΤΟΣ

ΣΕΝ ΠΧΗΝΔΙΚ ΉΣΙΩΝ ΔΗΘΕΛΗΛ ΣΑ
 ΝΙΕΘΗΟΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΗΕΤΑΥΜΟΥ† ΕΠΙ-
 ΡΑΝ ΉΒΕΡΙ ΉΤΕ ΠΧ̄C ΉΖΡΗΙ ΉΞΩΗ

ΟΥΓΑΡ ΣΕΝΑCΟΒΗΙ ΔΗ ΧΕ ΗΦΡΗ†
 ΉΟΥCΚΥΗΗ ΣΕΝ ΖΑΗΜΑ ΉΑΛΟΛΙ
 ΟΥΔΕ ΠΟΛΙC ΕCΨΩΨΨ ΉΗΝΟC

ΑΛΛΑ ΕΥΗΑΝΟΥ† ΕΡΟ ΧΕ ΦΗΔΗΨΩΠΙ
 ΉΦΗΕΤΒΟCΙ ΝΕΗ †CΚΥΗΗ ΘΗΕΤΟΥ-
 ΝΟΥ† ΕΡΟC ΧΕ ΧΕ (sic) ΘΗΕΘΟΥΑΒ
 ΝΤΕ ΝΗΕΘΟΥΑΒ

ΝΕΗ ΠΗΠΑΡΑΔΙCΟC ΉΤΕ* Φ† ΦΗΕΤ-
 ΑCΨΩΨΩΡΠ ΉΤΟΧΙ ΉΜΟC ΗΠΨΩΕ
 ΉΡΕCΤΑΝΣΟ ΉΤΕ ΠΓ†C΄

عندما تجددت صهيون قهللنا نحن ساير الامم
 الذي دعى علينا الاسم الجديد الذي للمسيح

لا تقولوا بموامرة انها مثل القبة في الكرم ولا
 مثل المحرس المنقطع ولا مثل مدينة خراب

ولكنها تدعى بيت العلي والقبة التي تدعا
 قدس القدس

وفردوس * الله الذي سبق يغرس فيه الخشبة
 المحيية التي الصليب الكريم

(29) Nahdat 'I-KANAIS, ΠΧΩΗ..., 102-103.

(30) The tone to which hymns are sung on Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays. the name is taken from the first stanza of the Theotokia for Thursday: "The Bush which Moses saw in the desert."

ΝΕΝ ΟΥΙ ΕΒΟΛΞΕΝ ΗΙΒΑΚΙ ΄ΕΤΑ ΜΩΥΧΗC †ΗΗΗΗ ΄ΕΡΩΟΥ ΄ΗΗΟΥCΙ ΜΠΩΩ ΝΕΜΩΟΥ ΄ΗΞΕ ΝΗΕ΄ΤΑΥΦΩΤ ΖΑΡΩΟΥ	او واحدة من المدن التي اشار بهم موسى ان من يدخلهم لا ينتقم منه
ΖΑΝΡΕCΩΤΕΒ ΓΑΡ ΔΗ ΕΘΗΔΑΝΤΟΝ ΄ΗΞΗ† ΔΛΛΑ ΖΑΗΛΥΗ†ΑΝΟΗ ΕΤΤΑΗΟΥΤ ΝΕ ΄ΗΤΕ ΗΙΡΕCΩΡΟ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΟC	ليس هم قتلى يستريحون فيك لكنهم اجساد مكرمة للشهدا الغالبيين
ΝΑΙΕΤΑCΩΩΠΙ ΗΩΟΥ ΄ΗΑΡΧΗΓΟC ΞΕΝ ΠΙCΤΑΔΙΟΝ ΄ΕΘΟΥΑΒ ΄ΗΞΕ ΦΗ΄ΕΘΟΥΑΒ CΤΕΦΑΝΟC* ΠΙΡΕCΔΙΧ- ΛΟΗ ΞΕΗ ΟΥΝΕΘΗΗΗ	هؤلاء الذين صار لهم ريسا في الميدان المقدس اعني استافانس* الغالب بالحقيقة
ΑCΡΙCΕΗ† ΓΑΡ ΗΜΟ ΄ΗΞΕ ΠΕΗΗΗΒ ΙΗC ΠΧC	اسسها مالكننا يسوع المسيح

Transalation II

At the dedication of Sion, we, all the *nations*, rejoiced, who were called by the new name of *Christ*

For they will neither consider it as a *tent*³¹ in the vineyard nor (as) a deserted *city*.

But it will be called the dwelling of the Most High and the *tabernacle* which is called the holy of Holies.

And the *Paradise* of God wherein he preceded to plant the life-giver wood of the *Cross*

And one of the cities which Moses indicated that those who take refuge to them, would be revenged.

No murders will rest in you (o Church) but honoured *relics* of the winner *martyrs*.

Those whose *leader* in the holy *stadium* is saint Stephen the truly bearer of the crown

For our Lord Jesus *Christ* established it (the church)

Commentary II

Stanza 1

the Coptic used the noun ΔΙΚ³² as verb, with the verbal prefix ΧΙΗ to form a noun. The Arabic rendered differently

“When Sion was renewed, we, all the nation who were called with the new name of Jesus, rejoice.

(31) Or “a cottage”

(32) CRUM, *A Coptic Dictionary...*, 3a.

Stanza 2

The stanza started with an analogy inspired by Isaiah 1:8 and Proverbs 25:28. It is important to mention that the book of Proverbs in Bohairic did entirely not survive.³³

The Arabic rendered the verb COCNH with تقولوا بمامرة “do not say with conspiracy”

We prefer to translate the Loan Greek word CKYHH with tent while in Arabic it is rendered as القبة “the dome”

Stanza 3

The first part of the stanza is inspired by many biblical texts among them Ps 91: 9

The second part is a direct quotation from two stanzas of the Sunday's Theotokia

$\text{CENOCY}^{\dagger} \text{EPONAIKOC } \omega \text{ } \Theta \text{HETCHAPOCY}^{\dagger} \text{SEN NI}^{\dagger} \text{CIONH } \chi \text{E } \dagger \text{HAYCNOY}^{\dagger}$
 NCKHHH
 $\text{ } \Theta \text{HETOYMOY}^{\dagger} \text{ } \epsilon \text{POC } \chi \text{E } \Theta \text{HETHOYAB } \text{HTE } \text{NHETHOYAB } \text{EPENIPIAAZ}$
 NSHTC

You are *truly* called, O blessed, among the women, the second *Tabernacle*

Which is called the Holy of Holies, wherein are *the tablets*.³⁴

Stanza 4

The stanza is inspired by Apocalypse 2:7.

The Arabic adds to the translation of the “Precious Cross” الصليب الكريم

Stanza 5

The text is inspired by Number 35:6,11, etc about the city of refuge.

The Arabic replace HCH و “and” او by “Or”

Stanza 6

The author of this stanza assumes that the church will be built over the relics of the martyrs As in the Apocalypse 6:9. “And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony”

(33) S. WAGNER, The Coptic Book of Job and Leiden Or. 14.544: An inquiry into its Textual History and its place with the Book of the Proverbs, *Saint Shenouda Coptic Quaterly* 1/3 (April 2005) 3–23.

(34) Nahdat 'I-KANAIS, ΠΧΩΗ... , 101.

Stanza 7

While in Coptic we have the bearer of Crown ΠΑΡΕΔΙΧΛΟΗ· the Arabic version rendered with the victorious الغالب

Stanza 8

In this stanza, the Arabic differs from the Coptic. The Arabic should be translated "Jesus Christ our *King* established it"

Conclusion

Despite that the book of the consecration of the Church was published many years ago,³⁵ several points should be observed:

1. The date of the Manuscript: The manuscript was copied while the Churches were closed for seven years. This could reflect the hope that the patriarch John Ibn Qiddis had. Not only by ordering the copying of the Manuscript of the consecration of the Churches but also the patriarch consecrates the Myron in the year 1305.³⁶ It is known that the Myron is used for the sanctification of the Water of the Baptistry, the unction of the new baptized, the consecration of the new churches, the consecration of the altars, the consecration of the portable altars, the consecration of the liturgical vessels, the consecration of the icons and the unction of the kings.³⁷ All these activities need a certain freedom which was unavailable in his time.

2. The psalis were composed in Coptic and later were translated in Arabic hence we find some differences

3. The author had a very good knowledge of the liturgical texts.

4. We can find a special veneration for Theodosius, in the psali Adam that surpass the other saints.

5. The author used free quotations from the Bible and especially from the psalms, Isaiah, and the book of revelation which are read during the ceremony of consecration the Church.

6. Most of the Loan Greek words used in these texts are known from other liturgical texts, which could be an indication that the Greek was not used as a spoken language in the time of the composition of the psalis.

(35) See above.

(36) A. VAN LANTSCHOOT, *Le manuscrit Vatican Copte 44 et le Livre du Chême ms Paris arabe 100, Le Muséon* 45 (1932) 181–234 especially 208–209, 230–231.

(37) Cf. BURMESTER, *The Egyptian or Coptic Church...*, see index.

7. The first psali from the praising of the Virgin while talking about the Church., The reasoning behind is easy to grasp: On the one hand, in the theotokia of Sunday, (as in the Marian homilies of Severus) the tabernacle symbolized the Virgin Mary,³⁸ on the other hand The tabernacle is the pre-figuration of Church of the New Testament, hence the Virgin Mary is the symbol of the Church.³⁹

8. The key-word in psali is “renew”, it is known that under the Islamic law the building of a new church was forbidden⁴⁰

SUMMARY

Since Horner’s publication no further studies had been done. In this article we will study several aspects of these psalis such as theology, liturgy and history.

(38) Y. NESSIM YOUSSEF, The Coptic Marian homilies of Severus of Antioch, *Bulletin de la Société d’Archéologie Copte* 43 (2004) 127–140.

(39) For a detailed study of this theme cf. C. VOLLERT, Mary and the Church, in: J. CAROL (ed.), *Mariology* (Milwaukee: The Bruce publishing company, 1957) 550–595.

(40) A. FATTAL, *Le Statut légal des non-musulmans en pays de l’islam* (Beirut, 1958).

Notes

Constanta Costea,
Bucharest

EARLIER VERSIONS OF PATRIARCH GERMANUS' HOMILY ON THE CROSS AND THE ICONS

ADDENDA to: Vladimir A. BARANOV, Unedited Slavonic Version of the *Apology on the Cross and on the Holy Icons* Attributed to Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople (CPG 8033), in *Scrinium* 2 (2006)

The investigation of the reasons underlying the infrequent representation of Lazarus the painter¹ in the outside murals at Voronet (1547) lead to a presumed revived interest in the discourses on icons for the initiators of the iconography.

A 15th century *Zlatoust* — a homiliary meant for the Great Lent, covering herein the period from the Saturday of the first week to the Palm Sunday — initially dedicated to the monastery of Moldovita (nowadays in the library of Dragomirna monastery, sl. 1813/724) includes five sermons on icons intended for the first Sunday, i.e. the feast of the Orthodoxy:² *Narration about the defence of the holy and honourable icons* (fol. 20–41, inc. **Π**ΔΟΛΗΓΓΕΝ ΤΥΜΕΚ Ὡ ΓΗΛΗΚ ΕΒΨΗΝ...),³ *Word on the first Sunday of the Sainly Lent called of the Orthodoxy by Callistus, archbishop of Constantinople* (fol. 41–51v, inc. **Ч**РТВЕРОДЕЛТНИИ СЪН ПО ВЪЗЛЮБЛЕНИИ...),⁴ *Word on the cross and on the holy and honourable icons by Germanus, archbishop of Constantinople* (fol. 51v–58v, inc. **Π**ΟΝΕΪΚΕ ὈΥΒΟ ΜΗΟΣΗ Ὡ ἸΪΚΕ ΚΕΖΔΜΗΚ

(1) The 9th century confessor under emperor Theophilus is figured with a paint brush in the right hand and a scroll in the left one, the inscription of which reads: **В**ѢДѢХЪ ЗΟΥΓΓΑΒΕΚΟΙ ΧΥΔΟЖИСТВО ПИСАХЪ, *I have known the art of painting and depicted.*

(2) Zl. IUFU, *Za desetomnata kolektia Studion* (iz arhiva na rumanskaia izsledovac Ion Iufu), in: *Studia balcanica* (Sofia, 1970) 336–337.

(3) BHG III, *Orthodoxiae festum* 1390g; I. R. MIRCEA, *Répertoire des manuscrits slaves en Roumanie. Auteurs byzantins et slaves*, ed. P. BOJCEVA (Sofia, 2005) 970.

(4) BHG III, *Orthodoxiae festum*, 1394h (attribution to Patriarch Philotheus); MIRCEA, *Répertoire...*, 108; A. P. KAZHDAN (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (New-York—Oxford, 1991) Vol. I, 1095: „The homiliary attributed to Kallistos in Slavic translation is the work of Patr. John IX Agapetos”.

и...),⁵ *Word delivered on the holy and honourable icons to all the Christians and against [the emperor Constantinus Cabalinus and] all the heretics, by John of Damascus* (fol. 58v–73, inc. ΠΟΝΕΪ ΟΥΚΟ ΜΗΟΣΗ ΗΛΙΑΣΑ ΓΛΥΗΝΕΒΛΗΤΗ ΠΟΒΕΤΥ...),⁶ *Memory... of the honourable icon... of our Mistress Theotokos and ever Virginal Mary, the one in Rome* (fol. 73–93, inc. Η ΚΑΤΕ ΟΥΚΟ ΛΕΓΤΟ ΕΛΙΚΑ ΠΟ ΛΕΓΤΟ ΚΑ ΡΟΜΕΤΙ Η ΡΟΜΕΤΙ ΕΜΒΛΕΜΑ...),⁷

An inscription in Dragomirna sl. 1813/724 having the same calligraphy as the text itself, reads: “*Saint Theodore Studite, in whose monastery these books have been written.*”⁸ As the homiliary is similar to other six codices in regard to the structure and the codicological data — teachings for the fixed or mobile feasts of the liturgical year and middle Bulgarian writing, in Euthymian orthography — certain scholars considered them to have been made up in the Slavonic scriptorium of the Studion monastery in Constantinople at the end of the 14th century.⁹

(5) MIRCEA, *Répertoire...*, 284 (wrong reference to BHG or PG, which do not include the text); V. BARANOV, *Unedited Slavonic Version of the Apology on the Cross and on the Holy Icons* attributed to Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople (CPG 8033), in *Scr* 2 (2006) 7–40 (attribution contested).

(6) BHG III, *Orthodoxiae festum* 1387e (attribution to John Patriarch of Jerusalem); PG 95, 309–344; MIRCEA, *Répertoire...*, 612.

(7) BHG III, *Maria Deipara* 1067 (uncertain attribution to Symeon Metaphrastes); M. GEDEON, in *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 3 (1882–1883) 211–215, 229–234; MIRCEA, *Répertoire...*, 801; M. McCORMICK, *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce. AD 300–900* (Cambridge, 2001) 921–922.

(8) I. IUFU, *Despre prototipurile literaturii slavo-române din secolul al XV-lea, Mitropolia Olteniei XV* (1963) nr. 7–8, 519; IDEM, *Mănăstirea Moldovița — centru cultural important din perioada culturii române în limba slavonă (sec. XV–XVIII), Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei XXXIX* (1963) nr. 7–8, 434–435. „Whether this is the prototype itself, brought from Studion or it is a copy after the prototype that included the inscription, this could be a subject of debate”: Zl. IUFU, *Manuscrisele slave din biblioteca și muzeul mănăstirii Dragomirna, Romanoslavica XIII* (1966) 201.

(9) IUFU, *Despre prototipurile...*, 511–535; IDEM, *Mănăstirea Moldovița...*, 429–433; this hypothesis has been cautiously viewed by other Romanian specialists in Slavonic as I. R. MIRCEA, *Relations littéraires entre Byzance et les Pays Roumains*, in *Actes du XIV^e CIEB* (Bucarest, 1971) 488, n. 9, or questioned by some Bulgarian authors, see P. RUSEV, G. PETKOV who favoured Ternovo and Patriarch Euthymius lifetime: apud D. ZAMFIRESCU, *Les Grandes Ménologes de lecture du Patriarche Euthyme de Ternovo*, paper read at the IVth International Colloquium „Ternovska Knjižovna Škola” Veliko-Ternovo, 1985,

The group, reconstituted to ten, is eventually known as the “Studite collection.”

Four of the mentioned sermons on icons, including the *Word on the Cross* (fol. 300–306v), can be retrieved in another Slavonic homiliary for the Great Lent — first part, referring to the interval from the beginning of the *Triodion* to the Sunday of the Orthodoxy.¹⁰ It is a Serbian version manuscript in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest, BAR sl. 300, datable in the 16th century and considered to have been copied out in Wallachia¹¹ if not „written on Mount Athos or sent to certain Athonite monasteries from Serbia, brought about, subsequently, in Wallachia.”¹²

As Vladimir Baranov’s publication of Patriarch Germanus’ *Apology on the Cross and on the Holy Icons* relied on a writing dating back in the beginning of the 17th century, the two earlier versions to be found in the Romanian collections could help a better understanding of the Slavonic manuscript tradition of this homily.

enlarged and distributed at the VIIIth International Congress of South-East European Studies (Bucharest, 1999).

(10) The fifth sermon is the *Narration...about the venerable and saint icon of our Lord Jesus Christ the one at Halkoprateia*, inc. ВЛАДИМІРІМЪ ЧРЕДЕМЪ ВЪСПОМНАНІЕ: BHG III, *De imagine dicta Antiphonete in Chalcoopratiis*, 8/797; MİRCEA, *Répertoire...*, 960.

(11) P. P. PANAITESCU, *Manuscrisele slave din Biblioteca Academiei RPR*, vol. I (București, 1959) 403–406 (mentions that Iatsimirski “dates it back in the 15th century, but the writing is later”, p. 403).

(12) I. IUFU, *Mănăstirea Hodoș-Bodrog, un centru de cultură slavonă din Banat, Mitropolia Banatului XIII* (1963) nr. 5–8, 235, n. 12.

SOGDIAN “ANCIENT LETTERS” (II, IV, V)

In Iranian Studies, the “Ancient Letters” is a name for the Sogdian letters on Chinese paper, found in 1907 by Aurel Stein in the ruins of the watchtower TXIIIa of the Chinese Wall. The garrison of this tower, which is located to the West of Dunhuang (Early Middle Chinese *twən-γwan*),¹ near the “Jasper Gates,” guarded the part of the Silk Road between Dunhuang (Sogd. *δrw'n, δrw'n* |*Θruwān*|, Ptolemy *Θροάνα*) and Louliang (Sogd. *Kr'wr'n* |*Krōrān*|). Five letters were preserved almost entirely, although with some lacunas, and the fragments of three other letters were also found. Each letter was folded several times, and the names of the sender and the addressee were written on the outer side of the letter. The second letter, the largest in volume, was wrapped in silk and placed in a covering made of rough linen fabric. This letter was addressed to Samarkand (Sogd. *Sm'rknδh, Sm'rknδh* |*Smārkanθ(ā)*|), which is located 3800 km to the West of Dunhuang.

The “Ancient Letters” are the earliest surviving Sogdian texts that were written in a script of Aramaic origin with numerous Aramaic ideograms. It is possible to deduce from the letters, that at least two of them were written in Dunhuang, one — in Guzang (Early Middle Chinese *kə-tsaŋ*). The letters, most likely, were placed in a bag that was lost or left by the deliverer. The first and the third letter were dictated by a woman named Myovnai (lit. “Little Tiger”), left by her husband, a Sogdian merchant Nanaidat (lit. “Created by the Goddess Nanai”) in Dunhuang.² The second, the fourth, and the fifth letter represent messages sent to Sogdian merchants by their contractors, who were making business transactions in China. As with other Sogdian texts, found or procured by Stein, the “Ancient Letters” are kept in the British Library in London.

(1) I would like to express my gratitude to T. A. Pan and P. B. Lurje, whose expertise in Chinese Studies I have used.

(2) For the Russian translation of these Letters, see: В. А. Лившиц, Согдийские «Старые письма» (1. III), in: *Письменные памятники Востока*. Т. I (8) (Москва, 2008) 173–176.

The dating of the “Ancient Letters” to 312–313, was established by Henning on the basis of the contents of the second letter that reports the events happening during those years in China: the war with the Xiongnu, (Sogd. *xwn* |*xūn*|), the fire in the Western capital Luoyang (Early Middle Chinese *lak-ĵian*, Sogd. *sry* |*Sar* or *Saray*|) and in the town of Ye (Early Middle Chinese *ŋiap*, Sogd. *’nkp’* |*Ankapā*|), the flight of the Emperor, who tried to escape from the Xiongnu, famine and devastation in China. Henning established that the letters were written after the Xiongnu captured the town of Ye in 307 and Luoyang in 311.³ Harmatta suggested dating the letters to 196,⁴ but Grenet and Sims-Williams confirmed the dating of Henning.⁵ The second letter was written between June 6 and July 5, 313. The dating in the letters is given in the Chinese way — the number of the month (and the Sogdian name of the month in the second letter) and of the days are provided.

(3) W. B. HENNING, The Date of the Sogdian Ancient Letters, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 12.3–4 (1948) 601–615.

(4) J. HARMATTA, Eine neue Quelle zur Geschichte der Seidenstrasse, *Jahrbuch für Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 2 (1971) 135–143; IDEM, The Archaeological Evidence for the Date of the Sogdian “Ancient Letters,” *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 24.1 (1976) 71–86; IDEM, Sir Aurel Stein and the Date of the Sogdian “Ancient Letters,” in: *Jubilee Volume of the Oriental Collection 1951–1976* (Budapest, 1978) 73–88; IDEM, Sogdian Sources for the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia, in: *Prolegomena of the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia* (Budapest, 1979) 153–165.

(5) F. GRENET, N. SIMS-WILLIAMS, The Historical Context of the Sogdian Ancient Letters, in: *Transition Periods in Iranian History. Actes du Symposium de Fribourg-en-Brisgau* (22–24 Mai 1985) (Leuven, 1987) (*Studia Iranica*, 5) 101–122. See also: N. SIMS-WILLIAMS, The Sogdian Ancient Letter II. in: *Philologica et Linguistica. Historia. Pluralitas. Universitas. Festschrift für H. Humbach zum 80 Geburtstag am 4 Dezember 2001* (Trier, 2001) 267–280; IDEM, Towards a new Edition of the Sogdian Ancient Letters: Ancient Letter I, in: É. DE LA VAISSIÈRE, E. TROMBET (éds.), *Les Sogdiens en Chine* (Paris, 2005) (*Études thématiques*, 17) 181–193; F. GRENET, N. SIMS-WILLIAMS, É. DE LA VAISSIÈRE, The Sogdian Ancient Letter V, *Bulletin of the Asia Institute. New Series* 12, 91–104; V. A. LIVŠIC, The Sogdian “Ancient Letters” (I, III), *Scr* 4 (2008) 306–310. Transliterations of the texts of “Ancient Letters,” made by Sims-Williams are available at the Internet site of the Titus Project [<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/iran/miran/sogd/sogdnswc/sogdn.htm>, pt. 377, downloaded on 03.10.09]. I am grateful to P. B. Lurje who sent me the offprints of these transliterations.

In the early fourth century, the Sogdian merchant settlements in the towns of China were quite sizable. The “Ancient Letters” mention “a hundred noble Samarkand men” in a town whose name was not preserved. There were “forty Sogdians” in Jiujuan (Early Middle Chinese *tsuw’* — *dzwian*, Sogd. *Δry’n*).

The second letter is addressed to Samarkand. The other four letters were sent, apparently, to Luoyang and other towns of Western China. Four letters tell us about the transactions made by the Sogdian merchants: the purchases of fabric made of linen and coarse wool, silk (Sogd. *pyrcyk* |*pīrčik*|, lit. “related to silkworm”⁶), musk, pepper, camphor, wheat, lead, dishes, goldware. The prices of the goods are given in silver staters (their weight and value are the same as in Central Asia of the time) or according to the rate of bronze coins that were issued in China.⁷

Translation of the second letter.

Address (on the covering, made of linen fabric).

Recto: (1) [This] letter (2–3) should be sent [and] brought to Samarkand. And (4) [noble Master Varzak ...] should receive (?) it in a complete [form]. (5) [] (6) [] [This letter] was sent by (7) [his] servant Nanaivandak.⁸

Verso: (1–5) To Master, Lord Varzak, [the son of] Nanaisvar,⁹ [from the family of] Kanak. [This letter] was sent by his servant Nanaivandak.

(6) Cf. Hotan pira — “worm, silkworm, silkmoth,” see: P. O. SKÆRVØ, Sogdian Notes, *Acta Orientalia* 37 (1976) 113–114.

(7) On the contents of the first Letter and its connection to the third Letter, see: HENNIG, *The Date...*, 615. For the first edition of transliterated texts and Hermnan translation of the “Ancient Letters” see: H. REICHELT, *Die soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums, II. Die nichtbuddhistische Texte* (Heidelberg, 1931) 1–56; see also: F. ROSENBERG, *Zu Reichelt’s Ausgabe der soghdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums. II, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* (1932) Nr. 12, 758–763; Ф. А. РОЗЕНБЕРГ, *СОГДИЙСКИЕ «Старые письма»*. К ранней истории согдийских колоний Центральной Азии, *Известия АН СССР» VII сер. ООИ* No. 5 (1934) 445–469; H. H. SCHAEFER, *Beiträge zur mitteliranischen Schrift- und Sprachgeschichte, ZDMG* 96 (1942) 1–22.

(8) Lit. “servant of (the goddess) Nanai.”

(9) Lit. “given (by the goddess) Nanai.”

Text of the letter

Recto: (1) To Master, Lord Varzak, [the son of] Nanaisvar [from the family of] Kanak, a thousand [and] ten thousand times blessing [and] (2) kneeling obeisance, the way the gods receive [it].¹⁰ Sent by his servant (3) Nanaivandak. And, o Masters,¹¹ the day [would be] splendid for one who could see you happy, without illnesses. (4) And, o Masters, [if the news about] your [good] health were [heard by me], I would consider myself happy.¹² (5) And, o Masters, Armatsach in Jiujuan is without scathe [and] safe. And Arsach in (6) Guzang is without scathe [and] safe. And, o Masters, three years [have passed] since a Sogdian came from the “inside” (= from China) (7). And I sent Gbtasmach [there?], he is without scathe and safe. (8) He went to Kureng (?),¹³ and no one has come from there yet, so (9) I could write you about [those] Sogdians that went “inside” (= to China), what (10) happened to them [and] what lands they reached. And, o Masters, (11) the last¹⁴ Emperor — as [people] say — fled Luoyang because of famine, and (12) the fire ran through his whole palace and city, and the palace was burnt (13), and the city [was destroyed?]. There is no more Luoyang, no more Ye! (14) And also [] the Xiongnu (?), and they [captured?] Changnan¹⁵ [], they captured [this town (?) and lands] up to Nainai-ich¹⁶ (16) and Ye — the same Xiongnu, [who only] yesterday were the subjects of the Chinese Emperor. (17–18) And, o Masters, we do not know whether the Chinese who remained [alive?] will be able to drive the Xiongnu from Changnan, from China, or the [Xiongnu] (19) will capture other (?) lands. And [in ... there are] a hundred noble men (20) from Samarkand... [and] in Drijan there are forty men. (21) And, o Masters, [...] three years have passed (22) since [...] came from] “inside” (= from China) [...], unmanufactured [fabric?]. And from (23) Dunxuang up to Jincheng¹⁷ [it is possible?] to sell, linen fabric (24) is

(10) On the combination ’YKZY XKyHMw βγ’nw βyrt, see: W. B. HENNING, Soghdisch βγ’n, ZDMG 90 (1936) 197–199.

(11) On the Sogd. xwt’ynβ, “masters, lords,” see: SIMS-WILLIAM, *The Sogdian Ancient Letter II...*, 273.

(12) Lit. “immortal.”

(13) *Kwr’ynk*.

(14) That is, “the current.”

(15) Early Middle Chinese drian-ʔan, Sogd. ’xwmd’n | Əxymdān|.

(16) *N’yn’yich*.

(17) Early Middle Chinese kim-dziain.

sold well.¹⁸ And if somebody has unmanufactured [linen fabric?] or coarse woolen¹⁹ [fabric, which] is not yet brought [to market (?), are yet] not taken,²⁰ (25) [he can (?)] sell [them] all... And, o Masters, as for us, those, who are [in the land] from Jincheng to Dunxuang, (26) we are [barely] alive,²¹ (27) and while [...] is alive. We [both] are without families, [we] are both old (28) and are on the fringe of death. If it were not [like this], I would not have been ready (29) to write you [about] how we are doing. And, o Masters, if (30) I were to write you about everything that has happened [now] with China, [it would have been] beyond [all] grief. (31–32) There is no use for you [to know about that?]. And, o Masters, [it has been already] eight years since I sent Sagrak and Farnagat “inside” (= to China) and three years since (33) I received an answer from there. They were safe ..., [but] now, when the last (34) disaster happened, I [did not] receive an answer from there about what happened to them. (35) And it has been also already four years since I sent another man named Artikhvandak.²² When (36) a coffle left Guzang, [a Sogdian named] Vakhush[ak] ... was there, and when (37) they reached Luoyang, b[oth they], the Indians and the Sogdians there (38), all died of famine. [And I] sent Nasjan to Dunxuang, (39) and he came “outside” (= out of China) and entered [Dunxuang, but] now he left without my permission (40), and great punishment [afflicted] him — he was beaten [and] killed in Krach (?).²³ (41) O Master Varzak, my greatest hope is in your Greatness.²⁴ (42) Pesak, [the

(18) Lit. “sought after,” “in demand.”

(19) *ryzk*, cf. Sogdian Manichaean *ryzy* “wool, woolen,” in the documents from the castle on Mount Mug *ryzcyk* |*rayzčik*| “woolen,” *ryzyn’k* |*rayzīnē*| “from coarse wool,” Yaghnobi *rayzá* “woolen pants.” *ráyvvañka* “belt for the pants,” Tadjik (from the Sogdian?) *rayzá* “woolen fabric; woolen cloth of lowest quality,” Shungan *rayzá* “woolen fabric.” Cf. N. SIMS-WILLIAMS, J. HAMILTON, *Documents turco-sogdiens du IX^e–X^e siècle de Touen-houang* (London, 1990) (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum. Pt. 11: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia. Vol. III: Sogdian) 85 — Sogd. *ryzy* “linen and woolen fabric,” *ryzcykw* “linen and woolen.”

(20) That is, “not bought.”

(21) Lit. “we only breathe.”

(22) Lit. “the servant of the deity of righteousness,” Avest. *Ašiš-vanuhi-* (AWb. 241–244).

(23) *Kr’cyh*.

(24) Or “in your Highness,” “in your Majesty.”

son of] Druvaspavandak,²⁵ has 5[.]4 staters [of silver] from me, and (43) he deposited them in safe custody (?), it is not allowed to hand them over, and you should keep [them] sealed from this moment on, (44) so without [my] permission... Druvaspavan[dak] ... [o Maaster] Nanaisvar, you should remind Varzak, (45) that he should take this [deposited] sum, and you [both] should count [it], and if (46) in the future one [of you?] will keep it, you should add (?) percent²⁶ to [this] sum and (47) write [it] down in the handover document. And you, [Nanaisvar], should give [this document] to Varzak. And (48) if you [both] decide that one [of you?]²⁷ will [no longer] keep [this sum?], you should take it (49) and give it to [the person], whom you think fit, so that this [sum] of silver (50) could grow. And, you should know, [that there] is an orphan..., [whose life] depends on the income [on this sum?]. And if (51) he lives and reaches full age,²⁸ and he has no other support except this (52) money, then, Nanaisvar, [if] it becomes known that Takut departed (?) to the gods,²⁹ (53) [let] the gods and the soul of my father [become] a support (?) for you. And when (the orphan) Takhsichvandak³⁰ grows up, (54) marry him, and don't send [him] away from you. (55) A posthumous reward (?) has left us (?), ..., for day after day (56) we expect murder (?) and robbery. And if you need (ready) money, (57) you, [Nanaisvar], take a thousand staters [of silver] from [this] money or two thousand. And Vanrazmak sent for me to Dunxuang (58) 32 [packs?] of musk that belong to Takut, so he can send it to you. When they will be handed (59) to you, divide them into five parts, and Takhsichvandak should take three parts out of them, and Pesak should take one part, and you should take one part.

Verso: (61) This letter was written,³¹ in the thirteenth year [of the reign] of Lord Chirdsvan, in the month of Tokhmich.³²

(25) Lit. "the servant of the deity Druuāspā."

(26) Sogd. *wrt* in the document from the Mug Mountain, Nov. 4, this word has a meaning "fine," "penalty," "percent on a debt."

(27) Apparently, "this one of you, who survives."

(28) Lit. "years."

(29) That is, "died."

(30) Lit. "the servant of the deity *Taxsīč*."

(31) Lit. "made."

(32) Tenth month of the Sogdian calendar.

Translation of the fourth letter.

Address on *Verso*: To Master, Lord Neveyart,³³ [the son of] Yodrazmak,³⁴ sent by his poor servant.

Text of the Letter.

Recto: (1) To Master, Lord Neveyart, [the son of] Yodrazmak, a thousand greetings, kneeling obeisance (2), the way the gods receive it. And, o Master, the g[old], that was delivered from you and from (3) Nanak,³⁵ [this] gold was sold for 800 [stators of silver]. And I, Vagichan, handed (?)³⁶ 323[] bronze [Chinese coins]. And I received a letter from you (4): “Buy vegetables for me.”³⁷ And I saw this letter. Write me, which (5) vegetables you ordered me to buy, and I will deliver [them] all, wherever you want me to.³⁸ And so far (?) it is not possible to get the wine [here], (6) for you to sell [it]. But I will probably be able to send the wine [to you]. It is not possible to get cups³⁹ here. (7) In Drutan [I] did not die. And, o Master, may you have no hardships. And this scoundrel⁴⁰ Evyamanvandak⁴¹ (8), let him remember the copper,⁴² (he) needs to be told about it. (On the right margin of the page:) (9) This letter was written on the 15th day of the tenth month.

Translation of the fifth letter.

Address on *Verso*: (1) To Master, Lord and the Head of merchants Aspandat⁴³ [sent by] his servant Frikhutav.

(33) Lit. “the one who received a glorious path.”

(34) Lit. “fighting in a battle.”

(35) Hypocoristic, made from a two-stem name with the goddess Nanai in the first component.

(36) *ptkwntw* The meaning of this word remains unclear to me (I doubt that it is related to *ptkwn* |*patkōn*| “overturned,” “tipped over”).

(37) Or “greens.”

(38) Lit. “everywhere.”

(39) Or “blocks,” Sogd. *pty’δ* |*patγād*|, Middle Persian. *paygāl*, Modern Persian *piyāle*.

(40) Lit. “murderer,” “butcher,” Sogd. *pyš* |*paxš?*|.

(41) “The servant (of the deity) of benefactor spirit,” Old Iranian **wahya-manyu-*.

(42) Or “the copper / bronze coins,” Sogd. *rwdk* |*rōde*|, Middle Persian. *rōy*, Parthian-Man. *rōδ*.

(43) “Created by the benefactor spirit,” Avest. *Spəntōdāta*. “The Head of merchants” — Sogd. *srtp’w*, *s’rtp’w* |*sartpāw*|, Chinese. *sabao* (adaption of Old

Text of the letter.

Recto: To Master, Lord Aspandat, blessing [and] obeisance. And the day [would be good] [for Frikhutav], (2) when he could see you healthy [and] well, happy, without diseases, [and] joyful. F[rom Frikhutav], your (3) servant. And [for me such a] day would be the best, if [I could] [see] you myself [and] (4) could pay you homage [being] near you, the way the gods [are] honored. And from “inside” (= from China) day after day (5) I hear worse [and worse] news, not better [news]. And what I could write about A[huromazdak], (6) how he went [to China] and what happened to him []. (7) I turned out to be alone, and here I am in Guzang, and I cannot go anywhere,⁴⁴ (8) and there is no coffee here, which would [go] out of here. In Guzang there are four bunches of the “white,”⁴⁵ [ready] for shipping, (9) and 2500 [taels?] of pepper, [ready] for shipping, and a double bunch of (*n...y*)t, (10) 5 bunches of *rysk*⁴⁶ and half a stater of silver. When Gavtus⁴⁷ (11) left Guzang, I followed him and arrived (12) in Dunxuang. I was warned (?) that [it is dangerous] to wander in [China. If] ... Gavtus (13) found⁴⁸ a smooth road, I can carry the “black (?)”⁴⁹ Many Sogdians are ready to leave [Dunxuang], but they cannot leave, (15) after all, Gavtus went [over?] the mountains. I stayed in Dunxuang, but (16) they (= the Sogdians who are in Dunxuang) are in great need. I [myself] depend on the mercy (?) of your Aprak, (17), since I serve ... in Guzang and [they ...] me, (18) and they made me [], (19) and they took my [] and increased [it] with our []. And [] I am very unhappy. (20) [] I (21) heard that Kharstrang⁵⁰ [owes?] you

Indian *sārtha-vāha* — “caravan leader, merchant,” in the Chinese administration of the fifth–ninth centuries, also a rank of a functionary who supervised the representatives of foreign religions. See: É DE LA VAISSIÈRE, *Histoire des marchands sogdiens* (Paris, 2002) 141–143, 173, 208–210; X. RONG, *Sabao or Sabo Sogdian caravan leaders in the wall-paintings in Buddhist caves*, in: DE LA VAISSIÈRE, TROMBERT, *Les Sogdiens en Chine...*, 207–230.

(44) Lit. “go here and there.”

(45) It is not clear what merchandise is referred to in the letter.

(46) Unlikely “rice,” Sogd. *ryz'kh* | *rēzāk*, *rēzē?* |.

(47) Lit. “Goading bulls”?

(48) Lit. “saw.”

(49) *š'wt*, the meaning of the word is unclear. Cf. the names of the villages Шāвкат-и боло and Шāвкат-и ноён in the valley of the Lower Zeravshan (*šāwkat* “Black house” or “Black settlement”).

(50) Lit. “(having) the color of a wild donkey”? Sogd. *rnk-* — “color” or Modern Persian. *rang*, Old Indian. *rañku-* — “deer.”

20 staters of silver, and he (22) said the following: "I will bring them." He gave me the silver, I weighed it (23) and [there was only] 4 and a half staters. I asked [him]: "If he [sent] 20 staters, (24) why did you give me [only] 4 and a half?" He answered thus: (25) «Aspandat met me on the road and (26) he [gave] [them?] to me." [Kharstrang] also said the following: "[There were only] 7 and a half staters of silver. For 4 staters I (27) purchased 4 loads of *stk*.⁵¹ And the "black" took away the silver, (28) moreover, they told me the following: "We do not have money." (29) They decided that it is better to make me unhappy, not them! [If] you (30) hear how Ahuromazdak caused damage to me, (31) also pay attention⁵² to [this]. Sent by your servant Frikhutav. (32) This letter was written in Guzang on the 30th day of the third month.

(51) The meaning of the word is unclear.

(52) Sogd. *ptywš* |*patyōš*l, "listen up."

COURTS OF SOLOMON, A JEWISH COLLECTION

In his recent article Anatolij Alekseev¹ has repeated, in a most systematic way, Meščerskiĭ's and his own² thesis that the so-called *Courts of Solomon*, preserved in Slavonic translation within *Palaea Interpretata*, were translated into Slavonic from Hebrew. His arguments are two-fold: Semitisms in the Slavonic text that he takes as Hebraisms and parallels in the Talmud and midrashim, already known for the major part of this cycle of Solomon.

In one instance, Alekseev tries to explain as Aramaic influence a mistranslation from Hebrew (see below). Nevertheless, he certainly does not know that a great part of the Babylonian Talmud, and especially that which he is referring to, is in Aramaic and not in Hebrew: "It seems to be, in the present case, a significant circumstance," Alekseev said, "that all the Hebrew originals used for the cycle of Solomon go back to the Babylonian Talmud or appeared in Babylonia..."³ Indeed, it is a significant circumstance. It reveals that Alekseev is not only unable to differ between Aramaic and Hebrew in the printed text, but has a bit distant knowledge of the allegedly "Hebrew sources" he deals with; his use (or, more exactly, non-use, except the only case) of the exact references to *bGittin* is, moreover, proof that even a translation of the Talmud was inaccessible to him.

Alekseev's methodology in interpretation of the parallels between the Slavonic and Hebrew texts⁴ has been criticised many times, as well

(1) А. А. АЛЕКСЕЕВ, Апокрифы Толковой Палеи, переведенные с еврейских оригиналов [A. A. ALEKSEEV, Apocrypha of the *Palaea Interpretata* translated from the Hebrew originals], *ТОДРЛ* 58 (2007) 41–57, here 47–53.

(2) А. А. АЛЕКСЕЕВ, Русско-еврейские литературные связи до 15 века [A. A. ALEKSEEV, Russian-Jewish literary connections up to the 15th century], *Jews and Slavs* 1 (1993) 44–75, esp. 67–70.

(3) «Значимым в данном случае представляется то обстоятельство, что все еврейские оригиналы, использованные для Соломонова цикла, восходят к вавилонскому Талмуду или возникли в Вавилоне...» (p. 53).

(4) Whose main principle is *non sequitur* (using a Francis Thomson's observation; cf. B. LOURIÉ, Slavonic Texts of Hard Fate: the *Prophecy of Solomon*

as his search of Semitisms.⁵ However, in the case of the *Courts of Solomon*, Alekseev's search of Semitisms has a rational nucleus and needs to be revisited.

In the following notes I avoid any discussion of the question as to how these Semitisms appeared in the Slavonic collection of legends. It is largely admitted that these legends are ultimately Jewish, but the exact means of transmission is highly disputable. My purpose now is to set up some landmarks helping to find out these means.

Šamir and how to find it

The stones for the Temple of Solomon should be treated without iron. The proper instrument is called a шамиръ. This is obviously the tool with a diamond known for such use from the Bible (Jer 17:1). This word has the same form in both Hebrew and Aramaic, including Targums and Syriac (Alekseev *a priori* takes it as Hebrew). This *šamir* must be obtained from the nest of some bird called a кокоць дѣтський ("childish cock" or "non-adult cock", that is, male chick⁶).

and some others, *Scrinium* 5 (2009) 370, n. 24). Thus, in the present paper (p. 52): "First, in Hebrew mediaeval literature, the whole collection of the same kind as we see in the Slavonic cycle of Solomon is not found; *consequently* [emphasis is mine. — B. L.] one can consider the creation of this cycle to be a work of the translator." Then, Alekseev submerges deeper in fantasies speculating how large would be the Hebrew library of the translator to allow him to produce such a cycle: "Talmud and its accompanying midrashim." Of course, only an "enlightened Jewish scribe" would have had such a library. Then, Alekseev's fantasy makes a further step in supposing two scribes instead of one: one to find out the places to quote from the Talmud, another to translate them into Russian (sic!). However, Alekseev does not insist on the latter possibility.

(5) The most rich data are accumulated concerning the Slavonic version of the *Book of Esther* whose Hebrew *Vorlage* is lost. Nevertheless, the lost original of the Slavonic version is Greek. See, for a résumé of the previous discussion and for additional arguments: A. Кулик, Judeo-Greek Legacy in Medieval Rus', *Viator* 39 (2008) 51–64, here 58–62. Cf., briefly, А. Кулик, Евреи в Древней Руси: источники и историческая реконструкция [A. Кулик, The Jews in Old Rus': Sources and Historical Reconstruction], *Ruthenica* 7 (2008) 52–70, here 68–69.

(6) Cf. *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* 1 (Praha, 1966) [reprint: *Словарь старославянского языка* 1 (Санкт-Петербург, 2006)] 552, s. v. дѣтський, second meaning is defined as *immaturus*.

The story has a parallel in *bGittin* 68b⁷ where the mysterious bird is called ברא תרנגול⁸ “cock of prairies”. “In its rendering,” Alekseev concludes, “the Hebrew בר has been interpreted as the Aramaic ‘son’” (p. 48).

Needless to say the parallel text in the Talmud is in Aramaic, and the name of the bird is Aramaic itself.⁹ Historically this bird’s name appeared in Jewish legends as an equivalent of the name of a magic bird זיו שדי,¹⁰ that is, in turn, a reinterpretation of the psalm phrase whose meaning is “all that moves [*scil.*, the beasts. — *B. L.*] in the field” (Ps 49/50:11 NRSV). Its identification with a Hebrew name of an unclean bird, דיביפה (Lev 11:19 etc.), εἶσοψ in the Greek Bible, is of later nature, but is responsible for the translation of ברא תרנגול as “hoopoe”. This Semitism is completely Aramaic, with no connection to Hebrew at all.

Alekseev’s explanation is not satisfying even in the supposition of “son” as the wrong meaning substituted by the translator. “Childish” does not mean the same as “son”. In fact, the corresponding word in all dialects of Aramaic has also the meaning of something small¹¹ and even “the young of animals.”¹² This meaning is much closer to the Slavonic дѣтський (“childish”).

(7) Alekseev gives the exact reference for the previous parallel between the Slavonic cycle and *bGittin*, 68a. Then, he refers to *Gittin*, with no folios.

(8) Thus in the Talmud. Alekseev reproduces in a “Hebraised” form, בר תרנגול (p. 48).

(9) M. JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (London—New York, 1903) 1700 (“the hen of the prairie”); J. LEVY, *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, 4 (Leipzig, 1889) 672 (“der Auerhahn”, that is, *Tetrao urogallus*, “wooden grouse”, “cock of the wood”); R. PAYNE SMITH, *Thesaurus Syriacus* (Oxonii, 1879–1901) 4501 (ܒܪܐ ܘܝܘܒܐ “upupa” = “hoopoe”).

(10) R. KIPERWASSER, D. SHAPIRA, *Irano-Talmudica II. Leviathan, Behemoth and “Domestication” of Iranian Mythological Creatures in the Eschatological Narratives of the Babylonian Talmud* (in press). I am grateful to the authors for sharing with me a part of their conclusions.

(11) JASTROW, *A Dictionary...*, 188–189 (meaning “son, offspring”). *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon* (Cincinnati, <http://call.cn.huc.edu/>), s.v. “br” distinguishes its meaning in compounds “small version of something”.

(12) J. PAYNE SMITH, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith, D. D.* (Oxford, 1903) 33; cf. IDEM, *Thesaurus Syriacus...*, 578–579 (“...de prole animalium”).

The name of the Queen of Sheba

The name of the Queen of Sheba in our cycle of Solomon is малкатошва от малкатъшка (different readings within the same manuscripts). It is obvious that the latter reading is erroneous (confusion between two similar letters in Cyrillic, *vedi* в and *kako* к). The difference in the vowels (full vowel о and reduced vowel ъ) is of orthographic nature. This name was initially considered as consisting of two words (*малкатъ шва), and, thus, ъ at the end of the first word was necessary after the consonant. Therefore, it is the reconstructed reading *малкатъшва that the modern scholars interpret. Of course, its meaning is transparent, “Queen of Sheba”. The problem is which Semitic language it is in. This problem is irresolvable with linguistic tools because the phrase “Queen of Sheba” is identical in Hebrew and Aramaic: *malkat šba*, to read *malkat šva*. Thus, the Slavonic transcription is perfect. The only difference in vocalism results from the so-called rule of open syllables in Old Slavonic: the consonant at the end of the word should accept a reduced vowel, ъ.

Again, Alekseev does not consider any possibility other than Hebrew. Again, he is not alarmed by the parallels known to him to the corresponding part of the cycle of Solomon in *Targum Sheni* to Esther. In fact, there are parallels in other sources¹³, but Alekseev, once more, does not realise that the only source known to him, *Targum Sheni* to Esther is in Aramaic. And, finally, Alekseev’s own reading of the Hebrew phrase for “Queen of Sheba” is mysterious: *mleket šva* (p. 50).¹⁴ This is not by chance, because in his 1993 paper he provides this impossible phrase in Hebrew script with the vowels,¹⁵ and, since then, it has become accepted by specialists in Russian literature.¹⁶

(13) Cf., for instance, a useful review of a part of the sources with a bibliography covering most of the others in the Appendix “Solomon and the Queen of Sheba” of C. R. A. MORRAY-JONES, *A Transparent Illusion. The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism. A Source-Critical and Tradition-Historical Inquiry* (Leiden—Boston—Köln, 2002) (SJSJ, 59) 230–289.

(14) I am grateful to Sergei Minov for bringing my attention to this fact, as well as for other helpful remarks.

(15) Алексеев, Русско-еврейские литературные связи..., 68.

(16) Cf. G. M. Prokhorov’s commentary to his latest edition of *Courts of Solomon*: Д. С. ЛИХАЧЕВ и др. (ред.), *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси 3* (Санкт-Петербург, 1999), note 9 (quoted according to the electronic publication at <http://www.pushkinskijdom.ru/>): *mleket šva* instead of *malkat šva*.

The Sword prudjan

In the legend whose parallel in Jellinek's *Beth ha-Midrash* has been noticed already by Aleksandr Veselovskij (1880)¹⁷ there is a *hapax*: an adjective *прудянь* applied to "sword". This is a rare case when the alleged source of the Slavonic cycle is available in Hebrew. In Hebrew, the word used is *בדיל* "tin" or "plumbum" (the sword is said to be made "from tin," *מן הַבְּדִיל*).

The context is the following.¹⁸ Solomon tests a couple enjoying a reputation for virtue. First of all, he tries to persuade the husband to kill his wife as a proof of his loyalty before giving him a high position. After some hesitation, the man refuses and returns to Solomon the sharp sword given him to murder his wife. After thirty days, Solomon promises the wife that he will take her as his first wife if she murders her husband. She agrees and has no hesitation. However, Solomon gives her a sword not of iron, but of tin (or lead), although it looks as if it were iron. Only this makes the murder impossible. This is why, says Solomon, "One man among a thousand I found, but a woman among all these I have not found" (Ecc 7:28 NRSV).

The Slavonic text has the only important difference from the above midrash in Hebrew: the sword given to the wife is *prudjan*. Prokhorov translates this word from the context: if the previous sword was "sharp", then, the second sword must be "blunt" (*тупой*), without any etymology but with implicit harmonisation with the midrashic account (where the leaden sword was certainly blunt). For lack of other data, this is, probably, the wisest decision. Alekseev, instead, is seeking for a Hebraism (p. 51). I think, that despite his inability to perform such a search,¹⁹ his intuition that there is a Semitism here could be right.

(17) The correct reference is A. JELLINEK, *Bet ha-Midrash: Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und vermischter Abhandlungen aus der altern jüdischen Literatur* 4 (Leipzig, 1857) 147–148.

(18) Cf. an English summary of Jellinek's text in L. GINZBERG, *The Legends of the Jews*, 4 (Philadelphia, 1913) 135–136.

(19) Here, Alekseev constructs a long chain. He supposes that *прудянь* is a corruption of some derivate of the word *путь* (in the sense of "wooden stick"). In turn, this *путь* could appear as a distortion of the Hebrew word *עפרת* (*sic!* the correct spelling is *עופרת*) "lead, plumbum", because the consonants are the same (the initial *ayyin* is not counted as a consonant; here Alekseev is right). However, it is useful to recall that the probability of a chain of events is the product of probabilities of the individual events in this chain, that is, in our case, a vanishingly small value.

I see no appropriate word in either Hebrew or Aramaic of Rabbis but I know an interesting possibility in Syriac (however, given that the word is derived from a very productive root, there is no possibility to exclude other Aramaic dialects): ܦܪܝܕܐ (*pridā* “fragile, putrid”).²⁰ Therefore, the second sword would be a perfect counterpart of the first, being not “sharp” but “putrid”, “fragile”, “crumbling”. The wife was trying to jugulate her husband but her sword crumbled. This would make better sense than that of the Hebrew text where, in this case, the recension of the midrash could be secondary.

The everlasting problem of Kitovras

Starting with Veselovskij (1872), the scholarly world has been hypnotised by the Old Russian identification of Kitovras as “centaur”. However, such identification has never been founded. Probably, there was some “popular etymology” behind the Old Russian identification but, in any way, it would be not enough to accept the identification as genuine. Veselovskij realised this quite well, and so, he went deeper into Indo-Iranian parallels. However, none of his parallels turned out to be pertinent to the case.²¹

(20) PAYNE SMITH, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 3237, in the sense of “putris, friabilis”.

(21) А. Н. ВЕСЕЛОВСКИЙ, *Из истории литературного общения Востока и Запада*. [1.] *Славянские сказания о Соломоне и Китавресе и западные легенды о Морольфе и Мерлине* (Санкт-Петербург, 1872) [*From the history of the literary communion between the East and West*. [1.] *Slavic legends on Solomon and Kitovras and Western legends on Morolf and Merlin* (St. Petersburg, 1872)] 137–141 [reprinted as: А. Н. ВЕСЕЛОВСКИЙ, *Собрание сочинений* <Collected Works>, т. 8, вып. 1 (Петроград, 1921)]. Veselovskij, referring to Vostokov [*Словарь церковно-славянского языка* (*Dictionary of Church Slavonic Language*), 1858–1861], quotes two instances where Kitovras is glossed as “centaur” or “onocentaur” (half-donkey and half-man) and the Novgorod image of 1336 that we will discuss below. Then, he follows Adalbert Kuhn in identification of the Greek “centaur” with the Indo-Iranian monster *gandharva*. Even if Kuhn was right, it is unclear how the corresponding legends do matter in our case. There is no particular proximity in the plots, not to speak of the chronological gap between this alleged Indo-Iranian background and the legends of Talmud. However, Sanskrit *gandharvā-* and Late Avestan *gandərəβa-* seem to be independently borrowed loanwords from an unknown substratum, and their hypothetical connection to the Greek κένταυρος has no confirmation in modern studies. Cf. A. LUBOTSKY, *The Indo-Iranian substratum*, in: Chr. CARPELAN, A. PARPOLA, P. KOSKIKALLIO, eds. *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations. Papers presented at an inter-*

Alekseev adds a new argument for the identification of Kitovras as “centaur” assuming that the Greek word reached the Slavonic text through Hebrew. He quotes two instances where Greek words were borrowed into Hebrew with simplification of the consonant group *nt* to *t* (p. 48). Thus, Alekseev hopes to explain why κένταυρος became *kitovras*. Alekseev says nothing about the actual rendering of the Greek term for “centaur” in either Hebrew or Aramaic. It looks a bit odd given that he speculates about a possible reconstruction of such a term.

I think that Alekseev’s hypothesis is not to be excluded absolutely, but it is not the most plausible. Its obvious advantage, in comparison with that of Veselovskij, is that it could explain the parallel existence, in Old Russian, of two words, *kentavr* (“centaur”) and *kitovras*:²² the latter is a loanword from Hebrew, the first directly from Greek. If, as Veselovskij thought, *kitovras* is another direct borrowing from Greek, and its meaning is, indeed, “centaur”, one has to explain what the different channels of borrowing were.

However, the major problem with Alekseev’s explanation is the fact that there was, in Rabbinic Hebrew, a proper word for “centaur”, while attested to only in the plural: קינטורין (*qīnṭōrīn*),²³ or, according to the critical edition of the main source (two verbatim identical passages of *Bereshit Rabbah* 23:6 and 24:6), קינטורים (*qīnṭōrīm*) with the manuscript variant קונטרנים.²⁴ Here, as well as in most similar cases, the Greek consonant group *nt* is preserved intact in Hebrew (that is, rendered as *nt*).

national symposium held at the Tvärminne Research Station of the University of Helsinki 8–10 January 1999 (Helsinki, 2001) (Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne, 242) 301–317. So, Veselovskij’s additional argumentation is of no help even for understanding the centaurs in Greece, not to speak of their possible connection to Kitovras.

(22) See И. И. СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ, *Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам* [I. I. SREZNEVSKIJ, *Materials for the Dictionary of Old Russian, According to the Literary Monuments*] 3 vols. (St Petersburg, 1893–1912) [reprint: Moscow, 2003] Vol. 1, col. 1210, s.v. КИТОВРАСЬ.

(23) Thus in S. KRAUSS, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*. 2 Teile (Berlin, 1898–1899) Teil 2, 532, and M. JASTROW, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York, 1903) 1363, with the main reference to the *Bereshit Rabbah* (see below). Modern Hebrew קינטאור and צנטאור are neologisms.

(24) J. THEODOR, Ch. ALBECK, *Midrash Bereshit Rabba: critical edition with notes and commentary* (Jerusalem, 1996) 227 and 235, correspondingly. I am very grateful to Michael Ryzhik from the Academy of the Hebrew Language

The singular form קינטור (**qīnṭōr*) is unattested to because the word itself is very rare in both Rabbinic languages. Normally, the Jewish sources prefer to substitute another notion or to explain the same meaning indirectly, even in the case of the name of the constellation Centaurus.²⁵ In Syriac, though, the word ܩܝܢܬܘܪ (exact transliteration of κένταυρος) is known quite well.²⁶

We have to conclude that the identification of *kitovras* as “centaur” is highly problematic from a linguistic viewpoint. And not only linguistic.

The “centaurs” of the midrashim have little to do with our *Kitovras*. The corresponding passage of the *Bereshit Rabbah* (great midrash collection on Genesis) runs as follows: “AND TO SETH, TO HIM ALSO THERE WAS BORN A SON; AND HE CALLED HIS NAME ENOSH (Gen 4:26). Abba Cohen Bardela was asked: ‘[Why does Scripture enumerate] Adam, Seth, Enosh, and then become silent?’ ‘Hitherto they were created in the likeness and image [of God],’ he replied, ‘but from then onward Centaurs were created’.”²⁷ Here, “centaurs” are men that have lost their likeness and image of God.

Kitovras of the Slavonic Solomonic cycle, as it is well known, is a creature analogous to Asmodeus (Hebrew and Aramaic אשמודאי *Ashmedai*, Greek Ἀσμοδαῖος) of Talmudic legends and of the late Jewish or early Christian *Testament of Solomon* available in the Byzantine Greek tradition only. The Indo-Iranian etymology of this name, **aēšma-daēva* “demon of wrath”, is compatible, more or less, with the function of *Kitovras* and his Hebrew prototype, Asmodeus (cf. also Tob 3:8, 17), but certainly is not responsible for the very name of *Kitovras*.

The situation with *Kitovras* is additionally complicated by the fact that we do not know the earliest legends where he appears. Apart from our cycle of Solomon, there were the legends where *Kitovras* is another son of David, a brother of Solomon. A Russian scribe of the late 15th century, Efrosin (Euphrosynos) informs us about such a

(Ha-Aqademia le-lashon ha-ivrit) who has pointed out the relevant source and checked the critical edition which was unavailable to me.

(25) I owe the latter example and the evaluation of the rarity of the word for “centaur” to Alexander Gordin (Bar Ilan University, Israel), to whom I express my warmest gratitude.

(26) PAYNE SMITH, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 3663.

(27) *Midrash Rabbah Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices*. Vols. 1–2. *Genesis*. Translated by H. Freedman and R. Simon, vol. 1 (London, 1961) 196 and 203.

legend(s).²⁸ It is this tradition that is attested to in the earliest Russian document concerning Kitovras, the Vasilij gates of the St Sophia cathedral in Novgorod constructed in 1335–1336 by the archbishop of Novgorod, Vasilij (Basil) Kalika (the gates were taken as war booty in 1570 by Ivan the Terrible and placed in his residence, Aleksandrovs-kaja Sloboda, now Aleksandrov).

According to a recent study, these doors were the main gates of the cathedral.²⁹ Their iconographic program covered the whole important topic of the cathedral cult. The picture on one plate presents a winged centaur with a crown, taking in hand a figure of Solomon and preparing to throw him over his shoulder to a city in the background; the city is on fire. The inscription states: *(Ки)товрасъ меце братомъ своимъ Сол(о)монъ на обетованую землю за словъ...* "Kitovras throws his brother Solomon to the promised land because of the word..." (a lacuna at the end prevents an exact translation of the words *за словъ*; my translation is conjectural). We do not know a legend where Kitovras throws Solomon *to* Jerusalem or *to* the Holy Land from elsewhere; instead, in the known legends, he throws Solomon *from* Jerusalem. Moreover, we do not know what the meaning is of the city (Jerusalem?) on fire. However, the general meaning of the picture of Solomon and Kitovras on the main gates of St Sophia of Novgorod is clear: this is a reference to the Temple of Solomon (constructed by Solomon with the help of Kitovras) whose new avatar is the Novgorod cathedral (after St Sophia of Kiev and their common pattern, St Sophia of Constantinople³⁰).

The picture on the Vasilij gates proves that our present set of written legends on Kitovras is not representative. Certainly, there were some others, accepted as a part of Holy Tradition of the Church, and so, transmitted by other channels than secular literature and folklore. This is why it seems to me very unlikely that the earliest Slavonic texts on Kitovras were translated otherwise than within some Church collection from an authoritative Church source.

(28) J. LURIA [= YA. S. LUR'É], Une légende inconnue de Salomon et Kitovras dans un manuscrit du XVe siècle, *Revue des études slaves* 48 (1964) 7–11.

(29) В. В. КАВЕЛЬМАХЕР, К истории Васильевских дверей Софии Новгородской [V. V. KAVEL'MANER, Toward the History of the Vasilij Doors of the Sophia of Novgorod], in: *Зубовские чтения*, вып. 2 (Струнино, 2004) 139–152.

(30) See now: K. KOVALCHUK, *Celebrating the Encaenia of St Sophia in Constantinople: Liturgical Context, Literary Associations, and Ideological Significance of the Byzantine Diegesis*. Doctoral dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. Promotor: P. Van Deun (Leuven, 2008).

Given that the previous and not especially helpful attempts to explain the word *kitovras* were presuming that the known form is a corruption of some other, it is reasonable to evaluate another possibility, namely, that it is an exact transliteration (except the regular omission of the Greek ending in Slavonic) of a Greek composite word that is not attested to in the preserved texts but is grammatically correct. Its first part could be κῆτος “sea monster”. The second component seems to be a derivate of the verb βράσσω (or Middle Greek βράζω) having different meanings with the basic values of “to throw”, “to boil”, and “to be hot”. In the late Jewish *Vitae Prophetarum*³¹ and in many Christian texts this verb (in the form of the passive participle ἐκβρασθεῖς) is regularly applied to Jonah, who was “thrown up” by the sea monster, κῆτος.³² Moreover, Lampe gives an example from Gregory of Nazianze where βράσις in the sense of “throwing up” is applied to “Jonah’s ejection from great fish”.³³

In Gregory Nazianzen, βράσις is enumerated within the list of means used by God to make Jonah go to Nineveh: “tempest, lot, beast, womb, throwing up”. The result of such throwing up could be named either βράσις or βραστός. The agent of this throwing up could be named βραστής. All these words are attested in either Ancient or

(31) I agree with Anna Marie SCHWEMER, *Studien zu den frühjüdischen Prophetenlegenden. Vitae Prophetarum*, 2 Bde (Tübingen, 1995–1996) (TSAJ, 49–50), and disagree with David SATRAN, *Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine. Reassessing the Lives of Prophets* (Leiden, 1995) (SVTP, 11) (the latter believes that the *Vitae Prophetarum* are a 4th century Christian work).

(32) A wildcard search κητ* AND βρασ* (within 3 lines) on the data base of the TLG results in, apart from four different recensions of the *Vitae Prophetarum*, their fifth recension known as *De prophetarum vita et obitu* under the name of Epiphanius, and the sixth recension of the *Life* of Jonah within the *Synaxarium* of Constantinople (on September 21), the following authors: Josephus (*Ant* 9:213), Claudius Aelianus (2nd–3rd cent. AD), *De natura animalium* (with no connection to Jonah), anonymous (7th cent.) *Chronicon paschale*, George Cedrenus (*Compendium historiarum*, 11th–12th cent.), George Tornices (12th cent., letters), Gregory Palamas (14th cent., homily).

(33) G. W. H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961) 304. Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmina de se ipso*, PG 37, 1414 A: Οὐκ ἠγνόουν Ἰωνᾶν, ὃς Θεοῦ λόγον Ἐφευγεν, ἀλλ’ ἐλήφθη Κλύδωνι, κλήρω, θηρίω, γαστροῖ, βράσει, Ἐξ ὧν ὁ κήρῡξ, κήρῡξ (“I do know Jonah, who fled from the word of God, but was picked up by the tempest, by lot, by the beast, by the womb, by throwing up, because of whom the preacher (became) preacher”).

Middle Greek or both, while with other meanings, not connected to “throwing up”.³⁴

Therefore, we can suppose the Greek prototype of *kitovras* as a composite word like *κητόβρασις, *κητόβραστος or *κητοβράστης (the latter two cases would presuppose **kitovrast* as the genuine Slavonic form).

From a linguistic viewpoint, and taking into account the real usage of Greek Christian literature, it would be tempting to suppose that *Kitovras* means either the prophet Jonah himself or the sea monster who threw him up, but according to an unknown tradition about Jonah.

The existence of some unknown tradition juxtaposing Jonah and Solomon is without question. This tradition reveals itself in the common background of Jesus' words in Mt 12:39–42 // Lk 11:29–32 and a prayer in *mTaanit* II, 4. Unfortunately, we largely ignore its contents.³⁵ The gospel data allow, however, noting that Jonah is mentioned in the context of his three-day journey within the sea monster, and Solomon is mentioned in the context of his wisdom and the visit of the Queen of Sheba. All of this perfectly fits the context of our present *Courts of Solomon*.

Thus, without rejecting definitively the hypothesis that *kitovras* means “centaur”, we have to consider alternative hypotheses that it is either a nickname of the prophet Jonah or that of the sea monster that swallowed him from some legend connecting Jonah and Solomon. Of course, other possibilities are not to be excluded as well.

(34) Cf. the corresponding lemmas in H. G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, H. S. JONES, with the assistance of R. MCKENZIE, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1940) [electronic edition at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/>] and N. ΚΑΖΑΖΗΣ, Τ. Α. ΚΑΡΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΗΣ (επιμ.), *Επιτομή του Λεξικού της Μεσαιωνικής Ελληνικής Δημώδους Γραμματείας (1100–1669) του Εμμανουήλ Κριαρά*, τόμ. Α', Β' (Θεσσαλονίκη, 2001–2003) [electronic edition at http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/medieval_greek/kriaras/index.html].

(35) D. CORRENS, Jona und Salomo, in: W. HAUBECK, M. BACHMANN (Hrsg.), *Wort in der Zeit: neutestamentliche Studien. Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorff zum 75. Geburtstag* (Leiden, 1980) 86–94.

Basil Lourié
St Petersburg

SLAVONIC TEXTS OF HARD FATE: THE *PROPHECY OF SOLOMON* AND SOME OTHERS

Toward a recent book:

Е. Г. ВОДОЛАЗКИН, *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (на материале хронографического и палеинового повествования XI–XV веков)*. 2-е издание, переработанное и дополненное (СПб.: Изд-во «Пушкинский Дом», 2008) (Серия «Библиотека Пушкинского Дома»). 494 с., 8 цветных илл. ISBN 978-5-91476-007-3.

Ye. G. VODOLAZKIN, *World History in the Literature of Old Rus' (according to the data of the Chronographs and Palaeas of the 11th–15th centuries)*. 2nd edition, reworked and augmented (St Petersburg: "Pushkinsky Dom", 2008) (Series "Library of Pushkinsky Dom"). 494 p., 8 colour ill., German *Zusammenfassung*, p. 468–472.

The author presents an improved and enlarged edition of his monograph, first appearing in 2000 in Munich under the same title, also in Russian (in the series "Sagners Slavistische Sammlung", Bd. 26). Despite the fact that it is focused on the problems of Russian medieval historical monuments, about half of the book is interesting in the larger context of the Christian Orient and the early Christian and Jewish pre-Rabbinical traditions.

The author, in collaboration with Tatiana Rudi, provides the first critical edition of the so-called *Prophecy of Solomon* (previously widely known under the title *Slovesa svjatyx prorok* "Words of Holy Prophets"), and this fact alone is enough to make his book worthy of the attention of anybody interested in Jewish and Christian pseudepigrapha. This is not the only interesting part of the monograph, though.

The two first chapters of the book (Introduction, p. 9–38, and "Historiography as Theology", p. 39–159), as well as the fourth ("Chronicle of Georges Hamartolos, the main source of Russian Chronography", p. 209–236) are deeply immersed in the centuries-

old discussions between specialists of Old Russian literature and are hardly comprehensible to outsiders. Some mentions of “theology” do not offer much: to put his observations into some methodological frame, the author quotes a few modern theological works, almost all of which belong to German scholars. However, where the author has no German book to quote, and so, remains free from his puzzling attraction to German theology, he is able to provide some sharp observations.

For instance, he makes an important conclusion on the nature of the calculations in the chronographs—that is, let us add, *a fortiori* applicable to the hagiography:

“In the chronographs, there are, in general, quite a few numbers. It is difficult to point out another genre where such an amount of dimensions, ages, dates, etc. is specified. At first glance, it could seem a bit odd given that we are dealing with very remote history, ‘epic’, having a highly symbolical sense. Nevertheless, from the theological tradition’s viewpoint, a number has been an especially important proof of the symbolical and multi-dimensional nature of a corresponding event. Despite its apparent belonging to ‘reality’, a number demonstrated the metaphysical essence of an object. It was a kind of code to the object, and this attitude toward numbers goes back to the Old Testament” (p. 89).

This is why, in chronographs, obvious contradictions between different modes of calculation are so often tolerated. Some numbers result from the calculations of an arithmetical nature, some others from symbolical considerations. The most known example is the date of the birth of Christ: AM 5500 according to most symbolical chronologies, but eight years later according to the most common Old Rus’ Byzantine chronology that was used for practical purposes.

Vodolazkin’s book is an important achievement in the systematic representation of the chronological data relating to Biblical and early Christian history. Even if we have here only the most obvious comparisons with the Byzantine sources (the author does not quote any study on the Byzantine chronology published after *La Chronologie de Venance Grumel*, 1958, nor any study at all on the chronologies of either the Christian Orient or late Judaism), Vodolazkin provides in a digestible form valuable raw material for students of Christian and Jewish chronological traditions. The pertinent parts of his monograph are chapter 3 (“Chronology of Russian chronography”, p. 161–208) and Appendices 1–3 (p. 319–388).

Another part of Vodolazkin's work is dedicated to matters related to the natural sciences (almost all of chapter 5 "Natural sciences', the supernatural, providential matters", p. 237–293). Here there are, among others, an interesting sketch on the sirens in Byzantine and Old Slavonic/Russian sources (p. 270–275) and an especially important essay on Arabic planet names in some Russian astronomical/astrological texts (p. 239–251). These names were identified as Arabic already by Gorsky and Nevostruev in 1862 and, since then, were studied in detail several times. Nevertheless, Vodolazkin managed to bring some new testimonies and, on their ground, to put forward important textological and palaeographical considerations helping to clarify the case very much.

Vodolazkin declines the hypothesis of the Bulgarian scholar M. Racheva (1981) that these Arabic names were borrowed through an intermediary of an oral tradition in either Persian or one of the Turkic languages of the Volga region, as well as the hypothesis of Franz von Miklosich (1884–1890) that the intermediary language was Osmanic Turkish. Vodolazkin is especially convincing in proving that the Arabic names were borrowed from a written tradition, and so, Racheva's arguments based on the pronunciation fail (p. 249–250). However, he has no idea about the precise source of the borrowing. As for the date, he limits himself to propose (from textological considerations) as a *terminus ad quem* the first half of the 15th century (p. 249). Vodolazkin is inclined to think that the source of the Russian borrowing was an astronomical treatise in Arabic, and so, he rejects Miklosich's hypothesis about an Osmanic Turkish intermediary as superfluous (p. 250–251).

From a linguistic viewpoint, Vodolazkin's exposition is rather vague; even the author's transliterations of Arabic words ignore contemporary conventions and are inadequate according to the standards of modern scholarly publications. He does not state clearly why these words should be considered as Arabic rather than taken from another Semitic language and why a Greek or Latin intermediary should be excluded. The cause of the latter is, however, obvious—presence of š in *šimes* or *šimos* "Sun" (cf. Arabic *šams*). The distinction between š and s in the name of the Sun could be considered as a marker of Arabic in contrast with Hebrew and Aramaic.

We know nothing about the historical situation underlying the appearance of such documents in Slavonic (Russian), and this is just another illustration of the fact that our knowledge of the cultural contacts of Old Rus' is severely limited. Be this as it may, one should add that there could be another possibility of an intermediary language that is

still unchecked, a European vernacular language. Indeed, a number of Arabic star names are preserved in European languages until today. This does not exclude the possibility that there was a vernacular European text containing an Arabic list of planet names produced with no Latin intermediary.

Here we can stop our review of the book as a whole and concentrate on its most important contribution, the publication of the *Prophecy of Solomon*. It occupies the final part of the fifth chapter (p. 293–311, an introduction to the publication) and Appendix 4 (p. 389–467, the publication itself). I will discuss the problems and the merits of Vodolazkin's and Rudi's publication of this important monument in a separate review published as a supplement to the present one.

In sum, the monograph is certainly a valuable contribution to the study of the afterlife of the Jewish and Early Christian legacy in the literature of Old Rus'. Its interest is not limited to Byzantine chronological traditions and their derivatives in the East Slavic realm.

SUPPLEMENT

The Prophecy of Solomon, Another Case of the "Made in Russia" Problem

A long anti-Jewish treatise collecting prophecies ascribed to Solomon and some other prophets, was first noticed by students of the *Palaea Interpretata* (I. N. Zhdanov, 1881). It looks as if the *Prophecy of Solomon* continues a harshly anti-Jewish interpretation of the biblical and parabiblical topics from the very chronological place where the *Palaea Interpretata* stops, from Solomon. However, according to the scholarly consensus acquired in the early 20th century and supported by Vodolazkin, it is a different work of different origin. It is noticeable that almost all eminent authorities in Russian pre-revolutionary scholarship (including V. M. Istrin, the student of 2 *Enoch* M. I. Sokolov, M. N. Speranskij, A. A. Šaxmatov) have had a hand in the early studies of the treatise. In the *editio princeps* by I. Ye. Evseev (1907) not all evidence has been taken into account, and so, the task of a critical edition was pending.

Yevgenij G. Vodolazkin and Tatiana R. Rudi prepared the first critical edition based on all five manuscripts known to this date.¹ Evseev

(1) Previously published as Е. Г. ВОДОЛАЗКИН, Т. Р. РУДИ, Из истории древнерусской экзегезы (Пророчество Соломона) [Ye. G. VODOLAZKIN,

based his edition on the earliest manuscript dated to 1452 (written in Lutsk, Western Russia, the modern Ukraine). All other manuscripts are of the 16th century. Four out of five manuscripts are Russian, one (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, cod. Slav. 125, 16th cent.) is Serbian. According to Vodolazkin and Rudi, the best manuscript is that of the Russian National Library, St Petersburg, collection of St Cyril of White Lake monastery, Nr 67/1144, and this is the manuscript on which their edition is founded. Here, the treatise has the title, *The Prophecy of Solomon about Christ...* The title is somewhat different in other manuscripts. The title of Evseev's edition that follows another manuscript, *Words of Holy Prophets...* is more fitting for the real contents of the treatise. Despite this instability of the title, the content of the manuscripts is almost the same aside from final parts, where some manuscripts differ substantially, and so, must contain later additions from different sources (*Apocalypse* of Ps.-Methodius and others). However, Vodolazkin does not pretend to define the end of the original recension other than conjecturally (p. 309–310).

Vodolazkin offers his own identification of the *Sitz im Leben* of the treatise (p. 302–311). His main tool is linguistics: "What is the origin of the monument? Without doubts, Russian. First of all, it is confirmed by the data of language."² His second argument is based on the presence in the *Prophecy* of quotations (as he put them) from Russian chronographs (p. 302). Vodolazkin means the textual intersections between *Prophecy of Solomon*, on the one hand, and *Palaea Chronographica Completa*,³ and a chronograph of *Troitsky* type, on the other, which have been identified by B. M. Kloss (1972) and O. V. Tvorogov (1975), respectively (p. 306–307). Thus, Vodolazkin comes to the conclusion that

T. R. RUDI, *From the History of the Old Russian Exegesis (Prophecy of Solomon)*, *ТОДРЛ* 54 (2003) 252–303.

(2) «Каково же происхождение этого памятника? Несомненно, русское. В первую очередь это подтверждается данными языка».

(3) Not to be confused with *Palaea Historica*. *Palaea Chronographica* is a work combining the materials of chronographa with that of *Palaea Interpretata*. There is no commonly accepted date of this work. Vodolazkin in his ongoing studies (to appear in *ТОДРЛ*) is trying to demonstrate that the work is a Russian compilation of the early 15th century. Cf., meanwhile, his important (in many respects) article: Е. Г. ВОДОЛАЗКИН, Новое о палеях (некоторые итоги и перспективы изучения палейных текстов) [Something New on the Palaeas (Results and Perspectives of the Study of the Palaea-related Texts)], *Русская литература* (2007) № 1, 3–23.

the *Prophecy of Solomon* is a Russian (and, even more specifically, North West Russian, from the Novgorod region) work dated to the 14th or the early 15th century.⁴ This part of his study seems not exempted from methodological flaws, and here Vodolazkin's conclusions are not so convincing.

Vodolazkin's linguistic argumentation

Vodolazkin's use of linguistic argumentation is common in Russian (and even Western, but "Russian-dependent") studies in Old Russian literature. It goes back to the Russian scholars of the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries and remains unchallenged, within Russia, even in our time. Vodolazkin, along with his predecessors, points out many East Slavic/Russian features (especially lexical) in the four Russian manuscripts assuming, with no discussion at all, that this data is relevant to the definition of the *Sitz im Leben*. The only South Slavic (Serbian) manuscript, in such a perspective, must be considered as depending on the Russian manuscript tradition, while Vodolazkin says nothing about specific cultural circumstances allowing such an unusual trajectory of the text history (more often, it was Rus' who accumulated Slavonic texts produced by the South Slavs, and not *vice versa*).

Vodolazkin's argumentation based on intertextual connections

Vodolazkin's second line of argumentation is based on the intertextual connections of the *Prophecy of Solomon*. Here, his situation is even more delicate than that of both of his predecessors in the 1970s, Kloss and Tvorogov, and that of V. M. Istrin (1907). Istrin was the first to discover the textual intersections between the *Prophecy* and the texts of *Palaea*. However, Istrin dated the latter to the 13th century, and so, he was free to construct schemes where the *Prophecy* used *Palaea* among its sources. Vodolazkin in his ongoing research is redating the relevant recension of *Palaea* to such a late period that, for him, unlike Istrin, Kloss, and Tvorogov, this possibility is excluded. Therefore he needs to suppose that the *Prophecy* drew from hypothetical sources of the *Palaea*

(4) Vodolazkin's main reasons resulted from his analysis of the manuscript tradition (see below). There is an indication of the *terminus ante quem* in the context: "...the great kingdom of Rome that is standing up to present" (p. 417). This would imply a pre-1453 date, if not even earlier.

that have had to be available to the Novgorod scribes in the 14th or the early 15th century.

We are not in a position to evaluate Vodolazkin's argumentation concerning the date of the *Palaea Chronographica*, especially because it is not yet published in full. However, if he is right, his modification of Istrin's conception makes the latter even more fragile.

There are three kinds of explanation for the textual intercessions between different texts: dependence in one direction, dependence in the opposite direction, and dependence from common sources (whose mutual relations could also be very complicated). Istrin has opted for the dependence of the *Prophecy* on *Palaea* when applying the Ockham razor to the data available in his time.⁵ Now we have to found our conclusions on different grounds, and here, Vodolazkin's alleged redating of *Palaea Chronographica* is certainly not the main acquirement. Before turning to the facts that make Istrin's approach to the intertextuality of *Prophecy* rather unhelpful, I would like to point out that Vodolazkin's assumption of the dependence of our text on his own hypothetical construct is nothing but a further dilution of the initial idea, which is not very strong.

What is the problem "Made in Russia"

Here it would be useful to make a digression for those who, being acquainted with the history of texts in the medieval Christian Orient and the Second Temple period, are unfamiliar with the methods and standards of scholarship in the Russian school of philological studies pertaining to Old Russian literature. These standards, being very high in such areas as textology and palaeography, are quite peculiar as it concerns the search of the origin of a given work. I will illustrate this by a comparison with the standards in other areas of the studies of medieval literatures of the Christian world.

For instance, the so-called Coptic version of *Didaché* (liturgical part only) is known in a unique manuscript in the Fayyumic dialect, and the Coptic version of *Apocalypse of Peter* in a unique manuscript in the Akhmimic dialect. It is hardly imaginable that one could meet, in some study, the claim that *this means* that the translation from Greek

(5) Istrin did know neither the value nor the very existence of the South Slavic manuscript, nor existence of the Greek original of the inscription on the Chalice of Solomon, nor the Greek *Vorlage* of the part of the Prophecy containing catenae on the Canticle.

into Coptic was performed, correspondingly, in Middle Egypt for the *Didaché* liturgy, and in Upper Egypt, for the *Apocalypse of Peter*. It looks *a priori* more probable that the Coptic translations were initially made into Sahidic dialect (in Upper Egypt, too), while, of course, other possibilities are not to be excluded. Now let us change the problem specification. Let us imagine that instead of the Coptic version we are dealing with the Slavonic one, and instead of the Fayyumic dialect of Coptic, we have the Novgorod East Slavic *izvod* (variant) of Church Slavonic, and instead of Akhmimic Coptic, a Western Russian *izvod*. The South Slavic translations that form the majority of the translated Slavonic texts are, in this case, an analogue of the Coptic Sahidic ones. Thus, in Russian scholarship, we will presumably meet the claims, if not the common opinion, that the *Didaché* was translated in Novgorod, while the *Apocalypse of Peter* in the Russian West. This opinion would be even stronger if there were not unique, but several Russian manuscripts. In this case, even the existence of a minority of South Slavic manuscripts containing the same work changes nothing: the well known fact that the bulk of the South Slavic manuscripts are simply destroyed, and so, we have to read most of the works of South Slavic literature in the Russian manuscript tradition, is normally not taken into account by “mainstream” Russian scholars when treating such cases. Finally, let us imagine that we have no Greek texts for the *Didaché* or the *Apocalypse of Peter* (in both cases, the Greek texts survive only by chance because the Greek manuscript tradition was ceased: the unique manuscript of *Didaché* dated to 1056 was written for a bibliophile; the Greek of the *Apocalypse of Peter* is preserved in two short papyrus fragments). In this case, the predictable consensus of Russian scholars would be to declare both to be original Russian works, while, of course, containing borrowings from some unknown Greek sources.

This was the case of the *Prophecy of Solomon* in Istrin’s time. Vasilij Mikhajlovich Istrin (1865–1937) was one of the main founders of the philological school that I describe above. I have limited myself to a harmless caricature because a detailed analysis of the methods and achievements of this school from the viewpoint of modern scholarship has already been done by Francis Thomson, who has written at length how the manuscripts could differ in their dialectal features and how erroneous the localisations made on this “linguistic basis” could be. “A mere glance at the textual apparatus of any critical edition of an early Slavonic translation will reveal that scribes did not hesitate to alter the lexical material of their exemplars, either because a word was less

well known, or because the text was adapted to specifically East Slav circumstances".⁶ In his seminal 1993 paper Thomson deals with the translations allegedly "made in Russia", but tangentially touches upon a similar problem with many texts whose Greek original is unknown, as in the case of the *Prophecy of Solomon*. In such cases, unbiased pondering of the mere possibility of the existence of a Greek original would imply running counter to the "mainstream" of the "Russian school".

To scholars with a background in studies of early Byzantine, not to say early Christian or Second Temple Jewish texts, it is not always easy to grasp the internal logic of these Russian pre-revolutionary scholars. They are used to dealing with texts, whose origin is divided by many centuries and, often, by several language and civilization frontiers from the available recensions, and so, they could only seldom suppose to restore "the original recension". However, the Russian scholars like Istrin were living at the dawn of the systematic study of the history of texts within the medieval Christian civilisation, and, despite their false tacit presumptions, they contributed very much to our current understanding of this very history. Moreover, they were working in close contact with Byzantine scholars, and some of them, like especially Istrin, were also Byzantine scholars themselves. Istrin and his contemporary Russian colleagues could be reproached for a lack of theoretical intuitions and integral vision of the Christian world like those of the Bollandist Paul Peeters (1870–1950), but they are not guilty of the further theoretical backwardness of their school under the Soviet regime.

Vodolazkin's data back to the drawing board

Unfortunately, Vodolazkin is among those who turn a deaf ear to Thomson. His standards of logical demonstration are as vague as was common in philology one hundred years ago. It is quite symptomatic that the bulk of the passionate Russian critics of Thomson get caught

(6) F. J. THOMSON, 'Made in Russia'. A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia, in: G. Birkfellner, hrsg. *Millennium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre Christliches Russland 988–1988. Vorträge des Symposiums anlässlich der Tausendjahrfeier der Christianisierung Russlands (Münster 5.–9. Juni 1988)* (Köln, 1993) (Schriften des Komitees der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zur Förderung der slawischen Studien, 16) 295–354 [reprint in: IDEM, *The Reception of Byzantine Culture in Mediaeval Russia* (Ashgate etc., 1999) (Variorum Collected Studies Series CS 590) Ch. V and Addenda, p. 16–48], here 299. In the additions to his paper made for its republication in the Variorum series, Thomson had the opportunity to reply to his Russian critics up to 1999.

in details but fail to meet—or, at least, recognise—his main argument that pertains to the logical standards of the scholarly demonstration as such.

It is interesting therefore to take a fresh look at the data collected by Vodolazkin and Tatiana Rudi. This data is quite important, regardless of not always helpful interpretations provided by Vodolazkin himself.

1. *The Manuscript tradition*

Vodolazkin and Rudi came to the conclusion that the earliest manuscript published by Evseev is not the best one, and such a kind of conclusion among the Slavists is rather unusual. Of course, nobody will argue against the theoretical possibility of meeting a better text in a later manuscript, but if a Slavic scholar needs to make practical use of this principle he must go into long explanations, if not excuses. After the publication of the first edition of his monograph, Vodolazkin was attacked by A. Pereswetoff-Morath.⁷ Among different points of their discussion, there was one about the relative priority of the texts preserved in different manuscripts, either the earliest one (Pereswetoff-Morath's opinion) or that chosen by Vodolazkin and Rudi. On this point, Vodolazkin stood firmly: the age of a manuscript has no necessary connection to the quality of the text that it preserves. It is a pity that, despite all of Thomson's warnings, he never made the further logical step, namely, to understand that the dialectal features of the oldest or the best manuscript or even the whole manuscript evidence have no necessary connection to the original dialect of the author, either.

Ironically, the new investigation of the manuscript corpus performed by Vodolazkin and Rudi has revealed another problem that so far has passed unnoticed. The best text is available not in one manuscript but in two, and the second manuscript is the South Slavic (Serbian) one.⁸

(7) A. PERESWETOFF-MORATH, *A Grin without a Cat. I. Adversus Judaeos texts in the literature of medieval Russia (988–1504); II. Jews and Christians in medieval Russia — assessing the sources* (Lund, 2002). Cf. a detailed answer by Vodolazkin: Е. Г. ВОДОЛАЗКИН, Об улыбках и котях (по поводу книги А. Пересветова-Мората «A Grin without a Cat». Lund, 2002), *Русская литература* (2004) № 4, 198–204.

(8) «Самым полным и исправным списком П<ророчества> С<оломона> является, вопреки мнению И. Е. Евсеева, не Я, а КБ (наряду с В, содержащим сербский извод памятника)» [“The most complete and correct manuscript of the *Prophecy of Solomon* is, on the contrary to I. Ye. Evseev's

This South Slavic manuscript was discovered on an unknown (pre-revolutionary) date by Mikhail Nestorovich Speranskij (1863–1938), but first mentioned in press in his posthumous publication in 1960.⁹ It was never known to Istrin who operated with Russian evidence of the *Prophecy* only. Speranskij interpreted his discovery within already established lines of previous scholarship, and so, took it as evidence of a Russian work having leaked into the South Slavonic literatures. Such an attitude, uncritical as it is, could be, at least, partially justified by the commonly accepted, then, opinion of Evseev, that the best manuscript is that of his edition, and so, the recension presented in the South Slavic manuscript, was considered as corrupted. Vodolazkin deprived himself of such an excuse.

Given that, according to Vodolazkin's and Rudi's study, the best recension is presented in two manuscripts, one of them being South Slavic, we should expect a reopening of the discussion about the origin of the work. A hypothesis of the South Slavic origin of the Slavonic text should be carefully reviewed and, if necessary, rejected. Even if we have never read Thomson (while Vodolazkin has certainly read him)¹⁰ and do believe that the dialect features of the manuscripts could provide the clue to the very origin of a given work, it is obvious that, in the present case, some difficulty arises and the previous scholarly consensus is challenged by the new facts. However, Vodolazkin seems to not feel any discomfort with repeating Speranskij (p. 305).

opinion, not Я, but КБ (along with В that contains the Serbian recension of the monument)"] (p. 311).

(9) In his article «Русские памятники письменности в югославянских литературах XIV–XV вв.» (“Russian Literary Monuments in the South Slavic Literatures of the 14th–15th cent.”, autograph of 1938), in: М. Н. СПЕРАНСКИЙ, *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей. Сб. статей*. Предисл., подгот. к печати, ред. и прим. В. Д. Кузьминой (Москва, 1960) [M. N. SPERANSKIJ, *From the History of the Russian-Slavic Literary Connections. Collected Papers*. Introduced, prepared to print, edited and commented by V. D. Kuz'mina (Moscow, 1960)] 55–130, esp. 85–89. Vodolazkin provides only a blind reference that does not allow for knowing which article is meant.

(10) Dealing mostly with the Russian prerevolutionary scholars, Thomson noticed that the “[a]ll too often claim of an East Slav origin has been made after the examination of only part, viz. the E<ast> Slav part, of the evidence” (THOMSON, ‘Made in Russia’..., 300). In the case of the *Prophecy of Solomon*, this was the situation of Istrin. However, Speranskij and especially Vodolazkin demonstrate that even the availability of the non-Russian part is not always of help.

For lack of any explicit discussion of the possibility of the South Slavic origin of the text, we are forced to extract Vodolazkin's implicit views on the matter. His first, linguistic, line of argumentation was crushed like the wall of a house where everybody was and remains sleeping.

The second line of Vodolazkin's argumentation that is based on textual intercessions could be considered now as the only grounds for rejecting, within the frame of Vodolazkin's approach, a hypothesis of the South Slavic original of the Slavonic text of the *Prophecy*. We have shown above how shaky this ground is. Every kind of textual coincidence between the *Prophecy* and Russian chronographic monuments can be treated in any way, because our present knowledge of the relevant textual traditions is too far from complete.

I do not see any further argument *for* a Russian or *against* a South Slavic origin of the Slavonic text of the *Prophecy*, neither in Vodolazkin's study nor elsewhere. Therefore we have to conclude that the possibility of a South Slavic origin remains open, especially because of the facts established by Vodolazkin and Rudi. If Vodolazkin refused to explore it, we have to do it instead of him.

2. Broader literary context

Vodolazkin discusses the *Prophecy* in the context of *Palaea* and its possible sources. This context itself leads to the South Slavic literatures and, through them, to the Greek originals, regardless of the complicated history of the *Palaea* texts on the Russian soil. In fact, the relevant context is broader.

A quite relevant context of the *Prophecy* is a very productive genre of South Slavic literatures, so-called *Erotapokriseis* ("Questions and Responses"), whose large part has been dedicated to the topics of faith and biblical exegesis. Most of this literature has been translated from the Greek. In some cases, where the Greek originals are unknown, there are reasons to presume original South Slavic compilations, but, even here, the sources should be considered as translated from the Greek.¹¹

(11) See now a large introduction to the whole this area, together with a critical edition of some important texts: А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Erotapokriseis. Съчиненията от кратки въпроси и отговори в старобългарската литература* (София, 2004) [A. MILTENOVA, *Erotapokriseis. The Works Containing Short Questions and Responses in the Old Bulgarian Literature* (Sofia, 2004)].

Another parallel presents the genre of the anonymous *Dialogue of Panagiotes with an Azymite*, a late 13th century Byzantine anti-Latin polemical treatise preserved in the original but also known in a South Slavic version (at least, its Slavonic version has never been included into the list of allegedly Russian translations). Here, the author makes use of many sources close to the *erotapokriseis* literature and *Palaea*, including some textual intercessions. The *Prophecy of Solomon* is structurally similar to the *Dialogue of Panagiotes with an Azymite*, while it is directed against the Jews instead of the Latins.

All this illustrates the fact that the *Prophecy of Solomon*, be it a South Slavonic translation from a Greek original, will never look strange within the context of South Slavic literature. However, in the context of Russian literature, it has affinities with only some *Palaea*-related texts, whose ultimate sources are unidentified but presumably are South Slavic translations from Greek, too.

Given that the best recension of the *Prophecy of Solomon* is available in a South Slavic manuscript, and not only in a Russian one, and, moreover, that the claims of the Russian origin of the *Prophecy* turned out to be unsubstantiated, we have here the second argument in favour of the South Slavic origin of the Slavonic text of the *Prophecy*.

So far we have not touched the question of whether the *Prophecy* is translated from the Greek. However, even now we can notice that this possibility is very likely, because most of the relevant South Slavic works are translations.

3. *Date and Sitz im Leben*

The text of the *Prophecy* contains its own date, admitted before Vodolazkin by all its students. Vodolazkin revised the previous scholarship on this point, too. This innovation seems to me rather unhelpful.

The relevant part of the text is preserved in only three manuscripts. It runs as follows (p. 446.4–6 of the critical edition; cf. p. 308, discussion of the date by Vodolazkin):

“Is this your retribution, oh Jew, that from that captivity by Titus up to the present year you are in servitude by us for years 1000 and 200 without *thirty* and three years?”

This is in the manuscript on which Vodolazkin’s and Rudi’s edition is founded. It contains an obvious scribal error corrected by all previous scholars and Vodolazkin and Rudi too: the word for “thirty” is spelled as *тридесятехъ* instead of *тридесятиехъ*. Two other manuscripts (one of them is the Serbian one) contain simply “more than

1000 years". It is by no means obvious how we have to count from this "captivity by Titus" these 1000 plus 200 minus 30 minus 3 years. It is obvious, however, that this computing leads to some date in the 13th century.

Previous scholars, and especially I. N. Zhdanov (1881), V. M. Istrin (1906), and A. A. Šaxmatov (1904) considered the exact date as genuine. If so, the approximate date "more than 1000 years" is to be taken as an editorial updating of the text. Indeed, this is the most natural way of thinking. It is *a priori* unlikely that such a detailed and complicated *lectio difficilior* was added by a later editor, while, on the contrary, an elimination of a reading that loses its actuality would be quite common.

Vodolazkin is trying to date the *Prophecy* to a period closer to the earliest manuscript and to the date that he proposes for *Palaea Chronographica*. Thus, he tries to avoid the acceptance of a 13th century date. He needs to provide some strong evidence that the "natural way of thinking" of the previous scholars is here inapplicable. Instead, he limits himself to saying that the date in the best, according to his own evaluation, manuscript resulted from a computational error of the scribe.¹² It would be better, however, before starting to judge the scribe's computational ability, to answer the question why he would have a need to insert a chronological precision whatever. Vodolazkin is silent on this matter, and so, we are free to go back to the early scholars who took the precise date seriously.

There is another difficulty: what this precise date means? What is the date of "captivity by Titus"? And, more exactly, what is its date according to the chronology implied in the *Prophecy*? Three previous scholars have left us three different answers.

Zhdanov has interpreted "captivity" as the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD and, placing the beginning of computation at AM 5500, dated the work to 1237. Then, Istrin corrected him as a historian, assuming that the correct date of the "captivity" (which is not "fall") is 75 AD. Thus, his date is 1242. Finally, Šaxmatov corrected Istrin recalling that

(12) «Учитывая многочисленные неточности, допускавшиеся древнерусскими книжниками в хронологических выкладках, ошибку в указании лет можно допустить и в расчетах КБ» ["Taking into account how many inaccuracies were committed by the Old Russian scribes in chronological computing, it is allowable to assume an error in the indication of years also in the computus of <the ms> КБ"] (p. 308).

the “correct” era starts at AM 5508.¹³ Therefore, his date (generally accepted by later scholars) is 1234.

Now we know that none of these dates could be accepted without additional evidence. The contents of Vodolazkin’s book is enough to realize that the eras of both AM 5500 and AM 5508 were actual to both Byzantine and Slavic scribes. It is also difficult to judge what event exactly is meant by “captivity”, and, moreover, what is its date implied by the *Prophecy*. The fall of Jerusalem could be considered as the most likely (*pace* Istrin, and so, also Šaxmatov) because this is the most remarkable event for chronology, but this is only a supposition and, even if it is right, we have no exact date of the fall of Jerusalem according to the *Prophecy’s* chronology. Our knowledge that this occurred in 70 AD, regardless of how exact it could be is not that we actually need.

Therefore, without additional evidence, we can with caution date the *Prophecy* to the interval between *ca.* 1220 and *ca.* 1245. The dates of 1237 (Zhdanov) and 1229 are especially probable. The latter date results from the same reasoning as Zhdanov’s one while supposing the era of AM 5508 instead of AM 5500. Istrin’s detailed knowledge of historical events of the first Jewish war seems to me hardly applicable to the reasons of the computists.

Our next step will be the most natural, but, oddly enough, has not been performed so far. We have to look for any remarkable conflict with the Jews in either Slavonic or Byzantine lands whose date fits our conditions.

The answer appears immediately, and it is only one: the beginning of the persecution of the Jews by the emperor of Epiros Theodore Komnenos Doukas when he conquered Thessalonica and was crown emperor, in 1229.¹⁴ By the way, such a successful expansion of Epiros would be a good occasion to recall “the great kingdom of Rome” that “stands up to the present” (p. 417).

(13) The *Prophecy* says that Christ “arrived after 5000 years and five hundred after the creation of world” (p. 432; the same thesis is repeated two times: p. 455 and 456–457), but this does not mean that the same chronology is applied to the non-symbolical chronography.

(14) P. CHARANIS, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire under the First Palaeologi*, *Speculum* 22 (1947) 75–77, here p. 75. Our source here is a Jewish document, a letter of Jacob ben Elijah to his cousin, a converted Jew, Dominican Friar Pablo Christiani, written in the late 1250s. Cf. R. CHAZAN, *The Letter of R. Jacob Ben Elijah to Friar Paul*, *Jewish History* 6 (1992) 51–63.

This observation would be almost enough to define the *Sitz im Leben* of *Prophecy*, but I will elaborate below on its Byzantine connections.

Greek Sources

The existence of Greek sources is not direct proof of the Greek original of the whole compilation, but it is, indeed, natural, if such an original did exist. In Istrin's time, such sources were known only for relatively little part of the work that depends on Josephus and some chronicles, as well as for several quotes from Byzantine hymnography (quoted along with other Christian Scriptures, as if a part of the New Testament), such as the canon for Easter of John of Damascus (p. 394–395) and the *Theotokia* stichera of the Octoechos (p. 392).¹⁵ All these Greek sources were presumably available in Slavonic translations from an early epoch.

The Story of the Chalice of Solomon, also included into the *Prophecy*, was unknown in Greek prior to 1967 and has been often considered as an original Slavic work (now two Greek manuscripts of the inscription on the Chalice of Solomon are available, while both contain a shorter text without any narrative at all¹⁶).

Unfortunately, there is no detailed inventory of the known sources of the *Prophecy*, and the critical edition does not contain any reference to the extra-biblical sources.¹⁷ This lack of references to the sources in the apparatus of a *critical* edition is not a particular sin of Vodolazkin

(15) Probably, a comparison with their earliest available translations would make sense. Despite the complete lack of references in the apparatus, this is not a difficult task for those who are acquainted, at least, superficially, with Byzantine hymnography.

(16) See, for the details, В. М. ЛУРЬЕ, Чаша Соломона и скиния на Сионе. Часть 1. Надпись на Чаше Соломона: текст и контекст [B. LOURIE, Chalice of Solomon and Tabernacle on Sion. Part 1. Inscription on the Chalice of Solomon: text and context], *Византинороссика / Byzantinorossica* 3 (2005) 8–74. Here I make use of and quote the second Greek manuscript found by R. Stichel in the 1990s, but so far unpublished.

(17) Normally, Vodolazkin and Rudi provide the references to the biblical sources. I would add here several precisions, apart from those that are elsewhere in the present review: p. 411 слѣпии прозрѣша и хромии протекоша ср. Mt 11:5 // Lk 7:22; p. 407 Господь бо, — рече, — крѣпок и силенъ: exact quote from Ps 23:8, while put into the mouth of Isaiah (editors' reference to "ср. Rev. 18.8" is erroneous); p. 438 «Се азъ послу, — рече, — глаголет Господь, духъ сыновьства от Дѣвы: без рала и без сѣмени мужеска родить младенецъ»: a paraphrase based on Gal 4:6 and Jn 1:13.

and Rudi, but just another expression of the philological standards of the whole school (such references were mostly considered as unnecessary by the Russian prerevolutionary scholars).

The work is constructed as several series of commentaries on the biblical prophecies of Solomon, Isaiah, and Daniel (the story of the Chalice of Solomon is considered on the same level, as a part of the Scriptures) and the history of the Jews under the Romans. Sometime these commentaries look as fragments of catenae, especially in the case of the Canticle whose text is covered in a large part. Presently none of these texts is identified. The study of the *Prophecy* within exegetical traditions remains a *desideratum*, and it is difficult to foretell the exact results of such research. My purpose here will be to point out several peculiarities.

Exegesis of Cant 5:10

Commentaries on Cant 5:10 (ἀδελφιδός μου λευκός και πυρρός, ἐκλελοχισμένος ἀπὸ μυριάδων) occur two times in succession (p. 296 and 297), with a very short interval (filled by the commentary on Cant 2:3), but, the second time, the verse is quoted in an altered form, and so, passes as a different verse attributed to Solomon and remains unidentified by the modern editors. Instead of “My kinsman is white and ruddy, chosen out from myriads” (Brenton’s tr.¹⁸) the text runs as “Give me whiteness and fire chosen” (Дай ми бѣлостъ и огнь избранныи). One has cut off “from myriads” at the end and divided into two the word at the beginning. Thus, instead of ἀδελφιδός μου appears δός μου “give me”. Presumably, the initial part of the first word was understood as Nominative ἀδελφή “sister”, that is, an indication of the person to whom the following phrase is attributed. Needless to say that such an alteration is possible only in Greek.

The remaining words were reinterpreted accordingly. A usual expression in Septuagint λευκός και πυρρός that means “white and red” has been reinterpreted in a literal way, so that the latter word acquired its etymological sense (from πῦρ “fire”). By the way, understanding of πυρρός as “of fire/fiery” became a common feature of the late Byzantine exegesis;¹⁹ however, we don’t know when it appeared

(18) Cf. new translation by Jay C. Treat in: A. PIETERSMA, B. G. WRIGHT (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (New York/Oxford, 2007) 664: “My brotherkin is radiant and ruddy, selected from ten thousands”.

(19) There is a slightly curious case in an oration of a 12th century rhetor, Michael Italicus, who applied his partial explanation of Canticle to the per-

first. In this exegetic tradition, the fire becomes a symbol of the Holy Spirit, while the white colour becomes a symbol of the flesh.²⁰ In the early Christian exegesis of this verse, it was an opposite understanding that dominated: the red colour was understood in the light of the famous “red garments from Bosor” (Is 63:1) as a symbol of flesh; thus, the white remained for the divinity.²¹

The first occurrence of Cant 5:10 in the *Prophecy* presents an undistorted text of the verse and goes in the line of the commentaries of Philo of Carpasius²² and Gregory of Nyssa²³ (“white” for flesh, but “red” for blood of Christ), both widespread in the catenae.²⁴

sonality of his addressee, the present Patriarch Michael II Oxeites (Kourkouas) (1143–1146); the exegetical tradition he relies on is nevertheless transparent: the Bridegroom is “white” because of his purity achieved by tears and ascetic life, and “fiery” because of the “fire of Spirit” that inflamed him. Cf. P. GAUTIER, Michel Italikos, *Lettres et Discours* (Paris, 1972) (Archives de l’Orient Chrétien, 14) 74.20–26 (*Oratio* 2). The same typology (“white” for flesh, “fiery” for Spirit) is in one of the greatest theological authorities of his epoch, Neophytos the Recluse (1134–1219): Β. Σ. ΨΕΥΤΟΓΚΑ, Τὸ Ἄισμα ἀσμάτων, in: Ι. ΚΑΡΑΒΙΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Κ. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΟΥ, Δ. Γ. ΤΣΑΜΗ, Ν. ΖΑΧΑΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Ἁγίου Νεοφύτου τοῦ Ἐγκλείστου, *Συγγράμματα* 4 (Πάφος, 2001) 643–674 (TLG 3085.012); Ch. 3, lines 103–113.

(20) Probably, this tradition is already traceable in Didymus the Blind (4th cent.). See Didymus, *Commentarii in Psalmos 40–44.4*: ἀδελφίδους μ[ου] λευκός καὶ <πυρρός>, οὐχ εἷς ἐστίν, ἄνθρωπος καὶ θεός ἐστιν; M. GRONWALD, Didymos der Blinde, *Psalmenkommentar*, pt. 5 (Bonn, 1970) (Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 12) 297.21–22. In this explanation, the phrase “man and God” follows the order of “white and red”.

(21) Cf. Origen, *Scholia in Canticum Canticorum*, PG 17, 273.51–53; Theodoretus of Cyrus, parallel commentaries in *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG 81, 156–157, and *Commentary in Isaiah* (in 63:1): J.-N. GUINOT, Théodoret de Cyr, *Commentaire sur Isaïe*. T. 3 (*Sections 14–20*) (Paris, 1984) (SC, 315) (TLG 4089.008), tomos 19, lines 580–581.

(22) Philo Carpasensis, *Enarratio in Canticum Canticorum*, PG 40, 108 B.

(23) Gregorii Nysseni Opera, Vol. 6: H. LANGERBECK, Gregorii Nysseni, *In Canticum Canticorum* (Leiden, 1960) 387.13–22, 388.5–6, 389.14.

(24) Including an especially influential work of Procopius of Gaza, *Catena in Canticum Canticorum*, PG 87/2, 1692 AB, and the only catena in a Canticle known in Slavonic translation (depending on the catena of Procopius): A. A. АЛЕКСЕЕВ, *Песнь Песней в древней славяно-русской письменности* (Санкт-Петербург, 2002) [A. A. ALEKSEEV, “*Song of Songs*” in the *Ancient Slavonic Literary Tradition* (St Petersburg, 2002)] 110. Here Alekseev repeats his claim that not only the translation, but the very composition of this catena

We can conclude therefore, that the second intervention of Cant 5:10, unlike the first one, is, in several ways, anomalous. It trickles through on the surface of the 13th-century fashioned text from the margins of the contemporary Byzantine culture. Its ultimate source is still unclear.

An Introduction to the Story of the Chalice of Solomon

Before the Story of the Chalice of Solomon the *Prophecy* introduces a short passage (p. 391) that may be a part of the story and, in any case, is interesting *per se*.

“Solomon has received from God great wisdom, foreknowing with the Spirit that the Lord had to descend on the earth and to be born from the Virgin. Revealing the way (образ = τρόπος) of his descent,²⁵ he [Solomon] arranged the Church, according to the command of God, and called it Holy of Holies. ‘Holy’ he called the Virgin Theotokos, and with ‘of Holies’ he revealed the Holy Trinity as the tripersonal divinity, that God has *to dwell and to live in her* [in the Virgin].²⁶ It is in this way that Solomon arranged the Church, and

were performed by an East Slavic scribe (who would have known Greek and have access to the Greek manuscripts hardly accessible in Rus’) (АЛЕКСЕЕВ, *Песнь Песней...*, 59–61). This viewpoint has been sharply criticized by Horace Lunt and Francis Thomson. In his 2002 book Alekseev enumerates their critical publications (p. 60, n. 43–44, however, omitting the 1999 republication of Thomson’s “Made in Russia”, while here in Addenda, p. 23, Thomson provides some additional linguistic evidence related to this catena) and his own earlier answers, together with publications of other Russian scholars critically disposed to Thomson but without touching the problem of this particular catena (p. 61, n. 45). *À propos* this claim of Alekseev, Thomson sharply remarks: “It scarcely needs to be pointed out that the reasoning because the catena has not been traced in Greek, ergo *it is a Slav compilation is a non sequitur*” (ТНОМ-СОН, ‘Made in Russia’..., 312, n. 96).

(25) Unlike the editors, I accept here the reading of ms Я, and so, I read образ схода (“way of descent”) instead of an obviously erroneous reading образ исхода (“way of exodus”) of the rest of the manuscripts. The general meaning of the phrase is that the Temple of Solomon was revealing the future *descent* (and not “exodus”, “disappearance” and the like) of the Lord. This is in full accordance with the first half of the verse 2 Cor 6:16 (“For we are the temple of the living God” NRSV), the second part of which is quoted below.

(26) The words яко хочет Бог вселитися и пожити в ней are a close paraphrase (unidentified by the editors) of 2 Cor 6:16: ὅτι ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω, despite the fact that for the latter verb the most close Slavonic rendering would be походу. However, see, for the inter-

he established as well a chalice²⁷ for the service to God, revealing beforehand his birth, that he has to be born from the Virgin.”

The authentic meaning of the Hebrew idiom “Holy of Holies” that is a common superlative construction would be equally incomprehensible to either a Greek or Slav unlearned audience. It is worth noting, however, that, in Greek, our text would imply a shift of the accent in ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων: to be applied to the Theotokos, the first word must be read in the feminine, that is, as ἁγία. Such a shift would be negligible in writing, but not in utterance. In Slavonic, both feminine singular and neutral plural are spelled as святая and have no difference in pronunciation. I would prefer not to infer too much from this difference in the pronunciation of a bookish word.

The fragment as a whole is especially interesting as a hallmark of the milieu where our *Prophecy* appeared. It is, in no way, learned elite but some much more simple people, similar to the milieu of the origin of the *Dialogue of Panagiotes with an Azymite*. It is in this milieu that the texts already buried in oblivion by the intellectuals, continued to exist in the living manuscript tradition, and this is why such “unlearned” Byzantine texts are so precise to the hunters for early Christian or late Jewish traditions...

An unknown prophecy of Nathan

Our *Prophecy* quotes (p. 405–406) an unknown pseudepigraphon attributed to the prophet Nathan. It is an obviously Christian elaboration on Is 7:14 LXX, but it may go back to the early centuries of Christianity.

“Nathan the prophet in the reign of David prophesised about Christ that he has to be born from the Virgin, as follows: ‘I saw, he said, a Virgin holding an infant, without getting married by a man.’²⁸”

changeability between походитьи and пожити in the Old Slavonic, *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* 3 (Praha, 1982) [reprint: *Словарь старославянского языка*, т. 3 (Санкт-Петербург, 2006)] 226–227, s.v. походитьи. The verse belongs to the passage 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 whose Pauline origin is disputed, but, in the case of our *Prophecy*, I see no grounds for supposing a source independent of Paul.

(27) The term used for “chalice” here (потир, from Greek ποτήριον) is different from the term used throughout the story itself (чаша, a word with Turkic etymology used along with потир in Church Slavonic texts). This could indicate a different origin of this introduction from the story itself.

(28) Original text of the Slavonic version of this Nathan’s *testimonium*: Видѣх, — рече, — Дѣвицу, держащу младенецъ без посяга мужеска.

Some *Book of Nathan the Prophet* is mentioned in 1 Chr 29:29 and 2 Chr 9:29. It is difficult to judge whether it is the same book that is meant in both cases, or not. In any case, however, these mentions form sufficient grounds for creating a pseudepigraphon to fill the void after this lost book.

A Byzantine source of the 6th century

One passage in the *Prophecy* is dedicated to a popular, since Proclus of Constantinople (430s), theme “the Virgin as the true Ark of Covenant”²⁹ (p. 434–435). Its wording would look shocking in Byzantium starting in, at least, the 530s, to both Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian milieus, unless it belongs to the Julianists:³⁰ here, the body of Christ as it has been born from the Virgin is called “incorruptible”. To both Chalcedonians and their opponents from the camp of Severus this term is applicable to the body of Christ after the resurrection (in some groups, with some reservations also during the three days of death), but, in no way, to the period before the death. However, our text insists, in the beginning and, again, in the end of the passage, that the Virgin gave birth to an “incorruptible” body: “...the pure Virgin from whom the incorruptible body of Christ issued...” and “...house of his [Christ’s] Mother, from whom [that is, from the Mother] his incorruptible body issued”.

A more close approach reveals, however, that the Virgin in this passage is a newcomer. The core of the passage is an explanation of Ex 25:11, the commandment to overlay the Ark with gold inside and outside (“You shall overlay it with pure gold, inside and outside you shall overlay it” NRSV), and this symbolism is applied to the body of Christ directly:

“...the pure Virgin from whom the incorruptible body of Christ issued, decorated [sc., body], as if with gold, outside by humanity and inside by the Holy Spirit, as Moses said: “Overgild inside, outside”. Because inside he became God by the godhead, and outside man by the humanity, both having perfected when he arrived. It is for this purpose, oh Jew, God commanded to Moses to create the Ark”.

(29) In general on this theme: M. VAN ESBROECK, *The Virgin as the true Ark of Covenant*, in: M. VASSILAKI (ed.), *Images of the Mother of God. Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium* (Aldershot—Burlington, 2005) 63–68.

(30) The conflict between Severus of Antioch and Julian of Halicarnassus (520s) became important, in the eyes of the official Church, at least, since the 530s.

In this exegesis, the Ark is the body of Christ itself, not the Virgin, and all the words around the quote above that, within our passage, apply the symbol of the Ark to the Virgin, resulted from an attempt to inscribe a strange exegesis into a familiar context.

The Ark, as composed from the “rot-resistant woods” (ἐκ ξύλων ἀσήπτων) (Ex 25:10 LXX; “wood of acacia” in MT), would be a natural symbol of the body of Christ, be this body considered incorruptible. We know many instances when the wood of the Ark is treated as ἄφθαρτος, but, in the most widespread exegetical tradition, this symbolism is applied to the Virgin and in a different context (when “incorrupt” means “virgin”).

The core quote of the above passage is easily recognisable. Most probably, according to modern scholarly consensus, it originally belongs to a lost commentary of Hippolytus of Rome, while it is more often cited in the Byzantine sources under the name of Irenaeus of Lyon³¹. The original text runs as follows:

Ὅσπερ γὰρ ἡ κιβωτὸς κεχρυσωμένη ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν χρυσίῳ καθαρῷ ἦν· οὕτω καὶ τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα καθαρὸν ἦν καὶ διαυγές· ἔσωθεν μὲν τῷ Λόγῳ κοσμούμενον, ἔξωθεν δὲ τῷ Πνεύματι φρουρούμενον· ἵνα ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τὸ περιφανές τῶν φύσεων παραδειχθῇ.³²

This fragment is preserved exclusively in the documents of the polemics between the adherents and the adversaries of the Council of Chalcedon. It is quoted, in this context, by Severus of Antioch (preserved in the Syriac version only, in his work against the Chalcedonian John Grammaticus of Caesarea), Leontius of Byzantium, Anastasius the Sinaite (the author of *Hodegos*, 7th cent.), and John of Damascus. The Chalcedonians loved this quote because of the mention of “natures” in Christ in the plural.

The wording of this fragment is still recognisable in our passage of the *Prophecy*, while the changes are substantial. The authentic fragment says nothing about the humanity (instead, it speaks about the

(31) CPG 1882.2 — the main entry under the name of Hippolytus, *In I Reg., quae de Helcana et Samuele*; CPG 1315.3 — under the name of Irenaeus, *Fragmenta varia graeca*, fr. 8 Harvey.

(32) “In the same way as the Ark was overgilded inside and outside with pure gold, the body of Christ was pure and brilliant: from the inside it was decorated with the Logos, and from the outside [it was] kept with the Spirit, to show from both [inside and outside] the splendour of the natures”.

Logos), and the Holy Spirit is, in the authentic text, not inside but outside. The mention of the Holy Spirit in the *Prophecy* in the place where one should put such a word as “godhead” (that is, not the name of only one hypostasis) makes the point of the author of the *Prophecy* unclear, and so, he needs to make a clarification (thus, he adds: “Because inside he became God by the godhead, and outside man by the humanity...”). However, this mention of the Holy Spirit in our passage of the *Prophecy* betrays the ultimate source of the quote. But this source says nothing about the incorruptibility, either.

Further research leads to a Church Father as authoritative as causing problems for everybody who later was claiming for his authority, Cyril of Alexandria. He elaborated on Hippolytus’ previous commentary on the glided Ark in the sense of incorruptibility of the body of Christ from the very beginning. The pertinent exegesis occurs in the known works of Cyril only twice and has evident traces of being suppressed from the Chalcedonian tradition. One occurrence is contained in an exegetical work, another in a dogmatic one. The first work is preserved in the manuscript tradition in Greek (*De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate*, CPG 5200) because the exegetical literature was less sensible to the changes of the conjuncture in dogmatics. The second is available in full in Syriac (unpublished) and Armenian only, but in Greek a lot of fragments are preserved (*Scholia de incarnatione unigeniti*, CPG 5225). However, the fragment about the body of Christ as incorruptible is preserved in Greek only by chance, within a florilegium of a unique destiny, the so-called *Florilegium Cyrillianum*.

In his exegetical work, Cyril follows Hippolytus’ fragment more closely, while without explicit reference to either Hippolytus or Ireneus. The Ark is a testimony that Christ was the Logos of God; then, Cyril continues:

“The woods of the Ark are rot-resistant, and it [the Ark] was bound round with gold from the inside and from the outside — because the body of Christ is incorruptible, being hold in incorruptibility, as if with some gold, with the power and brightness of the indwelling Logos and by the nature and life-giving energy of the Holy Spirit”.³³

(33) PG 68, 507 CD: Καὶ ἄσηπτα μὲν ἦν αὐτῆς τὰ ξύλα, χρυσῷ δὲ τῷ καθαρῷ καὶ δοκιμωτάτῳ κατεκαλλύνετο, ἔσωθέν τε καὶ ἔξωθεν. Ἄφθαρτον γὰρ τὸ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καθάπερ τινὶ χρυσῷ, τῇ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος Λόγου δυνάμει καὶ λαμπρότητι, καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος φύσει καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ ζωοποιῷ, πρὸς ἀφθαρσίαν διακρατούμενον.

Hippolytus' pattern is here clearly recognisable: the Logos is the gold that is inside, and the Spirit is the gold outside. In our *Prophecy*, the Spirit will be shifted from outside to inside, and the Logos will be replaced with the humanity, but the vicinity of the theme of incorruptibility will remain as a mark that it is still Cyril who is paraphrased.

In the second Cyrillian quote, the exegesis itself is different (the gold outside is the body and the gold inside is the rational soul, ψυχὴ λογικὴ, of Christ), but it is clearly stated that the body of Christ is incorruptible ("But the rot-resistant wood would be a typos of the incorruptible body..."³⁴). Its destiny is interesting to us as a means for evaluating to what extent Cyril's words about the incorruptibility of the body of Christ were incompatible with the mainstream Byzantine tradition.

The *Scholia*, being a major dogmatic work of Cyril widely known in the epoch of the first Council of Ephesus (431), are preserved as a whole in the anti-Chalcedonian traditions only, including that of the Julianists (Armenian). *Florilegium Cyrillianum* where the place about the incorruptibility is cited was composed probably in Alexandria in the epoch of *Henotikon* of Zeno (482) and reached Rome in the luggage of John Talaia, the incorrectly consecrated Chalcedonian Patriarch of Alexandria who preferred to fly to Rome instead of waiting to be deposed. Then, it was returned to Constantinople over the period 508–511, where Severus, future Patriarch of Antioch, composed his *Philalethes* as its refutation. The main purpose of the whole *Florilegium*, including our chapter 102, was to demonstrate that Cyril used the terms "nature" and "hypostasis" interchangeably, with no difference in meaning. In this epoch, nobody took care about Cyrillian "incorruptibility".³⁵

(34) The relevant passage is ch. 11 of the work (judging on the grounds of the Armenian version). The Greek is available as ch. 102 of the *Florilegium Cyrillianum*; R. HESPEL, *Le florilège cyrillien réfuté par Sévère d'Antioche* (Louvain, 1955) (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 37) 155–156: Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ἄσηπτον ξύλον εἶη ἄν εἰς τύπον τοῦ ἀφθάρτου σώματος. The same is in the Armenian version: F. C. CONYBEARE, *The Armenian Version of Revelation and Cyril of Alexandria's Scholia on the Incarnation and Epistle on Easter, ed. from the Oldest MSS. and englished* (London, 1907) 178 (English tr.) / 105 (Armenian text) (separate paginations).

(35) See, on *Florilegium Cyrillianum*: A. GRILLMEIER with Th. HAINTHALER, *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Tr. P. Allen and J. Cawte, vol. 2/2 (London—Louisville, 1995) 22–23.

The situation changed after the polemics between Severus of Antioch and Julian of Halicarnassus (520s) that affected the Chalcedonians not later than up to the Council of 536. After all this, the wording of such phrases of Cyril starts to sound Julianistic. This results in the expurgation of the “criminal” phrases from the Byzantine manuscript tradition, while, fortunately, not absolutely consecutive.

It is therefore reasonable to date the corresponding source of our *Prophecy* to the 6th century.

Varia

I would like to note several interesting features more or less important to our understanding of the text.

Poetic insertion. A relatively long passage (p. 400–401, from *пришедь и идольскый мракъ прогна... to ...и все древнее падение оправи*) seems to be a poetic insertion. Probably, it needs to be studied separately.

Φήλιξ αὐτοκράτωρ in Byzantine minuscule. The *Prophecy* lists the titles of Octavian Augustus as “*Filiz Utorator*, that is autocrat” (p. 415). A complete lack of editors’ commentaries leaves us in incertitude. What is *Филизь Утораторъ* [ms B: Уторитор]? It is clear that one means here the official title *Felix Imperator*, or, in its Greek form, Φήλιξ αὐτοκράτωρ. Who is to be blamed for the obvious corruptions, the medieval scribes or the modern editors? At least, in the case of *Филизь*, left without any correction, one can suppose a misreading of manuscripts by the editors, when the letter *ksi* ξ has been misread as *zemplja* з. It is otherwise unclear why the editors did not correct this reading, as they used to do elsewhere when their main manuscript was corrupt.

The case of *Утораторъ* is more complicated. This title is provided by a correct Slavonic translation, and so, its meaning was certainly clear to the translator. Nevertheless, this is not to exclude a misspelling on his part, if the initial diphthong αὐ- is read as οὐ- in minuscule, and κ was lost in a ligature. I think, this corruption could mean that the Slavic translator of the *Prophecy* had in his hands a Greek manuscript written in minuscule (where it could have been difficult to discern between αὐ and οὐ), and so, he transliterated the Greek term incorrectly.

A case of *téléscopage*: Pompey under Augustus in the role of Titus. This curious fragment runs as follows (p. 417–418):

“August has sent upon you Pompey, the Roman general, with a great force, and he has captured the whole of your city Jerusalem

and destroyed the Church, and he has killed you, and the remainder [of you] enslaved”.

This is, our text explains further, the final destroying of Jerusalem foretold by Daniel in his prophecy of the death of the Messiah and the subsequent fate of Jerusalem after the 62nd “week” (Dan 9:24–28 LXX). All this is said in the context of a rather detailed paraphrase of Josephus, without omitting even the names of high priests and other important personages. Josephus’ narrative seems to be here deliberately condensed. This kind of condensation is typical of the hagiography *épique*, as it was defined by Hippolyte Delehaye. The Bollandists coined it by the term *télescope*. In this procedure, all the events are projected onto the only epoch that is chosen in the same manner as the formative epoch in the epos. In our passage, this epoch is that of the birth of Christ, that of Augustus. This is the same epoch when Jerusalem was destroyed — according to the literalistic understanding of Daniel by our author. Therefore, it is clear to me why Titus disappeared from this picture, and why Augustus appears. However, why the deeds of Titus were attributed to Pompey (who entered into the Holy of Holies in 63 BC but, in other matters, was extremely respectful toward Jews and the Temple) is to me completely obscure.

Be that as it may, we have here, in our text, a curious epitome of Josephus’ *Wars*.

Conclusion

The critical edition of the *Prophecy of Solomon* is certainly a valuable contribution to our knowledge of several traditions of theological literature, namely, Russian, South Slavic,³⁶ and Byzantine. It opens new perspectives in the studies of pseudepigraphic and patristic texts as well. Vodolazkin and Rudi have failed to determine correctly which branch of the manuscript tradition is closer to the original Slavonic recension, either Russian or Serbian. Nevertheless, their edition is trustworthy, especially because the two best manuscripts, one of which is Serbian and the other Russian, present basically the same text.

The most important flaws of Vodolazkin’s study are those of the school of his background, that of Russian prerevolutionary scholar-

(36) The most comprehensive account of the South Slavic theological tradition does not take into account our text (presumably, because its author was relying on previous Russian scholarship): G. PODSKALSKY, *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien. 865–1459* (München, 2000).

ship with its overestimation of the role of dialectal features in the definition of the origin of medieval Slavonic translations. The evolution of this school, quite legitimate in its own time, during the Soviet period transformed it into a backward methodology aggravated by decreasing of general competence in non-Russian Slavic and Byzantine literatures.

All this said, I consider Vodolazkin's book as a sign of the dawn of renewed Russian tradition of studies of the texts that are going back, though in a complicated way, to the early Christianity or the pre-Rabbinic Judaism.

Tatiana A. Sénina (moniale Kassia)
Saint Pétersbourg

UN SAINT FOUETTE UN AUTRE : THÉOKTISTOS LE LOGOTHÈTE ET EUTHYME DE SARDES

Le logothète Théoktistos est connu comme un des initiateurs de la restauration de l'orthodoxie en 843, le principal collaborateur de l'impératrice S. Théodora en 842–855, et sa mémoire est célébrée par l'Église orthodoxe le 20 novembre.¹ Le *Recit sur la grâce à l'empereur Théophile* raconte que le basileus mourant a vu sur le cou de Théoktistos un cordon avec une icône (ἐγκόλπιον) ;² cet épisode montre que le logothète serait devenu iconophile vers le début de l'année 842. Mais l'était-il auparavant ?

Pour la première fois nous rencontrons Théoktistos à la veille de la Nativité de 820 quand ce jeune eunuque, serviteur de Michel le Bègue, aide son maître à éviter la mort imminente en faisant connaître le danger du dévoilement aux amis de Michel. Ceux-ci n'ont pas tardé à assassiner l'empereur Léon l'Arménien, et après son avènement au trône Michel II a recompensé Théoktistos en lui attribuant le titre de patrice et en le nommant préfet du caniclée (ἐπι τοῦ κανικλείου). Il l'est resté sous Théophile et vers 842 est devenu en plus le logothète du drome ; avant sa mort l'empereur l'a nommé un des régents et tuteurs de son fils Michel III. Théoktistos a donc fait une bonne carrière sous les empereurs iconoclastes, et les derniers ordres de Théophile indiquent que l'empereur ne soupçonnait point Théoktistos de sympathie envers les iconophiles. Le Continuateur de Théophane dit que Théophile, inquiet par une prédiction du rétablissement de la vénération

(1) R.-J. LILIE, C. LUDWIG, Th. PRATSCH, I. ROCHOW (Hrsg.), *Prosopographie der Mittelbyzantinischen Zeit. Erste Abteilung (641–867)* (Berlin, 1998) # 8050 ; la date de la mémoire y est indiquée de manière erronée le 20 octobre, cf. C. DE SMEDT, I. DE BACKER, F. VAN ORTROY, I. VAN DEN GHEYM, H. DELEHAYE, A. PONCELET (eds.), *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris. Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* (Bruxellis, MDCCCII; CD-éd.: Cambridge, 2002) 244.16–18.

(2) ВHG 1734, l'édition critique avec la traduction russe cf. Д. Е. АФИНОГЕНОВ, «Повесть о прощении императора Феофила» и Торжество Православия (Москва, 2004) (Scrinium Philocalicum, IV) 96.131sq.

des icônes après sa mort, a fait promettre sa femme et Théoktistos de ne pas détrôner le patriarche Jean le Grammairien ni de revenir au culte des images.³ Assurément Théoktistos le lui avait promis, autrement il n'aurait pas pu être nommé régent, — mais on sait qu'il n'a point tenu sa promesse, et que le conseil qui a condamné Jean a eu lieu dans le local de κανικλειον, c'est-à-dire dans le département de ce même Théoktistos.⁴

On peut apprendre davantage sur ce fonctionnaire en lisant la *Vie* de S. Euthyme de Sardes, confesseur iconophile martyrisé en 831. S. Méthode, l'auteur de cette *Vie* et témoin des derniers jours du confesseur, écrit que trois fonctionnaires ayant interrogé et flagellé S. Euthyme le 18 décembre 831 étaient le logothète, le préposé du caniclé et un manglavite.⁵ J'ai déjà démontré que le logothète du drome mentionné dans la *Vie* était Arsabère, le mari de Kalomarie, sœur de l'impératrice Théodora.⁶ Mais le préposé du caniclé ne pouvait être nul autre que Théoktistos. En effet, il occupait ce poste sous Michel II, donc avant 831, et il était toujours ἐπὶ τοῦ κανικλείου avant la mort de Théophile, en 842 ; nous n'avons aucune raison de penser que Théoktistos avait pu quitter sa fonction entre ces dates.⁷ Ainsi, au début du règne de Théophile ce futur partisan de la restauration de l'orthodoxie était non seulement un iconoclaste convaincu, mais l'un de ces « misérables »⁸ qui sont arrivés à l'îlot Saint-André pour interroger et fouetter le confesseur orthodoxe S. Euthyme et, au fond, l'ont fait mourir sous le fouet.⁹

(3) Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, dans : I. БЕККЕР (ed.), *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus* (Bonn, 1838) (CFHB) 121.21–122.5.

(4) Cf. АФИНОГЕНОВ, «Повесть о прощении императора Феофила»..., 63.

(5) J. GOUILLARD, La Vie d'Euthyme de Sardes († 831), une œuvre du patriarche Méthode, *Travaux et Mémoires* 10 (1987) 45, § 18.339–341.

(6) Et qu'il n'est pas identique au frère de Jean le Grammairien ; cf. Т. А. СЕНИНА (МОНАХИНЯ КАССИЯ), Несколько замечаний по поводу Жития св. Евфимия Сардского, *Scr* 2 (2006) 408–411.

(7) J. Gouillard remarque que « ó ἐπὶ τοῦ κανικλείου, haut fonctionnaire de la chancellerie impériale, apparaît précisément au début du IX^e s., avec Théoktistos, puis Bardas », mais, on ne sait pourquoi, il n'a pas identifié franchement le préposé de la *Vie* avec Théoktistos (GOUILLARD, La Vie d'Euthyme de Sardes..., 45, n. 97 ; cf. aussi p. 9–10).

(8) GOUILLARD, La Vie d'Euthyme de Sardes..., 47, § 19.363.

(9) Le saint est mort huit jours après la flagellation. Le troisième de ses tourmenteurs, le manglavite, devait s'appeler Kosmas ; cf. *ibid.*, 10 ; СЕНИНА, Несколько замечаний..., 408.

S. Méthode dans la *Vie* du confesseur reproduit un dialogue intéressant entre S. Euthyme et le préposé du caniclé. Malgré la flagellation cruelle le saint, ayant reçu 130 coups de fouet, refuse de nommer ceux qu'il a visité pendant son séjour à Constantinople.

« Alors ... le préposé au *kaniklion* ... : "Ne t'imagines pas que tu en resteras là et que tu couperas court aux interrogatoires ; sache que nous sommes venus pour te châtier." Le saint lui répondit : "On m'a dit que tu as ta mère et une sœur sous l'habit monastique." Et lui, sèchement : "Oui, dit-il" ; et le saint : "Les beaux traits, le beau modèle de piété que tu portes en toi !" Lui, comme foudroyé par l'ironie du bienheureux et ayant avalé le mot comme une pierre qui lui fût restée en travers du gosier, fit taire sa méchanceté et descendit avec les autres pour se retirer. »¹⁰

Ainsi, les paroles de S. Euthyme ont fait honte à Théoktistos, mais ne l'ont pas fait revenir à l'orthodoxie : nous avons vu qu'il n'a pas donné de soupçons à Théophile jusqu'à la mort de celui-ci, bien qu'il ait pu commencer à vénérer les icônes en secret — au moins l'épisode avec son *ἐγκόλιον* peut l'indiquer.

Il est assez intéressant de savoir quand et par qui la mémoire de Théoktistos a été incluse dans le Synaxaire. Il est peu probable que cela ait eu lieu pendant le patriarcat de S. Photios : le protoasécrite sous Théodora et, à cause de sa fonction, le collaborateur le plus proche du préfet du caniclé, Photios n'a point protesté contre l'assassinat de Théoktistos en 855. Après l'expulsion de Théodora et l'arrivée au pouvoir de Michel III avec le César Bardas, Photios est remplacé sur le patriarcat par S. Ignace, créature de Théodora et Théoktistos ; et Bardas, le principal complice du meurtre de Théoktistos, est resté jusqu'à sa mort un grand ami du nouveau patriarche. On peut donc supposer que l'insertion de Théoktistos dans le Synaxaire en tant que martyr a eu lieu pendant le deuxième patriarcat d'Ignace, entre 867 et 877.

(10) § 19, je cite la traduction de GOILLARD, *La Vie d'Euthyme de Sardes...*, 48.

TWO NOTES ON THE COPTIC THEOTOKIAS

I. NOTE ON A PUN IN A COPTIC THEOTOKIA OF SUNDAY

The Copts love playing on words and making puns,¹ they are in the same mentality as most of the oriental peoples.² In a previous article, while studying *theotokias*,³ I highlighted a pun, based on the name of Jesus and the Ten commandments.⁴ I deduced that the *theotokias* were written in Coptic.

While re-reading the text, I came across another pun in the Sunday *theotokia*.

Here is the text

ΔΚΟΛΑΕΛ ἠΠΕΝΤΥΧΗ Ω ΜΩΥΣΗΣ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΣΕΝ ΠΤΑΙΟ ἠΤΣΚΗΗ
ΕΤΑΚΕΛΑΟΛ ΕΒΟΛ

The translation given by the editor of the Arabic text and hence the recent English text is:

زينت انفسنا يا موسى النبي بكرامة القبة التي زينتها

You adorned our *souls*, o Moses the *prophet* with the honour of the *tent* that you adorned⁵

Brogi, in his Italian translation, rendered this sentence thus:

(1) Y. N. YOUSSEF, Un jeu de mots dans le rituel de la consécration des icônes, *Göttinger Miszellen* 142 (1994) 109–111; BOYAVAL, Jeu de mots dans un distique Chrétien d’Égypte? *Compte-Rendu de l’Institut de Papyrologie et de l’Égyptologie de Lille* 23 (2003) 95–96.

(2) Y. N. YOUSSEF, La genèse de la légende sur le roi Dioclétien, *BSA* 28 (1986–1989) 107–110.

(3) Y. N. YOUSSEF, Severus of Antioch in the Coptic Theotokia, in: B. NEIL, G. DUNN, L. CROSS (eds.), *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church: Liturgy and life*, vol. 3 (Sydney 2003) 93–108; IDEM, The Coptic Marian homilies of Severus of Antioch, *BSAC* 43 (2004) 127–140.

(4) Y. N. YOUSSEF, Une relecture des Théotokies Coptes, *BSA* 36 (1997) 153–170.

(5) R. ΤΥΚΗ, ΠΙΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ΠΘΕΟΤΟΚΙΑ ΠΕΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑΞΙΣ ΝΤΕ ΠΑΒΟΤ ΧΟΙΑΚ [The book of the Theotokias and according to the rite of the month of Kihak] (Rome, 1764) 71; K. ΛΑΒΙΒ, ΠΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ΤΨΑΛΜΟΔΙΑ ΕΘΥ ΝΤΕ ΠΡΟΠΠΗ ΠΦΡΗΤ ΕΤΑΥΘΑΩΣ

“Consolasti le nostre anime, oprefeta Mosè, onorando il tabernacolo che tu avevi ornato.”⁶

The author of this text played on the double meaning of the verb $\text{CO}\lambda\text{CE}\lambda$ “adorn”⁷ and “Comfort, encourage.”⁸

The Biblical and liturgical texts attest both meanings. These meanings were known even in its late stage. It is attested in the *Al-Sullam al-Muqaffa wa-al-Dhahab al-Musaffa*. rhymic scala of al-Mu’taman⁹ Ibn al-Assal¹⁰

In this article we will give some examples of the usage of these words.

Adorn

A – In the Bible

This meaning occurs in Gospel Bohairic version of Matthew 23:9 (Bohairic)

ΟΥΟΙ ΝΩΤΕΝ ΗΙΣΑΣ ΝΕΗ ΗΙΦΑΡΙΣΕΟΣ ΗΙΨΟΡΙ ΧΕ ΤΕΤΕΝΚΩΤ `ΝΗΗΗΖΑΥ
`ΝΤΕ ΗΙΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΟΥΟΖ ΤΕΤΕΝCOΛCEΛ `ΝΗΙΗΒ `ΝΤΕ ΗΙΘΗΗ

Woe unto you, scribes and *Pharisees*, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the *prophets*, and adorn the sepulchers of the righteous,

Matthew 25:7 (Bohairic)

ΤΟΤΕ ΑΥΤΩΟΥΗΟΥ `ΗΧΕ ΗΙΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΕΤΕΜΗΑΥ ΟΥΟΖ ΑΥCOΛCEΛ
`ΗΗΟΥΛΑΗΠΑΣ

Then all those *virgins* arose, and adorned their lamps.

ΗΧΕ ΗΕΗΙΟΥΤ ΗΤΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ ΗΡΕΗΗΧΗΗΗ ΔΥΤΟΠΣ ΗΧΕ ΠΗΗΒ ΚΑΔΥΔΙΟΣ 𐩮𐩺 𐩬𐩪𐩨 ΒΕΗ
ΣΕΗ ΤΡΟΗΠ ΗΗΔΖ 𐩮𐩺𐩸𐩺 [The book of the annual holy psalmodia as it was established
by the fathers of the fathers of the Coptic Church, printed by Mr Klaudios John Labib
Bey in the year 1624] (Cairo, 1908) 91; ΜΙΝΑ ΑΛ-ΒΑΡΑΜΟΥΣΙ, ΤΤΑΛΗΟΛΙΑ ΗΤΡΟΗΠ
ΕΘΟΥΔ [The Holy Annual Psalmodia] (Alexandria, 1908) 138.

(6) M. BROGI, *La santa salmodia annuale della chiesa Copta* (Cairo, 1962) (Studia Orientalia Christiana Aegyptiaca) 42.

(7) W. E. CRUM, *A Coptic dictionary* (Oxford, 1937) 331b–332a.

(8) Ibid., 332a–332b.

(9) G. GRAF, *Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur* (Città del Vaticano, 1947) (Studi e Testi, 133) 345, 347, 383, 404. cf. A. WADI, *Dirasa ‘an al-Mu’taman Ibn al-‘Assal wa-kitabihi “Magmu’ usul al-din” wa-tahqiqihi* (italian title *Studio su ...*), SOC.M 5 (Cairo—Jerusalem: The Franciscan Centre of Christian Oriental Studies, 1997) 188 & 86, n. 24.

(10) A. KIRCHER, *Lingua Aegyptiaca Restituta* (Rome, 1648) 359–360.

Luke 21: 5 (Bohairic)

ΟΥΟΥ ΕΡΕ ΖΑΝΟΥΟΝ ΧΩ ΉΜΟC ΕΘΒΕ ΠΙΕΡΦΕΙ ΧΕ ΔΥCΕΛCΩΛΙ ΝCΡΗΗ
 ΞΕΝ ΖΑΝΩΜΙ ΕΝΑΠΕΥ ΝΕΝ ΖΑΝΑΝΑΘΗΝΑ ΠΕΧΑΙ

And as some spoke of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and *gifts*, he said,

I Timothy 2:9 (Bohairic)

ΠΑΡΗΤ ΟΝ ΝΙΖΙΟΜΙ ΕΥΞΕΝ ΟΥΜΕΤCΑΙ ΉΖΗΤ ΕCΟΡΙ ΝΕΜ ΟΥΜΕΤΧΦΗΗ
 ΝΕΜ ΟΥCΑΒΕ ΕΥCΟΛCΕΛ ΉΜΩΟΥ ΞΕΝ ΖΑΝΖΩΛΚ ΔΗ ΝΕΜ ΖΑΝΝΟΥΒ ΝΕΜ
 ΖΑΝΑΝΑΜΗΙ ΙΕ ΞΕΝ ΟΥΔΙΖΩC ΕΝΑΩΘΕΝCΟΥΕΝΙ

In like manner also, women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array;

I Peter 3:3–5 (Bohairic)

ΞΕΝ ΝΑΙ ΝΑΡΕΦΩΠΙ ΉΧΕ ΠΙCΟΛCΕΛ ΔΗ ΕΤCΑΒΟΛ ΉΤΕ ΝΙΕΒ ΝΖΩΛΚ ΉΤΕ
 ΝΙCΩΙ ΝΕΝ ΝΙΕΒ ΝΝΟΥΒ ΙΕ ΞΕΝ ΟΥΖΕΒCΩ ΉΤΖΙΩΤΟΥ ΕCCEΛCΩΛ ...ΠΑΡΗΤ
 ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΝΟΥCΗΟΥ ΝΠΙΖΙΟΜΙ ΕΘΟΥΔΒ ΝΔΥΕΡΖΕΛΠΙC ΕΦΤ ΠΕ ΝΔΥCΟΛCΕΛ
 ΉΜΩΟΥ ΕΥΔΗΟ ΝΧΩΟΥ ΉΝΟΥΖΔΙ

Whose adorning let it not be that outward [adorning] of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; ... For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands:

B — In Liturgical books

In the rite of the marriage according to the *book of the Lamp of the Darkness for the Elucidation of Service* compiled by Shams al-Ri'asah Abu al-Barakat known as Ibn Kabar,¹¹ in the Chapter XX, although this part has never been scholarly published¹² mentions:¹³

(11) On the work of Ibn Kabar, see Samir KHALIL, L'Encyclopédie liturgique d'Ibn Kabar †1324 et son apologie d'usages coptes, in : H.-J. FEULNER, E. VELKOVSKA, R. F. TAFT (eds.), *Crosswords of Cultures Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler* (Roma, 2000) 619–655.

(12) Only two popular editions one by Samuel bishop of Shibin al-Qanatir according to a manuscript copied by Shenoudah al-Baramusi copied in 1955 and the other edition done by Mina Foundation for publication in 1998. See A. WADI, Abu al-Barakat Ibn Kabar, Misbah al-Zulmah, *Studia Orientalia Christiana Collectanea* 34 (2001) 243.

(13) Text is taken from Paris Arabe 203, fol. ̄̄̄̄ [221r] Cf. also A. ABDALLAH, *L'ordinamento Liturgico di Gabriele V, 88 Patriarca Copti 1409–1427* (Cairo, 1962) 135.

ثم يلبسه الكاهن بيده و يضع عمامته على راسه و يشد ز ناره و يقال
 كبير ياليصون والبركة و تر تل المر تلون عند لباسه مديحه اولما

ΔΜΟΥ ΤΕΚΗΝΑΥ ΕΤΑΨΕΛΕΤ ΕΤΑΥΣΕΛΣΟΛΣ ἠΠΙΖΙΗΒ ΔΣΕΡΦΟΡΙΗ
 ΝΟΥΣΩΧ¹⁴ ἠΨΟΥ ΠΕΧΑΔ ἠΧΕ ΠΩΗΡΙ ΝΤΣΑΡΑΒΑΙ
 ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ ΠΩΗΡΙ ΝΖΕΒΕΔΕΟΣ ΕΨΩΨ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΨΩ ἠΗΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΣΕΡΟΥΩΗΗ
 ἠΧΕ ΤΑΨΕΛΕΤ ΠΑΡΑ ΠΙΣΙΟΥ ἠΝΤΕ ΖΑΝΑΤΟΥ
 ΕΤΕ ΘΑΙ ΤΕ ΣΙΩΝ ΗΒΕΡΙ ΤΠΟΛΙΣ ἠΠΕΝΝΟΥΤ ΧΕ ΕΡΕ ΠΟΥΝΟΥ ἠΝΤΕ
 ΗΝΕΘΟΥΑΒ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΨΩΠΙ ἠΣΡΗΙ ἠΣΗΤΣ

“Come to see the bride who has been adorned for the lamb,¹⁵ she bore a great¹⁶ glory, said the son of Charabai

John the son of Zebedeus crying out and saying: “This bride was shinning *more than* the star of the morning

That is the new Sion, the *city* of our God, wherein is the joy of all saints.”

A note in the margin adds, “This psali is dedicated to the Lady. It has been composed by a father from the monks of Abu Maqar from the cell of Kadran and his name occurs in the first letters of the beginning of each stanza.”¹⁷

This hymn occurs in three manuscripts kept in Germany.¹⁸ The manuscripts could be dated by the twelfth/thirteenth century.

It is important to mention that this text is inspired from Apoc 21:9 while the word *κολοσα* does not occur in both Sahidic and Bohairic version.

Bohairic ΟΥΟΖ ΔϚ ἠ ΧΕ ΟΥΑΙ ΕΒΟΛΣΕΝ ΠΙΖ ἠΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΗΗΕΤΕ ΤΖ ΗΦΥ-
 ΑΛΗ ἠΤΟΤΟΥ ΕΥΗΕΖ ΕΒΟΛΣΕΝ ΠΙΖ ΗΕΡΣΟΤ ἠΣΑΕ ΔϚΣΑΧΙ ΝΕΜΗΙ ΕΨΩ
 ΗΗΜΟΣ ΧΕ ΔΜΟΥ ΗΤΑΤΑΜΟΚ ΕΨΕΛΕΤ ΤΣΖΙΗΗ ΝΤΕ ΠΙΖΗΒ

Sahidic ΔΥΩ ΔϚΕΙ ΗΚΙ ΚΕΟΥΑ ΕΒΟΛΖἠ ΗΣΑΨΩϚ ΗΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΕΤΕΟΥΗΤΟΥ
 ΤΣΑΨϚΕ ΗΦΙΑΛΗ ΕΤΗΕΖ ΗΝΕΠΛΥΓΗ ΗΖΑΗ ΔϚΨΑΧΕ ΝΗΜΑΙ ΕΨΩ ΗΗΜΟΣ
 ΧΕ ΔΜΟΥ ΤΑΤΣΑΒΟΚ ΕΨΕΛΕΕΤ ΤΖΙΗΕ ΗΠΕΖΙΕΙΒ.

(14) Corrected over the line *ΠΟΥΝΟΥΤ*. Abdallah read *ΟΥΛΩΧ*.

(15) Rev. 21:9 the Coptic version is different.

(16) Translation according to the correction of the text of Ibn Kabar and Gabriel V

(17) The translation is given according to the edition of Mina Foundation, p. 183–184.

(18) L. Störk, *Koptische Handschriften 2, die Handschriften der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, Teil 2, Die Handschriften aus Dair Anba Maqar* (Stuttgart, 1995) (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, XXI.2) 273, 454; *idem*, *Koptische Handschriften 4, die Handschriften der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Teil 2, Teil 1 Liturgische Handschriften 1* (Stuttgart, 2002) (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, XXI.4) 35.

And there came unto me one of the seven *angels* which had the seven *vials* full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife.

The rite of marriage (Crowning)

ΦΗΕΤΑΙΘΑΜΙΟ `ΝΤΦΕ ΝΕΜ ΠΚΑΖΙ ΝΕΜ ΖΩΒ ΗΙΕΝ ΕΤΕΙΣΗΤΟΥ ΟΥΟΖ ΔΚ-
ΣΕΛΣΟΛΟΥ ΣΕΝ ΤΕΚΟΦΙΑ

Who created heaven and earth and everything they are in them, and you adorned them with your *wisdom*.¹⁹

The rite of Baptism, the absolution of the woman for having a male boy:

ΦΗΕΤΑΙΦΟΛΣΕΛ `ΜΠΙΕΠΤΗΡΦ ΣΕΝ ΦΗΟΜΟΣ `ΝΤΕ ΤΕΦΑΓΑΠΗ ΖΙΤΕΝ
 ΤΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑ ΗΤΕ ΠΕΦΛΟΓΟΣ ΜΗΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ `ΗΦΗΡΙ .

O Who adorned (comforted) the universe with the *Law of Charity* through the *economy* of His Word, the *Only-Begotten* Son...²⁰

The liturgy of Baptism attributed to Severus of Antioch²¹ (which survived in Greek, Coptic and Syriac)

ΦΗΕΤΑΙΦΑΜΙΟ ΗΤΦΕ ΝΕΜ ΠΚΑΖΙ ΝΕΜ ΠΟΥΣΟΛΣΕΛ ΤΗΡΦ

Who created heaven and earth and all their adornment.²²

(19) Philotheus AL-MAQARI, Barnaba AL-BARAMOUSI, كتاب رتبة الاكليل الجليل, كتاب رتبة الاكليل الجليل حسب الكنيسة الارثوذكسية المرقسية [The book of the rite of the glorious crowning according to the *ordo* of the Coptic Orthodox Church of the predication of Saint Mark] (Cairo, 1921) 32

(20) Philotheus AL-MAQARI, Barnaba AL-BARAMOUSI, كتاب المعمودية المقدسة, كتاب المعمودية المقدسة لكنائس الكرازة المرقسية [The book of the holy Baptism used in the churches of the predication of Saint Mark] (Cairo, 1921) 8.

(21) STÖRK, *Koptische Handschriften 2...*, 314. for an English translation cf. R. M. WOOLEY, *Coptic Offices* (London, 1930) (Translations of Christian Literature Series, III. Liturgical Texts) 35–36. It is noteworthy that this prayer is not the same as the rite of Baptism attributed to Severus of Antioch in the Syriac Church cf. Murad Saliba BARSOM, *The Sacrament of the Holy Baptism according to the Ancient Rite of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch* (The Syrian Orthodox Church in the United States of America and Canada, 1974) 86–92. For the works of Severus concerning the Rite of Baptism cf. B. VARGHESE, *Les Onctions Baptismales dans la Tradition Syrienne* (Louvain, 1989) (CSCO, 512) 170–180; O. H. E. BURMESTER, *Baptismal Rite of the Coptic Church*, BSAC 11 (1945) 37–39. But in the Syriac rite is attributed to James of Edessa.

(22) Philotheus AL-MAQARI, Barnaba AL-BARAMOUSI, كتاب المعمودية..., 72.

*In the book of Glorifications*²³

A Doxology Adam for the Birth of the Virgin

†ΔΡΟΜΠΙ ΕΘΗΕΣΩΣ ΘΑ ΝΙΤΕΝΩ `ΗΖΑΤ ΘΗΕΤΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΟΥΟΖ `ΗΠΑΝΑΓΙΑ
ΕΥΤΜΗΝΗ ΕΡΟ ΞΕΝ ΖΑΝΗΩ `ΗΡΑΗ ΕΥΚΟΟΙ ΕΥΣΕΛΩΛ ΕΒΟΛ `ΗΧΕ ΝΙ-
ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΝΕΜ ΝΗΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΗΣ ΟΥΟΖ ΠΗΠΑΝΣΟΦΟΣ `ΗΤΕ †ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ

The beautiful dove, who has silver wings, the perfect and *all-holy*.
The *prophets* and the *patriarchs* and the *all-wise* of the *Church* indicate
about you with many names, extremely sublim and adorned (or
comforting)²⁴

A hymn for the entry of the Virgin to the temple:

ΑΝΩΗΝ ΣΩΤΕΝ ΝΤΑΤΑΜΩΤΕΝ ΧΑΜΑΨΧ ΕΡΟΙ ΝΤΑΣΑΧΙ ΝΕΜΩΤΕΝ ΕΘΒΕ
ΤΑΙΛΛΟΥ `ΗΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΜΑΡΙΑ ΤΨΕΡΙ `ΗΩΑΚΗΜ ΘΗΕΤΑ ΝΕΣΙΟ† ΣΕΛΣΟΛΣ
ΕΒΟΛ ΞΕΝ ΖΑΝΗΟΧ `ΗΤΑΙΟ ΝΙΒΕΝ²⁵ ΑΥΤΗΝΣ `ΗΛΩΡΟΝ ΕΠΙΕΡΦΕΙ ΙΣΧΕΝ
ΕΣΧΗ ΞΕΝ Γ `ΗΡΟΜΠΙ

Come, hear, in order that I inform you, listen so that I talk with
you about this *virgin* girl Mary daughter of Joachim that her parents
adorned her with great, all honours and presented as a *gift* to the
temple since she was 3 years old²⁶

A hymn for the dormition of the Virgin:

Α ΤΑΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΔΙ `ΗΟΥΤΑΙΟ ΗΦΟΟΥ ΑΤΑΨΕΛΕΤ ΔΙ `ΗΟΥΩΟΥ `ΗΦΟΟΥ ΘΑΙ
ΕΤΧΟΛΩ ΞΕΝ ΖΑΝΨΤΑ† ΝΙΕΒ `ΗΝΟΥΒ ΕΣΣΕΛΩΛ ΞΕΝ ΟΥΘΟ ΠΡΗ†.

"This *Virgin* has, today attained honour. This bride has toaday
attained glory, her gown is made of gold thread and is adorned with
many things"²⁷

A hymn for the consecration fo the Church of the Virgin:

(23) for this book cf. Y. N. YOUSSEF, Un témoin méconnu de la littérature copte, *BSA* 32 (1993), 139–147 ; IDEM, Une relecture des glorifications coptes, *BSA* 34 (1995) 77–83. Cf. also Yassa Abd AL-MASIH, *Doxologies in the Coptic Church*, edited Bohairic doxologies, *BSA* 6 (1940) 19–76, see p. 71.

(24) ΑΤΤΑΛΛΗ ΑΡΣΕΝΙΟΥ ΑΛ-ΜΟΧΑΡΡΑΚΙ, ΠΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ΝΙΧΙΝ†ΩΟΥ ΕΘΥ
Η†ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΝΙΔΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΝΙΔΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ ΝΗ† ΝΕΜ ΝΗΕΘΥ. [*The book of the holy
Glorifications for the Virgin, the angels, the apostles, the martyrs and the saints*]
(Cairo, 1972) 32.

(25) This text is not grammatically correct as the indefinite article should
be omit before ΝΙΒΕΝ

(26) ΑΤΤΑΛΛΗ, ΠΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ΝΙΧΙΝ†ΩΟΥ..., 38–39.

(27) Ibid., 45.

ΔΗΟΚ ΟΥΕΚΩΤ ΔΗΟΚ ΟΥΔΗΨΕ ΔΗΟΚ ΟΥΣΗΗΗ ΠΡΕΨΤΟΥΧΟ †ΟΥΨΩ ΠΤΑΚΩΤ
 `ΝΟΥΠΑΛΛΑΤΙΟΗ ΗΠΟΥΡΟ ΗΤΑΞΕΛΣΟΛΩ `ΗΚΑΛΩΣ

I am a builder, I am a carpenter, I am a healer physician, I wish
 to build a *palace* of the king and to *well adorn* it.²⁸

For the Epiphany and the feast of John the Baptist adorn

`ΗΘΟΚ ΠΕ ΠΣΟΛΣΕΛ ΗΠΩΔΩΕ

You are the adornment (consolation) of the desert.²⁹

In the book of the Psalmodia

ΧΕΡΕ ΠΙΜΑΝΨΕΛΕΤ ΕΤΣΕΛΣΩΛ ΞΕΗ ΟΥΘΟ `ΗΡΗ† `ΗΤΕ ΠΗΥΗΦΙΟΣ `ΗΜΗΗ
 ΕΤΑΔ†ΗΕΤΡΩΗΗ

Hail to the bridal chamber adorned in every way, for the true
Bridegroom, who united with humanity.³⁰

Consolation, comfort

This meaning occurs on the Gospels in the Sahidic versions only
 while in Bohairic there are different words:

A – In the Bible

Matthew (Sahidic)

2:18 ΧΕ ΟΥΣΗΗ ΔΥΣΩΤΉ ΕΡΟΣ ΖΉ ΖΡΑΗΔΑ ΟΥΡΙΜΕ ΜΉ ΟΥΤΟΕΙΤ ΕΝΑΨΩΔ
 ΖΡΑΧΗΔ ΕΣΡΙΜΕ ΕΗΕΣΩΗΡΕ ΔΥΩ ΗΠΕΣΟΥΨΩ ΕΣΧΩΛΣ ΧΕ ΠΗΟΥΣ ΔΗ ΗΕ

2:18 In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping,
 and great mourning, Rachel weeping [for] her children, and would
 not be comforted, because they are not.

Luke 16: 19 (Bohairic)

ΗΕ ΟΥΟΗ ΟΥΡΩΗ ΔΕ ΠΕ `ΗΡΑΗΔΟ ΟΥΟΖ ΗΕΨΑΔ† `ΝΟΥΠΟΡΦΥΡΑ ΖΩΤΩ
 ΗΕΗ ΟΥΨΕΗΣ ΕΨΟΥΗΟΔ `ΗΜΗΗ ΞΕΗ ΟΥΣΟΛΣΕΛ

There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in *purple* and
 fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day:

Luke (Sahidic)

16 :25 ΠΕΧΕ ΔΡΑΡΔΑΗ ΔΕ ΧΕ ΠΑΨΗΡΕ ΔΡΙΠΗΕΥΕ ΧΕ ΔΚΧΙ ΗΗΕΚΑΓΑΘΟΗ
 ΖΉ ΠΕΚΩΗΔΖ ΔΥΩ ΛΑΖΑΡΟΣ ΖΩΩΔ ΖΗ ΖΕΗΠΕΘΟΟΥ ΤΕΗΟΥ ΣΕΣΟΛΣΕΛ
 ΗΗΟΔ ΗΠΕΗΔ ΠΤΟΚ ΔΕ ΣΕΗΟΥΚΖ ΗΗΟΚ

(28) ΑΤΤΑΛΛΑΗ, ΠΧΩΗ ΗΤΕ ΗΙΧΗ†ΩΟΥ..., 59

(29) Ibid., 75.

(30) ΜΙΝΑ ΑΛ-ΒΑΡΑΜΟΥΣΙ, ††ΔΛΗΟΔΙΑ..., 199, ΛΑΒΙΒ, ΠΧΩΗ ΗΤΕ ††ΔΛΗΟ-
 ΔΙΑ..., 135.

16:25 But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in your lifetime received your *good things*, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.

John (Sahidic)

11:19 ΟΥΝΗΝΩΕ ΔΕ ΕΒΟΛΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙ ΗΕ ΔΥΕΙ ΠΕ ΨΑ ΜΑΡΘΑ ΜΗ ΜΑΡΙΑ ΧΕ ΕΥΣΕΛΑΧΩΛΟΥ ΕΤΡΕ ΠΕΥΣΟΝ

11:19 And many of the Jews came to Martha and Mary, to comfort them concerning their brother.

11:31 ΜΙΟΥΔΑΙΣΕ ΕΤΩΠ ΠΗΝΗΜΑΔΑ ΑΥΩ ΕΤΣΟΛΑΧΕΛ ΠΗΜΟC ΗΤΕΟΥΝΑΥ ΕΝΑΡΙΑ ΧΕ ΔΑΤΩΟΥΗC ΤΗ ΟΥΔΕΠΗ ΔΑΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ ΑΥΟΥΑΖΟΥ ΠΩC ΕΥΧΩ ΠΗΜΟC ΧΕ ΕCΗΑΒΩΚ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΠΤΑΦΟC ΧΕ ΕCΕΡΙΝΕ ΗΜΑΥ

11:31 The Jews then which were with her in the house, and comforted her, when they saw Mary, that she rose up hastily and went out, followed her, saying, She goes unto the *grave* to weep there.

In the Psalmodia

The same word is used to give the meaning of Consolation in the doxology for the Virgin:

ΕΡΕ ΠΣΟΛΑΧΕΛ ΜΑΡΙΑΝ ΞΕΝ ΗΦΗΟΥΙ ΕΤΣΑΠΩΩΙ ΣΑΟΥΗΝΑΗ `ΗΠΕCΗΕΡΠΤ ΕCΤΩΒΩ ΗΜΟQ ΕΖΡΗ ΕΧΩΗ

The consolation of Mary, in upper Heavens at the right of her Beloved, is to pray Him for our sake.³¹

And the second doxology for the Virgin for the Month of Kihak³²

ΕΡΕ ΠΣΟΛΑΧΕΛ ΗΤΠΑΡΘΕΗΝΟC ΜΑΡΙΑ ΤΩΕΡΙ ΗΠΟΥΡΟ ΔΑΥΙΔ ΣΑΟΥΗΝΑΗ ΗΠΠΕ ΠΧΕ ΠΩΗΡΙ ΗΦΤ ΠΗΕΗΡΤ

The consolation of the *Virgin*, Mary the daughter of King David, at the right of Jesus *Christ* the Beloved Son of God.³³

Yassa Abd-Al-Masih translated the word *σολαχελ* in both stanzas as “adornment”,³⁴ while the use of the other meaning suits better the context.

(31) BROGI, *La santa salmodia...*, 89 (ornamento); MINA AL-BARAMOUSI, ††ΔΑΜΟΔΙΑ..., 313; LABIB, ΠΧΩΗ ΗΤΕ ††ΔΑΜΟΔΙΑ..., 214; IDEM, ††ΔΑΜΟΔΙΑ ΕΘΥ ΗΤΕ ΠΑΒΟΤ ΧΟΙΑΚ [*The book of the holy Psalmodia of the month of Kihak*] (Cairo, 1911–1922) 331–332.

(32) Y. N. YOUSSEF, A doxology for the month of Kihak, *Journal of Coptic Studies* 8 (2006) 79–85.

(33) BROGI, *La santa salmodia...*, 131; MINA AL-BARAMOUSI, ††ΔΑΜΟΔΙΑ..., 378; LABIB, ΠΧΩΗ ΗΤΕ ††ΔΑΜΟΔΙΑ..., 483–485; IDEM, ††ΔΑΜΟΔΙΑ..., 566–567; Yassa Abd AL-MASIH, *Doxologies...*, 19–76.

(34) Yassa Abd AL-MASIH, *Doxologies...*, 20, 35.

The daily psalis of Monday:

†ΟΛΣΕΛ ΗΝΕΝ†ΥΧΗ ΠΕΡΟΥΤ ΗΝΕΝΖΗΤ ΠΕ ΠΕΚΡΑΝ ΘΘΥ Ω ΠΑΔΣ ΙΗϞ

The consolation of our *souls* and the joy of our hearts is Your holy name o my Lord Jesus³⁵

Il tua Santo Nome. O moi ignore Gesù è consolazione delle nostre anime e gioia dei nostri cuori³⁶

The doxology of Saint Macarius the Great:

ΣΕ ΤΕΗΝΑΖ† ΧΕ ΚΗ ΝΕΜΑΝ †ΥΧΗ ΝΕΝ ΣΩΜΑ ΝΕΝ ΠΠ̄Α ΚΩΟΠ ΗΑΝ `ΜΠΑΡΑ-
ΚΛΗΣΙΣ ΟΥΟΖ `ΗΣΟΛΣΕΛ ΗΝΕΝ†ΥΧΗ

Yes we believe that you are with us, *soul*, *body* and *spirit*. You became for us, a consolation and comfort to our *souls*.³⁷

Si crediamo che sei con noi, anima e corpo e spirite, e sei per no un consolatore ed un consolatore delle nostre anime³⁸

A doxology for Damianah

ΡΑΩΙ Ω ΘΗΕΤΣΟΛΕΛ ΣΕΝ ΠΠΑΡΑΔΙΣΟΣ ΣΕΝ ΟΥΩΟΥΗΕΝ ΟΥΘΕΛΗΛ
ΝΑΖΡΕΝ ΠΧϞ

Be happy o that who is adorned (conforted) in the *Paradise* with glory and joy in front of *Christ*.³⁹

B – In the psalis

The psalis in are in general from late date. Some of them are composed by Nicodemus (XVIII century). They are inspired by other liturgical texts.

Psali Adam for Nairouz This psali is from the last letter to the first. The stanza here is inspired by the daily psali of Monday:

†ΟΛΣΕΛ ΗΝΕΝΠΠ̄Α ΠΕΡΟΥΤ ΗΠΕΝΛΑΣ ΠΩΟΥ ΝΑΚ Δ̄Α ΔΟΞΑ ΣΙ Ο ΘΕΟΣ

The consolation of our *spirits* and the joyness of our tongues, Glory be to You Alleluia, *Glory be to You, o God*⁴⁰

The psali of Saint Mark inspired by the Theotokia of Sunday:

(35) ΛΑΒΙΒ, ΠΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ††ΑΛΗΟΛΙΑ..., 110

(36) ΒΡΟΓΙ, *La santa salmodia...*, 48.

(37) ΛΑΒΙΒ, ΠΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ††ΑΛΗΟΛΙΑ..., 241

(38) ΒΡΟΓΙ, ††ΑΛΗΟΛΙΑ..., 104

(39) ΑΤΤΑΛΛΗ, ΠΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ΝΙΧΙΝ†ΩΟΥ..., 226.

(40) Philotheus AL-MAQARI, Mikhail GIRGIS, كتاب الابصاليات والواطس والادام, كتاب المرقسية المستعمل في كنائس الكرازة المرقسية [The book of the Psalis and Turhurat, Batos and Adam used in the churches of the predication of Saint Mark] (Cairo, 1913) 11.

ΞΟΛΣΕΛ ἠΗΕΗΨΥΧΗ ΞΕΗ ΠΗΛΑΨ† ΕΤΣΟΥΤΩΗ ΟΥΟΨ ΟΗ ΔΚΤΑΧΡΟΗ ΞΕΗ
ΠΕΚΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΗ

You console our souls with the right faith and also you established us in your *Gospel*⁴¹

Psali Adam for the Virgin Mary for the consecration of the sanctuary of the monastery of al-Muharraq:

†ΟΛΣΕΛΗΗΕΗΖΗΤ ΦΡΑΨΗ ΗΗΙΑΔΟΨ ΕΒΟΛΖΙΤΕΗ ΜΑΡΙΑ †ΘΕΟΤΟΚΟΨ

The consolation of our heart, the happiness of the *peoples* through Mary the *God-Bearer*⁴²

Psali Batos of saint George attributed to Nicodemus

ΞΟΛΣΕΛ ΗΗΙΕΚΚΛΗΨΙΑ ΞΕΗ ΠΕΚΟΨΟΛΕΛ ΗΗΙΕΚΚΛΗΨΙΑ ΞΕΗ ΠΕΚΧΗΝΕΡ-
ΦΗΕΥΨ Ω ΠΙΓΕΗΗΕΟΨ ΕΘΒΕ ΠΩΟΥ ἠΝΤΕ ΤΕΚΠΑΡΘΕΗΔ Ω ΠΑΔΨ ΠΟΥΡΟ
ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΨ

You console the *churches* through your consolation of the *churches* in your commemoration, o *brave* because of the glory of your *chastety*, o my lord king George⁴³

Psali Adam for Saint George

ΟΛΣΕΛ ΞΕΗ ΗΨΗΟΥΨ ΠΕ ΠΕΚΡΑΗ Ω ΠΗΔΡΤΥΡΟΨ ΝΕΗ ΠΕΚΤΥΠΟΨ ΖΙΧΕΗ
ΠΙΚΑΖΨ Ω ΠΙΕΘΨ ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΨ

You are (a) Consolation (adornment) in heavens, o *Martyr* and your *example (type)* [is] on earth o saint George.⁴⁴

Psali Adam for Saint Mercurius

ΟΛΣΕΛ ΞΕΗ ΗΨΗΟΥΨ ΗΘΟΚ Ω ΠΗΔΡΤΥΡΟΨ ΝΕΗ ΠΕΚΤΥΠΟΨ ΖΙΧΕΗ ΠΙΚΑΖΨ
Ω ΦΗΕΘΨ ΜΕΡΚΟΥΡΙΟΨ

You are (a) Consolation (adornment) in heavens, o *Martyr* and your *example (type)* [is] on earth, o saint Mercurius

Psali for the consecration of the Church of Abba Shenoudi

ΔΚΗΟΥΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΞΕΗ ΟΥΤΑΧΡΟ ΞΕΗ ΖΑΗΠΡΟΨΕΥΧΗ ΕΥΟΥΑΒ ΞΕΗ ΗΔΙ ΔΚ-
ΟΛΣΕΛ ΗΠΕΚΒΙΟΨ ΗΦΡΗ† ΗΗΙΑΓΓΕΛΟΨ

You remain firmly, in holy *prayers*, therefore you console (adorn) your *life* like the *angels*.⁴⁵

(41) Philotheus AL-MAQARI, Mikhail GIRGIS, ... المستعمل في كنائس, 122.

(42) Ibid., 134.

(43) Ibid., 138.

(44) Ibid., 145.

(45) De Lacy O'LEARY, *The Difnar (Antiphonarium) of the Coptic Church* (London, 1926) Vol. I, 107.

C – In the Euchologion

We read in the Euchologion,⁴⁶ in the Litany of peace which is a distinctively Egyptian feature⁴⁷

ΠΙΟΥΡΟ ΝΗΑΤΟΙ ΝΙΑΡΧΩΝ ΝΙΣΟΘΝΙ ΝΗΗΩ ΝΕΝΘΕΨΕΥ ΝΕΝΧΙΝΗΩΥ ΕΞΟΥΗ
ΝΕΝ ΝΕΝΧΙΝΗΩΥ ΕΒΟΛ ΣΕΛΑΧΑΛΟΥ ΣΕΗ ΖΙΡΗΗΗ ΝΙΒΕΝ

The king, the soldiers, the notables, the councillors, the peoples, our neighbours, our inside ways and our outside ways (adorned / comfort) them with whole peace⁴⁸

The meaning here is not clear whether the verb ΣΕΛΑΧΑΛΟΥ is for the king, the soldiers or for the ways.

The Arabic version of the Greek version⁴⁹

الملك الرتب الجندية الرؤساء المشورات الجيران التي لنا داخلنا وخارجنا زينهم بكل سلامة

The Litany for the place from the Anaphora of Saint Gregory, we read⁵⁰

ΝΕΝ ΠΟΛΙΣ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΝΕΝ ΧΩΡΑ ΝΙΒΕΝ ΝΕΝ †ΗΙ ΝΕΝ ΠΟΥΣΟΣΕΑ ΤΗΡΩ

and all the *cities* and *countries* and towns and their whole adornment (consolation- universe)⁵¹

This part is not attested in the edition of Tukhi.⁵²

(46) We will refer to the best edition of this book prepared by Abd al-Masih Salib and printed by Claudius Labib which is considered as nearly critical edition cf. U. ZANETTI, *Esquisse d'une typologie des Euchologes Coptes Bohaïriques*, *Le Muséon* 100 (1987) 407–418.

(47) Cf. G. J. CUMING, *The liturgy of St Mark* (Roma, 1990) (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 234) 100.

(48) Abd AL-MASIH SALIB, ΠΙΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ΠΙΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΕΘΟΥΑΒ ΕΤΕ ΦΑΙ ΠΕ ΠΙΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ †ΨΟΗ† ΝΑΝΑΦΟΡΑ ΝΤΕ ΠΑΓΙΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΟΣ ΝΕΝ ΠΑΓΙΟΣ ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΣ ΝΕΝ ΠΑΓΙΟΣ ΚΥΡΙΑΛΟΣ ΝΕΝ ΖΑΗΚΕΕΥΧΗ ΕΥΟΥΑΒ. [*The book of the Holy Euchologion which is the book of the three anaphorae of St. Basil, St. Gregory and St. Cyril and other holy prayers*] (Cairo, 1902) 278, (liturgy of St Cyril) 581.

(49) Samir KHALIL, *La version arabe du Basile alexandrin* (codex Kacmarcik), *OCP* 44 (1978) 342–390 especially p. 364–365.

(50) E. HAMMERSCHMIDT, *Die Koptische Gregoriosanaphora. Syrische und Griechische Einflüsse auf Eine Ägyptische Liturgie* (Berlin, 1957); IDEM, *Some remarks on the History of, and Present State of Investigation into, the Coptic Liturgy*, *BSAC* 19 (1968) 89–113.

(51) Abd AL-MASIH SALIB, ΠΙΧΩΗ ΝΤΕ ΠΙΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ..., 517.

(52) R. ΤΥΚΗΙ, *The book of the three anaphoras which are those of Saint Basil, Saint Gregory the Theologian and Saint Cyril with other holy prayers* (Roma, 1736).

D – In the Literature

This word occurs only once in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* in Coptic

Sahidic ⲁⲮⲪⲐⲠⲟⲥ ⲈⲦⲮⲏⲏⲦⲒ ⲁⲠⲠⲁ ⲏⲁⲕⲁⲣⲏⲟⲥ ⲪⲈ ⲈⲢⲟⲘⲱⲱ ⲈⲢⲤⲬⲤⲬ ⲏⲈⲢⲤⲏⲏⲏⲏ
ⲏⲈⲪⲬⲁⲓ.

It was said about Abba Macarius that he wished to comfort the brethren, he said:..⁵³

This text is translated from the Greek:

Ἐλεγεν ἄββα Μακάριος θέλων παρηγορήσαι τοὺς ἀδελφούς
Abba Macarius, wishing to comfort the brethren, said: ...⁵⁴

This word occurs also in a letter addressed from Theophilus the Patriarch to the monks in Coptic

Sahidic ⲡⲘⲖⲖⲟ ⲁⲈ ⲁⲒⲀⲒⲦⲈⲒ ⲏⲠⲠⲘⲏⲈⲠⲓⲒⲕⲟⲠⲟⲥ ⲈⲦⲮⲈⲒⲒⲁⲒ ⲏⲟⲘⲈⲠⲓⲒⲕⲟⲠⲟⲥ
Ⲧⲁ ⲏⲈⲢⲤⲏⲏⲏⲁⲪⲟⲥ ⲈⲢⲤⲟⲘⲤⲬ ⲏⲏⲟⲘⲟⲘ Ⲓⲏ ⲏⲱⲁⲪⲈ

The elder asked the *archbishop* to write a *letter* to his *monks* comforting them with a word:..⁵⁵

Conclusion

This note shows once more the importance of the study of the Coptic liturgical texts. It highlights the Egyptian way of using pun to express a deep meaning.

It demonstrates also the Coptic origin of the Theotokia.

Sometimes it is difficult to choose which meaning of this word is meant. This is apparent from the above examples.

In our study, we did not take in consideration the meaning of ⲟⲘⲤⲈⲕⲁ as world (not mentioned by Crum) but attested only once in the Epistle of James 3:6

Bohairic ⲡⲓⲕⲁⲥ Ⲓⲱⲱⲓ ⲟⲘⲪⲱⲏⲏ ⲏⲈ ⲏⲤⲟⲘⲤⲬ ⲏⲦⲈ Ⲧⲁⲗⲓⲕⲓⲁ ⲏⲈⲕⲏⲟⲥ Ⲫⲏ ⲈⲢⲮⲏ
ⲪⲈⲏ ⲏⲏⲈⲖⲟⲥ ⲟⲘⲟⲘ ⲒⲒⲓⲁⲗⲏⲏ ⲏⲤⲁ ⲏⲓⲤⲱⲏⲁ ⲦⲏⲮⲒ

Sahidic ⲡⲓⲕⲁⲥ Ⲓⲱⲱⲓ ⲟⲘⲪⲱⲟⲧⲦ ⲏⲈ ⲏⲤⲟⲘⲤⲬⲟⲥ ⲏⲦⲁⲗⲓⲕⲓⲁ ⲏⲈ ⲏⲱⲁⲪⲈ
ⲏⲏⲏⲈⲖⲟⲥ ⲏⲠⲓ ⲈⲦⲪⲱⲟⲧⲦ ⲏⲏⲓⲤⲱⲏⲁ ⲦⲏⲮⲒ.

(53) M. CHAÏNE, *Le manuscrit de la version copte en dialecte sahidique des «Apophthegmata Patrum»* BEC 6 (Caire, 1960) 45 N182

(54) J.-C. GUY, *Les Apophthegmes des Pères, Collections systématique, Chapitre XVII–XXI* (SC, 498) (Paris, 2005) 62–63, N 15

(55) W. E. CRUM, *Der Papyruscodex saec. VI–VII der Phillippsbibliothek in Cheltenham* (Strassburg, 1915) (Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg, 18) 16: 14–15.

And the tongue [is] a fire, a **world** of *iniquity*: so is the tongue among our *members*, that it defiles the whole *body*.

It is important to mention the Greek verb κοσμέω has the following meaning "Order, set in order, adorn"⁵⁶ while the substantive κόσμος has three meaning of ornament or world⁵⁷ or order, or ornament decoration or World, universe⁵⁸

II. NOTE ON THE BOHAIRIC THEOTOKIA AND THE SAHIDIC ANTIPHONARION

The Antiphonarium is an important liturgical book. The Sahidic version dated in 893AD⁵⁹ has been edited by Marie Cramer and Martin Krause,⁶⁰ the Bohairic version dated 1385 is not published yet.⁶¹

In a previous article, Yassa Abd al-Masih demonstrated that many parts of the actual doxologies have similarities with the Antiphonarium of Hamouli.⁶²

Dr Gawdat followed this study with two articles about the composition and the origin of this book.⁶³

In his book of the Lamp of Darkness, Ibn Kabar indicates that the use of the Theotokias is not observed in the Upper Egypt⁶⁴

(56) G. W. H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961) 769a

(57) LIDDELL—SCOTT, 985.

(58) LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon...*, 771ab.

(59) L. DEPUYDT, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library* (Leuven: Peeter, 1993) (Corpus of Illuminated Manuscripts) Vol. 1, 107–112.

(60) M. CRAMER, M. KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar* (Jerusalem: Theologisches Forum, 12) (Münster: Aschendorff, 2008).

(61) Nashaat MEKHAIEL, Shenoute as reflected in the *Vita* and the *Difnar*, in: Gawdat GABRA, Hany N. TAKLA (eds.), *Christianity and Monasticism in Upper Egypt — Akhmim and Sohag*, vol. I (Cairo—New York: The American University in Cairo Press, 2008) 99–106.

(62) Yassa 'Abd AL-MASIH, Doxologies of the Coptic Church, *BSAC* 5 (1939) 175–191.

(63) For a study of this book cf. Gawdat GABRA, Untersuchungen zum Difnar der koptischen Kirche. I Quellenlage, Forschungsgeschichte und künftige Aufgaben, *BSAC* 35 (1996) 37–52; IDEM, Untersuchungen zum Difnar der koptischen Kirche. II zur Kompilation, *BSAC* 37 (1998) 49–68.

(64) L. VILLECOURT, Les observances Liturgiques et la discipline du jeûne dans l'Église Copte, *Le Muséon* 37 (1924) 201–280 especially p. 229.

In previous studies, I discussed the origin and the evolution of the theotokias and I compared with the patristic texts.⁶⁵ I concluded that some parts of the Theotokias are present in the Sahidic Antiphonarium.⁶⁶

Muyser compared the Bohairic theotokia and the Antiphonary,⁶⁷ I will reproduce the list and I will compare the two texts to comment on the linguistic evolution of the texts. We choose to compare in details the theotokia of Tuesday and Wednesday as representing to the tune Adam and Batos. We added also the unique stanza from the theotokia for Sundays and the table showing the correspondence between the theotokias of Thursday and Friday.

Theotokia of Sunday

Only one stanza was found in the Antiphonarium that resembles to the stanza of Sunday Theotokia.

Antiphonarium ⁶⁹	Theotokia of Sunday (part 1)	Translation
ΤΕΣΚΥΗΗ ΤΕΤΟΥΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΣ ΧΕ ΤΕΤΟΥΔΑΒ ΗΕΤΕ ΗΕΤΟΥΔΑΒ ΕΡΕ ΤΡΙΒΩ- ΤΟΣ ΝΗΤΗC	CEMOY† EPOLIKEW C W ΘΗΘΤCΜΑΡΩΟΥΤ ΞΕΝ ΗΙΖΙΟΜΙ ΧΕ †ΜΑΖ CΝΟΥ† \ΗCΚΗΗΗ ΘΗΕΤΟΥΜΟΥ† ΕΡΟΣ ΧΕ ΘΗΕΘΟΥΔΑΒ ΗΤΕ ΗΗΕΘΟΥΔΑΒ ΕΡΕ ΗΠΙΛΑΞ \ΗΨΗΤC	You are justly called, o blessed one, among women, the Second Tabernacle Which is called, the holy of the Holies, wherein are the tablets

Commentary

The Sahidic version of the Antiphonarium is slightly different from the Bohairic

“The Tabernacle which is called the holy of Holies wherein the Ark”

(65) YOUSSEF, Severus of Antioch..., 93–108 ; IDEM, The Coptic Marian..., 127–140; IDEM, Note sur La Vierge Marie Entre la tradition Copte et Syriaque (Maronite), *Parole de l’Orient* 31 (2006) 185–190.

(66) YOUSSEF, Une relecture des Théotokies..., 153–170 especially p. 170.

(67) J. MUYSER, *Maria’s Heerlikleid in Egypten Ein Studie der Koptische Maria Literature*, vol. I (Louvain, 1935) 60–74 and especially p. 72–74.

(68) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 106.

It resembles to the first two stanzas of the Theotokia of Sunday, however the Bohairic text talk about the “Tablets” while the Sahidic version mentions the “Ark”

Theotokia of Monday

I was unable to find any text in both books resembles to each other.

Theotokia of Tuesday

There are two parts from the Theotokia of Tuesday which have their counterpart in the Sahidic book of the Antiphonarion.

Antiphonarion ⁷⁰	Theotokia of Tuesday (part 2)	Translation
<p>ΟΥΝΟΣ ΠΕ ΠΤΑΙΟ ΠΤΟΥΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΑ</p>	<p>ΟΥΝΟΥ† ΠΕ ΠΩΟΥ `ΗΤΕ ΤΕΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΑ ΜΑΡΙΑ †ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΘΗΕΤΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ</p>	<p>Great is the glory of your virginity, O Virgin Mary, the perfect one</p>
<p>ΧΕ ΠΤΟ ΠΕ ΤΕΔΛΟΟΛΕ ΗΤΑ ΙΑΚΩΒ ΗΔΥ ΕΡΟΣ</p>	<p>ΔΡΕΧΕΗΖΗΜΟΤ ΠΒΤ ΩΟΠ ΗΕΗΕ `ΗΘΟ ΤΕ †ΗΟΚΙ ΘΗΕΤΑ ΙΑΚΩΒ ΗΔΥ ΕΡΟΣ</p>	<p>You have found grace, and the Lord is with you, you are the lad- der, which Jacob saw</p>
<p>ΕΡΕ ΧΩΣ ΖΗ ΤΠΕ ΕΡΕ ΡΑΤΣ ΖΙΧΉ ΠΚΑΖ⁷¹ ΕΡΕ ΗΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΗΗΥ ΕΠΕΣΗΤ ΠΖΗΤΣ</p>	<p>ΕΣΤΑΧΡΗΟΥΤ ΖΙΧΕΗ ΠΚΑΖΙ ΕΣΒΟΣΙ ΨΑ ΕΖΡΗΙ ΕΤΦΕ ΕΡΕ ΗΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΗΗΟΥ ΕΠΕΣΗΤ ΖΙΩΤΣ</p>	<p>Set firmly on the earth, reaching to heaven, where the angels come down upon it</p>
<p>ΗΤΑ ΟΗ ΠΕ ΠΒΑΤΟΣ ΠΤΑ ΜΩΥΣΗΣ ΗΔΥ ΕΡΟΙ ΕΡΕ ΠΚΩΖΤ ΠΖΗΤΣ⁷² ΔΥΩ ΠΩΡΟΚ ΔΗ</p>	<p>ΗΘΟ ΠΕ ΠΩΩΗΗ ΕΤΑΦΗΔΥ ΕΡΟΙ `ΗΧΕ ΜΩΥΣΗΣ ΕΦΗΟΖ ΞΕΗ ΠΙΧΡΩΗ ΟΥΟΖ ΗΑΦΡΩΚΖ ΔΗ</p>	<p>You are the bush, which Moses has seen flaming with fire and was not consumed</p>

(69) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 182 N 164.

(70) Which its head is in heaven and its feet on the earth.

(71) When Moses saw it while the fire in it.

////////////////////	<p>ετε φαι πε πωηρι ηφτ εταυωπι σεη तेनेखि `मपिख्रम `न्ते तेदमेथोयुत पवकः `मपेसवम</p>	<p>Who is the Son of God, who dwelt in your womb, the fire of His Divinity did not consume your body</p>
<p>ητα οη πε τπετρα ητα δαμηνα ηαυ ερος εαυψε ετπωηε ηρηης δαη διχ ηρωηε</p>	<p>////////////////////</p>	<p>You are also the stone which Daniel saw it in a wood separated from it without hum- an hand</p>
<p>ητα οη πε τρωψε ηπουχερος ερος αςτ ερηαι ηουκαρπος ηωηε</p>	<p>`ηθο τε τκοι ηπουτχροχ ερος αρεταουο εβολ ηουκαπρος `ηωηε</p>	<p>You are also the field which was not seeded and gave a fruit of life</p>
<p>ητα οη πε παρο ηταυωπιδ ηδωσνφ αυρε⁷³ επηαρκαριτης ερηηη ηη τεδμητε</p>	<p>ηθο πε παρο εταυωπιδ `ηχε ιωσνφ αχχεν πηαρκαριτης ερηηη σεη τεδμητ</p>	<p>You are the treasure that Joseph bought and he found the pearl, hidden in its midst</p>
<p>αυρε⁷⁴ πενσωτηρ ερηηη ηη τουμητρα αρχποδ εχηη πκαε αφι αφωτε ημον</p>	<p>αχχεν πενσωτηρ ηηε σεη तेनेखि αρεχφοδ επικοςμος φαντεφωτ `ημον</p>	<p>He found our Saviour Jesus in your womb, you gave birth to Him for the world so He might save us</p>

Commentary

– The translation provided here is based mainly on the Bohairic text.

– We find some minor changes such as in stanza 1 ταιο “honour” Sahidic and “ωου” “glory” Bohairic. Stanza 5 “τρωψε Sahidic and “τκοι” Bohairic. Stanza 6 “αυρε” in Sanidic, “αχχεν” in Boahric.

– Addition of a sentence in one stanza, as in stanza 1 Bohairic “ηαρια τπαρθενος θηετχηκ εβολ” in stanza 2 in Bohairic “αρεχενρηοτ ηεε ωοπ ηεηε

– Addition of a complete stanza as in stanza 5 in both Sahidic and Bohairic

(72) Lit “a pearl was found.

(73) Lit. “our Saviour was found.”

– Change in the formulation however the meaning is the same as in Stanza 3 $\epsilon\rho\epsilon \chi\omega\varsigma \zeta\eta\ \tau\pi\epsilon \epsilon\rho\epsilon \rho\alpha\tau\varsigma \zeta\iota\chi\eta\ \pi\kappa\alpha\zeta$ in Shaidic while in Bohairic $\epsilon\varsigma\tau\alpha\chi\rho\theta\upsilon\tau \zeta\iota\chi\epsilon\eta \pi\iota\kappa\alpha\zeta\iota \epsilon\varsigma\delta\omicron\varsigma\iota$ Stanza 4.

– Change Coptic word into Greek as Stanza 4 $\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ Sahidic $\pi\omega\psi\eta\eta$ Bohairic, Stanza 7 “ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\eta\tau\rho\alpha$ ” Sahidic, “ $\tau\epsilon\eta\epsilon\chi\iota$ ” Bohairic, “ $\pi\kappa\alpha\zeta$ ” Sahidic, “ $\pi\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ ” Bohairic.

– Addition of words such as $\chi\epsilon$ in stanza 2, Sahidic, Stanza 6 $\omicron\eta$ Sahidic, Stanza 7 “ $\overline{\text{III}}\overline{\text{C}}$ ” Bohairic.

– Change of the person such as in stanza 5 “ $\lambda\varsigma\tau$ ” she gave” Sahidic “ $\lambda\rho\epsilon\tau\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omicron$ ” You gave. It is important to mention that the beginning of the stanza is addressed to the Virgin using the 2nd person.

Antiphonarion ⁷⁵	Theotokia of Tuesday (part 5)	Translation
$\pi\tau\alpha\iota\omicron \overline{\text{II}}\tau\epsilon\overline{\text{I}}\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$ $\omicron\gamma\alpha\tau\omega\alpha\chi\epsilon \epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta \pi\epsilon$ $\chi\epsilon \lambda \pi\eta\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon \omicron\gamma\alpha\psi\varsigma$ $\lambda\zeta\epsilon\iota \lambda\zeta\omicron\upsilon\omega\zeta \overline{\text{II}}\zeta\eta\tau\varsigma$	$\pi\tau\alpha\iota\omicron \overline{\text{II}}\tau\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$ $\omicron\gamma\alpha\tau\varsigma\alpha\chi\iota \overline{\text{II}}\eta\eta\omicron\zeta \pi\epsilon$ $\chi\epsilon \lambda \phi\eta\omicron\upsilon\tau \omicron\gamma\alpha\psi\varsigma$ $\lambda\zeta\iota \lambda\zeta\omicron\upsilon\omega\psi\overline{\text{II}} \overline{\text{II}}\zeta\eta\tau\varsigma$	The honour of the Virgin is unutterable, for God desired her and came and dwelt in her
$\pi\epsilon\tau\omega\omicron\omicron\pi \zeta\eta\ \pi\omicron\gamma\omicron\epsilon\eta\eta$ $\eta\alpha\omega \zeta\omega\eta \epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta \lambda\eta$ $\lambda\zeta\omicron\upsilon\omega\psi\epsilon \overline{\text{II}}\zeta\eta\tau\varsigma \overline{\text{II}}\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\eta\epsilon\omega\tau$	$\phi\eta\epsilon\tau\omega\omicron\pi \zeta\epsilon\eta$ $\pi\omicron\gamma\omega\eta\eta \overline{\text{II}}\eta\alpha\tau\omega\zeta\omega\eta\tau$ $\epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta \lambda\zeta\omicron\upsilon\omega\psi\overline{\text{II}} \zeta\epsilon\eta$ $\tau\epsilon\varsigma\eta\epsilon\chi\iota \overline{\text{II}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{II}}\alpha\beta\omicron\tau$	He who abides in light that is unapproachable, dwelt in her womb, for nine months
$\pi\alpha\tau\eta\lambda\gamma \epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta$ $\pi\alpha\tau\tau\overline{\text{I}}\tau\omega\psi \epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta \lambda$ $\eta\alpha\rho\iota\alpha \chi\pi\omicron\zeta \epsilon\varsigma\omicron$ $\overline{\text{II}}\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$	$\pi\alpha\theta\eta\lambda\gamma \epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta$ $\pi\alpha\tau\tau\overline{\text{I}}\theta\omega\psi \epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta \lambda$ $\eta\alpha\rho\iota\alpha \eta\alpha\varsigma\zeta \epsilon\varsigma\omicron\iota$ $\eta\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$	Mary gave birth to the Invisible and the Infinite, One and remained Virgin
$\pi\alpha\iota \pi\epsilon \pi\omega\eta\epsilon \overline{\text{II}}\tau\alpha$ $\lambda\alpha\eta\eta\eta\lambda\eta\lambda\gamma \epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta$ $\epsilon\lambda\gamma\psi\epsilon\epsilon\tau\zeta \epsilon\omega\lambda\zeta\overline{\text{II}}$ $\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\omicron\upsilon$	$\phi\alpha\iota \gamma\lambda\rho \pi\epsilon \pi\omega\eta\eta$ $\phi\eta\eta\epsilon\tau\alpha \lambda\alpha\eta\eta\eta\lambda \eta\lambda\gamma$ $\epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta \epsilon\lambda\gamma\psi\alpha\tau\zeta \epsilon\omega\lambda$ $\zeta\iota \omicron\gamma\tau\omega\omicron\upsilon$	This is the rock which Dasniel saw which was cut from a mountain
$\overline{\text{II}}\pi\epsilon\delta\iota\chi \overline{\text{II}}\rho\omega\eta\epsilon \epsilon\omega\chi\omega\zeta$ $\epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta \epsilon\tau\epsilon \pi\alpha\iota \pi\epsilon$ $\pi\iota\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma \pi\epsilon \epsilon\omega\lambda\zeta\overline{\text{II}}$ $\pi\epsilon\iota\omega\tau$	$\epsilon\tau\epsilon \overline{\text{II}}\eta\pi\epsilon \chi\iota\chi \overline{\text{II}}\rho\omega\eta\eta$ $\delta\omicron\zeta \epsilon\rho\omicron\zeta \epsilon\pi\tau\eta\rho\zeta$ $\epsilon\tau\epsilon \phi\alpha\iota \pi\epsilon \pi\iota\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\iota\epsilon\omega\lambda\zeta\epsilon\eta \phi\iota\omega\tau$	The hands of men, never touched Him, for He is the Word of the Father
$\epsilon\lambda\zeta\chi\iota\varsigma\lambda\rho\zeta \epsilon\omega\lambda\zeta\overline{\text{II}}$ $\tau\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma \lambda\chi\overline{\text{II}}$ $\varsigma\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\alpha \overline{\text{II}}\rho\omega\eta\epsilon \lambda\zeta\epsilon\iota$ $\lambda\zeta\omicron\upsilon\omega\tau\epsilon \overline{\text{II}}\eta\eta\eta$	$\lambda\zeta\iota \lambda\zeta\delta\iota\varsigma\lambda\rho\zeta$ $\epsilon\omega\lambda\zeta\epsilon\eta \tau\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$ $\lambda\delta\eta\epsilon \varsigma\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\alpha \overline{\text{II}}\rho\omega\eta\eta$ $\omega\alpha \overline{\text{II}}\eta\tau\zeta\omicron\omega\tau \overline{\text{II}}\eta\eta\eta$	He came and took flesh, from the Virgin, without the seed of man in order to save us

(74) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 184, N 167.

Commentary

– The translation provided here is based mainly on the Bohairic text.

– We find some minor changes such as in stanza 1 ΔΟΥΩ Sahidic and ΔΟΥΩΠ Bohairic. Stanza 3 ΧΠΟΥ Sahidic and ΗΔΟΥ Bohairic.

– Addition of a complete stanza as in stanza 5 in both Sahidic and Bohairic

– Change in the formulation however the meaning is the same as in Stanza 3 ΗΔΩ ΖΩΗ ΕΡΟΥ ΔΗ in Shaidic while ΗΔΤΩΣΩΗΤ in Bohairic.

– Addition of words such as ΓΑΡ in stanza 4, Bohairic, Stanza 5 ΕΤΕ Bohairic. stanza 6 ΔΟΥ Bohairic.

Theotokia of Wednesday

The entire Theotokia of Wednesday occurs in the book of the Antiphonarium

Antiphonarium ⁷⁶	Theotokia of Wednesday (part 1)	Translation
<p> ΝΕΤΑΓΝΑ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΠΤΕ ΗΔ ΜΠΗΥΕ ΣΕΧΩ ΠΠΟΥΗΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΧΕ ΠΤΟ ΠΕΤΗΕΖCΗΤΕ ΠΠΕ ΤΔΙ ΕΤΖΟΟΠ⁷⁷ ΖΙΧΠ ΠΚΑΖ </p>	<p> ΗΤΑΓΝΑ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΉΝΤΕ ΗΠΗΟΥΙ ΣΕΧΩ ΗΗΕΗΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΧΕ ΉΘΟ ΤΕ ΤΗΑΖCΗΟΥΤ ΉΜΦΕ ΕΤΩΟΠ ΖΙΧΕΗ ΠΚΑΖΙ </p>	<p>All the heavenly ranks declare your blessedness, for you are the Second Heaven upon earth</p>
<p> ΤΙ(ΔΥ)ΛΗ ΗΤΕ ΗΑΡΙΑ ΤΕΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΠΜΑΝΨΕΛΕΕΤ ΕΤΤΒΗΟΥ ΠΤΕ ΠΗΥΗΦΙΟΣ ΗΓΑΘΑΡΟΣ </p>	<p> ΤΠΥΛΗ ΉΝΤΕ ΗΜΑΝΨΑΙ ΤΕ ΗΑΡΙΑ ΤΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΠΜΑΝΨΕΛΕΤ ΕΤΤΟΥΒ- ΗΟΥΤ ΉΝΤΕ ΠΗΥΗΦΙΟΣ ΉΚΑΘΑΡΟΣ </p>	<p>The gate of the East is the Virgin Mary, the pure bridal chamber for the pure Bridegroom</p>
<p> Δ ΠΕΙΩΤ ΚΩΨΤ ΕΒΟΛΖΠ ΤΠΕ ΗΠΕΥΖΕ ΕΟΥΟΗ ΕΦΕΙΝΕ ΗΜΟ ΔΟΥΧΟΥ ΠΠΕΥΗΕΡΙΤ ΠΨΗΡΕ⁷⁸ ΔΦΕΙ ΔΟΥΩ⁷⁹ ΠΖΗΤΕ </p>	<p> Δ ΦΙΩΤ ΧΟΥΨΤ ΕΒΟΛΣΕΗ ΤΦΕ ΉΠΕΥΧΕΗ ΦΗΕΤΟΗ ΉΜΟ ΔΟΥΩΡΠ ΉΠΕΥΜΟΗΟΓΕΗΗC Ι ΔΦΙCΑΡΞ ΕΒΟΛ ΉΣΗΤ </p>	<p>The Father looked from heaven and found no one that resembles you. He sent His Only Begotten who came and took flesh from you</p>

(75) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 212, N 207.

(76) Read “ΕΤΩΟΟΠ” I am not sure whether it is a misprint or mistake from the scribe of the manuscript.

(77) “His Beloved Son.”

(78) “and abode in you.”

Commentary

— The translation provided here is based mainly on the Bohairic text.

— We find some minor changes such as in stanza 1 $\bar{\mu}\rho\bar{\omega}\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\circ\varsigma$ Sahidic and “ $\bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\circ\varsigma$ ” Bohairic. Stanza 3 $\chi\circ\circ\gamma$ Sahidic and $\circ\gamma\omega\rho\bar{\eta}$ Bohairic

— The reconstruction of the editor for the first word of stanza 2 in Sahidic is probable however Bohairic is more probable. It seems that the scribe did not copy the word $\bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\delta}\bar{\alpha}$.

— Addition of words such as $\tau\alpha\iota$ in stanza 1, Sahidic.

— Change in the formulation however the meaning is the same as in Stanza 3 $\alpha\chi\chi\circ\circ\gamma$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\bar{\tau}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}$ “He sent his Beloved Son” in Shaidic while in Bohairic $\alpha\chi\circ\gamma\omega\rho\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\bar{\tau}$ $\bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\delta}\bar{\alpha}$. “He sent His Only Begotten. The same could be said $\alpha\chi\circ\gamma\omega\bar{\gamma}$ “dwelt” in Sahidic while in Bohairic $\alpha\chi\bar{\iota}\bar{\iota}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\gamma}$ “took flesh

Antiphonarium ⁸⁰	Theotokia of Wednesday (part 2)	Translation
<p>$\alpha\chi\chi\omega$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\iota}\circ$ $\epsilon\bar{\tau}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\tau}\bar{\rho}\circ\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\chi\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\circ$ $\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\delta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\phi}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\eta}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\circ\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}$</p>	<p>$\alpha\chi\chi\alpha\chi\iota$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\iota}\circ$ $\epsilon\bar{\theta}\bar{\nu}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}$ ω $\bar{\tau}\bar{\nu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\iota}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\phi}\bar{\tau}$ $\chi\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\theta}\circ$ $\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\phi}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\eta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\delta}\bar{\omega}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\tau}\circ\bar{\gamma}\bar{\eta}\circ\bar{\alpha}$ $\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\circ\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}$</p>	<p>They spoke of you with honour, O city of God, for you are the dwelling place of all the joyful</p>
<p>$\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\rho}\bar{\omega}\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\circ\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}\bar{\kappa}\circ\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\mu}\circ\varsigma$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\mu}\circ\omega\bar{\phi}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}\circ\lambda\bar{\gamma}\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\rho}\circ\bar{\gamma}\circ\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}\bar{\eta}$ $\alpha\chi\omega$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\theta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\circ\varsigma$ $\bar{\gamma}\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\rho}\circ\bar{\gamma}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}\omega\bar{\lambda}\circ\kappa\circ\varsigma$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\bar{\alpha}$</p>	<p>$\bar{\eta}\bar{\iota}\circ\bar{\gamma}\bar{\rho}\bar{\omega}\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\circ\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\rho}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\iota}$ $\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\circ\bar{\omega}\bar{\iota}$ $\bar{\gamma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\circ\bar{\gamma}\bar{\omega}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$ $\circ\bar{\gamma}\circ\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\theta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}\circ\varsigma$ $\bar{\gamma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\rho}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\phi}\bar{\iota}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}$ ω $\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\bar{\alpha}$ $\bar{\theta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\phi}\bar{\tau}$</p>	<p>All the kings of the earth walk in your light and the nations in your brightness, O Mary the Mother of God</p>
<p>$\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\mu}\bar{\alpha}\kappa\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\mu}\bar{\eta}\circ$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\iota}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\phi}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\circ\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\alpha}\circ\varsigma$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\tau}\circ\varsigma$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\bar{\kappa}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}$ $\alpha\chi\omega$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\iota}\bar{\kappa}\circ\bar{\eta}$ $\alpha\chi\omega$ $\bar{\alpha}\bar{\eta}\circ\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\gamma}\bar{\omega}\bar{\eta}$</p>	<p>$\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}\bar{\alpha}\kappa\bar{\alpha}\bar{\rho}\bar{\iota}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\iota}\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\circ$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\chi}\bar{\epsilon}$ $\bar{\eta}\bar{\iota}\bar{\gamma}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\eta}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\alpha}$ $\bar{\tau}\bar{\eta}\bar{\rho}\circ\bar{\gamma}$</p>	<p>Every generation bles- ses you and</p>

(79) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 208, N 198.

<p> <u>ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲩ</u>⁸¹ ⲧⲓⲟⲩⲱⲫⲧ ⲛⲓⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲣⲛⲓⲈ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ ⲧⲓⲉⲣⲣⲟⲩⲟ ⲉⲭⲓⲈ ⲛⲓⲛⲟⲩ <u>ⲭⲉ ⲡⲱⲩ ⲡⲉ</u> ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ <u>ⲛⲓⲱⲁ ⲉⲛⲉ</u>⁸² </p>	<p> ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩⲱⲫⲧ <u>ⲛⲓⲫⲛⲉⲧⲁⲣⲉⲭⲫⲟⲩ</u> ⲧⲉⲛⲉⲣⲣⲟⲩⲟ ⲟⲓⲥⲓ ⲓⲛⲟⲩ </p>	<p>we worship Him to whom you gave birth and we exalt you</p>
--	---	---

Commentary

– The translation provided here is based mainly on the Bohairic text.

– We find some minor changes such as in stanza 1 ⲭⲱ “say” Sahidic and “ⲥⲁⲭⲓ” “spoke” Bohairic. Stanza 3 “ⲛⲓⲈ” Sahidic “ⲭⲫⲟⲩ” Bohairic

– Addition of a sentence in one stanza, as in stanza 3 Sahidic “ⲛⲓⲡⲕⲁⲣ ⲛⲓ ⲛⲓⲗⲁⲟⲥ ⲛⲓⲡⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲛⲓⲡⲕⲁⲣ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲓⲧⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲓⲉⲗⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲣⲱⲛ ⲛⲓⲛⲁⲩ and also ⲭⲉ ⲡⲱⲩ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲱⲁ ⲉⲛⲉ”

– Change Coptic word into Greek as Stanza 1 ⲡⲟⲓⲥ Sahidic ⲧⲃⲁⲕⲓ Bohairic, Stanza 1 “ⲉⲩⲫⲣⲁⲛⲉ” Sahidic, “ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ” Bohairic, Stanza 2 “ⲡⲓⲕⲟⲥⲛⲟⲥ” Sahidic, “ⲡⲕⲁⲣⲓ” Bohairic. Stanza 3 ⲧⲉⲑⲉⲱⲗⲟⲕⲟⲥ Sahidic ⲑⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲓⲫⲧ Bohairic

Antiphonarium ⁸³	Theotokia of Wednesday (part 3)	Translation
<p> ⲛⲓⲧⲟ ⲡⲉ <u>ⲧⲉⲕⲗⲟⲟⲗⲉ</u> ⲉⲧⲁⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲧⲁⲩⲥⲩⲛⲓⲛⲁⲛⲉ <u>ⲛⲁⲥ</u> ⲛⲓⲡⲛⲟⲩⲛⲓⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲛⲓⲧⲡⲁⲣⲣⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲓⲡⲛⲟⲛⲟⲓⲉⲛⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲡⲉⲱⲧ </p>	<p> ⲛⲑⲟ ⲧⲉ <u>ⲧⲃⲛⲓⲡ</u> ⲉⲧⲁⲥⲓⲱⲟⲩ ⲑⲛⲉⲧⲁⲥⲉⲣⲥⲩⲛⲓⲛⲉⲛⲓⲛ <u>ⲛⲁⲛ</u> ⲓⲛⲡⲓⲛⲟⲩⲛⲓⲣⲱⲟⲩ ⲓⲛⲧⲉ ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲓⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲓⲛⲟⲛⲟⲓⲉⲛⲓⲥ <u>ⲓⲛⲟⲩⲧ</u> </p>	<p>You are the light cloud that has lead us to the rain of the advent of the Only Begotten of God</p>
<p> ⲁ ⲡⲉⲱⲧ ⲉⲣⲧⲉⲭⲛⲓⲧⲛⲥ ⲉⲣⲟ ⲁ ⲡⲉⲡⲓⲗⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲗⲃ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲭⲱ <u>ⲁⲩⲱ</u> <u>ⲁ</u> ⲧⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲡⲉⲧⲭⲟⲥⲉ ⲉⲣⲣⲁⲓⲃⲉⲥ ⲉⲣⲟ <u>ⲱ</u> ⲛⲁⲣⲓⲁ </p>	<p> ⲁ ⲫⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲣⲧⲉⲭⲛⲓⲧⲛⲥ ⲉⲣⲟ ⲁ ⲡⲓⲡⲓⲗⲁ <u>ⲉⲑⲱ</u> ⲓⲉⲭⲱ ⲟⲩⲭⲟⲛ ⲓⲛⲧⲉ ⲫⲛⲉⲧⲟⲥⲓ ⲉⲑⲛⲁⲉⲣⲥⲛⲓⲃⲓ ⲉⲣⲟ ⲛⲁⲣⲓⲁ </p>	<p>The Father created you skilfully the Holy Spirit came upon you and the Power of the Highest overshadowed you, Mary</p>

(80) “ Of the earth and the faithful peoples and the angelic ranks and we also with them.”

(81) For Glory be to Him forever.

(82) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 208, N 197.

ΑΡΧΠΟ ΠΠΑΛΗΘΗΝΟΣ ΠΩΗΡΙ ΠΩΗΡΙ ΠΤΕ ΠΠΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΗΜΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ ΔΥΕΙ ΔΥCOTTEN ΖΠ ΝΕΝΝΟΒΕ	<u>ΧΕ</u> ΔΡΕΧΦΟ ΉΠΠΑΛΗΘΗΝΟΣ ΉΛΟΓΟΣ ΉΩΗΡΙ ΉΝΤΕ ΦΨΤ ΕΘΜΗΗ ΕΒΟΛ ΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ ΔΥΉ ΔΥCOTTEN ΞΕΝ ΝΕΝΝΟΒΙ	For you have given birth to the True Word, the Son of the Ever existing Father, whom came and save us from our sins
--	---	--

Commentary

— The translation provided here is based mainly on the Bohairic text.

— We find some minor changes such as in stanza 1 TEKLOOLE Sahidic and “†DHPI” Bohairic.

— Addition of words such as XE in stanza 3, Bohairic, Stanza 2 ΔΥΩ Δ Sahidic, Stanza 7 “ΠΠC”.

— Change of the person such as in stanza 1 “ΝΑC” to her” Sahidic “ΝΑΗ” to us”. It is important to mention that the beginning of the stanza is addressed to the Virgin using the 2nd person hence the Bohairic is more logic.

— In stanza 1, 3 there is an interchange between the Father and God in both ways

Antiphonarium ⁸⁴	Theotokia of Wednesday (part 4)	Translation
ΟΥΝΟΣ ΠΕ ΠΑΤΙΟ ΠΤΑΚΦΩΡΕΙ ΠΗΝΟC Ω ΓΑΒΡΙΗΛ ΠΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΠCΑΙΩΕΝΝΟΥCΙ ΕΡΕ ΠΕCΖΟ ΨΟΥΕΡΑΨΙ ΕΒΟΛ	ΟΥΝΨ† ΓΑΡ ΤΕ †ΤΗΗ ΕΤΑΚΗΠΨΑ ΉΗΝΟΣ Ω ΓΑΒΡΙΗΛ ΠΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΉCΑΙΩΕΝΝΟΥCΙ ΕΡΕ ΠΕCΖΟ ΨΟΥΟ ΡΑΨΙ ΕΒΟΛ	For great s the hon- our which you are worthy of O Gabriel, the messenger Angel, your face beams with joy
ΔΚΤΑΨΟΕΨ ΝΑΗ ΠΠΕΧΠΟ ΠΠΠΟΥΤΕ ΠΤΑΥΕΙ ΨΑΡΟΗ ΔΚΖΙ ΨΕΝΟΥCΙ ΠΝΑΡΙΑ ΤΕΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΝΑΤ- ΤΩΛΠ	ΔΚΕΡCΥΗΜΕΗΗ ΝΑΗ ΗΠΙΧΦΟ ΉΝΤΕ Φ† ΕΤΑΥΉ ΨΑΡΟΗ ΔΚΖΙΨΕ- ΗΝΟΥCΙ ΉΜΑΡΙΑ †ΠΑ- ΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΉΝΑΤΘΩΛΕΒ	You announced to us the birth of God who came to us and you declared to Mary the undefiled Virgin

(83) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 198, N 184.

<p><u>ΕΚΧΩ ΠΗΝΟΣ</u> ΧΕ ΧΑΙΡΕ ΤΕΝΤΑΣΔΠΖ- ΝΟΤ ΠΧΘΕΙC ΠΗΜΕ</p>	<p>ΧΕ ΧΕΡΕ ΘΗΘΗΕΖ ΉΖΗΟΤ ΟΥΟΖ ΠΔC ΨΟΠ ΝΕΝΕ ΔΡΕΧΙΗΙ ΓΑΡ ΉΟΥΖΗΟΤ ΟΥΠΠΔ ΕΥΟΥΑΒ ΕΘΗΗΟΥ ΕΧΩ</p>	<p>Saying: “Hail to you O full of grace, the Lord is with you, you have found favour, the Holy Spirit shall come upon you.”</p>
<p>ΤΕΡΗΑΜΙCΕ ΠΠΕΤΟΥ- ΔΑΒ ΠCΩΤΗΡ ΠΠΕΙΚΟC- ΗΟC</p>	<p>ΟΥΧΟΜ ΉΝΤΕ ΦΗΕΤ- ΔΟCΙ ΕΘΗΔΕΡΨΗΙΗΙ ΕΡΟ ΗΔΡΙΑ ΤΕΡΑΜΙCΙ ΜΦ- ΗΕΘΥ ΠCΩΡ ΉΠΙΚΟC- ΗΟC ΤΗΡC</p>	<p>The power of the Highest will overshadow you Mary, you shall give birth of to the Holy, the Saviour of the whole world</p>

Commentary

– The translation provided here is based mainly on the Bohairic text.

– We find some minor changes such as in stanza 3 CΔΠΖΗΟΤ “find grace” Sahidic and “ΘΗΘΗΕΖ ΉΖΗΟΤ” “full of grace” Bohairic.

– Addition of a sentence, as in stanza 3 Sahidic “ΕΚΧΩ ΠΗΝΟΣ” in stanza 3 in Bohairic “ΔΡΕΧΙΗΙ ΓΑΡ ΉΟΥΖΗΟΤ ΟΥΠΠΔ ΕΥΟΥΑΒ ΕΘΗΗΟΥ ΕΧΩ and in stanza 4 Bohairic ΟΥΧΟΜ ΉΝΤΕ ΦΗΕΤΔΟCΙ ΕΘΗΔΕΡΨΗΙΗΙ ΕΡΟ ΗΔΡΙΑ

– Change Coptic word into Greek as Stanza 1 ΤΑΙΟ Sahidic ΤΗΗΗ Bohairic, Stanza 1 “φωρεί” Sahidic, “ερηψα” Bohairic, Stanza 2 “ακ-ταψοειψ” Sahidic, “ακερCΥΜΜΕΗΗΗ” Bohairic.

– Change of the person such as in stanza 1 “περζο” his face” Sahidic “πεκζο” Your face. It is important to mention that the beginning of the stanza is addressed to the Virgin using the 2nd person.

Antiphonarium ⁸⁵	Theotokia of Wednesday (part 5)	Translation
<p>ΟΥΨΑ ΠΠΑΡΘΕΗΙΚΟΗ ΠΕΤΤΩΖΗ ΠΠΕΗΔΑC ΠΠΟΟΥ ΕΤΡΕΗΤΤΑΙΟ ΠΤΕΘΕΩΔΩΚΟC ΗΔΡΙΑ</p>	<p>ΟΥΨΑΙ ΉΠΑΡΘΕΗΙΚΟΗ ΕΤΘΩΖΕΗ ΉΠΕΗΔΑC ΉΦΟΟΥ ΕΘΡΕΗΕΡΕΥΦΟΗΗ ΉΤΘΕΟΤΟΚΟC</p>	<p>A virginal feast, today, called our tongues to give praise to Mary, the Mother of God</p>

(84) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 164, N 143.

Antiphonarium	Theotokia of Wednesday (part 5)	Translation
ΕΤΒΕ ΠΕΝΤΑ Σ ΜΑ Σ Ϟ ΝΑΝ Ζἢ ΤΠΟΛΙ Σ ΝἌΔἌ ΠΕΝΗΟΥΤΕ ⁸⁶ ΠΕΝ Σ ΩΡ̄ Ι Σ ΠΕΧ̄ Σ ΠΧΟΕΙ Σ	ΕΘΒΕ ΦΗΕΤΑΥΜΑ Σ Ϟ ΝΑΝ ΞΕΝ Θ Β ΑΚΙ ἸΝΔΑΥΙΑ ΠΕΝ Σ ΩΡ̄ ΙΗ Σ ΟΥΟΥ ΠΧ̄ Σ Π Σ ̄ Σ	Because who was born for us in the City of David, our Saviour Jesus Christ the Lord
ΔΗΝΙΤἢ ΝΕΛΛΟ Σ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΝΤΕΝΗΑΚΑΡΙΖΕ ΝΗΟ Σ ΧΕ ΔΣΩΠΕ ΝΗΑΥ ΑΥΩ ΝΠΑΡΘΕΝΟ Σ ΖΙ ΟΥ Σ ΟΠ	ΔΗΩΝΙ ΝΗΛΛΟ Σ ΤΗΡΟΥ ἸΤΕΝΕΡΗΑΚΑΡΙΖΙΝ ἸΗΟ Σ ΧΕ ΔΣΩΠΙ ἸΗΑΥ ΟΥΟΥ ἸΠΑΡΘΕΝΟ Σ ΕΥ Σ ΟΠ	Come all you nation. So we may give bles- sings to her for she has become both the Mother and Virgin
ΧΑΙΡΕ ΤΠΑΡΘΕΝΟ Σ ΕΤΤἪΒΗΥ ΝΑΤΤΑΚΟ ΤΕΝΤΑ ΠΛΟΓΟ Σ ΝΠΩΤ ΕΙ ΔΧΙ Σ ΑΡ Σ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΖΗΤ Σ	ΧΕΡΕ ΝΕ Ω †ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟ Σ ΘΗΕΤΤΟΥΒΗΟΥΤ ἸΝΑΤΤΑΚΟ ΕΤΑ ΠΛΟΓΟ Σ ἸΝΤΕ ΦΩΤ Ι ΔΧΙ Σ ΑΡ Σ ΕΒΟΛ Ν Σ Η†	Hail to You, O Virgin, the pure and incorrupt one, the Word of the Father, came and took flesh from you.
ΧΑΙΡΕ ΠΙΚΥΝΙΑΙΟΝ ΕΤ- ΣΟΤΠ ΝΤΕΠΑΡΘΕΝΟ Σ ΝΗΕ ΑΥΩ ΕΤΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ	ΧΕΡΕ ΠΙΚΥΝΙΑΙΟΝ ἸΝΔ- ΤΑΔΗΙ ΟΥΟΥ ΕΤΣΩΤΠ ἸΝΤΕ ΤΕΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΑ ἸΗΗΗΙ ΟΥΟΥ ΕΤΧΗΚ ΕΒΟΛ	Hail to the chosen vessel which is with- out blemish that is of your true and perfect virginity
ΧΑΙΡΕ ΠΠΑΡΑΔΙ Σ Ο Σ ΝΛΟΓΙΚΟΝ ΝΠΧ̄ Σ ΠΕΝΕΤΑΥΩΠΕ ΝΗΕΖ ΣΗΑΥ ΝΑΔΔΗ ΕΠΝΑ ΝΠΩΟΡΠ ΝΡΩΗΕ ΑΔΔΗ	ΧΕΡΕ ΠΠΑΡΑΔΙ Σ Ο Σ ἸΛΟΓΙΚΟΝ ἸΝΤΕ ΠΧ̄ Σ ΦΗΕΤΑΥΩΠΙ ἸΗΗΖ ΣΗΑΥ ἸΑΔΔΗ ΕΘΒΕ ΑΔΔΗ ΠΩΟΡΠ ἸΡΩΗ	Hail to the rational Paradise of Christ, who became the Second Adam for the sake of Adam the first man
ΧΑΙΡΕ ΠΕΡΚΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΝΤΕ ΤΗΝΤΟΥΑ ΝΑΤΠΩΡΧ ΝΤΕ ΝΕΦΥ Σ Ι Σ ΝΤΑΥΕΙ ΕΥΝΑ ΝΟΥΩΤ ΖΙ ΟΥ Σ ΟΠ Ζἢ ΟΥΝΗΤΑΤΗΟΥΧΤ	ΧΕΡΕ ΠΕΡΚΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ἸΝΤΕ ΤΗΝΤΟΥΑΙ ἸΝΑΤΦΩΡΧ ἸΝΤΕ ΝΙΦΥ Σ Ι Σ ΕΤΑΥ Ι ΕΥΝΑ ΕΥ Σ ΟΠ ΞΕΝ ΟΥΝΕΤΑΤΗΟΥΧΤ	Hail to the uniting place of the unsepa- rated natures, that came together in one place without ever mingling

<p>χαίρε ΠΝΑΝΨΕΛΕΕΤ ΕΤ ΕΤΣΕΛΩΛ ΖΙΘΗ ΠΠΑΤΨΕΛΕΕΤ ΠΤΑϞΩΤΠ ΕΤΕΙΜΠΤΡΩΜΕ</p>	<p>χΕρε ΠΝΑΝΨΕΛΕΤ ΕΤΣΕΛΩΛ ΞΕΝ ΟΥΘΟ ἸΡΗ† ἸΝΤΕ ΠΗΥΗΦΙΟΣ ΗΗΗ ΕΤΑϞΩΤΠ Ε†ΗΕΤΡΩΗ</p>	<p>Hail to the bridal chamber adorned in every way, for the true Bridegroom, who united with humanity.</p>
<p>χαίρε ΠΒΑΤΟΣ ΝΕΝ†ΥΧΟΗ ΝΤΕ ΝΕΝΦΥΣΙΣ ΕΤΕ ΝΠΕ ΠΚΩΤ ΠΤΕϞΗΠΤΗΟΥΤΕ ΡΩΚΖ ΠΤΚΑΛΑΖΗΠΤΠΑΡΘ⁸⁷</p>	<p>χΕρε ΠΗ†ΥΧΟΗ ἸΒΑΤΟΣ ἸΝΤΕ †ΦΥΣΙΣ ΕΤΕ ἸΝΠΕ ΠΙΧΡΩΗ ἸΝΤΕ ΤΕϞΜΕΘΗΟΥ† ΡΩΚΖ ἸΝΖΑΙ ἸΝΤΑϞ</p>	<p>Hail to cool bush by nature, which the fire of His Divinity did not consume any of it</p>
<p>χαίρε ΤΙΖΗΖΑΛ ΑΥΩ †ΝΑΑΥ ΗΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ΑΥΩ ΤΠΕ ΤΕΝΤΑϞΤΩΟΥΗ ΕΠΕΤΖΙΧΠ ΝΕΧΕΡΟΥΒΗ</p>	<p>χΕρε †ΒΩΚΙ ΟΥΟΖ †ΝΑΥ †ΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΟΣ ΟΥΟΖ ΤΦΕ ΘΗΕΤΑϞϞΑΙ ϞΩΗΑΤΙΚΩϞ ΞΑ ΦΗΕΤΖΙΧΕΝ ΗΙΧΕΡΟΥΒΗ</p>	<p>Hail to the handmaiden and mother, the Virgin and the heaven, who carried in the flesh, He who sits upon the Cherubim.</p>
<p>ΖΠ ΗΑΙ ΤΕΝΡΩΑ ΤΕΝΤΕΛΗΑ ΗΠ ΝΕΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΕΤΟΥΑΛΒ ΞΕΝ ΕΝΧΩ ΠΗΟΣ ΧΕ ΠΕΟΟΥ ΠΠΗΟΥΤΕ ΖΠ ΗΕΤΧΟϞΕ</p>	<p>ΞΕΝ ΗΑΙ ΤΕΝΡΑΩΙ ΤΕΝΕΡ†ΑΛΗΗ ΝΕΗ ΗΙΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΕΘΥ ΞΕΝ ΟΥΘΕΛΗΑ ΕΝΧΩ ἸΗΗΟΣ ΧΕ ΟΥΘΟΥΞ ΞΕΝ ΗΗΕΤϞΟϞΙ ἸΗ†</p>	<p>Therefore we rejoice and sing with the holy Angels and we joyfully proclaim: "Glory to in the Highest to God"</p>
<p>ΤΕϞΕΙΡΗΗΗ⁸⁸ ΖΙΧΠ ΠΚΑΖ ΝΕΗ ΟΥΤΗΜΑΤΕ ΖΠ ΝΕΡΩΜΕ ΧΕ ΑϞΤΗΜΑΤΕ ΓΑΡ ΠΖΗΤΗ⁸⁹ ΠΔΙ ΠΕΤΕ ΠΩϞ ΠΕ ΠΕΟΟΥ</p>	<p>ΗΕΗ ΟΥΖΙΡΗΗΗ ΖΙΧΕΝ ΠΚΑΖΙ ΝΕΗ ΟΥ†ΗΑ† ΞΕΝ ΗΡΩΗ ΧΕ ΑϞ†ΗΑ† ΓΑΡ ἸΞΗ† ἸΧΧΕ ΦΗΕΤΕ ΦΩϞ ΠΕ ΠΩΟΥ ΨΑ ΕΝΕΖ</p>	<p>"And in Earth peace, goodwill toward men." For He was pleased with you to whom is the glory forever,</p>

Commentary

— The translation provided here is based mainly on the Bohairic text.

— We find some minor changes such as in stanza 3& stanza 7 ΖΙ ΟΥϞΟΠ Sahidic and "ΕΥϞΟΠ" Bohairic, stanza 6 ΕΠΝΑ "in the place of." Sahidic, ΕΘΒΕ "for the sake of" Bohairic, ΠΠΩΡΠ ΠΡΩΜΕ ΔΔΗ

(86) Womb of the Virgin.

(87) His peace.

(88) With us.

“for the first man Adam” Sahidic, $\Delta\Delta\Delta\text{H } \Pi\text{I}\omega\text{OPH } \text{'}\eta\text{P}\omega\text{H}\text{I}$ “Adam the first man, Bohairic. Stanza 9 we find $\Pi\text{I}\beta\text{ATOC } \text{H}\eta\text{H}\gamma\chi\text{ON}$ in Sahidic while $\Pi\text{H}\text{I}\gamma\chi\text{ON } \text{'}\eta\text{B}\text{ATOC}$ in Bohairic. Stanza 10 The word $\gamma\eta\gamma\lambda$ in Sahidic is replaced by $\beta\omega\kappa\text{I}$ in Bohairic, and also $\text{TE}\eta\text{TAC}\tau\omega\text{OYH}\text{'}$ in Sahidic has $\theta\epsilon\eta\text{TAC}\sigma\alpha\text{I}$ in Bohairic.” Or in Stanza 11 we have $\text{TE}\eta\text{P}\omega\alpha$ “We make feast” in Sahidic while in Bohairic is $\text{TE}\eta\text{P}\alpha\omega\text{I}$ “we rejoice”

– Change Coptic word into Greek as Stanza 1 $\epsilon\text{T}\rho\epsilon\eta\text{T}\tau\alpha\text{I}\text{O}$ Sahidic $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\eta\epsilon\eta\epsilon\gamma\phi\text{OMH}\text{I}$ Bohairic, Stanza 2 $\text{T}\rho\text{O}\lambda\text{I}\text{C}$ Sahidic $\theta\epsilon\text{B}\alpha\kappa\text{I}$ Bohairic, Stanza 8 $\text{H}\Pi\text{AT}\omega\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\text{T}$ Sahidic “ $\text{H}\Pi\eta\gamma\eta\mu\text{I}\text{OC}$ Bohairic, in stanza 11 $\text{TE}\eta\text{T}\epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda$ in Sahidic became “ $\text{TE}\eta\epsilon\text{P}\gamma\lambda\lambda\text{H}\text{'}$ ” in Bohairic

– Addition of words such as $\text{P}\epsilon\eta\eta\text{OY}\text{T}\epsilon$ in stanza 2, Sahidic, Stanza 4 “ $\text{H}\epsilon\ \omega$ ” Stanza 5 “ $\text{'}\eta\text{ATAC}\text{H}\text{I } \text{OY}\text{OZ}$ ” Bohairic

– Change of the person such as in stanza 4 “ $\text{'}\eta\text{ZHT}\overline{\text{C}}$ ” from her” Sahidic “ $\text{H}\eta\text{H}\text{I}\text{I}$ ” from you” Bohairic. It is important to mention that the beginning of the stanza is addressed to the Virgin using the 2nd person. And also in Stanza 12 in Sahidic $\text{H}\eta\text{ZHT}\text{H}$ “with us’ while in Bohairic $\text{H}\eta\text{H}\text{I}\text{I}$ “with You” also in Stanza 12 we find $\text{TE}\sigma\epsilon\text{I}\rho\eta\eta\eta\text{H}$ “His peace” while in Bohairic “peace”.

– Change the substantive into adjective such in stanza 5 $\text{TE}\text{P}\alpha\text{-}\rho\theta\epsilon\text{NOC}$ “The Virgin” Sahidic, $\text{TE}\text{P}\alpha\text{P}\theta\epsilon\text{N}\text{I}\alpha$ “Vriginity” Bohairic.

– Change in the formulation however Stanza 8 $\gamma\eta\theta\text{H}$ “in front of” Sahidic while in Bohairic $\beta\epsilon\eta\ \text{OY}\theta\text{O } \text{'}\eta\text{P}\eta\text{I}\text{I}$ in every way. In Stanza 9 we find “ $\text{H}\text{T}\kappa\lambda\lambda\alpha\text{Z}\eta\eta\text{T}\text{P}\alpha\text{P}^{\text{B}}$ ” “the womb of the Virgin” in Sahidic while it is $\text{'}\eta\text{Z}\lambda\text{I } \text{'}\eta\text{TAC}$ “any of it” in Bohairic.

– Change of the Word order as in stanza 11 $\text{H}\Pi\eta\eta\text{OY}\text{T}\epsilon\ \gamma\eta\ \text{H}\epsilon\text{T}\chi\text{OC}\epsilon$ in Sahidic and $\text{OY}\omega\text{OY } \beta\epsilon\eta\ \text{H}\eta\epsilon\text{T}\sigma\text{OC}\text{I } \text{'}\eta\text{P}\text{I}$ in Bohairic.

Antiphonarium ⁹⁰	Theotokia of Wednesday (part 6)	Translation
$\text{OY}\eta\text{OC } \text{P}\epsilon\ \text{P}\tau\alpha\text{I}\text{O}$ $\text{H}\eta\text{H}\alpha\text{R}\text{I}\alpha\ \underline{\sigma\chi\text{OC}\epsilon}\ \epsilon\eta\text{-}$ $\epsilon\text{T}\text{OY}\lambda\lambda\beta\ \text{T}\eta\text{P}\text{OY } \chi\epsilon$ $\lambda\sigma\text{H}\Pi\omega\alpha\ \underline{\lambda\sigma\omega\text{P}}\ \epsilon\text{P}\text{OC}$ $\text{H}\Pi\text{OY}\text{T}\epsilon\ \underline{\lambda\gamma\omega}\ \text{P}\lambda\text{OY}\text{OC}$	$\text{OY}\eta\omega\text{I } \text{P}\epsilon\ \text{P}\tau\alpha\text{I}\text{O}$ $\text{'}\eta\text{H}\alpha\text{R}\text{I}\alpha\ \underline{\text{P}\alpha\text{P}\alpha}$ $\text{H}\eta\epsilon\text{-}\theta\text{OY}\lambda\beta\ \chi\epsilon\ \lambda\sigma\epsilon\eta\text{-}$ $\text{P}\omega\alpha\ \text{'}\eta\omega\text{P}\ \epsilon\text{P}\text{OC } \text{'}\eta\text{P}\text{I}$ $\text{P}\lambda\text{OY}\text{OC}$	Great is the honour of Mary above all the saints, for she became worthy to receive God the Word
$\text{P}\epsilon\text{T}\epsilon\text{P}\epsilon\ \text{H}\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\text{OC}$ $\text{P}\eta\text{Z}\text{OT}\epsilon\ \gamma\alpha\ \text{TE}\sigma\tau\eta\ \lambda$ $\text{H}\alpha\text{R}\text{I}\alpha\ \text{H}\eta\text{P}\alpha\text{P}\theta\epsilon\text{NOC}$ $\underline{\text{T}\omega\text{OY}\text{H}}\ \underline{\gamma\alpha\text{POY}}\ \gamma\eta\ \text{TE}\sigma\text{-}$ $\text{H}\eta\text{T}\text{P}\alpha$	$\Phi\eta\epsilon\text{T}\epsilon\text{P}\epsilon\ \text{H}\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\text{OC}$ $\epsilon\text{P}\eta\text{Z}\text{O}\text{I } \gamma\alpha\ \text{TE}\sigma\tau\eta\ \lambda$ $\text{H}\alpha\text{R}\text{I}\alpha\ \text{H}\eta\text{P}\alpha\text{P}\theta\epsilon\text{NOC } \underline{\sigma\alpha}$ $\underline{\gamma\alpha\text{POY}}\ \beta\epsilon\eta\ \text{TE}\sigma\text{H}\epsilon\chi\text{I}$	The one feared by the angels, Mary the Virgin, has carried in her womb

(89) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 202, N 189.

ΣΧΟCΕ ΕΝΕΧΕΡΟΥΡΙΝ CΤΑΙΗΥ ΠΠΑΡΑ ΝΙΖ- ΕΡΑΦΗ ΧΕ ΔCΩΠΙΕ ΗΟΥΡΠΕ ΗΟΥΑ ΕΒΟΛΖΠ ΤΕΤΡΙΑC	CΚΟCΙ ΕΝΙΧΕΡΟΥΡΙΝ CΤΑΙΗΟΥΤ ΕΝΙCΕΡΑΦΗ ΧΕ ΔCΩΠΙ ΗΟΥΕΡ- ΦΕΙ ΗΠΙΟΥΑΙ ΕΒΟΛΖΕΝ †ΤΡΙΑC	She is exalted above the Cherubim, more honored than the Sera- phim, she became a temple for the One from the Trinity
ΤΑΙ ΤΕ ΘΠΠΛΗ ΤΠΟ- ΛΙC ΠΠΕΝΗΟΥ† ΕΡΕ ΠΟΥΗΟΥ ΠΤΕ ΝΕΤΟΥ- ΔΑΒ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΨΟΟΠ ΠΖΗΤC	ΘΑΙ ΤΕ ΠΠΛΗ ΤΠΟΛΙC ΗΠΕΝΗΟΥ† ΤΕ ΕΡΕ ΠΟΥΗΟΥ ΗΝΤΕ ΝΗΕΘΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΨΟΠ ΗΣΗΤC	This is Jerusalem, the city of our God, the joy of all saint abides in her.

Commentary

– The translation provided here is based mainly on the Bohairic text.

– We find some minor changes such as in stanza 1 ΔCΠΠΩΔ ΔCΩΠΙ “She was, she receive” Sahidic and “ΔCΕΠΠΩΔ ΗΩΠ” “she was worthy in receiving” Bohairic. and also in stanza 2 ΤΩΟΥΠ in Sahidic has ϣΑΙ in Bohairic.”

– Change Coptic word into Greek as Stanza 1 “CΧΟCΕ” “elevation” Sahidic ΠΑΡΑ above in Bohairic, and in Stanza 3 we find the opposite in Sahidic “ΠΑΡΑ” while in Bohairic Ε

– Addition of words such as ΤΗΡΟΥ “all” in stanza 1, Sahidic, Stanza 6 ΟΗ Sahidic, Stanza 7 “ΠC” Bohairic.

Antiphonarium ⁹¹	Theotokia of Wednesday (part 7)	Translation
ΤΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΑ ΠΝΖΕΘΗΟC ΝΕΤΖΗΟΟC ΖΠ ΠΚΑΚΕ ΗΠ ΘΑΙΒΕCΙ ΠΠΗΟΥ ΟΥΗΟC ΗΟΥΟΕΗ ΔCΩΑ ΗΔΗ	†ΓΑΛΙΛΕΑ ΗΝΤΕ ΝΗΕΘ- ΗΟC ΝΗΕΤΖΕΜCΙ ΣΕΝ ΠΧΑΚΙ ΝΕΝ ΤΣΗΡΙ ΗΦ- ΗΟΥ ΟΥΗΩ† ΗΟΥΩΗΗ ΔCΩΑΙ ΗΩΟΥ	Galilee of the nations who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, had great light shine to them
ΠΠΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΠΤΟΝ ΠΠΟΥ ΖΠ ΝΕΤΟΥΔΑΒ ΔCΧΙCΑΡΖ ΖΠ ΤΚΑ- ΔΔΖΗ ⁹² ΠΠΠΑΡΘΕΝΟC ΕΤΒΕ ΠΕΝΟΥΧΑΙ	†† ΦΗΕΘΗΟΤΕΝ ΗΗΟΥ ΣΕΝ ΝΗΕΘΥ ΗΤΑΔ ΔCΧΙCΑΡΖ ΣΕΝ †ΠΑ- ΡΘΕΗΟC ΕΘΒΕ ΦΗΕΤΕ ΦΩΗ ΗΟΥΧΑΙ	God who rests, with His saints became in- carnate of the Virgin, for our salvation

(90) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 194, N 180.

(91) In the womb.

Antiphonarium	Theotokia of Wednesday (part 7)	Translation
ΑΜΗΝΤΗ ΑΝΑΥ ΠΤΕΤΠ- ΡΩΠΗΡΕ ΣΗΟΥ ΤΕΛΗΑ ΖΠ ΟΥΛΟΥΛΑΙ ΕΞΠ ΠΙΝΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΠΤΑ- ΦΟΥΩΗΖ ΝΑΗ ΕΒΟΛ	ΑΜΩΗΗ ΑΝΑΥ ΔΡΙΩΦΗΡΗ ΖΩΣ ΘΕΛΗΑ ΞΕΗ ΟΥΨ- ΛΗΛΟΥΙ ΖΙΧΕΗ ΠΑΙΗΥ- ΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΕΤΑΦΟΥΩΗΖ ΝΑΗ ΕΒΟΛ	Come behold and be amazed joyfully sing on account of this mystery, which was revealed unto us
ΠΑΤΣΑΡΞ ΔΦΙΣΑΡΞ ΑΥΩ ΠΛΟΓΟΣ ΔΦΔΥ- ΞΑΗΕ ΠΑΤΑΡΧΗ ΔΦΧΙΑΡΧΗ ΠΑΤΧΡΟΝΟΣ ΔΦΩΠΕ ΖΑ ΟΥΧΡΟ- ΝΟΣ	ΞΕ ΠΑΤΣΑΡΞ ΔΦΙΣΑΡΞ ΟΥΟΖ ΠΛΟΓΟΣ ΔΦΞΘΑΙ ΠΑΤΑΡΧΗ ΔΦΕΡΖΗΤΣ ΠΑΤΣΗΟΥ ΔΦΩΠΙ ΞΑ ΟΥΧΡΟΝΟΣ	For the One without flesh was incarnated, and the Word became thick, the one without beginning began and the Eternal one be- came temporal
ΠΑΤΤΑΖΟΥ ΑΥΔΠΔΩΗΦ ΠΑΤΗΑΥ ΕΡΟΦ ΔΥΗΑΥ ΕΡΟΦ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΠΠΗΟΥΤΕ ΕΤΟΗΖ ΔΦΡΩΗΡΕ ΠΡΩΗΕ ΖΠ ΟΥΜΕ	ΠΑΤΨΤΑΖΟΥ ΑΥΧΕΜΧΟΜΦ ΠΑΘΗΑΥ ΕΡΟΦ ΣΕΗΑΥ ΕΡΟΦ ΠΩΗΡΙ ΄ΗΦ† ΕΤΟΗΣ ΔΦΩΠΙ ΄ΗΨΗΡΙ ΄ΗΡΩΗ ΞΕΗ ΟΥΜΕΘΗΗΗ	The Unlimited has been touched, and the Unseen has been seen, and the Son of the Liv- ing God truly became the Son of Man
ΙΣ ΠΕΧΣ ΠΣΑΦ ΜΠ ΠΟΥ ΠΤΟΦ ΠΤΟΦ ΟΠ ΠΕ ΖΠ ΟΥΖΥΠΟΣΤΑΣΙΣ ΠΟΥΩΤ ΤΕΝΟΥΩΨΤ ΗΑΦ ΤΠ†ΕΟΟΥ ΗΑΦ	ΠΠΣ ΠΧΣ ΄ΗΣΑΦ ΝΕΗ ΦΟΥΨ ΄ΗΘΟΥ ΄ΗΘΟΥ ΠΕ ΝΕΗ ΨΔ ΕΗΕΖ ΞΕΗ ΟΥΖΥΠΟΣΤΑΣΙΣ ΄ΗΟΥΩΤ ΤΕΝΟΥΩΨΤ ΄ΗΗΟΥ ΤΕΗΨΟΥΨ ΗΑΦ	Jesus Christ the same yesterday today and forever, in one hypos- tasis, we worship and glorify Him.

Commentary

— The translation provided here is based mainly on the Bohairic text.

— We find some minor changes such as in stanza 3 ΣΗΟΥ “sing” Sahidic and “ζωσ” “praise” Bohairic. And also in Stanza 4 we find in Sahaidic ΔΦΧΙΑΡΧΗ while in Bohairic ΔΦΕΡΖΗΤΣ.· the same could be said for stanza 5 ΑΥΗΑΥ· ΔΦΡΩΗΡΕ Sahidic in Bohairic ΣΕΗΑΥ· ΔΦΩΠΙ ΄ΗΨΗΡΙ

— Change in the formulation however the meaning is the same as in Stanza 2 ΠΕΝΟΥΧΑΙ in Shaidic while in Bohairic ΦΗΕΤΕ ΦΩΗ ΄ΗΟΥΧΑΙ Stanza 3 we have ΠΤΕΤΠΡΩΠΗΡΕ “in order to be amazed” in Sahidic while in Boharic ΔΡΙΩΦΗΡΗ “Be amazed

– Change Coptic word into Greek as Stanza 4 ΔΑΥΖΑΝΕ·ΠΑΤΧΡΟ-
ΝΟΣ Sahidic ΔΑΨΘΑΙ·ΠΑΙΤΣΟΥ Bohairic, Stanza 7 “ΤΟΥΗΤΡΑ” Sahidic,
“ΤΕΝΕΧΙ” Bohairic, “ΠΚΑΩ” Sahidic, “ΠΙΚΟΣΜΟΣ” Bohairic.

– Change of the person such as in stanza 1 “ΗΔΗ” to us” Sahidic
“ΗΩΟΥ” to them. It is important to mention that the beginning of the
stanza is addressed to the Nations.

– Addition of words such as `ΝΤΑΩ “His” in stanza 2, Bohairic,
Stanza 1 ΚΑΛΛΩΗ “from the womb” Sahidic, Stanza 6 “ΟΗ”.

– Addition of a sentence, as in stanza 6 in Bohairic ΝΕΜ ΨΑ ΕΝΕΩ

Theotokia of Thursday

Only three parts, out of nine, have their counterpart in the book of
the Sahidic Antiphonarium

Antiphonarium ⁹³	Theotokia of Thursday (part 1)
Antiphonarium ⁹⁴	Theotokia of Thursday (part 2)
Antiphonarium ⁹⁵	Theotokia of Thursday (part 3)
Antiphonarium ⁹⁶	Theotokia of thursday (part 9)

Theotokia of Friday

The whole theotokia of Friday, including the lobsh can be found in
the Sahidic book of the Anitphonarium

Antiphonarium ⁹⁷	Theotokia of friday (part 1)
Antiphonarium ⁹⁸	Theotokia of friday (part 2)
Antiphonarium ⁹⁹	Theotokia of friday (part 3)
Antiphonarium ¹⁰⁰	Theotokia of friday (part 4)

(92) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 204, N 191.

(93) *Ibid.*, 206, N 193.

(94) *Ibid.*, 200, N 187

(95) *Ibid.*, 210, N 203.

(96) *Ibid.*, 216, N 213.

(97) *Ibid.*, N 214.

(98) *Ibid.*, N 215.

(99) *Ibid.*, 202, N 188.

Antiphonarion ¹⁰¹	Theotokia of friday (part 5)
Antiphonarion ¹⁰²	Theotokia of friday (part 6)
Antiphonarion ¹⁰³	Theotokia of friday (part 7)
Antiphonarion ¹⁰⁴	Lobsh of Theotokia of Friday (part 1)

Theotokia of Saturday

I was unable to find any text in both books resembles to each other

Conclusion

No parts from the Theotokias of Monday, Saturday came to our knowledge through the Sahdic Antiphonarion.

Only one stanza from the theotokia of Sunday, three parts from the theotokias of Tuesdays and Thursdays occur in the Sahidic Antiphonarion.

The whole theotokias of Wednesday and Friday survived in the Sahidic Antiphonarion.

The comparison between both texts shows some changes adding words or changing Greek to Coptic or vice versa. In other few occasions, we have addition of complete stanzas or part of stanzas.

It is difficult to determine which of them is the original text; however the comparison shows that Bohairic possesses more parts than the Sahidic.

We can conclude with the words of Heinzgerd Brakmann and repeated by Ugo Zanetti (both most distinguished scholars in the field of Coptic Liturgy):

“...Even the simple questions concerning the liturgy of Southern Egypt do not meet a satisfactory answer. At present, scholarly literature has very little, if anything, to offer on how services were conducted in the course of time.”¹⁰⁴

(100) CRAMER, KRAUSE, *Das koptische Antiphonar...*, 210, N 202.

(101) *Ibid.*, N 201.

(102) *Ibid.*, N 200.

(103) *Ibid.*, 228, N 230.

(104) U. ZANETTI, Liturgy in the White Monastery, in: Gawdat GABRA, Hany N. TAKLA (eds.), *Christianity and Monasticism in Upper Egypt*, vol. 1 (Cairo—New York, 2008) 201–210, see p. 201.

Bibliographie

Michel Stavrou, Nicéphore Blemmydès, *Cœuvres théologiques. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes. Tome 1* (Paris : Cerf, 2007) (SC 517) 363 p. ISBN 978-2-204-08515-1.

Ce n'est pas toujours facile d'être à la fois théologien et philologue, mais les œuvres théologiques de Blemmydès résistent aux éditeurs qui ne savent qu'à peine partager les soucis dogmatiques de leur auteur. Il leur fallait donc attendre leur éditeur présent, Michel Stavrou.

On compte, parmi les œuvres théologiques de Nicéphore Blemmydès, dix traités pas trop longs ou bien assez courts qui sont devenus l'objet de l'édition dans la série des *Sources chrétiennes* dont le tome premier est paru. Ce tome contient quatre opuscules dans les éditions critiques dont l'unique est *l'editio princeps* (*Syllogismes hypothétiques sur la procession du Saint Esprit*, écrit entre 1237 et 1249, p. 207-233, d'après le ms unique *Mosq. gr. Vlad. 250*, fin XVII^e s.). Deux autres traités inédits sont en attente, y compris un sous le titre et la date très suggestifs, *De theologia*, adressé en 1256 ou 1257 à Théodore II Laskaris, le destinataire de la célèbre lettre pneumatologique de l'année 1255 dont on verra dans le volume présent une nouvelle édition critique et considérablement améliorée. Si le « nouveau » traité *De theologia* a été composé dans le sillage de la lettre pneumatologique, on pourrait s'attendre à y voir un troisième témoignage principal de la doctrine blemmydienne des années 1250 concernant la procession du Saint Esprit, à côté des deux témoignages déjà connus qui sont la dite lettre à Théodore Laskaris et la lettre de 1256 à Jacques de Bulgarie (dont l'édition critique est retardée, elle aussi, jusqu'au tome 2).

Tel est, en général, le programme d'édition de Michel Stavrou, effectué déjà en grande partie. Mais ce n'est pas l'intégralité de son entreprise. Le tome 1, avec son ample Introduction, est configuré comme une intervention au cœur d'un combat patrologique sinon théologique, car il est difficile de trouver un théologien byzantin plus discuté que Blemmydès. Nous ignorons les réactions des interlocuteurs de Blemmydès à ses idées sur le *Filioque*, mais on sait bien qu'elles sont devenues une pomme de discorde quelques années après sa mort († entre 1269 et 1272), lorsque Jean Bekkos se déclara, en 1275, dans le camp unioniste après l'Union de Lyon. Bekkos prétendait avoir été convaincu du bien-fondé de la position latine envers le *Filioque* élaborée par le Concile de Lyon II (1274), c.à.d. *tanquam ab uno principio*, précisément par la lecture de Blemmydès. Dès lors, les œuvres de Blemmydès ne cessent pas de constituer une partie importante de la tradition byzantine uniate. Toutefois, ils n'ont jamais disparu de la tradition byzantine

opposée, anti-uniate et anti-filioquiste. La source d'inspiration de Grégoire de Chypre, le patriarche qui avait aboli l'Union de Lyon (1283) et promulgué une doctrine conciliaire sur la participation du Fils dans la procession de l'Esprit (1285), n'était autre que Blemmydès. Malgré les discussions et divisions ecclésiastiques sur cette doctrine du vivant de Grégoire de Chypre, on ne voit rien de cela vers le temps de Grégoire Palamas qui cite librement Grégoire de Chypre et même Nicéphore Blemmydès¹. La tradition manuscrite, elle aussi, témoigne que les œuvres théologiques de Blemmydès circulaient aussi bien chez les latinophones que chez les orthodoxes, comme l'a noté Stavrou (p. 120).

L'étude de la théologie de Blemmydès entreprise par Stavrou dans le cadre de l'Introduction, bien qu'elle soit succincte (p. 81–121), est assez détaillée pour être une contribution importante à ce que Stavrou appelle les « lectures modernes de la théologie de Blemmydès » (le titre du chapitre 5 de l'Introduction, p. 85–92). En un mot, Stavrou renforce la position de ceux qui partagent le point de vue byzantin orthodoxe d'après lequel Blemmydès n'aurait jamais violé les frontières de la tradition théologique des Pères, y compris dans sa composante qui appartenait à la polémique antilatine : « Notre analyse a montré que, dans l'herméneutique patristique déployée par Nicéphore, il n'y avait pas évolution mais approfondissement ou *involution* de la pneumatologie byzantine, pour reprendre une notion chère à Vladimir Lossky » (p. 117).

D'ailleurs, ce point de vue est devenu minoritaire dans le cours du XX^e siècle, surtout dans les milieux où l'on cultivait la synthèse dite néopatristique. Le point de vue opposé (c.à.d. que Blemmydès aurait adopté intégralement la doctrine latine ou, du moins, aurait élaboré une doctrine particulière intermédiaire qui ne coïnciderait plus avec aucune des deux doctrines) est beaucoup plus répandu, même dans les milieux orthodoxes. Stavrou omet dans sa liste (p. 85–89) Aristide Papadakis (bien qu'il le cite plusieurs fois par ailleurs), peut-être, parce que celui-ci n'a donné aucune analyse approfondie de Blemmydès, mais son attitude me semble très caractéristique, car il est le spécialiste le plus reconnu sur Grégoire de Chypre. Or, Papadakis ne se refuse pas de citer Jugie : Blemmydès « ... embraced the Latin exegesis, or, at least, came very close to it. As one scholar [M. Jugie. — B. L.] notes, the two texts [les lettres de Blemmydès à Théodore Laskaris et à Jacques

(1) Stavrou tient compte (p. 120) d'un article important de D. Polemis « Blemmydes and Palamas » (2004).

de Bulgarie] contain all the essentials of Catholic dogma »². Ce n'est pas seulement le verdict qui est ici caractéristique. Il en est de même de l'absence d'une étude approfondie de Blemmydès. L'interconnexion entre les textes disputés de Blemmydès et de ceux de Grégoire de Chypre a été notée par moi-même déjà en 1992³, mais elle reste encore à étudier d'une manière propre.

Étant moi-même le dernier figurant de la liste des étudiants de la doctrine trinitaire de Blemmydès chez Stavrou (p. 92), je voudrais y ajouter le nom de Dumitru Stăniloae (1903–1993)⁴ auquel j'avais envoyé mon article de 1992 avec un sommaire français. Blemmydès n'était pas le seul thème de mon article, mais le P. Dumitru, qui l'avait accueilli cordialement, a été pourtant quelque peu frappé par ma « justification » de Blemmydès. D'après lui, Blemmydès avait certainement accepté la position des Latins. C'était, encore une fois, l'opinion préconçue sans une étude systématique de la théologie de l'époque. On ne peut que souscrire à l'affirmation de Stavrou : « Aujourd'hui, les études sur le renouveau hésychaste du XIV^e siècle foisonnent à tel point qu'il est difficile de suivre l'ensemble de la recherche en ce domaine. Cependant, l'histoire de la théologie du XIII^e siècle byzantin demeure mal connue » (p. 13). À vrai dire, l'obscurité de l'arrière-fond historique des querelles hésychastes empêche, à son tour, l'étude de la théologie du XIV^e siècle, au point que la prolifération contemporaine des études sur l'hésychasme byzantin est devenue un phénomène de valeur ambiguë.

Je dois avouer mon incapacité à demeurer un juge impartial de l'analyse théologique effectuée par Stavrou, car sa méthode et ses idées générales sont trop proches des miennes. Cependant, j'essaierai d'en tirer avantage en demeurant sensible à nos difficultés communes — car, hélas, notre approche n'est pas privée de problèmes.

Dans son résumé de la pensée de Blemmydès, Stavrou propose d'abord une approximation du premier degré : « ...la donation de l'Esprit est pour ainsi dire une propriété hypostatique du Fils, de même que le resplendissement par le Fils est une propriété hypostatique de l'Esprit » (p. 114), — j'oserais dire, peu utile, car elle fait l'usage d'un

(2) A. PAPADAKIS, *Crisis in Byzantium. The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283–1289)* (Crestwood, NY, 1997²) 114 (paru pour la première fois en 1983).

(3) LOURIÉ 1992 (cité par Stavrou), p. 8–10, 18–19.

(4) Brillant théologien, un des représentants majeurs de la « synthèse néopatriстique », connu surtout par son ouvrage sur Grégoire Palamas (1938) qui a fait date dans les études de la patristique byzantine tardive.

terme bien établi (« propriété hypostatique »), y compris chez Blemmydès, dans un sens inventé *ad hoc*, qu'on ne voit nulle part dans les sources. Ensuite, il continue d'une manière plus précise : « Autrement dit, de même que l'Esprit procède du Père et repose sur le Fils, le Fils est considéré comme étant engendré du Père, recevant l'Esprit et en faisant don. De même que la procession de l'Esprit est inconcevable sans le Fils, de même la génération du Fils est inconcevable sans l'Esprit Saint, de sorte que le Fils n'est vraiment fils du Père que dans la mesure où il reçoit de celui-ci l'Esprit Saint » (*ibid.*). C'est ici le point principal de la triadologie de Blemmydès, et c'est ici son problème central. Dans quel sens les deux « procès » (πρόοδοι)⁵ *in divinis* sont-ils symétriques ?

Stavrou est très attentif à ne pas confondre la théologie de Blemmydès avec celle des théologiens modernes comme Serge Boulgakoff et Serge Verkhovsky avec leur *Spirituque* comme un contrepoids au *Filioque* latin (cf. surtout p. 113, n. 4). Ainsi, écrit-il, « Cela [la doctrine blemmydienne qu'on vient de résumer] ne signifie pas pour autant l'existence, pour la génération du Fils, d'une causalité seconde, sorte de ' *Spirituque* ', contrepartie ou alternative du *Filioque*, puisque le seul causateur est le Père » (p. 114, n. 3). Oui, il est clair qu'il ne s'agit point, chez Blemmydès, d'un *Spirituque* au sens symétrique au *Filioque* latin. Mais s'il est permis de considérer la doctrine de Blemmydès comme un traitement orthodoxe de la formule *Filioque*, on devrait accepter qu'elle sous-entend une sorte du *Spirituque* : pas en ce qui concerne les propriétés hypostatiques, bien sûr, mais dans le même sens « énergétique ». La *crux interpretum* me semble ici le ch. 10 (= ch. 14 dans l'édition de PG 142) de la *Lettre à Théodore Laskaris* :

« Si en effet ce n'était pas par le Verbe que l'Esprit procède d'auprès du Père, le Père serait intermédiaire, portant d'un côté et de l'autre le Verbe et l'Esprit. Mais [le Père] est confessé aussi comme principe, et si le Verbe et l'Esprit <existent> à partir du Père comme du principe sans que l'un des deux <existe> par l'autre (μη διὰ θατέρου θάτερον), une division s'introduit dans la Divinité » (p. 346/347 txt/tr.).

J'ai posé les formes du verbe « exister » entre chevrons car elles sont absentes dans l'original. On saurait bien traduire en russe sans introduire un verbe, mais le français est moins commode aux traductions de cette sorte. Toutefois, le verbe « exister » peut être associé trop étroitement avec les termes grecs ayant le sens de l'existence hypostatique

(5) Cf. p. 127–128, sur ce terme chez Blemmydès et sa traduction française.

tout entière (par exemple, ὑφίστημι), tandis que la pensée de Blemmydès semble ici plus nuancée, car il ne présuppose aucune réciprocité entre les propriétés hypostatiques. Quoi qu'il en soit, la condition διὰ θατέρου θάτερον (« l'un des deux par l'autre ») est formulée par Blemmydès comme une condition stricte, ce qui s'accorde d'ailleurs avec l'ensemble de sa pensée trinitaire. Jusqu'ici, la compréhension de Blemmydès par Stavrou (et par moi-même) est cohérente. Malheureusement, elle cesse de l'être dans un contexte plus large de la tradition byzantine, car nous ne trouvons pas une pareille condition explicite chez Grégoire de Chypre, c'est-à-dire dans la version « canonique » traditionnelle de la doctrine de Blemmydès. Dans l'état actuel de nos connaissances de la théologie de Grégoire de Chypre aussi bien que de celle de ses adversaires du camp antilatin (comme, par exemple, Jean Chilas, Georges Moschambar), il serait prématuré de se prononcer d'une manière définitive, s'il agit d'une divergence stylistique (l'attitude de Stavrou ; cf., au dernier lieu, M. STAVROU, Le théologien Nicéphore Blemmydès (1197–v. 1269), figure de contradiction entre orthodoxes et latinophones, *OCP* 74 (2008) 165–170) et tactique ou bien d'une vraie différence doctrinale. Le travail de Stavrou est devenu cependant un nouveau stimulus pour les recherches sur les discussions trinitaires dans le camp antilatin au dernier quart du XIII^e siècle. Je suis sûr que ces recherches jetteront de la lumière également sur l'origine des querelles hésychastes.

Cela dit, je n'ai qu'à répéter que le travail de Stavrou présente maintenant la reconstruction de la pensée de Blemmydès la plus convaincante. On attend avec impatience le tome 2.

Basile Lourié

Tedros Abreha, *Il Gädl di Abuna Demyanos santo eritreo (XIV/XV sec.). Edizione del testo etiopico e traduzione italiana (Patrologia Orientalis Tome 50. Fascicule 2. N° 223, Turnhout, Belgique: Brepols, 2007). Pp. 125. [= 113–237]. Prezzo: € 46. [Senza ISBN]*

L'edizione del testo del *Gadla Demyānos* pubblicato con introduzione, traduzione e commento a cura di Tedros Abreha nel nuovo fascicolo della *Patrologia Orientalis* colma una lacuna importante nella conoscenza del *corpus* agiografico dei discendenti di Ēwostātēwos, che tanto di sé hanno improntato il monachesimo diffuso sull'altopia-

no oggi eritreo. Se ne ricava indubbiamente nuova luce e una meno incompleta conoscenza delle tradizioni sulla personalità del monaco Demyānos — immediato predecessore di Yonās nella linea genealogica che da Absādi, successore di Ēwoṣṭātēwos, procede a Musē e via Demyānos a Yonās stesso — se è vero che non se ne aveva alcuna notizia nell'ampia documentazione eustaziana indagata da Gianfrancesco Lusini, *Studi sul monachesimo eustaziano (secoli XIV–XV)* (Studi Africanistici. Serie Etiopica 3), Napoli 1993, e che non gli sono oggi riconducibili chiese o monasteri. Notizie al suo riguardo già offriva una serie di testi raccolti dalla Missione Italiana in Eritrea (MIE) dell'Università di Bologna (1992 sgg.) diretta da Irma Taddia, e pubblicati nell'occasione ancora da Lusini, "Scritture documentarie etiopiche (Dabra Deḥuḥān e Dabra Ṣegē, Sarā'ē, Eritrea)", *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici*, 42 (1998 [1999]), pp. 5–55, ms. MIE 17, doc. I, f. 1^{r-v}, trad. pp. 22–23, testo pp. 26.7, 26.17 (genealogia Ēwoṣṭātēwos, Absādi, Musē, Demyānos, Yonās); ms. MIE 19, doc. I, ff. 2^{va-b} e 3^{va}, trad. pp. 30–31, testo pp. 32.6 (data di nascita di Demyānos nell'anno di grazia 33 = 1381), 32.23 (salvamento di Ṭarāqit nell'anno 80 = 1428: a tal proposito, non credo si possa concordare con Tedros, p. 126, n. 28, nel ritenere che il nome non sia un toponimo e valga, *scilicet* come participio femminile, "ammalata di dissenteria", perché Ṭarāqit è altrove chiaramente un luogo, cfr. ms. MIE 22, doc. V, f. 4^{va}, trad. p. 44, testo p. 47.25) e 32.36 (commemorazione di Demyānos il 28 yakkātit); MIE 22 I, f. 6^a, trad. p. 40, testo p. 46.2 (morte di Demyānos nel 7° anno di regno di Zar'a Yā'qob = 1441) e MIE 22, doc. V, ff. 3^{va} e 4^{va}, trad. p. 44, testo pp. 47.7 e 47.28 (genealogia).

L'esperienza della frequentazione "sul campo" delle comunità monastiche di oggi e la diretta conoscenza dei luoghi, combinate con la rassegna puntuale della bibliografia relativa e il tentativo di spiegazione globale del testo del *gādī* (in particolare, con il reperimento di citazioni e allusioni alla letteratura biblica, monastica, liturgica), hanno permesso all'Editore di fornire varie rettifiche e non pochi dati nuovi (spec. pp. 124–127; e a p. 123, n. 16 si annuncia che anche l'edizione del *Gādī Fiqṭor* è in preparazione, cfr. ora anche Tedros Abraha, "Controversie sul Sabato e sul Millennio secondo i *Gādī* inediti di Tāwāldā-Mādāhn (*sic*) e di Fiqṭor", in *Scrinium* 4 (2008) = V. Baranov — B. Lourié (eds.), *Patrologia Pacifica. Selected papers presented to the Western Pacific Rim Patristics Society 3rd Annual Conference (Nagoya, Japan, September 29 – October 1, 2006) and other patristic studies*, Санкт-Петербург 2008, pp. 79–102). Da tradizioni orali, a quanto pare (p. 125), risulta precisamente collocabile la chiesa di Dabra Sinā, oggi dedicata a Ma-

ria (ma in origine, unica finora nota, a Demyānos), anziché nel Daqqi Tasfā — come indicato da Lusini, “Dəmyanos”, in *EAE* (Siegbert Uhlig (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, Wiesbaden 2003 sgg.), vol. 2, p. 132b, sulla scorta di Carlo Conti Rossini, “Gli Atti di Abbā Yonās”, in *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, s. 5^a, 12 (1903), pp. 177–201, 239–262, spec. p. 178 e n. 1, e p. 187.23–24 — nel distretto del Zāydakkolom, sempre nel Sarāya, al pari di altri luoghi legati all’attività del monaco: Endā Abbā Sem’on (pp. 162 / 163, §§ 33–34, probabilmente lo stesso citato alle pp. 138 / 139, § 4, e 136, n. 25), l’oscuro Dabra Salām (cfr. p. 126, n. 25), o Dabra Deḥuḥān, ove risulterebbero conservati i resti di Demyānos (p. 125 e n. 23). Per il resto, mentre Dabra Sinā figura nel testo solo in una nota marginale, a glossare il generico «deserti di Bārāka» nel ms. B (pp. 160, apparato, n. 62 / 161, n. 91, § 32, non incluso nell’indice, come forse sarebbe stato opportuno almeno per alcuni termini di maggior rilievo che figurano solo nelle note o nell’apparato), il Bur con Aramo (Hagara Masqal di pp. 182, 204 / 183, 205, §§ 59, 88) e i meno perspicui (forse cuscitici) Dabla Sumā e Dalu’etā, lo Sira con Zāger, il Ḥamāsēn, costituiscono l’orizzonte geografico della formazione e della predicazione del santo.

Tutte concentrate nella parte centrale e terminale della sua vita sono invece le figure storiche evocate, tra le quali l’oscuro governatore del Sira, Dēganā (p. 127), il cui omonimo Tegrē Mak^wannen in Karolus Conti Rossini, *Documenta ad illustrandam historiam. I. Liber Axumae*, 2 voll. (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium s. altera, 8; rist. 54 e 58, *Scriptores Aethiopici* 24 e 27), Parisiis 1909–10 (rist. Louvain 1961–1962), doc. nr. 51 (testo p. 43.15, trad. p. 51.23), è altrimenti attestato all’epoca del re Galāwdēwos; il *nebura ‘ed Nob* (cfr. p. 215, n. 27) — su cui cfr. ora Claire Bosc-Tiessé — Marie-Laure Derat, “Nob”, in *EAE*, vol. 3, p. 1192 — del quale, stando al *gād*, Demyānos sarebbe stato il fratello del padre, nonché *ḥadāni*, «tutore» (pp. 214–216 / 215–217, §§ 101–103); ma anche i re Yesḥaq e Ḥezba Nāñ (Yenāyn nel testo, pp. 210 / 211, §§ 96 sgg.), presso la corte dei quali il santo muore, sicché la sua salma è poi reclamata dai suoi compaesani e loro dal re concessa. Nell’insieme, il testo pare mantenersi sostanzialmente lontano dal tono e dalla tensione propria di altre agiografie eustaziane, e si dispiega nell’esaltazione delle virtù monastiche e taumaturgiche del protagonista, se pur più punti narrativi restano da chiarire: la sofferenza del santo per il forzato richiamo e la permanenza a corte potrebbero nascondere, sotto il disagio agiografico per l’impossibile rifiuto del mondo, la prigionia o la relegazione presso il re. Il testo presuppone per di più quasi certamente la redazione dell’agiografia del suo successore Yonās, dato che

del *Gadla Yonās* è richiamato un episodio (pp. 208 / 209 sgg., e p. 211, n. 16, §§ 92–95, 98–99), e la mancata insistenza sull'osservanza del sabato porta la datazione del *gadl* a un'epoca posteriore alle controversie eustaziane stesse, come l'Editore giustamente nota (pp. 123–124). Nel complesso, pur dopo questa prima analisi di Tedros, resta ancora spazio per approfondire la natura del rapporto tra la tradizione agiografica e quella documentaria, entrambe fortunatamente presenti nel caso di Demyānos.

L'edizione del testo si fonda su due testimoni (un po' impropriamente indicati come «fonti», p. 117): il ms. A, ff. 125^{ra}–184^{vb}, del XV–XVI sec., direttamente visionato e nuovamente descritto con qualche elemento aggiuntivo rispetto alle prime segnalazioni, già fornite di indicazioni sulla fascicolazione, conservato presso il monastero di Dabra Deḥuḥān (stando alla descrizione di Tedros, il f. 3, con la nota cronografica del doc. I = f. 2 di Lusini, "Scritture", pp. 29 sgg.), cfr. Alessandro Bausi — Gianfrancesco Lusini — Irma Taddia, "Materiali di studio dal Sāra'ē (Eritrea): le istituzioni monastiche e la struttura della proprietà fondiaria", in *Africa* (Roma), 48/3 (1993), pp. 446–463, spec. p. 462, e Lusini, "Scritture", pp. 29–32, ms. MIE 19, con pubblicazione di varie note aggiunte; e un secondo, nuovo, ms. B, pp. 174–315, probabilmente del XVIII sec., esaminato in fotocopia e conservato presso il monastero di Māryām Ṣeyon presso 'Addi Wusseḡ, non lontano da Māy Demā, Sarāya. Del ms. A è inoltre pubblicata e tradotta una finora inedita nota aggiunta al f. 2^r, con le date di morte di varie personalità eustaziane, tra cui ancora Demyānos il 28 di yakkātīt (p. 124, n. 17).

Seguono alcune osservazioni più puntuali sul testo (testo e trascrizioni del volume sono riportati tali e quali, tra «caporali» la traduzione). — P. 118: nella descrizione dei testi vengono dati come *incipit* le formule iniziali che *incipit* non sono. — p. 119.11 sgg.: i rapporti tra i mss. sono definiti utilizzando elementi che appartengono alla "critica delle forme" nella sua accezione più superficiale, e che vanno piuttosto inquadrati nella prospettiva delle varianti linguistico-grafiche; il ms. B (XVIII sec.) non può essere «l'antigrafo» di A (XV/XVI sec.); ne potrebbe se mai essere "l'apografo": la questione, che è essenziale, andava però ulteriormente chiarita; in ogni caso, non possono essere tacciati di «incuranti o forse inconsapevoli ...» i copisti dei codici A e B per la mancata distinzione tra laringali e sibilanti: la confusione, come noto, è antica, né ci è nota alcuna tradizione *manoscritta* a noi conservata che rispetti perfettamente la grafia etimologica; l'apparato, giustamente, non registra tali «errori ortografici», mentre «l'interpunzione è stata sovente "riaggiustata"» dall'Editore, senza che il lettore abbia modo di

sapere dove e come; cfr. a tal riguardo Alessandro Bausi — Alessandro Gori, *Tradizioni orientali del «Martirio di Areta»*. *La Prima recensione araba e la Versione etiopica*. Edizione critica e traduzione. Presentazione di Paolo Marrassini, Firenze 2006 (Quaderni di Semitistica, 27), pp. 112–113. — pp. 119–120: tra gli errori ricorrenti propri del testo, è segnalato (p. 120) **ወጥኖት ፣** infinito flesso secondo la forma I.2, mentre Tedros ne ammette unicamente la forma I.1 e non esita a correggere in tal senso (cfr. p. 146, apparato, n. 73: **ወጥኖት ፣** mentre a testo **ወጢኖት ፣** e ancora p. 148, n. 57; lo stesso per il verbo **ጠርአ ፣** p. 224, n. 43: ma in altri casi, tale “rigore” necessario manca: cfr. p. 206, n. 8: «ḥayäsä» recte “ḥayyasa”): in realtà **ወጠኖት ፣** e **ጠርአ ፣** sono ben attestati sia come forme I.1 che come I.2, tanto che entrambe sono registrate in August Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae Aethiopicae*, Lipsiae 1865, cc. 941, 1220: non è quindi «uno dei casi di forme lessicali chiaramente errate»: e stupisce leggere che le forme attestate dai testimoni manoscritti sono state corrette quando «sono erronee», il che avrebbe senso nella prospettiva di un metodo consapevolmente praticato, ovviamente, «o per lo meno superate», il che non lo ha affatto: in tal modo, quell’embrione di diacronia che potrebbe cogliersi nei testi etiopici viene schiacciato sulla norma dell’insegnamento tradizionale di oggi, di cui Tedros un po’ troppo si compiace, cfr. «“all’esercito” (i.e. alla coniugazione)» (p. 120), e varie altre volte nelle annotazioni; ciò disturba tanto più che per altri aspetti l’Editore mette in luce l’importanza, non solo dell’individuazione delle citazioni e allusioni a testi biblici ed extra-biblici (in questo lo sforzo di Tedros è veramente ammirevole), ma anche della sopravvivenza in esse di fasi testuali arcaiche del testo biblico (cfr. p. 128; p. 136, n. 20; p. 141, n. 35); il principio è ribadito a p. 127: «si è cercato di sostituire alcune forme ḡʾəz sorpassate», in pieno conflitto con lo scopo prefisso «di recuperare il testo originale», *ibid.* — p. 120: interessante l’osservazione sull’uso dell’accusativo con **ቦ ፣ አልቦ ፣** e **አኮ ፣** che nel ms. A sarebbe arbitrario per arcaismo. — pp. 121–123: l’Editore sottolinea l’importanza del “modello scritturale” (i riferimenti al quale, tenuto conto della precisione e profondità che alcuni contributi di agiografia etiopica hanno raggiunto al riguardo, sono un po’ generici), e della tessitura di allusioni e citazioni bibliche e letterarie; sembra però fraintendere che la dichiarazione dello scrittore («povero di intelligenza e dalla parola stentata») sulla propria inadeguatezza obbedisce a un ben noto *tópos*. — p. 122.31–32: **ብእሲ ፣ እግዚአብሔር ፣** (recte **ብእሴ ፣ እግዚአብሔር ፣**) è piuttosto l’“homme de Dieu” che non il «*Theios Anēr*». — p. 127, nn. 33–34: «Lusini 1988»: “Lusini 1998”. — pp. 134.2 / 135.3: **ገብረ ፣** / «creò»: “fece”. — pp. 134.4 / 135.5: **አሰርገዐ ፣** / «adornò»: ma il testo ha il plu-

rale. — pp. 134.13 / 135.11: **የሐውር** : / «si trascina»: “cammina, procede”. — pp. 134.16 / 135.13–14: **እንዝ : ይሰግዱ** : / «quando si prostrano»: “prostrandosi”. — p. 136.16: **ጎጥኦ** ፣ *recte* **ጎጥኦ** ፣ — p. 137, n. 14: la *Vita Antonii* è data come certamente tradotta dal greco, ma il testo è stato finora oggetto di indagini solo esplorative. — pp. 138.22 / 139.30: **መጎሬ : ክርስቶስ** : / «Maḥari Krəstos»: “Maḥarē Krestos”. — pp. 138.10–11 / 139.15: **ዘተሠይመ : ላዕለ : አባግዓ : መርዒት** : / «fu eletto a guida delle pecore del gregge»: “fu messo a capo” ecc. — pp. 138.27 / 139.36: **ንብረተ : ዝንቱ : ዓለም** : / «la condizione di questo mondo», ma pp. 140.4 / 141.4–5: *id.* / «il soggiorno in questo mondo». — pp. 140.1 sgg. / 141.3 sgg.: i tempi della trad. sono incoerenti. — pp. 140.3 / 141.5: **የጎልዮ** : / «pensa»: “pensi”. — pp. 140.15 **ንጹሐን** : / 141.20: «liberi»: “puri”. — pp. 140.24 / 141.30: **ወጽሐፍ : አሰግተ** : «e c’erano le scritte dei nomi»: “e c’erano scritti i nomi”. — pp. 140.25–26 / 141.31–33: **ውስተ : አንቀጽ : ጽባሐዊያን : ቩ** / «sulla porta orientale tre (nomi)»: ma parrebbe “su una porta i tre orientali” ecc., anche se l’espressione resta oscura. — pp. 140.28 / 141.3 **ይጸውር : ሕለተ : አምጣነ : በዘቦቱ : ይሜጥና** : / «portava la verga della misura per misurarvi»: “portava una verga della misura con cui misurare”, con frase relativa restrittiva. — pp. 140.29 / 141.36: **ወአምጣነ : ኑኃ : ግድማ** : / «quanto alla sua altezza e larghezza»: “e la sua lunghezza è pari alla sua larghezza”. — pp. 140.30 / 141.37: **ወመጠና : ለይእቲ : ሀገር : በውእቲ : ሕለት** : / «e la mole di quella città era di tali proporzioni»: “e la misura di quella città era di quella verga”. — pp. 142.1 / 143.1: **ኑሐ : ወግድማ : ወቆማኒ** : «la sua altezza, la sua larghezza e la sua statura»: “la sua lunghezza, la sua larghezza e la sua altezza”. — pp. 142.14 / 143.15: **ዮብርሀ : ሳቲ** : / «risplendano in essa»: “perché le facciano luce”. — pp. 142.20 / 143.20–21: **ኢይጽሐፍ** : «non verrà registrato» / “non scriva”. — pp. 142.26 / 143.27: **ወይሬእይዎ : ገጸ : ወስሞ : ውስተ : ፍጽሞሙ** : «e vedono il suo volto e il suo nome è sulla loro fronte»: “e vedono il suo volto e il suo nome sulla loro fronte”. — pp. 142.23 / 143.24–25: **ወይገብር : ... ወይሁብ** : / «produce... produce»: “produce... fornisce”. — pp. 142.29 / 143.32: **ተሰፊዎ** : / «ripose»: “avendo riposato”. — pp. 144.18 / 145.19: **ለሥርዓተ : ምንኩስና** : / «ordine monastico»: “regola monastica”. — pp. 145.20: **ለዓቃቢ : ገበዝ** ፣ ma p. 144, n. 44: **ዓቃቤ : ገበዝ** ፣ — pp. 144.28–29 / 145.30: **ከመ : ማይ : ቈሪር : ውስተ : አፈ : ጽሙእ** : / «come acqua fresca che ristora la bocca di un assetato»: ma «che ristora» non è nel testo. — pp. 144.30 / 145.32: **አረጋዊ** : / «vegliardo»: potrebbe trattarsi di una allusione allo *Aragāwi Manfasāwi*. — pp. 146.6 / 147.6: **ወእምዝ : እምድጎረ** : / «Dopodiché»: meglio a testo, anche se ridondante, **ወእምዝ : እምድጎረዝ** : come in apparato la lezione

del ms. A. — pp. 146.23 / 147.26: **ወበተጸምዶ ፡** / «nel digiuno»: “nella dedizione”. — pp. 148.1–2 / 147.36: **ወከመ ፡ ትትዐቀብ ፡ እምኩሉ ፡ እኩይ ፡ ዘይደልወከ ፡ ትጉይይ ፡ እምኔሁ ፡** / «e custodire e tutti i mali dai quali dovrai fuggire»: “e che tu ti guardi da tutti i mali da cui ti conviene fuggire”. — pp. 148.3 / 149.2: **ዘይኤሲ ፡** / «che superi»: “che ricompenserà”. — pp. 148.18 / 149.22: **ይፌጽም ፡** / «vi riporti alla perfezione»: “vi riporterà alla perfezione”. — pp. 152.8 / 153.13: **በርእሰ ፡ መጽሐፍ ፡** / «nel titolo del libro»: “al principio del libro”. — pp. 152.16 / 153.17: **ሰዋ ፡** / «birra»: cfr. p. 153, n. 67: l’etimologia di *sawā*, “birra” da *ṣewā*, “calice”, è assolutamente inaccettabile; il termine *śawā*, poi, è attestato in etiopico con il significato di “birra” sin dai testi epigrafici aksumiti, cfr. le celebri occorrenze in *DAE* (Enno Littmann, *Deutsche-Aksum Expedition herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung der königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Band IV. Sabäische, griechische, und altabessinische Inschriften*, Berlin 1913), nrr. 6.11, 7.13 = *RIÉ* (Étienne Bernand — Abraham Johannes Drewes — Roger Schneider, *Recueil des Inscriptions de l’Éthiopie des périodes pré-axoumite et axoumite*, 3 vols. [Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres], Paris 1991–2000), vol. I, nrr. 185 I.11, II.13, e le parallele *RIÉ* nrr. 185 bis I.13, II.(C).1. — pp. 154.25 / 155.31 e 154, n. 75: **ዶል ፡** / «campana»: la forma è segnalata in ulteriori testi, cfr. Alessandro Bausi, “Su alcuni manoscritti presso comunità monastiche dell’Eritrea [III]”, in *Rassegna di Studi Etiopici*, 41 (1997 [1998]), pp. 13–56, spec. p. 46b, indice, s.v. — pp. 156.10 / 157.12–13: **ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡ ሐብተ ፡ አቡነ ፡ ጴጥሮስ ፡ ዘተወፊዶ ፡ እምእደ ፡ ኩኩሕ ፡** / «la Chiesa, il cui custode è il nostro Padre Pietro che l’ha ricevuta dalla mano della Roccia»: ma **ሐብተ ፡** non può valere “custode”. — pp. 156.6 / 157.7: **ወርቆ ፡** / «il suo tesoro»: “il suo oro”. — pp. 174.13 / 175.15 e n. 26: **ኢተከብተ ፡ ላቲ ፡** / «non era passata inosservata»: testo congetturale (**ኢተከብተ ፡ ላቲ ፡**) per il trádito **ኢተከብታ ፡**, salvo che in questo caso la correzione non dà nel segno, perché **ኢተከብተ ፡ ላቲ ፡** vale esattamente come **ኢተከብታ ፡** e qui sarà forse da pensare a costruzione a senso o a interferenza con forma di gerundio tigrino (forme e parole anomale, amariche, ma soprattutto tigrine e tigrineggianti sono segnalate nelle note a più riprese, cfr. pp. 141, n. 36, **ድንቀት ፡**; 154, n. 57, **ዶል ፡**; 156, n. 85, e 181, n. 39, **ኅሠሠ ፡**; 205, n. 4 **ሔማ ፡**). — pp. 184.1 / 185.1 e n. 52: **ቀላየ ፡ አእምሮ ፡** / «mare di conoscenza»: “abisso di conoscenza”. — p. 202, n. 98: *l’usus scribendi* è evocato un po’ a sproposito: nella fattispecie, l’espressione **ንሣእ ፡ ዘይረክበከ ፡** vale semplicemente “prendi ciò che ti tocca”, e non è affatto «un errore», né di norma *usus scribendi* — contrariamente all’accezione che l’Editore fa propria — denota espressione irrazionale o

grammaticalmente anomala: *usus scribendi* indica semplicemente l'uso linguistico e stilistico di un autore, di un genere, di un'epoca ecc. quale che esso sia, e vale come criterio interno in critica testuale. — p. 212, n. 24: «Abba Mälkä Şedeq 2002» non pare reperibile in bibliografia. — pp. 216.32 / 217.39: በርእዮትዮ ፣ / «nella mia rivelazione»: inutile congettura per il trádito በርእዮትዮ ፣ dove il pronome suffisso può benissimo valere come oggetto: “Gioisci o mio servo Demyānos, per il fatto di vedere me”. — p. 228.6: l'occorrenza di ብራና ፣ “pergamena”, si aggiunge alle non molte sinora note a corroborare l'etimologia del termine da μεμβράνα, cfr. Alessandro Bausi, “La tradizione scrittoria etiopica”, in *Segno & Testa*, 6 (2008), pp. 507–557, spec. p. 522; per la tradizione scrittoria è ugualmente utile la menzione a p. 144.21 della ቤተ ፣ መዛግብት ፣ da cui lo ዐቃቤ ፣ (!) ገበዝ ፣ riceve l'ordine di consultare un libro di contenuto monastico (ነገረ ፣ አበው ፣).

Alessandro Bausi

NOUVELLES PUBLICATIONS
DE L'INSTITUT DE LA LITTÉRATURE RUSSE
(MAISON DE POUCHKINE)
SUR LA LITTÉRATURE ANCIENNE DE LA RUSSIE

1. *TODRL*, tome LVIII (2007). *Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы*. Том LVIII (Санкт-Петербург: Наука, 2007) 964 с.

Travaux du Secteur de la littérature russe ancienne. Tome LVIII (St Pétersbourg : Nauka, 2007) 964 p. ISBN 978-5-02-026502-8. [Hommage à Gelian Mikhailovitch Prokhorov]

2. Г. М. Прохоров, «Так воссияют праведники...» *Византийская литература XIV в. в Древней Руси* (Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во Олега Абышко, 2009) (с2008) (Библиотека христианской мысли. Исследования) 268 с.

G. M. Prokhorov, *Alors les justes resplendiront... La littérature byzantine du XIV^e siècle dans la Russie ancienne* (St Pétersbourg : chez Oleg Abychko, 2009) (с2008) (Bibliothèque de pensée chrétienne. Recherches) 268 p. ISBN 978-5-903525-18-8.

Le tome LVIII^e de la célèbre série *TODRL* est paru comme l'Hommage à Gelian Mikhailovitch Prokhorov pour son 70^e anniversaire. Un vol-

ume d'à peu près mille pages (deux fois plus grand que les volumes récents) rappelle l'âge d'or des *TODRL*, au tournant des 1950s et 1960s, lorsque chaque tome de la série ouvrait un univers habité par des personnages médiévaux, pas toujours des saints, mais, du moins, privés de la platitude des héros de la littérature soviétique ou du névrotisme de ceux de la littérature russe classique... Mais le volume présent est encore plus riche que les volumes d'autrefois.

Naturellement, il s'ouvre par une biographie du jubilaire écrite d'une manière informelle et cordiale par Natalia Vladimirovna Ponyrko, suivie de sa bibliographie complète dès le début, 1964, jusqu'à 2007. Présentement, cette bibliographie est quelque peu vieillie. L'addition la plus importante est un recueil d'articles sur la littérature byzantine que nous avons signalé comme le numéro 2 de la revue présente. Ce recueil englobe les réimpressions des études fort importantes, à savoir, sur les versions slavonnes des œuvres de l'auteur hésychaste David Disypatos et de la *Disputation avec les chionnes et les turcs* de Grégoire Palamas, sur l'héritage hymnographique du patriarche hésychaste Philothée Kokkinos (aussi bien des textes grecs que de leurs versions slavonnes), sur l'hymnographie russe de l'époque de la bataille sur le champ de Koulikovo (1380)...

Le contenu des articles du tome d'hommage varie d'après la palette des intérêts du jubilaire. Le tome est donc divisé en neuf sections : 1. Études bibliques, apocryphes, théologie, 2. Hymnographie, 3. Hagiographie, 4. « Littérature d'instruction » (en effet, il s'agit de la littérature médiévale qu'on n'a pas classée ailleurs, c.à.d. de la littérature ascétique, morale, des indices des livres « vrais » et « faux » etc.), 5. Chronographie, chroniques, historiographie, 6. Narrations, itinéraires, 7. Art, architecture, épigraphie, 8. Archéographie, 9. La continuation de la littérature russe ancienne après la Russie ancienne (il s'agit de la survie de la littérature ancienne dans les temps nouveaux ; cette section comprit un article sur Paisii Vélitchkovsky et un autre sur l'écrivain vieux croyant Ivan Filippov).

À part deux articles sur la littérature pseudépigraphique, dont un est discuté ailleurs¹ et l'autre est la continuation (part 2) de la publication des *Palaea Chronographica, recensio brevior* (*Краткая Хронографическая паля*) par E. G. Vodolazkine (p. 534–556), le tome contient un nombre considérable d'articles concernant la patrologie, l'hagiographie, l'hymnographie et la littérature ascétique. Ainsi,

(1) B. LOURIÉ, *Courts of Solomon*, a Jewish Collection, *Scr* 5 (2009) 353–363.

S. Fahl et D. Fahl analysent les scholies dans la version slavonne du *Corpus Areopagiticum* (« Der Starec Isaija als Leser: Scholien und Schli- enfragmente unbekannter Herkunft in der ersten wollständigen kir- chenslavischen Übersetzung des Corpus areopagiticum », p. 87–98),

V. B. Kryś'ko retrouve les originaux grecs (toujours inédits) pour la soi-disante *Il'ina kniga* (« Livre d'Élie »), un des plus anciens manu- scrits du ménée slavon (XI^e–XII^e s.), qui n'ont pas été encore signalés dans l'édition de *Il'ina kniga* de 2005 effectuée par le même auteur (p. 127–134),

A. E. Smirnova-Kosickaja compose un répertoire alphabétique des canons hymnographiques aux saints russes (p. 174–253),

N. V. Ponyrko s'occupe de la textologie des canons hymnogra- phiques pénitentiels de Kirill (Cyrille) de Tourov (p. 254–281),

les auteurs des études dans le domaine hagiographique se concen- trent sur le ménologion russe d'octobre du XV^e siècle (O. V. Tvorogov, p. 282–289), la recension originale de la *Vie* de Serge de Radonège (M. A. Šibaev, p. 290–319), la *Vie* d'Evfrosine de Pskov (V. I. Okhotniko- va, p. 320–331), la *Vie* de Cyrille du Lac Nouveau (Kirill Novoezerkskij) (T. B. Karbasova, p. 332–365), la *Vie* de Nicétas le Stylite de Perejaslavl' (M. A. Fedotova, p. 366–383), un manuscrit de la narration sur Isaïe du Ruisseau (L. B. Belova, p. 384–389), les Vies des justes dans la tradition hagiographique du Nord russe (B. A. Ryžina, p. 390–442), les Vies des fols en Christ (T. R. Rudi, p. 443–484), le culte de la Vierge de Loretto, y compris ses amplifications russes (M. Pljukhanova, p. 669–696), la narration de Jean Semenov, le fondateur du monastère de S. Ekaterina (V. P. Budaragin, p. 697–709), les narrations sur Stéphane de Perm et sur les évêques de Perm (A. N. Vlasov, p. 710–731), une narration peu connue du XVIII^e siècle sur la fondation du « désert » nommé « de Cy- gnes » près de Kargopol (A. V. Pligin, p. 753–772), le destin des arté- facts provenant du patriarche Philothée Kokkinos à Moscou (O. A. Be- lobrova, p. 789–794),

S. A. Semjačko réfute l'opinion commune des savants préévolu- tionnaires que Nil de Sora aurait composé un *gerontikon* (p. 505–512), tandis que E. É. Ševčenko fait un rapport de sa découverte d'un auto- graphe nouveau du même saint (p. 913–919),

G. Majeska fait une notice sur « An Unnoticed Rus' Embassy to Constantinople in A.D. 1200 » (p. 732–734).

Bien sûr, la liste ci-dessus est loin d'épuiser la richesse du volume offert à Gelian M. Prokhorov et à tout le monde.

3. *Книжные центры Древней Руси. Кирилло-Белозерский монастырь*. Отв. ред. С. А. Семячко (Санкт-Петербург: Дмитрий Буланин, 2008) 497 с.

Centres littéraires de la Russie ancienne. Le monastère de Cyrille du Lac Blanc. Éd. par S. A. Semjačko (St Pétersbourg : Dmitrij Bulanin, 2008) 497 p. ISBN 978-86007-576-4.

La série « Centres littéraires de la Russie ancienne », établie en 1991, est devenue une addition importante à la série majeure des *TODRL*. Le domaine de chaque volume de la série est normalement limité à l'un ou l'autre centre littéraire, comme, par exemple, le monastère de S. Cyrille du Lac Blanc dans le volume présent. Ce monastère était le nœud principal de l'activité littéraire dans la Thébaïde du Nord établi par un de ses fondateurs qui était ce S. Cyrille.

Le nouveau volume de la série contient un nombre d'études qui seront des jalons importants pour toute la recherche future sur le monachisme russe et sont de valeur pour la compréhension du monachisme chrétien en général.

Le volume s'ouvre par une paire d'articles (ceux de G. M. Prokhorov, p. 3–24, et de S. A. Semjačko, p. 25–71) sur deux traités ascétiques dont l'importance pour le monachisme russe est comparable à celle du *Pratique évagrien* pour le monachisme ancien, quoique les traités russes se soient concentrés plutôt sur la vie cénobiale. Il s'agit de *l'Instruction d'un vieillard à un disciple de Cyrille le thaumaturge du Lac Blanc* (Поучение старца ко ученику Кирилла Белозерска чудотворца), l'objet de l'étude de Prokhorov, qui s'est amplifié, dans la tradition postérieure, jusqu'une œuvre beaucoup plus détaillée *L'instruction d'un vieillard à un jeune moine* (Предание старческое новонаначальному иноку), l'objet central de l'étude de Semjačko qui est maintenant lancée dans une recherche magistrale des tous les *gerontika* russes (les recueils qui s'appellent, dans la tradition russe, *Старчество* — « (Les préceptes) des vieillards »). Les deux traités sont publiés dans les éditions critiques.

On ne saurait que regretter que ces traités ne fussent jamais traduits dans une langue européenne afin de les faire connaître également au large public et aux spécialistes dans l'histoire du monachisme et la littérature monastique. À ce qu'il semble, c'est une condition *sine qua non* pour comprendre les traditions spirituelles héritées par les auteurs russes, qui ne sont accessibles qu'à travers les sources byzantines de leur formation monastique. Cependant, la majorité absolue des publi-

cations des textes russes anciens ne présuppose point l'indication des sources citées ou sous-entendues. C'est évidemment une tâche qui dépasse les forces actuelles des slavistes.

L'édition de *L'instruction d'un vieillard* donne lieu à quelques corrections et notes que je fais ci-dessous, mais je voudrais, tout d'abord, traduire un spécimen d'instruction « utile à l'âme » qui nous fera saisir l'esprit du monachisme dans la version du S. Cyrille du Lac Blanc :

« Mais il (te) faut s'exercer dans les prières et dans la lecture des livres. Si tu ne sais pas lire, occupe-toi de l'ouvrage des mains [рукоделье = χειροουργία]. Car, pour le vrai moine, il n'y a pas de fête dans la vie terrestre [lit., sur la terre], pas même la Pâque. Il lui sera la Pâque lorsqu'il arrivera à la repose éternelle. » (Éd. Prokhorov, p. 20 = éd. Semjačko, p. 51, où le texte est à peu près le même).

L'article suivant de R. Romanchuk est publié dans la traduction russe de l'anglais [« Le scribe Alexandre-Oleška Palkin et les réformes cénobitiques et pédagogiques sous l'hégoumène Trifon (1430–1440s) : contribution à l'étude de l'éducation monastique orthodoxe », p. 72–93]. L'idée de traduire un article académique de l'anglais ne semble pas très fondée en elle-même (qui sont ces lecteurs savants qui ne savent pas lire anglais ?), d'autant plus que le traducteur, dans le cas présent, ne sait pas tenir compte de la terminologie monastique russe, d'où provient un monstrueux *новичок* au lieu du correct terme *послушник* à titre de la correspondance au terme « novice » partout dans l'article. L'imperfection évidente de l'article lui-même est le rattachement plutôt à l'*Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* qu'aux études spécialisées et aux sources sur les traditions monastiques byzantines. Néanmoins, l'article est fort intéressant dans sa partie magistrale. C'est une première étude directe du processus que j'oserais nommer, en utilisant le bon mot de Florovsky, une « pseudomorphose » de la tradition hésychaste russe. Le produit de l'activité de l'hégoumène Trifon était encore bien éloigné des typiques monastères russes postérieurs au Grand Schisme du XVII^e siècle — sans culture littéraire quelconque, sans l'accent sur la prière intellectuelle, avec des énormes labeurs physiques engloutissant tous le temps des uns et avec la vie paresseuse pour les autres... Il s'agissait, chez Trifon, d'un changement d'une culture littéraire à l'autre : au lieu de la littérature ascétique et concentrée sur la prière, on a introduit la lecture des œuvres consacrées aux matières théologiques générales ou même aux connaissances séculières. D'ailleurs, dans les temps nouveaux, nous rencontrons la même culture littéraire dans les milieux

des vieux croyants : le répertoire de la littérature byzantine, aisément est reconnaissable à travers les coloris locaux, mais toute la tradition de l'esprit « philocalique », c.à.d. de la prière dite intellectuelle et de l'acquisition des vertus « théoriques » étant amputée.

Un autre héros important du volume présent, c'est le moine Efrosine (Euphrosynos) du monastère du S. Cyrille du Lac Blanc, un célèbre scribe de la seconde moitié du XV^e siècle. A. G. Bobrov propose, dans un long article (p. 94–172), l'identification de ce moine avec le prince Ivan Dmitrievitch Šemjakin qui était le fils du prince Dmitrij Šemjaka de Novgorod (empoisonné en 1453 par le grand prince de Moscou Basile l'Aveugle) et l'arrière-petit-fils du prince Dmitrij de Don, le vainqueur sur le champ de Koulikovo. Nous ne sommes pas en position d'évaluer cette hypothèse entraînant, mais, en tout cas, elle présuppose une discussion détaillée sur plusieurs aspects historiques de la vie monastique de la Thébaïde du Nord dont les connexions avec la réalité extérieure ne sont pas toujours claires. Les deux articles suivants sont consacrés également à Efrosine. M. A. Šibaev a découvert quelques-uns de ses autographes nouveaux (p. 173–182) et I. V. Fedorova a décrit et publié un petit itinéraire dans la Terre Sainte et l'Athos préservé dans un autographe d'Efrosine (p. 183–192).

L'article de I. M. Gricevskaja « Le système de textes pour la lecture cellulaire dans les monastères du S. Cyrille du Lac Blanc et de la Trinité et S. Serge et les indices des livres vrais » (p. 193–210) contient une publication de la liste des livres « vrais » et « faux » composée par le disciple de Nil de Sora Gourij (Gurias) Toušine au tournant des XIV^e et XV^e siècles. D'après Gricevskaja, les hésychastes des générations du S. Nil et ses disciples directes essayaient d'établir un nouveau standard du système littéraire englobant la tradition déjà établie vers le XIV^e siècle et les traductions apportées par la soi-disante seconde influence sud-slave, tout en préservant, bien sûr, l'accent sur les instructions pour la vie spirituelle.

S. A. Semjačko a publié un article très détaillé sur le contenu des *Gerontika* russes, les recueils qu'on appelait *Starčestvo* (p. 211–296). Ces recueils sont, pour la plupart, composés des traductions du grec, quoique avec quelques insertions russes. C'était l'instrument principal de la formation ascétique qui englobait les règles extérieures de la vie monastique aussi bien que la pratique de la vie spirituelle. Dans ses publications récentes, mais surtout dans cette œuvre magistrale Semjačko la base nécessaire est fournie aux futurs étudiants des traditions monastiques russes dans leur contexte byzantin.

Les autres articles du volume sont les suivants (les titres sont traduits du russe par moi-même, les résumés en langues européennes ou, du moins, la table des matières étant absents) :

B. Bil'djug, G. M. Prokhorov, *Dioptra* de Philippe Monotropos, le *Logos* 2, d'après le manuscrit du monastère du S. Cyrille du Lac Blanc au premier quart du XV^e s. (p. 297–351) [continuation d'un long projet ; les *Logoi* 1 et 3 ont été publiés déjà en 1987],

Tch. Kh. Tchoj, Sur le nouvellement trouvé manuscrit de la « Sermon sur les princes [Boris et Gleb] » (XII^e s.) (p. 352–363, avec la publication du texte),

Ju. Mikhno, À propos de la place du manuscrit du monastère du S. Cyrille du Lac Blanc du « Livre contre les hérétiques » de Joseph de Volokolamsk dans l'histoire du texte de sa recension courte (p. 364–395, avec l'*editio princeps* de cette recension que l'auteur tient pour la plus ancienne),

T. B. Karbasova, Cyrille du Lac Blanc et Cyrille du Lac Nouveau (p. 396–410, sur les influences mutuelles entre les dossiers hagiographiques),

T. F. Volkova, La Vie de Cyrille du Lac Blanc dans le *Torzhestvennik* [homiliaire festal] d'Ust'-Cil'ma. (Contribution à l'étude de l'héritage manuscrit du scribe I. S. Mjandine de Petchora) (p. 411–421, Mjandine était un célèbre scribe vieux-croyant du XIX^e siècle, un représentatif de « la Rus' après la Rus' »),

E. A. Ryžova, Le motif de sujet « Choix de la place pour la fondation du monastère au moyen des signes miraculeux » dans l'hagiographie de la Russie du Nord (« Voix-Lumière ») (p. 422–440),

A. E. Kosickaja, Le manuscrit de la Vie de Savva [Sabbas] de Storozevsk fait pour le monastère du S. Cyrille du Lac Blanc et la tradition manuscrit du texte (p. 441–454),

B. N. Morozov, « L'arrivée au monastère de Cyrille » de Iona [Jonas] de Solovki (p. 455–461, avec l'*editio princeps* de l'instruction, écrite au premier quart du XVII^e siècle, à un moine qui va dans le monastère pour une visitation),

E. M. Jukhimenko, Les monastères du Nord de Russie et celui du S. Cyrille du Lac Blanc parmi les intérêts des scribes de Vyga [important centre littéraire des vieux croyants dans le XVIII^e s.] (p. 462–471),

O. A. Belobrova, Sur les recueils manuscrits provenant du monastère du S. Feraponte [Pherapontos] (p. 472–476, un plus petit mais pas moins célèbre monastère près de celui du S. Cyrille du Lac Blanc),

A. G. Sergeev, La bibliothèque du monastère du S. Kornilij [Cornelius] de Komel'sk : problèmes de reconstruction (p. 477–492).

Supplement
Quelques notes sur la publication
de *L'instruction d'un vieillard à un jeune moine*
[éd. Semjačko]

1. Données pour la préhistoire du Psautier avec les acolouthies (Следованная псалтирь).

Le psautier liturgique contient normalement l'horloge, mais, dans la tradition slavonne, ce livre est devenu beaucoup plus amplifié dès le XVI^e siècle. *L'instruction* utilise quelques articles qui entreront dans le Psautier. Un conseil, après les prières « pour ceux qui vont coucher », de placer au lieu du chevet une pierre « au nom du Christ » et de subir, s'il en est besoin, le froid, « ...car certains ne dorment point » est tiré d'une pièce dont la citation plus large se lit dans notre *Instruction*, p. 58 (les limites exactes de la citation ne me sont pas claires). La première prière du matin actuelle (Боже, очисти мя грешнаго...) se lit, dans *L'Instruction*, comme la prière qu'on doit dire après chaque heure de la psalmodie cellulaire (p. 65).

2. Problème d'indication des sources.

Malheureusement, en ce qui concerne l'indication des sources, la publication suit les pires standards russes, pour ne pas dire « soviétiques », car même les citations bibliques ne sont pas indiquées. Parfois cela nuit à l'éditeur lui-même qui ne sait pas où fermer les guillemets lorsque le texte introduit une citation explicitement. Ainsi, la citation du Luc 17,10 « lorsque vous aurez fait tout ce qui vous a été prescrit, dites : Nous sommes des serviteurs inutiles ; nous avons fait ce que nous devons faire » (tr. FBJ) est rompue par le guillemet posé incorrectement après la phrase « nous sommes des serviteurs inutiles » (p. 55). Les citations et les allusions bibliques introduites implicitement ne sont jamais reconnues ni même marquées, même dans les cas des citations verbales. Les exemples sont assez nombreux, mais je me limite à un seul, où la citation biblique pas reconnue, Ps 73/74,16 « à toi le jour, et à toi la nuit » (tr. FBJ), est citée, à son tour, à l'intérieur d'une citation plus ample et pas reconnue non plus de l'apophtegme Sy gr X, 152 = N 230 (98) = X, 139 de la traduction russe de la Collection systématique (p. 69 ; l'éd. critique du texte grec d'après la Collection systématique : J.-C. Guy, *Les apophtegmes des Pères. Collection systématique. Chapitres X–XVI* (Paris, 2003) (SC, 474) 114/115–116/117).

3. *Points mineurs.*

и манасию (р. 54, l. 4 d'en bas) : le nom propre, Manasse, n'est pas reconnu ; il fallait écrire du majuscule, Манасию ;

аще ли [variante : ли ни] то всеу трудишися (р. 61, l. 7 d'en bas) : la lecture correcte est celle de la variante, c'est qu'il fallait noter dans l'apparat.

Basile Lourié

LES PUBLICATIONS RÉCENTES DANS LA SÉRIE ΣΜΑΡΑΓΔΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΛΙΑΣ

Г. И. БЕНЕВИЧ, Д. С. БИРЮКОВ, А. М. ШУФРИН (сост.), *Максим Исповедник: полемика с оригенизмом и моноэнергизмом* (Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во СПбГУ, 2007) (*Византийская философия, 1; Σμάραγδος Φιλοκαλίας*) 564 с.

Gregory BENEVICH, Dmitri BIRYUKOV, Arkadi CHOUFRINE (comp.), *St. Maximus the Confessor: His Polemics against Origenism and Monoenergism* (St. Petersburg: UP, 2007) (*Byzantine Philosophy, 1; Σμάραγδος Φιλοκαλίας*) 564 p.

The monograph focuses on the two major contributions made by Maximus the Confessor to the theological tradition, namely, his refutations of Origenism and monoenergism, respectively. These aspects of Maximus' thought have been so far treated separately. This is the first attempt to look at them as being in the same context. The monograph has two parts which correspond, respectively, to the two stages first distinguished in Maximus's life by H. U. von Balthasar. The first part deals with the later stage: from the publication of the monoenergist Pact of Union in 633, which prompted Maximus's entering the arena of Church politics and public theological debate, up to his martyrdom and repose in 662. Its first section consists of an article by Grigory Benevich and Arkadi Choufrine, which, in dialogue with recent Maximus scholarship, traces, stage by stage, the development of Maximus's polemic against monoenergism and monotheletism.

The second section of the monograph's first part contains a Russian translation of seven texts documenting trials, interrogations, and the exile of Maximus and his disciples.

The second part of the monograph, beginning with a short introductory article by Arkadi Choufrine as its first section, focuses on the

work representative of the earlier part of Maximus's life, namely, on the seventh chapter of his so-called *Ambigua*. Besides being a polemical treatise, this work, like the others from the same period, is rich in philosophical content and constitutes the part of Maximus's heritage that exercised, despite its complexity, the deepest and most lasting influence on the Byzantine theological tradition as a whole.

The second section of the second part begins with a new Russian interpretative translation and a parallel Greek text of this treatise. The same section includes the commentaries on it by Arkadi Choufrine, analyzing the structure and logic of Maximus's argument, the background of the theoretical and dogmatic concepts he uses, and the peculiarities of his language and style. It is considerably more detailed than the other extant commentaries on the same treatise, namely, those by D. Stăniloae and Cl. Moreschini.

The last, third, section of the second part contains an annotated Russian translation of the still not outdated parts of the two studies on Maximus's refutation of Origenism by P. Sherwood.

Георгий Факрасис, *Диспут свт. Григория Паламы с Григорией философом. Философские и богословские аспекты паламитских споров*. Пер. с древнегреч. Д. А. ПОСПЕЛОВ; отв. ред. Д. С. БИРЮКОВ (Святая гора Афон: Пустынь Новая Фиваида Афонского Русского Пантелеимонова монастыря — Москва, 2009) (Σμάραγδος Φιλοκαλίας) 200 с.

George Phakrasis, *Disputation of St Gregory Palamas with Gregoras, a Philosopher. Philosophical and Theological Aspects of the Palamite Controversy*. Trans. D. A. POSPELOV; ed. D. S. BIRYUKOV (Mount Athos—Moscow, 2009) (Σμάραγδος Φιλοκαλίας) 200 p.

Die von einem byzantinischen hohen Beamte Georgios Fakrasis verfasste Nacherzählung des Disputes zwischen hl. Gregorios Palamas und Nikephoros Gregoras stellt ein wichtiges theologisches Schriftdenkmal der Epoche der palamitischen Diskussionen dar. Diese Redeschlacht hat fast alle Fragen der hesychastischen Theologie berührt. Im Disputsverlauf wurden die Probleme der Unterscheidung des Wesens und Energien Gottes sowie die Fragen der Gottesnamen- und Eigenschaftslehre besprochen. Die betreffende Übersetzung des Disputes wird von zwei Beiträgen vorausgeschickt. Im Vergleich zur Kritikausgaben M. Candals und P. Christou wurde die Zitatidentifizierung präzisiert. Die Übersetzung ist mit dem ausführlichen Kommentar

versorgt. Die Ausgabe enthält auch die der Teilnahmenparadigmen in der theologischen Tradition der Kirche und im Gregoras Denken gewidmete Untersuchung, die einige philosophische Grundlagen der Diskussion erklärt.

Г. И. БЕНЕВИЧ (сост., ред.), Д. С. БИРЮКОВ (ред.), Антология восточно-христианской богословской мысли. Ортодоксия и гетеродоксия. В 2 т. Т. 1 (Санкт-Петербург: РХГА, 2009) (Византийская философия, 4; Σμάραγδος Φιλοκαλίας) 669 с.

Grigory BENEVICH (comp., ed.), Dmitry BYRUKOV (ed.), *Anthology of the Eastern Christian Theological Thought (Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy)*. In 2 vols. Vol. 1 (St. Petersburg: RChAH, 2009) (Byzantine Philosophy, 4; Σμάραγδος Φιλοκαλίας) 669 p.

The two volumes of *The Anthology of the Eastern Christian Theological Thought (Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy)* include texts of more than fifty different Eastern Christian authors from the second to the fifteen centuries, as well as studies on these authors. For the first time in the history of Russian culture, this anthology unites under one cover the texts of those who are known as the Church Fathers and those who were called “heretics” by the mainstream of the Byzantine Empire Church. The aim of the anthology is to show a variety of trends in Eastern (mainly Greek) Christian thought and to represent, as much as possible in a comparatively small anthology, a productive, though often “politically incorrect” dialogue between “Orthodox” and “heterodox” Eastern Christian theologians.

Свт. Григорий Палама, архиепископ Фессалоникийский. Poleмика с Акиндином. Ред. и пер. А. Г. ДУНАЕВ (Святая гора Афон, 2009) (Σμάραγδος Φιλοκαλίας) 270 с.

St Gregory Palamas, Archbishop of Thessaloniki. *Polemics against Acyndinos*. Ed. and trans. A. G. DUNAEV (Mount Athos, 2009) (Σμάραγδος Φιλοκαλίας) 270 p.

Il presente libro include la traduzione in russo dei trattati polemici di st. Gregorio Palamas, precisamente due primi *Concertatorii libri contra Acindynum*, ed anche una piccola opera *Enarratio ingentis multitudinis scelerum Barlaami et Acindyni*, il cui contenuto in tanto corrisponde al primo *Concertatorius*. C'è la seconda traduzione in una lingua europea (dopo la traduzione in greco moderno fatta da P. Christou).

DEUX LIVRES SUR L'AUTOCÉPHALIE RUSSE

O. A. АБЕЛЕНЦЕВА, *Митрополит Иона и установление автокефалии Русской Церкви* (Москва—Санкт-Петербург: Альянс-Архео, 2009) 472 с.

O. A. АБЕЛЕНЦЕВА, *Métropolitaine Iona [Jonas] et l'établissement de l'autocéphalie de l'Église russe* (Moscou—St. Pétersbourg : Al'jans-Arkheo, 2009) 472 p. ISBN 978-5-98874-031-5.

В. М. ЛУРЬЕ, *Русское православие между Киевом и Москвой. Очерк истории русской православной традиции между XV и XX веками* (Москва: Три Квадрата, 2009) 296 с.

V. LOURIÉ, *L'orthodoxie russe entre Kiev et Moscou. L'essai d'histoire de la tradition orthodoxe russe entre les XV^e et XX^e siècles* (Moscou : Tri Kvadrata, 2009) 296 p. ISBN 978-9-94607-112-7.

Les deux livres ont pour objet central l'état de l'Église russe à l'époque de l'établissement de l'autocéphalie au XV^e siècle. La monographie d'Abelenceva consiste en deux parties dont la deuxième est la réédition très commode des actes et des épîtres du métropolite Iona (Jonas) de Moscou, le premier métropolite russe élu en 1448 sans l'approbation de Constantinople. La première partie du livre d'Abelenceva est l'étude assez détaillée et objective. L'auteur ne va pas dans le sillage de l'historiographie ecclésiastique russe prérévolutionnaire (de même que de ses épigones soviétiques) faisant du métropolite Iona le créateur de l'autocéphalie russe. Au contraire, sa conclusion est très sobre : « Il résulte des sources que les droits du patriarche de Constantinople de nommer le métropolite [de Russie] n'ont pas été contestés même après le décès du métropolite Iona [1461], du moins, du vivant du grand prince Basile II [mort en 1462] » (p. 292).

Le livre de Lourié n'est pas aussi détaillé en ce qui concerne l'époque de Iona, mais sa perspective est beaucoup plus large. Après avoir fait indépendamment la même conclusion sur Iona et le prince Basile II, Lourié fait une recherche des attitudes diverses vis-à-vis de l'autocéphalie de Moscou durant le schisme entre l'Église moscovite et l'Église de Constantinople, y compris la partie occidentale de l'ancienne métropole de Kiev (1467–1589). Les deux autres thèmes majeurs de Lourié sont les procès liés (directement ou non) avec le Grand Schisme de l'Église russe au XVII^e siècle (il y a un nombre de documents dont on ne tient pas compte dans les études précédentes) et le procès de la

mainmise de l'Église de Moscou sur la métropole de Kiev du patriarcat Constantinopolitain. Les documents des pourparlers entre Moscou et Constantinople en 1686 ne sont préservés que dans la version slavonne assez malaisée, peu compréhensible à ceux qui ne savent pas le grec. C'est pourquoi ces documents, quoique édités en 1872, n'ont guère été lus par les historiens (bien sûr, les historiens, souvent trop « politisés », avaient encore d'autres raisons de ne pas citer ces documents). D'après ces documents, Constantinople n'a jamais concédé sa juridiction sur Kiev au patriarcat de Moscou. Le patriarche de Moscou n'a reçu que le droit du vicaire du patriarche de Constantinople dans la métropole de Kiev. Le nom du patriarche de Moscou devait être acclamé liturgiquement, dans la métropole de Kiev, en second lieu après le nom du patriarche de Constantinople. La soumission totale de la métropole de Kiev au patriarcat de Moscou n'était qu'un acte de violence tout pur.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE DU R. P. MICHEL VAN ESBROECK, S.J.

*Addenda*¹

2001

La pomme de Théodose II et sa Réplique Arménienne, dans : C. SODE, S. TAKÁCS (éds.), *Novum Millennium. Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck* (Ashgate, 2001) 109–111.

2004

Un apocryphe sur les apôtres Pierre, Jean et Paul dans le ms. Mingana 40, pièce 30, dans : Rifaat EBIED, Herman G. B. TEULE (éds.), *Studies in the Christian Arabic Heritage, offered in Honour of Father Samir Khalil Samir S. I., at the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday* (Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2004) (Eastern Christian Studies, 5), pp. 243–261.

2005

La litteratura patristica in Armenia e in Georgia, dans : P. SINISCALCO (ed.), *Le chiese orientali* (Roma: Città Nuova, 2005) (Storia e letteratura), pp. 300–327.

(1) Cf. *Scr.* 2 (2006) xxxi–lxvi; *Scr.* 4 (2008) 351–370.

Discussion

Т. Л. Вилкул
Киев

ПО ПОВОДУ РЕЦЕНЗИИ П. В. ЛУКИНА «ДЕКОНСТРУКЦИЯ ДЕКОНСТРУКЦИИ»

...et dum alienos errores emendore
nituntur, ostendunt suos

Hieronimus

В предыдущем номере *Scrinium* появилась рецензия П. В. Лукина на мою книгу «Людые и князь в конструкциях летописцев XI–XIII вв.»¹ Рецензия написана с позиции исследователя, подчеркивающего свою «традиционность», и содержит множество критических замечаний как частного, так и общего плана. Прежде всего, хотелось бы отметить, что я чрезвычайно признательна П. В. Лукину за указание на ошибки, и приношу читателям свои извинения за допущенные неточности. К сожалению, в монографии действительно оказался ряд недочетов, связанных как с некоторыми огрехами при работе с огромным массивом источников и цитируемых текстов, так и, увы, с естественной ограниченностью знаний автора. К примеру, в Ипатьевском списке под 1151 г. читается «рекуче», а не «рекоша» (последнее в Хлебниковском), имеется погрешность в написании фамилии Zernack, в одной из записей Киевского свода было пропущено титло, что привело к смещению смысла известия. Указания на подобные недочеты работы являются очень полезными и с искренней благодарностью принимаются. Вместе с тем, следует отметить, что все они касаются «технической» стороны дела и никак не влияют на результаты исследования.

Примечательно, что П. В. Лукин на 30 страницах своей объемистой рецензии не изложил содержания рецензируемой им книги и не охарактеризовал ее структуру. Из этой рецензии никакого общего впечатления о работе составить невозможно, и в чем состоит «нарративизм» автора и в чем «традиционность» рецензента, совершенно неясно. В целом, читатель из этого текста узнает только то, что автор рецензируемой монографии отличается высокомерным отношением ко всем предшествующим научным достижениям в причудливом соединении с просто редкой некомпетентностью. К сожалению, ре-

(1) П. В. Лукин, Деконструкция деконструкции. О книге Т. Л. Вилкул по истории древнерусского веча, *Scr* 4 (2008) 403–434.

цензент не внес ясность в некоторые базовые вопросы и не уточнил, в чем суть монографии. Попытаемся восполнить этот пробел.

Прежде всего, несколько слов о терминологии. П. В. Лукин назвал свою рецензию «Деконструкция деконструкции» и неоднократно обыграл это слово, а также слово «нарратив» и его производные (не всегда, впрочем, верно и к месту употребляя соответствующие понятия). Однако, «деконструкция» в моей книге не используется ни разу. В монографии действительно исследуются нарративные модели древнерусских летописей, применительно к тем случаям, когда в источниках описываются взаимоотношения народа и правителя. Но отождествлять исследование нарратива и деконструкцию неверно, как неверно и то, что подобные исследования непременно должны приводить к принятию непознаваемости реальности и погружению исключительно в реальность текста.² Сам термин «деконструкция» не является необходимым и обязательным в подобных работах. Он, конечно, широко употреблялся одно время, в особенности французскими интеллектуалами. Соответственно, впоследствии стал модным, а затем даже несколько заезженным, появляясь и в высказываниях далеко не интеллектуальных персонажей. Понятие «нарратив» также не относится к ругательным. Оно обозначает 'повествование', 'рассказ' (или, в более специальном значении, 'определенный вид повествования'). Тем не менее, «нарратив» предпочтительнее в научной литературе, поскольку «повествование» и «рассказ» — слова многозначные. Точно так же, не являются ругательными понятия «конструирование» и «нарративное конструирование». В любом случае, в книге речь идет не о деконструкции, а об определении формантов летописных известий и нарративных моделей в целом.

Итак, о чем рецензируемая П. В. Лукиным книга? (коль уж рецензент никак не обозначил содержание, по-видимому, необходимо исправить это упущение). Книга посвящена взаимоотношениям народа и правителя в Древней Руси, в частности, рассматривается такой феномен, как древнерусское вече. Автор сосредоточился на определении принципов описания взаимоотношений «людей» и князя и рассматривает их через призму нарративных конструкций и представлений древнерусских летописцев. Делаются также попыт-

(2) См. замечания П. В. Лукина на с. 404, завершающиеся словами: «не будем придираться к теоретической путанице». Познание действительности, в том числе в различных науках, является гораздо более сложным феноменом, чем предполагалось. См., напр.: Т. Кун, *Структура научных революций* (Москва, 1977) (этого автора не причисляют к постструктуралистам, поскольку он принадлежит к предыдущему поколению).

ки реконструкции реалий: определения состава и компетенции веча. Монография состоит из вступления и 4-х глав, прилагается указатель имен и географических названий. В первой главе анализируются особенности «социальной» терминологии древнерусских летописей XI–XIII вв. Исследуется слово «вече» и сфера его значений, соотношение прямых и непрямых упоминаний о вече,³ специфика использования таких летописных обозначений, как «людие», «народъ», «весь градъ», «дружина», «сборъ», «бояре», «от мала и до велика», «сборъ». Словоупотребление ранних древнерусских летописей сравнивается со словоупотреблением в отдельных книгах Священного Писания, хронографических текстах, житийной литературе. Делаются подсчеты частоты употребления, уточняется значение слов и формульный ряд. Вторая глава — «Нарративное конструирование в параллельных сюжетах летописных сводов». Исследуются более двух десятков летописных сообщений, для каждого из которых мы имеем по две или более версий, где изложение событий различается, иногда до зеркальной противоположности. Показывается, что различия в изложении, наблюдаемые в параллельных летописных текстах, не бессистемны, в сюжетах прослеживаются устойчивые комплексы формантов (основных элементов повествования). Описываются три нарративные модели; отмечено, что в двух из них выступления «людей» фиксируются летописцами только в том случае, если необходимо оправдание и одобрение поступков князя; напр., на людей возлагается ответственность за жестокость, проявленную по отношению к политическим оппонентам. В третьей главе, «Состав и функции веча», сделана попытка очертить социальный состав и компетенцию веча, выясняются возможности решения проблемы на имеющемся материале и ограничения, накладываемые на исследовательские решения нарративными источниками. В древнерусских текстах прослеживается принцип репрезентативности, позволяющий в большинстве случаев замещение больших групп малыми и наоборот. Вследствие чего, князь или несколько самых знатных людей могли представлять «всю землю»; в тех же случаях, когда перед летописцем стояла задача скрыть недостойные поступки князя, «людие» «замещали» верхушку. К сожалению, социальный состав, количество участников, частота собраний не поддаются точному определению. Тем не менее, имеется и положительный результат — можно предполагать, что вече и дружина не были жестко ограниченными одна от другой общнос-

(3) Т. е. таких известий, где имеется слово «вѣче» и таких, где оно отсутствует, и вечевое выступление определяется по тем или иным косвенным признакам.

тями. По-видимому, в ситуации политической стабильности в их состав входили одни и те же люди, составлявшие верхушку общества. Раскол местного социума происходил тогда, когда шла борьба между двумя лидерами (князьями). В последней главе систематизируются данные о представлениях летописцев о взаимоотношениях правителя и народа. В том числе, сделана попытка объяснить тот факт, что в описаниях деятельности «людей» в центре внимания книжников неизменно стоит князь; рассматриваются представления о законности и незаконности вечевых собраний, проистекающей, как выясняется, из оценки «верности» и «неверности» горожан, единства и разделения участников собраний, а также тревожности всех сообщений подобной тематики.

Собственно говоря, многие положения и исследуемые вопросы являются вполне традиционными. В частности, первая глава, посвященная социальной терминологии (ср. напр., работы А. С. Львова, А. А. Горского, С. В. Завадской и многих других). Разве что материал взят в соответствии с темой монографии — рассматриваются обозначения, которые использовались в описаниях взаимоотношений народа и правителя, и акцентируется неустойчивость терминологии. Далее, о том, что повествование летописей не столько отражает действительность, сколько конструировано — ныне мнение почти общепринятое и отнюдь не «экстремистское». Много внимания учеными уделяется поиску книжных образцов летописных текстов, в том числе — библейских.⁴ Новизна исследования состоит в том, что построенными согласно определенным нарративным моделям признаются сугубо светские рассказы летописей. Полагаю, что обнаруженные серии параллельных известий, когда в одной из летописей то или иное деяние приписывается князю, а в другой — горожанам, необходимо объяснять, и методика сравнения летописных текстов и выявления нарративных моделей предоставляет необходимые для этого инструменты. Новые подходы использовались также при рассмотрении представлений летописцев о взаимоотношениях народа и правителя (для разработки этой проблемы до обнаружения параллельных версий было недостаточно материала).

(4) Следует отметить, это весьма традиционное направление, в том числе, в российской науке, поиск ведется не только в летописях, но и в западноевропейских хрониках. См., напр.: Д. Егоров, Новый источник по истории прибалтийского славянства, в: *Сборник статей, посвященных В. О. Ключевскому его учениками, друзьями, почитателями ко дню 30-летия его профессорской деятельности в Московском университете (5 декабря 1880 – 5 декабря 1909)* (Москва, 1909) 332–346.

Анализу основных положений и аргументов рецензент предпочитает сугубый анализ деталей, и изучает их настолько скрупулезно, что неоднократно разбирает подробно окончание какого-нибудь примечания, каковых в книге более 1000. При всем уважении к проделанной им огромной работе нельзя не указать не вполне верную ее направленность. Среди орудий, привычных для «рецензионной кухни» П. В. Лукина, попадаются своеобразные. К примеру, часто дискуссионные темы и вопросы он излагает так, будто речь идет о твердо установленных вещах. В таких случаях у читателя неизбежно создается впечатление, что автор по своему недомыслию или невежеству нарушил общепринятые конвенции (а не предпочел то или иное решение в научной дискуссии). Порой рецензент, видимо, сам того не замечая, подменяет написанное в книге совершенно чуждыми утверждениями, а в иных случаях неверно понимает написанное. Встречается и такое, что, предлагая «корректное» прочтение взамен, по его мнению, «некорректного», рецензент обнаруживает слабое знакомство с текстами, которые необходимо было проанализировать.

Форма рецензии П. В. Лукина предполагает соответствующую структуру ответа — приходится следовать его «деконструкциям». Хотелось бы остановиться на высказываниях, не соответствующих действительному положению вещей. Разумеется, все их охватить невозможно, ибо рецензент своеобразные приемы использует достаточно часто, но я попытаюсь к каждому параграфу предложить несколько комментариев. При необходимости уточнений, приводятся отрывки из моей книги. Так как далее речь часто будет идти о летописях, привожу принятые сокращения: Ипат. (у рецензента Ип.) — Ипатьевская летопись, Лавр. — Лаврентьевская, НПЛ — Новгородская первая летопись, МЛС — Московский летописный свод конца XV в.

По поводу «деконструкции историографии».

По словам рецензента, в монографии из-за «высокомерного отношения автора к предшествующей историографии» дан только краткий обзор литературы. Правда, в книге на с.8 в книге прямо указано, что детальная разработка историографических проблем при том интересе, который историки традиционно проявляли к вопросу о взаимоотношениях правителя и народа, потребовала бы отдельной монографии.⁵ Но П. В. Лукин, очевидно, полагает объяснение автора несущес-

(5) См.: «Если заняться исключительно тем, что уже написано историками о вече, этим материалом можно было бы исчерпать весь объем книги. Ведь вече всегда выступало в качестве элемента, необходимого для реконструкции целостных систем — древнерусского общества, государс-

твенным и спешит предложить читателю собственное. Твердо решив продемонстрировать «плохое знание украинской исследовательницей историографии», П. В. Лукин иллюстрирует свой тезис несколькими примерами. Среди них, напр., такой: при анализе летописных сообщений «о вечевых расправах» не учитывалась зарубежная историография относительно аналогичных явлений в Центральной и Восточной Европе (с. 405), и необходимо было бы привлечь хотя бы статью в Анджее В. Поппэ в: *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich*, t. IV, 251–252.

Замечание рецензента относится не к обзору историографии (в книге с. 8–16), а к разделу «Вечевой суд» (гл. 3, с. 301–306). Здесь анализируются сообщения о наказаниях горожанами князей и «своей братьи»-горожан. «Расправы людей» известны, в самом деле, в Центральной и Восточной Европе, но не только. Для анализа огромного сравнительно-исторического материала потребовалась бы специальная монография, и, по всей видимости, не одна. К тому же, в этой тематике довольно много спорных вопросов, и вряд ли имеет смысл пытаться решить одно неизвестное через другое. Соответственно, в книге я сознательно ограничивалась древнерусскими источниками (что ней и оговорено). Рецензент ссылается на статью в словаре. Словарные статьи, действительно, привлекались только в тех случаях, когда необходимо было уточнить значение слов, привести подсчеты частоты употребления, и т.п. Как правило, считается, что привлечение или непривлечение статей из словарей и энциклопедий не может свидетельствовать о знакомстве или незнании с историографией вопроса. Но достаточно примечательно то обстоятельство, что П. В. Лукин смешивает справочные статьи, имеющие свою специфику, и научную литературу.

Далее, комментируя выражение «немецкая школа права» рецензент восклицает: «трудно поверить, но автор, по-видимому, не знает о немецкой «общинной» теории Г. Л. Маурера и его последователей, оказавшей огромное влияние на русскую историографию» (с. 405). Так сложилось, что русская историческая наука и смежные дисциплины во многом зависели от теорий, разработанных немецкими учеными. Однако уже в конце XIX в. это наследие было хотя бы отчасти освоено, и М. Ф. Владимирский-Буданов, напр., писал о «немецкой»

тва, общины, права. Даже решение многих, казалось бы, частных вопросов зачастую зависело от общих взглядов ученых на развитие общества. Соответственно, тема веча разрабатывалась или хотя бы упоминалась почти во всех работах, посвященных Древней Руси, и, как следствие, ее почти невозможно представить в полном объеме. Здесь придется ограничиться сравнительно кратким обзором».

и «славянской школе».⁶ Кроме того, корректнее было бы говорить о Маурере как об основателе «теории марки» (для историка такие детали обычно важны).

П. В. Лукин пишет, что автор книги совершенно зря пытается опровергнуть тезис о владими́ро-суздальском «самовластии», ведь он давно опровергнут А. Н. Насоновым и др. (с. 407).⁷ Уважаемый коллега, к сожалению, недопонял, что на указанной им странице опровержений нет. В книге анализируются два рассказа об изгнании епископа Леона из Владимиро-Суздальской земли (Лавр. под 1164 г. и Ипат. под 1162 г.), и вначале излагается мнение исследователей по поводу каждой из версий этого летописного сообщения. На с. 141 сделаны две ссылки — пишется об ученых, опирающихся на Лавр. и об исследователях, опирающихся на Ипат. В обоих случаях перед указанием литературы сделана оговорка: «см., например...»⁸ (ее рецензент «не приметил»). Впрочем, вся 2-я глава посвящена анализу летописных версий в параллельных известиях, и чтобы это недопонять и не заметить, необходимо приложить значительные усилия. Поэтому не исключено, что П. В. Лукин не недопонимает, а сознательно прибегает к искажению содержания.

Ниже, еще раз обратившись к исследованиям А. Н. Насонова, рецензент упрекает меня в том, что исследование, противоречащее наблюдениям ученого о соотношении Ипат. и Лавр. за XII в., проведено в «труднодоступном издании», и, видимо, скорбя о «труднодоступности», ссылку на упомянутую статью не дает (с. 407). При этом, речь идет о периодическом издании: *Palaeoslavica* (Cambridge, Massachusetts) — на деле вполне доступном в крупных научных цен-

(6) В. Ф. Владимирский-Буданов, *Обзор истории русского права* (Киев—Санкт-Петербург, 1900) 7–8 и др. Название «славянской» получила теория, поддержанная славянофилами (ее также называли «школой общинного быта», противопоставляя «школе родового быта»).

(7) «Так, Т. А. Вилкул успешно борется с ветряными мельницами, опровергая тезис ... (с. 141), забывая сообщить, что он давно был уже опровергнут А. Н. Насоновым, мнение которого впоследствии было неоднократно повторено (Ю. А. Лимоновым, И. Я. Фрояновым и др.)».

(8) Текст книги, касающийся версии Ипат., с. 141: «В частности, исследователи, использовавшие Ипат, основывали на этой версии вывод о “самовластии” Андрея и о начале нового периода истории в “молодом” княжестве»¹⁰⁶

Прим. 106: «См. например: Рыбаков Б. А. Киевская Русь. С. 550; Грушевський М. С. Історія України-Руси. Т. 2. С. 192. О том, что историки следуют схеме, предложенной летописцем, см. в: Приселков М. Д. История русского летописания (1940). С. 72–73».

трах России⁹. За сим следует еще одна претензия: якобы автор «ни разу не приводит классических показателей вставок, типа текстологических швов...», а в сноске на с. 301 «грубо примитивизирует» мнение А. Н. Насонова.¹⁰ П. В. Лукин по какой-то причине не заметил доказательств в книге (на той же с. 141 (!), на с. 149, 165, 201, 204, 210, 212 и др.),¹¹ а также недопонял, что на с. 201 (не 301, в рецензии описка) прим.310 речь идет отнюдь не об общей оценке исследований А. Н. Насонова. Здесь приводится мнение ученого относительно одного из фрагментов летописной статьи 1151 г. — а именно, описания пути и встречи полков Изяслава Мстиславича и Юрия Долгорукого «у Перепетовых».¹² Кроме того, именно в этом месте приведены текстологические доказательства наличия в Ипат. вставки. В итоге,

(9) В Москве *Palaeoslavica* поступает в РГБ, ГИМ, ИНИОН, ИВИ, ИРЯ, Ин-т славяноведения РАН, РГГУ; в Санкт-Петербурге в РНБ, БАН, СПбГУ, редакцию журнала *Byzantinorossica*. Интересно, что московский коллега помещает ремарку о «труднодоступности» и не указывает выходные данные статьи именно в параграфе «деконструкция историографии».

(10) «... вот как она передает его основную мысль: “А. Н. Насонов сравнивал тексты, но он считал Лавр. сокращением Ипат. (с. 301, сноски)... Но вот к какому выводу на самом деле пришел этот историк: «Несомненно также, что этот киевский летописный источник, хотя был очень близок к Ипатьевской летописи, однако несколько отличался от текста последней, представляя более раннюю редакцию и не имел вставок из черниговского источника”. Таким образом, точка зрения А. Н. Насонова грубо примитивизируется, и на этом фоне расцветают достижения автора».

(11) Разумеется, в моей статье: Т. Вилкул, О происхождении общего текста Ипатьевской и Лаврентьевской летописи за XII в. (предварительные заметки), *Palaeoslavica* 13.1 (2005) 21–80, фрагменты летописей анализируются более детально; приводится свыше 30 примеров текстуальной зависимости Ипат. от общего протографа, в целом вернее отраженного в Лавр. В книге, посвященной иному предмету, разбирать тексты столь подробно было бы непозволительной роскошью, однако некоторые я постаралась рассмотреть. Часть из приведенных в книге примеров затрагивается ниже.

(12) Ср. текст книги, с. 201: «Одна из вставок разрывает фразу, благодаря разрыву возникают противоречия и грамматические несогласования. Действующие лица этой интерполяции — Вячеслав, Изяслав и Ростислав, в общем же с Лавр тексте присутствует один Изяслав. При переходе от одного блока текста к другому меняются формы множественного и единственного числа и создается неправильная грамматическая конструкция³⁰⁹. Эта и иные неувязки позволяют рассматривать тексты Лавр и Ипат не только как параллельные источники, но как первоначальную и вторичную версию³¹⁰.

строгие критические утверждения П. В. Лукина прямо противоречат содержанию рецензируемой им монографии.

Наконец, рецензент упрекает автора книги в незнакомстве с примером из монографии Б. Н. Флори относительно полоцкого пира 1158 г.: пир «называется точно так же («братчиной»), как и крестьянские общинные пиры, зафиксированные в делопроизводственной документации XVII в.» (с. 405–406). П. В. Лукину выгоднее было бы поместить это замечание в иной параграф — «Деконструкция лингвистики». Дело в том, что в своей оценке важности этого наблюдения рецензент разошелся во мнениях не только с автором рецензируемой им книги, но и с большинством лингвистов. Общеизвестно, что лексемы могут функционировать долгое время, изменяя при этом свое значение, и наличие одного и того же слова в ранних и поздних текстах вовсе не свидетельствует о тождественности явлений. Например, слово «посадникъ» применительно к новгородским реалиям XI в., когда так могли называть сына киевского князя, и применительно к реалиям даже не XIV–XV вв., а 2-й пол. XII–XIII вв. — обозначает разные понятия. Посадничество в XI в. и в XIII в. имеет разные функции. То же касается обозначения «тысяцкий» в Киеве в XI–XII вв. и в Новгороде в XIII в., и др.

Прим. 309: «Изяслав же слышав то (так Л, 'ту вѣсть' РА и ЛПС), поиде по нем, блюда того, дабы ся не снялъ с Володимерком // и постиже и (его — Т. В.) у Перепетовыхъ"; 333Л. Ср. распространение Ипат., курсивом выделен общий с Лавр текст: "Изяславъ же слышавъ ту вѣсть, поиде по Дюрги, блюда того, абы ся не снялъ с Володимеромъ... Вячьславъ же и Изяславъ и Ростиславъ поклонившеся въ вторникъ святѣи Богородици... Изяслав же съхавъся с Вячеславомъ и съ ...Ростиславомъ, и тако угадавше...а сами вѣсташа к Василеву... поидоша... и сташа полкы своими на ночь, и постиже и (его, но в этом контексте непонятно, кого, поскольку первая половина фразы написана за пол-листа до ее продолжения — Т. В.) у Перепетовыхъ"; 434И. Подробнее: Вилкул Т. Л. О происхождении общего текста, 48–49».

Прим. 310: «Дополнительный фрагмент Ипат как вторичная редакция до сих пор не рассматривался. А. Н. Насонов сравнивал тексты, но он считал Лавр сокращением Ипат: Насонов А. Н. История русского летописания. С. 94–95. Как правило, для анализа сюжета избирают более пространную версию Ипат, см. например: Грушевський М. С. Історія України-Руси. Т. 2. С. 29. Следует добавить, текст протографа лучше сохранился в Лавр, но здесь также имеются следы редактирования. В последней фразе слова "бѣ бо ему вѣсть" касаются Юрия, но его имя не названо, а вслед за этим описываются подвиги Андрея...»

По поводу «деконструкции текстологии».

Текстология дисциплина достаточно сложная, предполагает работу с текстами и, зачастую, высокий уровень гипотетичности построений. Уважаемый коллега начинает параграф с безапелляционного заявления:

«Текстологические вопросы тоже решаются вполне “нетрадиционно”. Рассказ о событиях 1015 г. в Новгороде НПЛ м.л., по Т. Л. Вилкул, является “примером текстуальной зависимости от ПВЛ” (с. 29), хотя в первом есть очевидные лучшие чтения, а во втором — столь же очевидная вставка» (с. 409; здесь и далее подчеркнуто мною. — Т. В.).

На этом придется остановиться подробнее. П. В. Лукин предполагает решенной крайне сложную и запутанную проблему соотношения текстов ПВЛ и НПЛ младшей редакции, связанную с еще более запутанной проблемой так называемого Начального свода. В своей недавней статье он попытался опровергнуть часть моих аргументов.¹³ На самом деле, однако, ни опровержения, ни доказательства в его работе отнюдь не «очевидны».¹⁴ В частности, здесь исследователь апел-

(13) Т. Вилкул, Новгородская первая летопись и Начальный свод, *Palaeoslavica* 11 (2003) 5–35; П. В. Лукин, События 1015 г. в Новгороде: К оценке достоверности летописных сообщений, *Отечественная история* (2007) № 4, 3–20.

(14) Покажу это на одном примере. Как известно, число славянских воинов Ярослава по ПВЛ — 40000, а по НПЛ м.л. — 4000, в 10 раз меньше. Я писала о том, что писцы могли как «увеличивать» численность войска, так и «уменьшать» его, и что вполне возможно, исходным является вариант ПВЛ. Примеры приводились из летописных сводов. П. В. Лукин заявил о том, что необратимых доказательств об уменьшении чисел нет (не смотря на то, что мною сравнивались цифры в ПВЛ и поздних летописях — напр., Львовской, и, в том числе, уменьшение чисел в библейских цитатах, число жен Соломона 70 — вместо 700!). Исследователь утверждает также, что в Новгороде вместе с его округой вряд ли набралось бы 40000 воинов, а значит, исходя из таких, «рациональных» соображений, необходимо предполагать, что первоначальный вариант в НПЛ (Лукин, События..., 13). Прежде всего, писцы действительно могли уменьшать числа. Даже не обращаясь вновь к поздним сводам. Ср. пример из Александрии Хронографической, для которой мы имеем контрольный текст греческих списков, что исключает какие-либо сомнения. Александрия кн. 1, гл. 41, Иудейский хронограф (Архивский и Виленский списки): «плѣнникъ же баше моужи. ѡд.; Троицкий: роуками же иманыхъ моужь ѡд. тысячи» (порча в Троицком списке, список НСРК №15 ѡд.); Еллинский лето-

лирует к такому показателю, как вставка и, шире, непротиворечивость изложения, и к «лучшим» чтением. Апелляция весьма сомнительная. Книжники, работавшие в период позднего средневековья и имевшие большой опыт работы с компиляциями, могли не только «наращивать», но и устранять противоречия, делая изложение более внятным и «рациональным».¹⁵ К тому же, определение вста-

писец 1-й редакции: «и план'никъ же баше моужии . \bar{y} .» (во 2-й редакции контаминация, но число сохранено: «а плѣнникъ же бяше мужии, руками изыманых, 400»; см. *Летописецъ Еллинский и Римский*, т. 1 (Москва, 1999) 114); греч. ред. β и список С $\xi\lambda\alpha\phi\upsilon\rho\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta\theta\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega\acute{\nu}\ \chi\iota\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$, 2 списка ред. γ , RD ... $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \chi\iota\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega\acute{\nu}\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon$. Библиографические справки см. в: Т. Вилкул, Александрия Хронографическая в Троицком хронографе, *Palaeoslavica* 16.1 (2008) 103–117. Далее, известно, что «рациональные» соображения в древних описаниях битв, особенно связанных с агиографической тематикой (а сюжеты ПВЛ и НПЛ м. входят в борисо-глебский цикл, о чем необходимо помнить) недействительны. О символике чисел в древнерусской письменности уже накопилась значительная литература, П. В. Лукин мог бы обратиться, напр., к книге В. М. Кириллина, посвященной этой теме, и лекциям И. Н. Данилевского. См.: В. М. Кириллин, *Символика чисел в литературе Древней Руси* (Санкт-Петербург, 2000); И. Н. Данилевский, *Русские земли глазами современников и потомков. IX–XII вв.* (Москва, 2000) 226–228. В данном случае, может быть, моделью для составителя послужило описание войска Соломона: «Баше оу соломона . \bar{x} .м. пѣшець . десатъ инь съ вроужьемъ . \bar{x} .ви. коньникъ» (*Троицкий хронограф*, л. 120а, цитируется 3 Цар. 4.26; вроужие — здесь означает 'колесница'). Ср. также Песнь Деборы, *Троицкий хронограф*, л. 25b, Ис. Нав. 5.8 «аще явиться праца . въ . \bar{m} . тысяцахъ». Может быть, однако, права Н. Н. Невзорова, предположившая, что исходным является чтение Паримейника, где общее число воинов Ярослава — 36 тысяч. Исследовательница обратила внимание на то, что число 36 имело символическое значение в древнееврейском, в толкованиях оно обозначало 'праведник'. Н. Н. Невзорова, «Старая» борисоглебская проблема в «новом» свете Паримийных чтений, в: *Древнерусское духовное наследие в Сибири: научное изучение памятников традиционной русской книжности на востоке России*, т. 2 (Новосибирск, 2008) 113–124. Следует, видимо, обратить внимание на то, что и в паримейных чтениях, и в ПВЛ называются десятки тысяч, а не тысячи. В любом случае, обращение П. В. Лукина в таком сюжете к соображениям здравого смысла свидетельствует не только о крайне упрощенных, но о принципиально неверных представлениях.

(15) См., напр.: Е. Г. Водолазкин, О Толковой Палее, Златой Матице и «естественнонаучных» компиляциях, *ГОДРЛ* 51 (1999) 89; он же, *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси* (Санкт-Петербург, 2008) 267 и др. Еще один прием П. В. Лукина, вызывающий сомнения: при определении ранних и поздних чтений он оперирует таким понятием, как «по-

вок отличается чрезвычайно большой степенью гипотетичности, в этом ошибались даже филологи высочайшего класса. То же касается «лучших», «архаичных» и «трудных» чтений.¹⁶ Следует принять во внимание то, что в НПЛ, по-видимому, использованы палейные тексты¹⁷ и, в целом, книжникам XIV–XV вв. были доступны весьма архаичные по языку памятники, часто служившие образцом.¹⁸ Вдум-

ность» сообщения летописи и распространение «понятных» чтений в поздних летописных сводах (Лукин, События..., 11). Что текстологически неоправданно, ибо первоначальные чтения часто содержат, наоборот, «непонятные» и «трудные» варианты. Кстати, когда у него возникает потребность, он со столь же прямолинейной настойчивостью использует аргумент *lectio difficilior* (там же, 15).

(16) Ср., напр., о правиле *lectio difficilior*: Э. Тов, *Текстология Ветхого Завета* (Москва, 2001) 281, 288–289.

(17) Т. Л. Вилкул, О начальных датировках «Начального свода». Доклад (22.10) на международной конференции «Повесть временных лет и начальное летописание, посвященной 100-летию выхода книги А. А. Шахматова «Разыскания о древнейших русских летописных сводах», проходившей в Москве, 22–25 октября 2008 г. Несмотря на то, что палеи создавались в XIII–XV вв., в их составе видим архаические древнеславянские переводы. Об одном из сюжетов Толковой палеи и зависимости ее от ПВЛ см.: Т. Л. Вилкул, Толковая Палея и Повесть временных лет. Сюжет о «разделении язык», *Ruthenica VI* (2007) 37–85 (Интернет-версия: <http://www.history.org.ua/index.php?urlcrnt=ruthenica/index.php&numnam=6>). Создание Полной хронографической палеи Е. Г. Водолазкин относит к рубежу XIV–XV вв. Е. Г. Водолазкин, Новое о палеях (некоторые итоги и перспективы изучения палейных текстов), *Русская литература* (2007) № 1, 3–23.

(18) В частности, П. В. Лукин уповает на первоначальность выражения «вои славны тысяща» (Лукин, События..., 9, 15). Однако ничто не показывает, что это уникальное выражение восходит к тексту более раннему, чем создание ПВЛ, а не сконструировано новгородским книжником из имеющегося материала. В хронографической литературе и ветхозаветных книгах масса упоминаний «тысящъ» и «тысящниковъ», реже, но встречаются «славные». Относительно последнего обозначения ср. *Виленский хронограф*, л. 205об., Ис. Нав. 4.4: «и призва ѿс .ѿѿ. моужь славень от сновъ ийлевъ единь»; *Троицкий хронограф*, л. 57а, 1 Цар. 9.6: «и ре^ч отрокъ его . се zde члѿвкъ бжїи въ градѣ семь . члѿвкъ славень»; л. 112а, 2 Цар. 23.19 «от трии тѣхъ славень»; л. 272б, Дан. 14.2: «Въ вавилонѣ же бѣяше даниль жизньникъ . съ црѣмь коуромь славень . паче другъ его». См. также об Александре Македонском, Ам. 200.1–2: «призва славныя своя, с ними * въспитася, и раздѣли имъ црѣтво и оумре». П. В. Лукин пишет о том, что «нарочитые» ПВЛ не является «terminus technicus», но «вои славны тыся-

чивые писцы в иных случаях восстанавливали даже испорченные названия и имена¹⁹. Ни одного необратимого доказательства в статье

ща» тем более им не является. Ср. хотя бы массу усилий, потраченную исследователями на то, чтобы выяснить значение выражения.

(19) Приведу, снова-таки, одно из чтений редакций Александрии Хронографической. Этот памятник удобен тем, что имеется контрольный текст греческих списков, и сохранился в разных редакциях. Соответственно, первоначальные чтения обычно реконструируются надежно. В приведенном ниже примере восстановлено имя персидского царя Ксеркса, широко известное из хронографической литературы. В разных списках: Архивский хронограф «кр̑ксови», Виленский «кер̑ксови», Еллинский летописец 2-й редакции «Кер̑ксови» (в одном из списков, однако, угадано правильное: «Ксер̑ксови»), Троицкий список — «кс̑ероксови». См.: *Александрия*, книга 3, глава 28; *Арх.* л. 340; *Вил.* л. 494; *Тр.* л. 334d; *Летописец Еллинский и Римский*, т. 1 (Москва, 1999) 173. Наиболее далеко разошедшиеся (из ранних) редакции Иудейского хронографа и Еллинского летописца 2-й редакции дают схожие чтения, т. е. исходным, видимо, было ошибочное «Кер̑ксови» (и, в любом случае, в архетипе Еллинского-2 несомненно читалось «Кер̑ксови»). В одном из списков Еллинского-2 и, по-видимому, в Троицком имя было восстановлено. В некоторых случаях, конечно, идентификация могла быть ошибочной. Напр., в той же Александрии имя Набонассара («Нав̑насор̑») несколькими писцами независимо один от другого было восстановлено в «Навуходоносор̑». Т. е., в общем случае, если название было узнаваемо, ошибку книжники могли попытаться исправить. Тем временем, относительно сюжета 1015–1016 (1015–1019 по ПВЛ) в НПЛ мл и ПВЛ один из пунктов, по которым мнения исследователей расходятся — исходное написание наименования «Рокомъ»/«Ракомъ» в летописях. П. В. Лукин считает, что «шедь на Рокомъ» ПВЛ испорченное чтение, и аутентично «сѣдь на Ракомѣ» НПЛ мл. ред., поскольку в документах XV в. село вблизи Новгорода называется «Ракома» (Лукин, *События...*, 13). Почему исследователь считает, что «Ракома» XV в. должна свидетельствовать не о том, что именно в такой форме название было известно позднему книжнику, и тот в соответствии со своими знаниями приспособил текст летописи, а о том, что в писцовой книге XV в. отразилась форма, более древняя, чем известная из ПВЛ — неясно. Тем более, что мена «а» и «о» в древнерусских текстах обычна. В том числе, в переводных памятниках в ранних редакциях встречаются такие чтения как Сарданаполь и т. п. Между прочим, если поздние известия имеют преференции, может быть следует читать не «Содко», как в НПЛ мл, а «Садко», и не «Олександръ», а «Александръ»? Ср. иные примеры изменения названия. В Киевском своде в одной из годовых статей сер. XII в. о поселении говорится: «от Буличь», ПСРЛ, т. 2, стб. 518, более позднее и современное название — «Б̑личи» / Беличи. «Ж̑лянь» изменилось в «Жуляны», и т.д.

П. В. Лукина нет, т.е. с утверждением об «очевидности» исследователь поспешил.

Далее рецензент пишет об «абсурдности», применительно к 1147 г. писать о том, что Ростислав Мстиславич смоленский распоряжался смольнянами и новгородцами. И что достаточно «просто открыть летопись» и убедиться в обратном: киевский князь Изяслав предлагал брату «нарядить» на войну «кроме новгородцев, еще и смольнян» — жителей земли, где он сам княжил (с. 409). Снова сталкиваемся с категоричностью утверждения П. В. Лукина, дополненной здесь еще необычайной «простотой» предлагаемых им текстологических процедур. Рецензент, возможно, знает, что в 1147 г. в Новгороде сидел Святополк Мстиславич, а далее его сменил сын Изяслава. Предложение «нарядать» людей чужого князя (Святополк, между прочим, был старше Ростислава) выглядит странно, и такому явлению необходимо искать объяснение. Может быть, П. В. Лукин подозревает и о том, что при рассмотрении исторических событий сер. XII в. следует тщательно анализировать текст Киевского свода, отредактированного в пользу Ростислава Мстиславича,²⁰ а также сопоставлять его с известиями НПЛ и Лавр.²¹ В данном случае, несколько увлекшись, он, видимо, упустил это из виду.

(20) В литературе отмечались случаи, когда в перечислениях Ростислав поставлен перед киевским князем Изяславом, его роль неоправданно преувеличена (в моей книге прим. 55 на с. 33). Примеры позднего редактирования свидетельствуют о вмешательстве в текст составителя Киевского свода (создан на рубеже XII–XIII или в начале XIII в.), а он настойчиво пытался создать видимость идеального соправления Изяслава, Ростислава и их дяди Вячеслава Володимирича.

(21) Известно, что Изяслав Мстиславич обращался к брату Ростиславу с такими речами (1147 г.): «а тамо наряди новгородци . и смольняны ать оудержать Гюргя», «а тамо оу тебе смольняне и новгородци». См.: ПСРЛ, т. 2, стб. 347, 359. При этом Ростислав появился на новгородском столе лишь в 1154 г., сместив Ярослава Изяславича. В том же 1154 г., по-видимому, велась подготовка к новой серьезной войне между Изяславом Мстиславичем и Юрием Долгоруким, но внезапно Изяслав умер, и события повернулись иначе. Судя по всему, произошла перестройка коалиций, и Ростислав стал врагом своего родного брата (и это выразилось, в том числе, в занятии им новгородского стола), тогда как Святополк Изяслава не предавал, несмотря на некоторые трения между ними. Согласно НПЛ, Ярослава «выгнали» новгородцы в марте 1154 г., а в апреле в Новгороде утвердился Ростислав Мстиславич. При этом, Изяслав Мстиславич умер в ноябре (мартовского) года. Ср. НПЛ с. 29, ПСРЛ. Т. 1, стб. 341–342, Т. 2, стб. 468–469. В начале года на помощь себе Изяслав Мстиславич позвал именно Святополка. По моим наблюдениям, «изгнания» и «призвания»

Но следующий пассаж глубокоуважаемого коллеги может поставить в совершенное затруднение. П. В. Лукин всесторонне исследует окончание примечания 424 на с. 103 рецензируемой им монографии и обвиняет меня в том, что, квалифицируя известие МЛС о созыве Всеволодом Юрьевичем в 1211 г. «т.н. собора» как позднее, я опираюсь исключительно «на мнение А. Е. Преснякова», которое «не имеет ценности», ибо было высказано «до основополагающих открытий в области текстологии». ²² В частности, не учтено предположение А. Н. Насонова о том, что это известие из свода Юрия Всеволодича, и что писать о «поздней практике» нельзя, ибо первые соборы относятся к XVI в. (с. 410). Для ясности, приведу текст книги, с. 103 прим. 424 («историк» — речь идет о В. Т. Пашуто):

«В большинстве текстов, которые историк предлагал рассматривать как доказательство существования “собора”, это слово отсутствует,⁴²⁴ а в одном случае он неверно определил значение».

⁴²⁴ Отсутствует, в том числе, в описании завещания Всеволода Юрьевича 1211 г. по МЛС, на которое во многом опирался исследователь: «Князь же великы Всеволод созва всѣх бояръ своихъ с городовъ и съ волостей, епископа Иоана, и игумены, и попы, и купцѣ, и дворяны и вси люди, и да сыну своему Юрью Володимерь по собѣ, и води всѣхъ къ кресту, и цѣловаша вси людие на Юрьи». ПСРЛ. Т. 25. С. 108. Кстати сказать, о созыве разных чинов нет в Л и Сим-Тр под 1211–1212 гг., нет в ЛПС, а также в поздних сводах Новгородско-Софийской группы и Летописи Авраамки. Данное сообщение помещают лишь своды, зависящие от МЛС: Воскресенская летопись, Тверской сборник и др. О позднем происхождении известия: *Пресняков А. Е.* Княжое право. С. 150–151, прим. 3. Несомненно, перед нами сочинение московского книжника, бравшего за образец современную ему практику.

князей, в том числе, в Новгороде часто были тесно связаны с политической князей и соотношением политических сил в различных коалициях, и мою аргументацию рецензент не смог опровергнуть. Кроме книги, этот тезис обосновывается также в: Т. Л. Вилкул, Новгородцы и русские князья в летописании XII века, *Russia Mediaevalis* X.1 (2001) 34–54. Относительно редактирования летописных статей сер. XII в. см.: она же, О происхождении общего текста..., 38–58.

(22) «Аргумента два: ссылка на мнение А. Е. Преснякова и заявление о том, что “несомненно, перед нами сочинение московского книжника, бравшего за образец современную ему практику” (с. 103, сноска)» (подчеркнуто мною. — Т. В.).

Увы, рассуждения П. В. Лукина о земских соборах не имеют отношения к рассматриваемым проблемам, ибо в известии 1211 г. в МЛС слово «соборъ» отсутствует. В книге речь идет о том, что В. Т. Пашуто, постулируя наличие на Руси «собора», привлекал известия, где слова «соборъ» нет,²³ в том числе, известие МЛС 1211 г. Утверждение о позднем происхождении этого фрагмента опирается не на «ссылку на мнение А. Е. Преснякова», а на тот факт, что известие отсутствует в ряде летописей,²⁴ в том числе, в ранних летописных сводах;²⁵ работа А. Е. Преснякова отмечена потому, что именно этот исследователь заострил внимание на позднем происхождении известия. Что касается гипотез А. Н. Насонова о наличии в поздних

(23) В ранних летописных сводах слово «сборъ» употребляется единственный раз, в Киевском своде под 1147 г., в Ипат., где его появление вызвано, судя по всему, использованием евангельских мотивов. Мучительная смерть князя Игоря Ольговича от рук киевлян уподоблена смерти Христа. В другом случае, в известии 1187 г., В. Т. Пашуто неверно определил значение слова в выражении «и сборы и монастыри». Разумеется, в переводных памятниках значение слова «сборъ» более широкое, но В. Т. Пашуто опирался на летописи. Например, в 5-й книге Хроники Иоанна Малалы выражение «и съшедша на сборъ» является переводом греческого καὶ συναχθέντες ἐν κομβέντῳ, а в 6-й книге — «въ сборъ бо пришедшу Малию» — перевод ἐν κομβεντίῳ γὰρ εἰσελθόντος τοῦ Μαλλίωνος. В первом случае подразумевается собрание ахейских воинов, на котором было принято решение наказать Ахилла и лишить его возможности участвовать в войне, во втором — сюжет осуждения Манлия римскими «боярами». См.: Н.-Г. ВЕСН, А. КАМБУЛИС, R. КЕУДЕЛЛ (eds.), Ioannis Malalae, *Chronographia* (Berolini: Novi Eboraci, 2000) (СФНВ, 35) 75, 140. Но словоупотребление летописей в данном случае резко отличается от словоупотребления переводных текстов (в том числе — от древнеболгарского, как считают, перевода Хроники Малалы), что также отмечено в моей книге.

(24) В Лаврентьевской, Симеоновской и Троицкой (как она реконструируется) летописях, Летописце Переяславля-Суздальского, сводах Новгородско-Софийской группы и в Летописи Авраамки. Имеется оно только в сводах, зависящих от МЛС. Полагаю, приведенный ряд летописей репрезентативен.

(25) Если рассматривать более детально, выходя за рамки монографического исследования, можно было бы отметить также то обстоятельство, что известие 1211 г. отсутствует, прежде всего, в ранних сводах (Лаврентьевской летописи, Летописце Переяславля-Суздальского, НПЛ). При том, что НПЛ, по-видимому, пополнялась во Владимире во время пребывания здесь архиепископа Митрофана (1210-е гг.). Т. В. Гимон, Новгородское летописание первой четверти XIII в.: хронология и процесс пополнения летописи, в: *Средневековая Русь*, вып. 6 (Москва, 2006) 103.

московских сводах фрагментов владими́ро-суздальских и киевских сводов XII–XIII вв., не дошедших до нас, то это крайне дискуссионная проблема,²⁶ и вводить рассмотрение дискуссионного вопроса, имеющего косвенное отношение к теме исследования, в окончание прим. 424 было бы вряд ли оправданным. И так, на упреки П. В. Лукина ответить затруднительно, ибо коллега никак не объясняет, почему отсутствие известия 1211 г. в большинстве летописей он не зачислил в разряд аргументов, и по какой причине он считает, что в МЛС упоминается «т.н. собор», когда этого слова там нет. (Следование мнению В. Т. Пашуто, а также торжественные размышления о «земских соборах Российского государства» вряд ли могут оправдать удивительный пассаж рецензента.)

Но вот, наконец, П. В. Лукин приводит суждение, которое в самом деле может послужить «деконструкции текстологии». По поводу одного из предполагаемых автором монографии заимствований он восклицает:

«Но ведь фразы-то разные! Если бы вторая, действительно, была «образцом» для первой... то летописец более позднего времени просто переписал бы ее из более раннего текста и обе фразы полностью бы совпали» (с. 412).

(26) В целом, летописеведы делятся на тех, кто считает, что в поздних летописях сохранились фрагменты ранних сводов, и тех, кто полагает, что поздние сводчики могли «творить» историю при помощи комбинирования имевшихся в их распоряжении источников, и, так сказать, дописывать их. Оба «лагеря» имеют свои аргументы, я принадлежу ко второму. Однако для обсуждения этих проблем, в самом деле, необходимы специальные текстологические исследования. Следует добавить, что далеко не все наблюдения и не все подходы замечательного российского летописевода, работавшего в середине XX в. (книга А. Н. Насонова была издана посмертно, в 1969 г.) были приняты в позднейших исследованиях. В частности, А. Н. Насонов часто считал критерием первичности и древности летописных записей их пространность. Поэтому, кстати, он положил в основу издания НПЛ младшего извода наиболее удаленный от протографа, но наиболее «полный» Комиссионный список, а также считал возможным привлекать версии весьма поздних летописцев — Устюжского, Архангелогородского и пр., о чем уже писал, напр., Дональд Островски: D. Ostrowski, Introduction, в: *idem* (ed.), *The Povest' vremennykh let: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis* (Cambridge, Mass., 2003) (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Texts, X.1–3) LI; D. Ostrowski, *The Ideal Prince for the Times: Alexander Nevskii in Rus' Literature: Mari Isiaho, The Image of Alexander Nevskiy in Medieval Russia: Warrior and Saint* (Leiden, 2006), *Palaeoslavica* XVI.2 (2008) 265.

Такое «простое» представление о способах работы летописца и о введении заимствований из источников в корне неверно. Летописцы могли включать буквальные заимствования, а могли вводить парафразы, подчас цитировали точно, а подчас существенно изменяли текст, заимствовали крупными блоками или интерполировали небольшие включения. На материале библейских аллюзий это в последнее время было хорошо показано И. Н. Данилевским²⁷, а в целом наличие различных способов работы книжников с источниками общепризнано в научной литературе²⁸. Для наглядности, приведу в качестве примера заимствование из «Истории иудейской войны» в Киевском своде, отмеченное А. С. Орловым и Н. А. Мещерским. Ср. тексты, подчеркиваю не сближения, как это обычно делается в подобных случаях, а расхождения, дабы обратить внимание на то, что книжники не всегда «просто переписывали» фразы:

<p><i>Ипатьевская летопись</i> и <u>ту бѣ</u> видити ломъ копиинны . и <u>звукъ оружьинны</u></p>	<p><i>«История Иудейской войны»</i> И <u>бысть</u> видѣти ломъ копѣинны и <u>скрѣжетание мечное, и щиты</u> <u>искѣпаны</u></p>
---	---

По поводу «деконструкции церковной письменности».

В начале этого параграфа рецензент делает несколько полезных замечаний корректорского плана. Однако серьезные упреки рецензента вызывают, по меньшей мере, недоумение. В частности, он пытается уличить в непонимании древнеславянского текста, не зная самого древнеславянского текста, и привлекая лишь русский перевод (!).

Анализируя эпизод из Деяний апостолов (с. 413–414) П. В. Лукин, возражая против моей интерпретации фрагмента древнеславянского текста, прямо признается в том, что он привлекает текст «русского перевода».²⁹ Рецензент не может не знать о том, что привлечение

(27) И. Н. Данилевский, *Повесть временных лет. Герменевтические основы изучения летописных текстов* (Москва, 2004).

(28) Не только летописцев. О том, что в творениях отцов церкви Священное Писание не всегда передано буквально см., напр.: М. Мещер Брьюс, *Текстология Нового Завета. Рукописная традиция, возникновение искажений и реконструкций оригинала* (Москва, 1996) 87 (перевод работы, впервые вышедшей на английском языке в 1964 г.).

(29) Эти суждения достойны того, чтобы привести обширную цитату из рецензии: «Действительно, если мы откроем русский перевод Нового Завета, увидим, что там написано следующее: “Ведь для всех афинян и

русского перевода при анализе древнеславянских памятников и, в особенности, при проверке интерпретаций, некорректно,³⁰ но для него, вероятно, древнеславянский текст был «труднодоступен». Цитируемый фрагмент Деяний рецензент называет «элементарным». Уважаемый коллега ошибается. В ДА 17.21–22 читается следующее (в книге цитата была приведена с купюрами, выделяю опущенные в ней сегменты курсивом): «...страньнии . ни въ что же ино праздни бѣахоу глѣти . или и слышати что новѣю . Став же Павел посре^а Ариѣва леда ре^ч моужи атинѣисции по всему тако хоудожаишею вы виж^ою»³¹. Текст этот отнюдь не «элементарен», и даже, смею утверждать, достаточно сложен. В подобных случаях, как правило, славянские читатели и писцы ориентировались на «ключевые» слова, опуская «темные» места. Из древнеславянского текста неясно, что в первой фразе речь идет о жителях Афин, а во второй — о собрании в Ареопаге. Тем более, что даже перевод последнего слова неверен — «Ариевь ледь». Т.е. после прочтения этого отрывка Апостола для древнерусского книжника вполне естественным был вывод о том, что в Ареопаге собирались «все афинее», и что они же обозначались как «мужие афинеистии». Современного русского перевода книжники, в том числе летописцы, знать не могли.

иностранцев, живущих в городе, нет большего развлечения, чем узнавать и обсуждать все новейшие идеи. Павел, представ перед Ареопагом, заговорил” (Деян. 17.21–22). Ясно, что, на самом деле, “все афиняне” — это просто жители Афин, и к членам Ареопага они никакого отношения не имеют. Но откуда же взялась “интерпретация” Т. Л. Вилкул? Выясняется, что ее основой послужил славянский перевод Апостола [в самом деле, работать необходимо исключительно с русским Синодальным переводом, ни в коем случае не с древнеславянским. — Т. В.], который автор цитирует следующим образом: “Афинее же все приходяще и страннии (все афинские граждане и неафиняне. — Т. В.)... став же Павел посре^а Ариева леда рече мужие афинеистии”. Таким образом, Т. Л. Вилкул, во-первых, не поняла элементарного славянского текста, а, во-вторых, по-видимому, незнакома с содержанием Деяний апостолов”.

(30) Славянские книжники имели более ограниченные ресурсы, нежели переводчики Нового и Новейшего времени. Они часто применяли технику пословного перевода, сохраняя синтаксис оригинала и калькируя лексику; в иных случаях без привлечения греческого текста смысл переводных текстов вообще понять невозможно.

(31) Так в сербском Матичином Апостоле; в македонском Струмицком: «...страны : илѣ глѣти чесо : слышати новое : став же Павел посре^а ариева леда ре^ч мажие афинеисти : по вѣсмѣ гько хлдожаиши ви виж^оа».

Ниже, рецензент возражает против утверждения, что избиение 70 братьев приписано сначала самому Авимелеху, а затем «мужам», принявшим его на царство. Он утверждает, что если бы автор проанализировала весь «рассказ полностью», то поняла бы, что Авимелех совершил убийство с «праздными и своевольными людьми», «которые и были сихемскими мужами» (с. 414). Здесь П. В. Лукин снова обращается к русскому переводу³², более того, к его небольшому отрывку, а не к «рассказу полностью», анализ всего фрагмента Суд. 9.1–18 не мог бы послужить подобным выводам. В тексте Синодального перевода отмечу только: Суд. 9.3. «братья матери его внушили о нем все сии слова жителям Сихемским и склонилось сердце их к Авимелеху, ибо говорили они: он брат наш. 9.4. И дали ему семьдесят /сиклей/ серебра из дома Ваалверифа; Авимелех нанял на оные праздных и своевольных людей, которые и пошли за ним. 9.5. И пришел он в дом отца своего в Офру и убил братьев... (обращается к «мужам сихемским», собравшимся для процедуры поставления на царство оставшийся в живых младший сын Гедеона) 9.18. а вы теперь восстали против дома отца моего, и убили семьдесят сынов отца моего...»³³ Древнеславянский текст Суд. 9.1–7,16–18 категорически препятствует толкованию П. В. Лукина. Ср. особенно: «9.3. и глаша бра̑та м̑три его ш немь . въ оуши всѣхъ мужъ сикимескъ . вса словеса си . и приведеса ср̑це ихъ въслѣдъ Авимелеха ... 9.4. и даша .б̑. сребра ѿ домоу Ваальверефѣ завѣтоу . и наа ими Авимелехъ мужъ тысяцю . не боащеса (в другом списке: мужа тоща и боаща; «тоща» — по-видимому, исходный вариант, перевод κενούς, «и» порча вм. «не»)»³⁴

(32) На сей раз об этом не заявлено прямо, но о том свидетельствует приведенная им цитата.

(33) То же в соответствующем месте Септуагинты: 9.3 καὶ ἐλάλησαν περὶ αὐτοῦ ... ἐν τοῖς ὡσὶν πάντων τῶν ἀνδρῶν Σικιμῶν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ... 9.4 καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ ἑβδομήκοντα ἀργυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Βααλ διαθήκης, καὶ ἐμισθῶσα τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς Αβιμελεχ ἄνδρας κενούς καὶ θαμβουμένους, καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ. 9.5 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ... καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς... 9.18 καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐνανέστητε ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου σήμερον καὶ ἀπέκτείνετε τοὺς υἱούς αὐτοῦ ἑβδομήκοντα...

(34) Для оценки «рассказа полностью» привожу фрагмент Суд. 9.1–7,16–18, согласно тексту Троицкого хронографа XIV в., л. 30с–31а (близкие чтения — в Полной хронографической палее); с некоторыми разночтениями по списку Виленского хронографа (далее: Вил) 1-й пол. XVI в. (один из списков Иудейского хронографа 2-й пол. XIII в.), л. 229об., а также Острожской Библии. «(Суд. 9.1) И иде Авимелехъ къ с̑номъ Иеровалемъ въ Сикимоу . къ братьи м̑тре своєа и ре^ч имь . (9.2) г̑лите оубо

Из текста ясно, что Авимелех совершил убийство с наемниками, которых нельзя отождествлять с «мужами сикимскими». Одни и те же действия, как видим, действительно приписываются Авимелеху и «мужам сикимским», и выводы, сделанные в книге, опирались на корректное прочтение. В итоге: П. В. Лукин неверно прочитывает русский текст, при этом обвиняя в ошибке прочтения (в древнеславянском тексте) автора. Возможно, в книге было слишком кратко сказано об этом, но в общем кажется достаточно очевидным, что специалисты по древнерусской проблематике обычно пользуются древнеславянскими переводами Библии.

Пара «мелочей в придачу». На с. 414 рецензент пишет о том, что в книге (с. 143) неверно трактуется то, что ростовский епископ якобы «запрещает праздновать в великие праздники», тогда как на деле речь шла о необходимости поста на Рождество или Крещение Господни. Но на с. 143 моей книги приводится цитата из летописи и читается буквально следующее: «...(Леон) велел «не ѣсти мясь» на великие церковные праздники: «ни на Рожьство Господне, ни на Крещенье», то есть нарушил даже достаточно суровую константинопольскую практику постов». Поскольку на с. 142 приведены обширные фрагменты Лавр и Ипат, я не стала повторять о посте по средам и пятницам (в

въ оуши моужемъ сикимскомъ . кое добръе вамъ . ежели владѣти вами .
 .б̄. моужь . всѣмъ с̄номъ Иеровалемъ . или владѣти моужоу единомуу .
 и поманете ѡко кость ваша и плоть ваша есмь азъ . (9.3) и г̄лаша бра̄та
 м̄три его ѡ немъ . въ оуши всѣхъ моужь сикимескъ . вса словеса си . и
 приведеса ср̄це ихъ въслѣдъ Авимелеха . и ѡко рекоша бра̄т нашъ естъ .
 (9.4) и даша .б̄. сребра ѡ домоу Ваальверефъ завѣтоу . и наа ими Авиме-
лехъ мужь тысяцю . не боащеса /Вил моужа тоща и боаща^с, Острожск.
 мѹжевь младыхъ и лѣпыхъ/ . и идоша въслѣдъ его . (9.5) и приведе и /
 Вил Острожск прииде/ в домъ ѡ̄тца своего . въ ефратъ . и изби братью
 свою . с̄ны Иеровоала .б̄. моужь подъ камень единъ . и вста Ивафамъ с̄нъ
 Ишроваль мнии . ѡко ск̄рыса . (9.6) и собрашаса вси моужи сикимьстии .
и весь домъ Адонь . и шедъше ц̄ръствиша Авимелеха . оу Валана стану
 иже въ Сикимѣхъ . (9.7) и повѣдаша Ивафамоу . и шедъ ста на верхоу
 горы Газиринъ . и въздвиже гла^с свои . и въззвавъ реч̄ имь . послушайте
 мене моужи сикимьстии . и да ва^с оуслышитъ б̄ъ ... (9.16) И нынѣ аще
 поистинѣ . и по свершенью створисте . и ц̄ръствисте Авимелеха . и аще
 есте добростворили . съ Ишровелемъ . и з домоу его . по ѡданию роуки
 его . створисте емоу . (9.17) ѡко же воева ѡ̄тцъ мои по васъ . и поверъже
 д̄шю свою въ страну . и ѡ̄та васъ ѡ роуки Мадиамла . (9.18) вы же въста-
сте на домъ ѡ̄тца моего днь^с . и избисте с̄нве его .б̄. моужь подъ единемъ
 каменемъ /Вил доб.: и ц̄рътвовасте авимелеха, Острожск и постависте
 ц̄ремъ авимелеха/ . с̄нъ женимыи его надъ моужи сикимьски . ѡко братъ
 вашъ ест^с».

Лавр — «в среды и в пяткы», с. 142, левая колонка табл.), предполагая, что читатели понимают язык летописи и могут сами сопоставить тексты.

На с. 114–115 рецензент пишет о том, что ему «непонятно, на каком основании делается вывод о том, что в словах пророка Исаии о «князьях содомских» и «людях гоморских» идет речь о «группах людей равного статуса». Если необходимы пояснения — в книге приводится цитата из Паримейника (Ис. 1:6) относительно известного библейского сюжета о разрушении Содома и Гоморры. Господь через пророка обращается к «князьям содомским» и «людям гоморским». Как правило, не предполагают, что в Содоме жили только «князья», а в Гоморре — исключительно «люди», или что «князья» или «люди» по отдельности вызвали гнев Господень (города были уничтожены полностью).

По поводу «деконструкции лингвистики».

В этом параграфе в поправках уважаемого коллеги встречаются погрешности. П. В. Лукин, возражая против отнесения слова «прѣтити» к редкой книжной лексике, пишет о том, что глагол «присутствует в говорах» (с. 419). Этот довод не доказывает не книжного происхождения. Вокабуляр народных говоров формировался, в том числе, за счет книжной лексики и, в том числе, на достаточно позднем этапе развития церковно-славянского языка. Подобные заимствования в народные говоры — одна из тем лингвистических исследовательских разработок. О том, что «претить» заимствовано из церковно-славянского см. у Фасмера.³⁵

Делая замечание относительно дательного самостоятельного в тексте из Галицко-Волынской летописи «Самому же Данилу созвавшу вѣче, оставышуся въ 18 отрокъ вѣрнихъ и с Дѣмьяномъ тысяцкымъ своимъ, и рече имъ...» (с. 418), рецензент несколько сокращает цитату, забывает уведомить читателя, что речь идет о таком значении слова «вѣче» как 'совет' и что в работе обсуждаются возможные интерпретации и мнения, высказанные в научной литературе.³⁶ Если

(35) М. ФАСМЕР, *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, т. III (Москва, 1987) 361.

(36) Текст книги, с. 25: «Значение 'совет' вполне удовлетворительно и экономно объясняет контекст без необходимости прибегать к домыслам. В том же ряду стоит и необычайно малочисленное галицкое собрание, в составе которого названы тысяцкий и 18 отроков²⁷».

Прим. 27: «"Самому же Данилу созвавшу вѣче, оставышуся въ 18 отрокъ вѣрнихъ и с Дѣмьяномъ тысяцкымъ своимъ, и рече имъ...", 763И.

же не пытаться подменить сказанное в книге иными суждениями, окажется, что дательный самостоятельный не может препятствовать предложенной интерпретации.³⁷ Помимо всего прочего, при анализе текста Галицко-Волынской летописи необходимо учитывать то, что ее составитель или составители пытались имитировать текст своих источников (в том числе, хронографа), язык которых был архаичен и чужд им, из-за чего в летописи встречаются крайне тяжеловесные обороты.

Имеются и такие случаи, когда ошибки сопровождают корректные высказывания и поправки.³⁸

Хл без даты, И под 1231 г. Так интерпретировали: *Самоквасов Д. Я.* Заметки по истории. С. 54–55; *Линниченко И. А.* Вече в Киевской области. С. 5; *Крип'якевич І. П.* Галицько-Волинське князівство. К., 1984. С. 122; *Свердлов М. Б.* Генезис и структура. С. 53; *Granberg Jonas*, *Veche in the Chronicles of Medieval Rus'*, 86. С другой стороны, некоторые исследователи считают, что не названы "люди", и в данном случае состоялось обычное вечевое собрание галичан, но "боярская партия" была ослаблена отступничеством большей части бояр. См.: *Владимирский-Буданов М. Ф.* Обзор истории. С. 64, 68; *Грушевський М. С.* Історія України-Руси. Т. 2. С. 476.; *Софроненко К. А.* Общественно-политический строй Галицко-Волынской Руси XI–XIII вв. М., 1955. С. 112; *Котляр Н. Ф.* Формирование территории и возникновение городов Галицко-Волынской Руси IX–XIII вв. К., 1985. С. 137».

(37) Возможный перевод таков: «сам Данил созвал совет, оставшись с 18 отроками и тысяцким, и сказал им».

(38) Один из них — критика предположения, высказанного в моей книге в прим. 13 на с. 23, о возможности ошибки писца в одном из текстов Успенского сборника (в рецензии с. 417–418). Хотя рецензент верно отмечает погрешности при расставлении знаков препинания в цитате, П. В. Лукин приводит фразу, оформленную по правилам современной пунктуации, ссылаясь на соответствующую страницу издания Успенского сборника: «...встанеть ти брать . не кычения дѣльма не вѣча азъ вѣставлю брать ти . нь нарочно встанеть рекии искоушая еи вѣроу». Делая вывод о «прозрачности» или непрозрачности синтаксиса для древнего писца, необходимо учитывать древнюю, а не современную, пунктуацию и исходить из того, что было перед глазами книжника. Точно так же, при оценке возможности ошибок в евангельских сюжетах следует опираться не на соображения здравого смысла (ср. восклицание П. В. Лукина «Или древнерусский книжник не знал этого хрестоматийного евангельского рассказа?», — о Лазаре), а привлекать специальные работы. П. В. Лукин мог бы обратиться к уже упоминавшемуся труду Брюса Мецгера, где, в том числе, приводятся ошибки, возникавшие при переписывании Нового Завета. Некоторые из них совершенно замеча-

Пример на с. 420 способен приоткрыть «рецензионную кухню» П. В. Лукина, и на нем следует остановиться подробнее. Рецензент, по его словам, «иллюстрирует непонимание Т. Л. Вилкул древнерусских текстов»: пишет о том, что ошибки прочтения в монографии ведут к неверной интерпретации и к приписыванию слову «дружина» значения, которое текстами не подтверждается («дружина как участники веча»). Что имеется лишь одно известие, где упоминается «дружина» и «само слово «вече»» — 1015 г., и оно неверно проинтерпретировано, а остальные не имеют значения и «отношения к делу».³⁹

тельны. Один из примеров: копиист, списывая родословие Иисуса с текста, написанного в 2 столбца, и пытаясь поместить его в один столбец, перепутал все имена, и в результате имя Бога попало в середину списка и он оказался сыном Арама. См.: МЕЦГЕР Брюс, Текстология Нового Завета..., 190. Между тем, в этом и иных случаях речь шла о писцах, знавших Евангелия. Необходимо помнить о том, что при переписывании запоминалась обычно ближайшая краткая синтагма, что также способствовало появлению ошибок (масса примеров в рукописях). Вдобавок, сочетание «нарочно» или «нарочито» + глагол, вероятно, не было для книжника столь необычным, каким оно есть для современного русиста. Ср. в Хронике Амартола, Ам. 259 «и того ради въ ть днь соуботныи нарочито именуоуть римлане». Учитывая все вышесказанное, мое предположение о возможности ошибки, способствовавшей появлению слова «вѣча» (при греч. εἶπεν) остается в силе.

(39) Для точности, процитирую эти высказывания П. В. Лукина: «...существует напрасно якобы не отмеченное словарями древнерусского языка значение слова “дружина”-“участники веча”. Но в действительности составители словарей поступали совершенно верно, не отмечая этого фантастического значения. Дело в том, что все примеры, которые приводит в подтверждение своего тезиса Т. Л. Вилкул, либо опять-таки основаны на элементарном непонимании текста, либо на его неправильной (или неполной интерпретации). Прежде всего, исследовательница смогла найти только один пример, в котором есть само слово “вече”, — известие ПВЛ под 1015 г. о конфликте Ярослава и новгородцев. В нем, по утверждению автора, “новгородцы, собравшиеся на вече, в речи князя названы также ‘дружиной’” (с. 72, 294). Однако в источнике — совсем другое. [далее цитата из летописи] Т. Л. Вилкул явно принимает чтение большинства списков ПВЛ..., но в этой версии «дружина» не обозначает участников веча, а представляет собой риторическое восклицание, сетующего о гибели «нарочитых мужей» Ярослава. Все же остальные примеры отождествления веча и дружины, приводимые автором, в принципе, не имеют отношения к делу: во-первых, вече в них вообще не упоминается, во-вторых, во всех случаях слово “дружина” можно легко объяснить вполне традиционно» (везде подчеркнуто мною — Т. В.).

Что касается известия 1015 г., имеется в виду следующий текст:⁴⁰

«заоутра⁴¹ же собравъ избытокъ⁴² новгородецъ⁴³ Ярославъ ре^ч. о
люба моя⁴⁴ дружина юже вчера избихъ⁴⁵ а нынѣ быша надобѣ .
и оутре слезъ . и ре^ч имъ⁴⁵ на вѣчи».

Здесь упоминается «избытокъ» ('остаток') новгородцев. К «избытку» («имъ») обращается Ярослав в своей речи. Этот «избытокъ» вместе с теми людьми, которые иссекли варягов⁴⁶ и были, в свою очередь, посечены Ярославом, представляет собой, по-видимому, политическую общность «всех новгородцев». В основе интерпретации лежит следующий перевод: «о любимая моя дружина — та, которую я вчера посек», что предполагает наличие «всей дружины», аналогичное политической общности «новгородцев». Т.е. высказывание П. В. Лукина о том, что в источнике «совсем иное», отнюдь не бесспорно.

Прямое упоминание, где слово «вѣче» используется наряду со словом «дружина», действительно единственное. Однако в моей книге прямо указано, что прямых упоминаний в древнерусских летописях — абсолютное меньшинство (с. 27–31), и опираться исключительно на прямые сообщения о вече было бы абсурдным. В частности, имеются параллельные известия двух или трех летописных сводов, когда лишь в одном из них собрание названо вечем, а в других оно так не называется. Большая часть рассказов о новгородских собраниях также не содержит слова «вече», отсутствует оно и в знаменитом

(40) Сообщение 1015 г. известно в пяти списках ПВЛ, а также в составе Сильвестровско-Минейной редакции «Сказания о Борисе и Глебе», см.: Т. Л. Вилкул, Летописные вставки из ПВЛ в Сильвестровско-Минейной редакции «Сказания о св. Борисе и Глебе», *Ruthenica* 5 (2006) 37–72, Интернет-версия статьи: <http://history.org.ua/0/?l=spdf&pdfn=5&pdfy=2006&pdf=rothenika> Далее текст летописи приводится в основном по Лаврентьевскому списку, варианты подведены из др. списков.

(41) Р *Наоутра*, Ак *Наоутрии*

(42) Сильв-Минейн *прокъ*

(43) так ЛХ, Сильв-Минейн *новгодець*; РАИ *новгородцевъ*

(44) так Л, Сильв-Минейн *люба моя*, Х *о любаа моя*; РАИ *о любимая*

(45) в Л проп. *а нынѣ... имъ*.

(46) Они названы также «нарочитыми мужами», но наличие разных обозначений обычно для древнерусских текстов. В рецензируемой книге приводится пример, когда одна и та же группа из 3-х человек, перечисленных поименно, названа «мужами», «боярами» и «дружиной» (с. 107).

рассказе о восстании 1136 г.⁴⁷ В рецензируемой П. В. Лукиным монографии обосновывается тезис, что необходимо учитывать косвенные сообщения. Этот тезис рецензент не опровергает и даже не обсуждает, но полагаю, что обратное доказать не удастся. Соответственно, известие 1015 г. не играет основной роли в исследовании. При решении вопроса о «дружине» в книге были привлечены, в частности, сообщения Ипат. и Лавр. 1175–1177 гг., где упоминание вече косвенное, см. на с. 72:

«...увѣдеше же смерть князю (Андрея Боголюбского — Т. В.) ростовци и сужьдалци и переяславци и вся дружина от мала до велика, съѣхашася к Володимерю и рѣша...: по кого хочемъ послати в своихъ князех... И приѣхавше сли (послы к избранымъ людьми князьям, Мстиславу и Ярополку Ростиславичам — Т. В.), повѣдаша речь дружиньню». Далее приводятся благодарственные речи Ростиславичей: «Помози Богъ дружинѣ, оже не забываютъ любве отца нашего».²⁷⁰ Описывается процеду-

(47) В книге на с. 31 приведена статистика:

«В НПЛ на 70 упоминаний о собраниях новгородцев в XII в. записей со словом “въече” — 0⁴⁹, в Лавр на 15 косвенных сообщений о вече приходится 1 прямое⁵⁰, в Ипат. соотношение, соответственно, 17/6⁵¹».

Прим. 49: «Одно — в том случае, если учитывать известие 1193 г. в НПЛ мл. ред., имеющее характер вставки. Косвенные известия — см. в НПЛ статьи 1125 г., 1126 г., 1128 г., 1130 г., 1132 г., 1134 г. (упоминается 2 раза), 1135 г., 1136 г. (2), 1137 г. (2), 1138 г. (2), 1139 г. (2), 1141 г. (2), 1142 г. (2), 1144 г., 1146 г., 1148 г. (2), 1154 г., 1156 г. (2), 1157 г., 1160 г. (2), 1161 г., 1166 г., 1167 г. (2), 1168 г., 1169 г., 1170 г., 1171 г., 1172 г., 1175 г. (2), 1176 г., 1177 г., 1178 г. (2), 1179 г., 1180 г. (3), 1181 г., 1184 г., 1186 г. (2), 1187 г., 1188 г., 1189 г., 1191 г., 1193 г., 1194 г., 1195 г. (3), 1196 г. (2), 1197 г. (2). НЛ, с. 21–45. На этот феномен не так часто обращают внимание. Обычно считают, что в НПЛ слово «въече» встречается чаще, чем в других сводах, что верно только для XIII в. См.: *Львов А. С.* Лексика «Повести временных лет». С. 192. На отсутствие прямых упоминаний до конца XII в. обратила внимание *Подвигина Н. Л.* Очерки социально-экономической и политической истории. С. 104».

Прим. 50: «См. статьи Лавр: 1102 г. 275–276Л (входит в ПВЛ); 1138 г. (2), 304Л, 305Л; 1140 г. 308Л; 1155 г. 346Л; 1160 г. 351Л; 1169 г. 362Л; 1174 г. 365Л; 1178 г. 386Л; 1182 г. 388Л; 1186 г. 400Л; 1188 г. 406Л; 1197 г. 414Л; 1200 г. 415–416Л. Прямое — под 1176 г., 377Л».

Прим. 51: «Косвенные известия о новгородских собраниях в Ипат.: 1102 г., 251И (из ПВЛ); 1154 г., 468И; 1158 г. (2), 491И; 1161 г. 518И, 1168 г., 529И; 1170 г., 543И; 1173 г., 566И; 1178 г. (2), 606–607И, 609–610И; 1180 г., 624И; 1196 г., 702И. Прямые известия: 6648/1141 г., 307И; 1148 г., 370И; 6668/1160 г., 510И; 6669/1160 г. (2), 510И; 6677/1167 г., 537И».

ра крестоцелования новым князьям, и «дружина» стоит на том месте, где обычно видим горожан.²⁷¹

²⁷⁰ 371–372Л — 595И. Ср. также обвинение летописца, предъявленное той самой дружине, в том, что они забыли крестоцелование к князю Юрию (Долгорукому) и посадили на столе Андрея Боголюбского. Оно отсылает к статье 1159 г., где речь идет о «суздальцах и ростовцах»; 372Л — 595И. Кроме того, см. статью 1176 г.: «...дружинѣ не суши въ градѣ, ѣхали бо бяхут противу Ярополку», этот фрагмент Ипат. дополняет общее с Лавр чтение: «...не сущимъ володемерцемъ Володимери... ѣхали бо бяху... противу князема»; 373Л — 596–597И.

²⁷¹ В 1176 г. «Ярополкъ же поѣха отаи брата к дружинѣ Переяславлю... а дружина вся ... утвердившеса крестнымъ цѣлованьемъ с ним»; 373Л — 596И. «...тя привели старѣишая дружина, ... тебе ростовци привели и боляре, а мене былъ с братомъ Богъ привель и володимерци»; 380Л.

Эти известия имеют некоторое «отношение к делу», поскольку собрания ростовцев и суздальцев, небезосновательно квалифицируемые исследователями как упоминания о вече, в них названы также «дружиной», и «объяснить традиционно» эти тексты едва ли возможно.

Как видим, на деле «иллюстрация непонимания Т. Л. Вилкул древнерусских текстов» оборачивается иллюстрацией методов рецензирования П. В. Лукина. Имеем дело с попыткой выдать неоднозначную интерпретацию за однозначную, замалчиванием основных положений, обсуждаемых в книге, и важных текстологических свидетельств.

По поводу «деконструкции иностранных языков».

П. В. Лукин продемонстрировал свою эрудицию и проделал огромную работу (вплоть до того, что отметил, что однажды Клаус Цернак неверно назван Цорнаком на с. 14, см. с. 422 рецензии). Однако когда рецензент выходит за рамки корректорских поправок и речь заходит о содержательной стороне, его высказывания во многих случаях не соотносятся с действительным положением вещей.

Так, П. В. Лукин предъявляет упрек в том, что автор приписывает Клаусу Цернаку «мнения, которых он не придерживался». Немецкий ученый считал чтение Воскресенской летописи более логичным, и писать о том, что он принимал чтение Киевского свода (отличающееся от Воскресенской), якобы значит «принципиально исказить его позицию» (с. 422). Глубокоуважаемый коллега, к сожалению, недопонял, о чем идет речь. В книге обсуждается обязательность или необя-

зательность принятия конъектуры при согласном чтении обоих списков Киевского свода, Ипатьевского и Хлебниковского. В прим. 273 на с. 73 читается следующее:

«Спорят, как читать: «дружину кияне» (так ИХл) или «дружину и кияне» (конъектура). А. Е. Пресняков считал, что конъектура здесь излишняя, это мнение принял Клаус Цернак».

Если обратимся к книге Клауса Цернака, то в его переводе соответствующего фрагмента Ипат., прочтем следующее: «...seine Bojaren und seine gesamte družina, die Kiever, und sagte zu ihnen» (курсив мой. — Т. В.; после die Kiever — ссыла: Die Voskresenskaja-Chronik verbindet "družina" und "Kiever" sinngemässer durch "und", PSRL VII, S. 65)⁴⁸. Немецкий ученый в свой перевод конъектуру не вводит. С учетом того, что в исследованиях, предшествующих книге А. Е. Преснякова, конъектура считалась необходимой, такой шаг свидетельствует о принятии варианта Ипат. и о признании того, что конъектура не обязательна.

Излишне категоричен рецензент и в иных случаях. Напр., он пишет по поводу списка начальных форм греч. соответствий слову «вѣче» на с. 23:

с. 422–423, «ошибки здесь буквально в каждом слове. Так, βουλευεσθαι («советоваться, совещаться, решать») — это не просто «форма» глагола βουλεύω («советовать»), а медиальный залог с *другим* значением... Разумеется, лексема «вѣче» никак не может соответствовать словосочетанию ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ на самом деле, ему соответствует словосочетание «въ вѣчи»... Для греческой лексемы σύλλογος (собрание) в списке русских соответствий аналога нет, как и для русского «собираться» отсутствует греческий аналог».

В словарях обычно приводится одна исходная форма и, как правило, это βουλεύω.⁴⁹ В списке на с. 23 приведена форма βουλευτήριον;

(48) К. ZERNACK, *Die burgstädtischen Volksversammlungen bei den Ost- und Westslaven* (Wiesbaden, 1967) 68. Текст летописи: «Изяславъ же /Хлебн доб.: сзѡва/ бояры своя . и всю дружину свою кияне и рече имъ», ПСРЛ, т. 2, стб. 343–344.

(49) См., напр., LIDDELL—SCOTT, p. 325; Т. MURAOKA, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)* (Louvain: Peeters, 1993) 38 (различие значений залогов не оговаривается, примеры в т.ч. в мед.-пасс.); *Симфония на канонические книги Священного Писания с еврейским и греческим указателями*, т. 2 (Санкт-Петербург, 2003) 285 (то же; для βουλεύω указаны в т.ч. значения «посоветуется, решились, умышляли»); *A Homeric Diction-*

«лексема «вѣче» соотносится с нею. Если П. В. Лукин хочет сказать, что ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ соотносится лишь с устойчивым оборотом «въ вѣчи», то необходимо обосновывать наличие такого устойчивого оборота в X–XI вв. (время перевода Хроники Амартола, откуда взято выражение; следует учитывать то, что славянские переводчики часто руководствовались пословным, а в некоторых случаях, поморфемным принципом перевода).⁵⁰ Что касается «отсутствия аналога» (последняя фраза), речь, видимо, идет о том, что τοὺς σύλλογους ποιῆσθαι передано как «собираться». Однако в теории перевода такие явления называются не «отсутствием аналога», а «неточным соответствием»;⁵¹

ary, based upon the German of Georg Autenrieth, transl. by R. P. Keep (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1958) 62 (различие оговаривается, но 'determine' указано для βουλευῶ). Правда, у Софоклиса — βουλευομαι, но при этом не приводится βουλεύω: E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Zürich—New York, 1992) 314.

(50) Возможно, рецензент принял мнение Йонаса Гранберга, показавшего, что в поздних текстах словосочетание «в вѣчи» стало устойчивой формулой (J. GRANBERG, *Veche in the Chroniclers of Medieval Rus': A Study of Functions and Terminology* (Göteborg, 2004)), но у Гранберга речь идет именно о поздних свидетельствах новгородских и псковских летописей. Если считать, что это положение справедливо и для перевода Амартола, сочинения переводного, а не оригинального, и датируемого не XIV–XV вв., а X или XI в., то тогда необходимо привести доказательства, привлекая ранние переводные тексты. Каковы, кстати, крайне немногочисленны, хотя новые находки и возможны. Напр., недавно мне удалось дополнить список таких чтений: в Иудейском хронографе, по Виленскому списку л. 103об., Исх. 12.3: глїи ко всему вечеви снмъ . ийльв (...πρὸς πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν υἰῶν Ἰσραήλ); 12.6: и заколють все мно*ство вѣща . сновъ ийлевъ къ вечерѣ (...πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος συναγωγῆς υἰῶν Ἰσραήλ...).

(51) Неточные соответствия обычны в переводах, в т.ч., кстати, обычны при переводе с греческого древнеславянскими книжниками. См., напр., *Хроника Иоанна Малалы*, кн. 2, гл. 14: «състарѣвся и бодѣвъ оумрѣ» передает греч.: γεγήρακεν καὶ νόσω βληθεὶς τελευτᾶ; «и прѣтвоста анфио^и, и синовъ . вѣотии странѣ , гоусльноую хитрость оумѣюща» — «καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν ὁ Ἀμφίων καὶ ὁ Ζῆθος τῆς Βοιωτίας χώρας οἱ μουσικοί». Много внимания подобным примерам уделял В. М. Истрин, см. *Хроника Иоанна Малалы в славянском переводе* (Москва, 1994) (комментарии к каждой книге). В приведенном выше примере (τοὺς σύλλογους ποιῆσθαι) имеется еще такая сложность: в современном русском нельзя сказать «собраниям делаться /совершаться», как невозможны и многие иные конструкции, допустимые в древнеславянском. Вдобавок, «созывать» или «устраивать собрания» устойчиво ассоциируется с комсомольско-партийно-профсоюзной деятельностью, т.е. привносит иной смысловой оттенок.

взаимное же нулевое соответствие⁵² невозможно. Создается впечатление, что рецензент изобретает собственные правила, не согласовав их с тем, как принято поступать в подобных случаях, отчаивается, что автор книги им не следует, и пишет об «ошибках в каждом слове».

Напоследок, небольшая ремарка по поводу фрагмента хроники Сигеберта из Жамблу. В книге действительно привлекался перевод М. Б. Свердлова, опубликованный в книге: *Латиноязычные источники по истории Древней Руси* (М., 1989). Но, думаю, следует учитывать то, что никто не застрахован от ошибок, даже переводчики высокого класса. Зная о разногласиях питерских и московских коллег, я не считаю нужным вмешиваться (рецензент же вмешался «подпольно» и достаточно своеобразным образом,⁵³ см. в его рецензии с. 424). Тем более, что для целей моей книги было важно то, что в этой хронике сообщалось об изгнании Изяслава Ярославича «всей землей», в то время как из ПВЛ известно об изгнании Изяслава его братьями-князьями, и именно это расхождение было предметом рассмотрения.

К «деконструкции исторического анализа» П. В. Лукина.

Этот пространный раздел включает множество претензий, которые, в отличие от предыдущих, могли бы повлиять на оценку результатов исследования. При одном условии — если бы замечания рецензента были бы справедливыми. Однако ближайшее рассмотрение показывает, что утверждения П. В. Лукина не соответствуют действительности. Ниже привожу наиболее примечательные образцы его суждений. Почти каждый из помещенных ниже примеров требует детального анализа и точного цитирования слов рецензента, поэтому читателю потребуется некоторое терпение.

1) Интересный пассаж встречаем на с. 425; кстати, его П. В. Лукину выгоднее было бы поместить в «деконструкцию текстологии». Это один из немногих случаев, когда рецензент затрагивает тезис о противоречиях в параллельных версиях летописей (см. 2-ю главу, св. 100 страниц текста), но старается создать впечатление, что никаких противоречий нет. При этом, обнаруживает непонимание содержания рецензируемой им книги.

(52) Как правило, «отсутствие аналога» называется «нулевым соответствием».

(53) Ссылаясь не на перевод А. В. Назаренко, см. А. В. Назаренко, *Древняя Русь на международных путях. Междисциплинарные очерки культурных, торговых, политических связей IX–XII веков* (Москва, 2001) 530, — а попытавшись создать видимость собственной деятельности.

«Все случаи поиска мнимых противоречий в летописных известиях, позволяющих автору пространно распространяться о “нарративном конструировании”, невозможно перечислить. Здесь можно легко выбирать любой эпизод наугад. Вот Т. Л. Вилкул пишет о борьбе за Киев после смерти Изяслава Мстиславича, и, естественно, сразу же в рассказах о ней целую россыпь “неувязок” (с. 149). Летописи, например, сообщают о приглашении киевлянами на княжение Изяслава Давыдовича из-за страха перед половцами. Автор удивляется: ведь “половцы находились как раз в войске Изяслава и угроза исходила именно от него”. Что здесь удивительного, непонятно. Киевляне, естественно, боялись погрома своего города степняками-союзниками Изяслава — и, стремясь его избежать, вынуждены были признать его князем».

Прежде всего, относительно неувязок: в книге речь идет не об Изяславе Давыдовиче и половцах, а о *редактировании* текста Ипат., при котором возникли несогласования с предыдущим слоем летописных записей. При определении сравниваются соответствующие фрагменты Ипат. и Лавр.⁵⁴ Т.е., судя по всему, рецензент не понимает

(54) Текст книги, с. 149: «Ипат включает дополнительные блоки сведений о Ростиславе Мстиславиче¹⁴⁰, вписанные симпатизировавшим ему летописцем, и множество деталей, касающихся других князей. Часть из них привела к неувязкам с фрагментами общего с Лавр текста, что свидетельствует об очевидно позднем редактировании Киевского свода. Например, племянник Ростислава Мстислав Изяславич бросает дядю, войско еще два дня бьется с половцами, и половцы даже “смятошась” (“пришли в замешательство”, слово, употребляемое обычно в победных описаниях бегства врагов). После чего русские князья в спешке бегут, причем Мстислав бежит вместе с остальными, чего не могло быть, если бы сражение в самом деле продолжалось еще два дня после его ухода. В Лавр этого двухдневного периода нет. Далее, в дополнительных фрагментах Ипат сын Ростислава Святослав спасает отца, а в общем с Лавр тексте он бежит вместе со Мстиславом, то есть отдельно от Ростислава. Оба фрагмента Ипат следуют один за другим, и, таким образом, Святослав “пребывает” одновременно в двух разных местах¹⁴¹».

Прим. 140: «Радость киевлян по поводу того, что Ростислав пришел в Киев (470–471И); справедливое наделение им Святослава Всеволодича (471И); оказание помощи Мстиславу Изяславичу (471–472И); щедрая раздача “имѣния” Вячеслава церквям, монастырям и убогим (473И); описание битвы с половцами, где Ростислав бьется с врагами, а не бежит при одном их виде (475И). См. также вероятный пропуск фрагмента общего с Лавр текста. По Лавр, Юрий “Не помяня злобы брата его и его”, то есть Изяслава Мстиславича и самого Ростислава. В Ипат только “злобы брата его”, значит, одного Изяслава; 476И — 344Л.

того, что обсуждаются текстологические приметы (!). Относительно приглашения черниговского князя Изяслава. В моей книге пишется о том, что летописец пытается уверить читателя, что киевляне не предавали своего князя, и, одновременно, старается воспрепятствовать напрашивающемуся предположению, что поступок горожан уж очень похож на капитуляцию после поражения в войне. Отмечается и тот факт, что исследователи уже обращали внимание на странную «добровольность» приглашения Изяслава, сделана ссылка на книгу Н. Ф. Котляра.⁵⁵

В целом, на с. 148 предварительно сравнивается сообщение Ипат. и сообщение НПЛ; об НПЛ подробнее речь идет далее, на с. 151. «Выбирая наугад» это параллельное известие, рецензенту следовало бы уведомить читателей о том, что я анализирую три текста: Ипат., Лавр. и НПЛ. В том числе, привожу свидетельство НПЛ, где об Изяславе Давыдовиче сказано, что он сел в Киеве без приглашения киевлян, тогда как в Ипат. и Лавр. (представляющих собой две редакции одного рассказа, почему и необходимо было оговорить особенности редакторской работы летописца) подробно описывается приглашение. Всего в 1-м разделе 2-й главы привлекаются 10 параллельных сюжетов;⁵⁶ для получения более четкой картины в завершении раздела приводится таблица наличия формантов этой нарративной модели (с. 160). Среди параллельных известий — такие, напр., как ослепле-

Прим. 141: «Подробнее: *Вилкул Т. А.* О происхождении общего текста, 53–56».

(55) Текст, с. 148–149: «Летописец, похоже, хотел сказать, что Ростислав сам был повинен в своем несчастье, оказался плохим политиком, и, во всяком случае, его никто не предавал (что вызывает сомнения в свете данных НПЛ, см. ниже). После поражения киевляне вынуждены были пригласить на стол черниговского князя, и вновь нет речи о предательстве — говорится о мирном приглашении на свободный стол из-за страха перед половцами, хотя половцы находились как раз в войске Изяслава и угроза исходила именно от него¹³⁸.

“Тогда же тяжко бысть кыяномъ, не остал бо ся бяшетъ у них никаковъ князь. И послаша кыяне... по Изяслава по Давыдовича, рекуще: поиди г Киеву, ать не возмутъ нас половци”».

Прим. 138: «Отмечалось, например, в: *Котляр Н. Ф.* Древнерусская государственность. С. 339».

(56) Кстати, параллельное сообщение 1154 г. достаточно сложно для анализа, поскольку Ипат. и Лавр. имеют общие фрагменты текста, версия Ипат. сильно отредактирована, а НПЛ лапидарна. Поэтому оно помещено в конце ряда параллельных известий нарративной модели «Оправдание / осуждение князя».

ние Ростиславичей их дядей Всеволодом Юрьевичем или история повешения Игоревичей в Галиче. Два ослепления или два повешения одних и тех же князей вообразить себе невозможно,⁵⁷ тем временем, в одной из летописей это деяние приписывается князю, а в другой (других) — «людям».

Таким образом, противоречия в параллельных текстах действительно существуют, но П. В. Лукин «борется» с этим непреложным фактом своеобразным способом: замалчивая то, что в монографии проведен анализ серии параллельных известий, и позволяя себе сразу два неадекватных тексту рецензируемого им исследования высказывания в одном абзаце. А именно, относя неувязки не к редактированию в Ипат., а к известию о приглашении Изяслава Давыдовича, и «забывая» сообщить о том, что «псевдодобровольность» поступка киевлян уже отмечалась исследователями. Впрочем, скорее всего, сознательное искажение одно, а высказывание о «россыпи неувязок» связано с непониманием содержания. Иначе говоря, весьма велика вероятность того, что оппонент не понял, что «неувязки» отмечаются в отредактированном тексте Ипат. и что приводятся доказательства редактирования: наличие швов и противоречий. В таком случае его квалификация в области текстологии оказывается под сомнением, но выбор именно таков: искажение либо непонимание.

2) Следующий пример, по замыслу рецензента, должен продемонстрировать неверность другого тезиса автора, о неустойчивости летописной терминологии. Текст Повести временных лет вызывает у П. В. Лукина «простую мысль»:

«В рассказе о белгородском киселе (ПВЛ под 997 г.) старейшины градские и «люди», разумеется, не отождествляются, а составляют разные группы населения, что прямо вытекает из слов самих старейшин: “Не стерпеть людье глада”. Комментарии автора только запутывают вполне ясный текст. Сообщение о том, что старцу, которые не был на вече, “людье поведаша... яко утро хотять ся людье предати печенѣгом”, Т. Л. Вилкул снабжает такой ремаркой: “людье (собеседники старца. — Т. В.) поведаша... яко утро хотят ся людье (на этот раз участники веча) предати печенегом”. Простая мысль о том, что собеседники старца наверняка тоже были участниками веча, очевидно, не приходит украинской исследовательнице в голову» (с. 425).

(57) Эти два сюжета в книге — с. 117–124, 129–130; см. также в более доступной для российского читателя статье: Т. Л. Вилкул, Конструирование нарратива в параллельных летописных сообщениях о вече, в: *Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы* (Москва, 2004) 212–222.

В ПВЛ читаем: «И людье повѣдаша ему . яко утро хотят ся людье предатися печенѣгом . се слышавъ посла по старѣишины градскыя . и рече имь слышахъ, яко хочете ся передати печенѣгом . они же рѣша . не стерпятъ людье глада». Напомню, в книге речь идет о том, что одна и та же группа людей летописцем могла обозначаться по-разному и, наоборот, одно и то же название могло использоваться для обозначения разных групп; пример с «белгородским киселем» приводится как иллюстрация этого положения. При переводе на современный русский язык: «люди сообщили... что на следующий день люди собираются сдаться...» (члены одной группы говорят о другой в третьем лице). Если попытаться создать аналогичную конструкцию: «москвичи сообщили ему... что... москвичи... собираются... и воззвал он к руководящим лицам, и сказал им: “Слышал, что собираетесь...”, — они же ответили: “Не вытерпят москвичи...”» («москвичи» можно заменить на «киевляне» и пр.). Часто ли говорят о себе в третьем лице, а потом заменяют это иным обозначением?⁵⁸ В моей книге речь идет не о том, что собеседники старца могли быть или могли не быть участниками веча, но о том, что в данном фрагменте слово «людье» имеет разные значения: ‘случайная (и, видимо, небольшая) группа собеседников’ белгородского старца и ‘политическая общность’, принимающая решение о сдаче города; последняя названа также «старѣишинами градскими». «Простая мысль» рецензента показывает то, что он не понимает в данном случае текста летописи — здесь достаточно просто.

3) Далее рецензент обращается к свидетельству Жития Авраамия Смоленского, и высказывает аналогичные претензии — непонимание текста автором и неверность тезиса о неустойчивости терминологии — пополняя их упреком в «выборочном цитировании»:

«Не меньшую роль играет и такой старый (но недобрый) метод, как “выборочное” (в свою пользу) цитирование, меняющее порой смысл текста на противоположный... Фраза цитируется следующим образом: “Събраша же ся вси от мала и до велика, весь градъ на нь (Авраамия. — Т. В.)... Всем же собравшимся на дворъ владыченъ, игуменомъ же и попомъ, и черньцемъ, княземъ и бояромъ, диакони и вси церьковници...” (и далее говорится о суде). А вот что скрывается за первым многоточием: “...градъ на нь, инии глаголють заточити, а инии къ стѣнѣ тоу привоздити и зажещи, а друзии потопити и, проведше

(58) Если только речь не идет об ироническом контексте, что для древнерусских летописей невозможно.

въсквозѣ градѣ. Всем же собравшимся". Нетрудно заметить, что "весь град" лишь требовал расправы с Авраамием, а к судившим его это словосочетание не применяется» (с. 427).

Прежде всего необходимо отметить, что ратующий за полноту цитирования рецензент «забывает» продолжить цитату, приведенную в книге на с. 66: «Посланья же слугы, емше, яко злодѣа влачяху... и весь градѣ, и по торгу, и по улицамъ — везде полна народа, и мужи же, глаголю, и жены, и дѣти». Речь идет о том, что словосочетание «весь градѣ» в двух соседних фразах жития использовано в разных значениях: для обозначения собравшихся на судилище на «дворѣ владычень» и для обозначения наблюдавших позор Авраамия жителей Смоленска. И это действительно так.⁵⁹ Если остановиться на свидетельствах Жития подробнее, следует отметить следующее. «Дѣти» вряд ли могли желать «заточити и пригвоздити», тем более, что буквально несколькими строками выше «попы» жаловались на то, что святой «уже наши дѣти вся обратиль естъ». ⁶⁰ В Житии выражение «весь градѣ» встречается также ранее, в повествовании о наличии в «граде» сочувствующих Авраамию и о сопротивлении ему в «официальных кругах»: «...и паки не преставааху, крамолы на нь въздвизающе въ градѣ и везде, глаголюще: «Се уже весь градѣ к собѣ обратиль естъ». ⁶¹ Эти учтенные при написании монографии известия не цитировались, поскольку в книге с достаточно широкой тематикой невозможно поместить все свидетельства источников. Не говоря уже о том, что никак нельзя было предусмотреть, что пылкий рецензент, предъявляя претензии, не ознакомится с несколько более широким контекстом, нежели фрагмент, охватывающий менее одного листа текста жития. Наконец, возвращаясь к исходной фразе, столь категорически истолкованной П. В. Лукиным: из Жития Авраамия не следует, что к судившим святого словосочетание «весь градѣ» не применяется — «все»

(59) Без купюр этот фрагмент Жития выглядит следующим образом: «Събраша же ся вси от мала и до велика весь градѣ на нь: инии глаголють заточити и, а инии къ стѣнѣ ту пригвоздити и зажещи, а друзии потопити и, проведше въсквозе градѣ. Всѣм же собравшимся на дворѣ владычень, игуменомъ же и попомъ, и черньцемъ, княземъ и боляромъ, диакони и вси церьковници, внегда послаша по блаженаго, уже всѣмъ собравшимся. Посланья же слугы, емше, яко злодѣа влачяху, овии ругахуся ему, инии же насмихахуся ему и бесчинная словеса кыдающе, и весь градѣ и по торгу, и по улицамъ — вездѣ полна народа, и мужи же, глаголю, и жены, и дѣти, и бѣ позорѣ тяжекъ видѣти».

(60) ПЛДР. XIII век (Москва, 1981) 80.

(61) Там же, с. 74.

предварительно обсуждали и «все» собрались. Таким образом, мое прочтение опирается на полный текст Жития Авраамия Смоленского, рецензент же, очевидно, исходил из чего-то иного.

4) Далее, разбирая известия о степняках и дружине в Киевском своде (ПСРЛ, т. 2, стб. 424–428), рецензент обвиняет меня в «глухих ссылках» (в книге с. 81, ссылки занимают часть текста примечания 321), неточном воспроизведении летописи, неверной расстановке современных знаков препинания, замене «рекуче» на «рекоша» при цитировании Ипатьевского свода и, в целом, неправильной интерпретации. Степняки-де не могли входить «in corpore» в состав дружины, следует писать о том, что «характеризуется состав войска»: сначала дружина, затем остальные составляющие (киевляне, черные клобуки и т.п.). Сразу необходимо отметить, что в цитатах П. В. Лукин применяет весьма примечательные сокращения и использует не древнюю пунктуацию, а современную.⁶²

(62) См. с. 427–429: «Еще один “деконструктивный” способ, применяемый Т. Л. Вилкул, очень прост (так и хочется сказать, до неприличия). Назовем его методом глухих ссылок. Автор, скажем, утверждает, что в “Киевском своде” в составе Ип. “есть перечисления, где дружина отделена от степняков, и такие, где степняки... включаются в состав дружины” (с. 81)... В подтверждение данного тезиса Т. Л. Вилкул приводит три упоминания “под 1151 г., где дружина — общее название для киян и черных клобуков” (с. 81, сноска), на стб. 424, 426, 428 шахматовского издания Ип. Первое и третье упоминания даются в глухих ссылках, второе приводится в весьма своеобразном виде (об этом ниже). Обратимся к летописному тексту. Стб. 424: “Вячславъ же, и Изяславъ съ братомъ своим Ростиславомъ, и съ Изяславомъ Давыдовичемъ, и съ Ярославомъ братом своимъ, и с Городеньским княземъ, и с дружиною своею, и с Кияны, и с Черными клобуки... поидоша...”. Характеризуется состав войска: сначала перечисляются князья, потом упоминается дружина, потом киевляне, потом черные клобуки. Ни малейших оснований считать последних частью дружины нет. /то же о тексте, стб. 428; далее рецензент пишет о неверном воспроизведении мною текста/ Вот что на самом деле написано в источнике: “Дружина же Вячеслава, и Изяслава, и Ростислава, и всех князи оустягывахоуть от того /военных действий. — П. Л./, и Кияне, наипаче же Чернии Клобуци от того оустягоша, рекоуче... Вячеславъ же, Изяславъ и Ростиславъ послоушавше дружины своея, и Киянь, и Черныхъ Клобуковъ...”. Во-первых, как и в двух других упоминаниях, дружина здесь — часть войска, черные клобуки в нее, разумеется, не входят (более того, здесь как будто специально уточняется, что черные клобуки не хотели воевать больше, чем другие (“наипаче”): дружинники и киевляне). Во-вторых, выясняется, как “работает” с источниками Т. Л. Вилкул: летописную фразу она отредактировала (заменила “рекоуче” на “рекоша”, так чтобы

Одно замечание среди перечисленных является верным — о «рекуче» и «рекоша». Эта ошибка вызвана использованием гарвардского факсимильного издания Хлебниковского списка, где «рекоша». ⁶³ В остальном же, обратившись к тексту летописи, где современных знаков препинания нет, обнаружим, что действительное положение вещей не соотносится с картиной, нарисованной П. В. Лукиным. Прежде всего, во всех случаях в летописи описывается не «состав войска», а совещания. Говорится: «и тако оугадавшє», «не оудоумаша», «почаша доумати». Рецензент *всякий раз* цитирует летопись без этих слов, обрывая цитаты или обозначая невыгодные для его интерпретации выражения отточием, но они, тем не менее, в летописи присутствуют. ⁶⁴ Я расставляю современные знаки препинания следующим образом: «съ дружиною своею: и с кияны, и с черными клобуки» (Ипат., стб. 424); «дружина же оустягывахоуть... (и кияне, наипаче же чернии клобоуци)» (стб. 426); «дружины своя: и киянь, и черных клобо-

получилось полноценное сказуемое), а “ненужную” информацию (упоминание в первой части киевлян и черных клобуков) просто выкинула».

(63) Хлебниковский список представляет, наряду с самим Ипатьевским, Ипатьевский свод. О. PRITSAK (ed.), *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Chlebnikov) and Četvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990) (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, VIII) 190 (Хлебн. арк. 386). Одно время я работала с этим изданием, а не с ПСРЛ, т. 2, и, стандартизируя ссылки по Ипатьевской версии, ненароком оставила чтение Хлебн.

(64) В частности, в 1-й цитате рецензент «забыл» всего три слова, «и тако оугадавшє», проставив вместо них отточие. См. ПСРЛ, т. 2, стб. 424: «и съ дружиною своею . и с кияны и с черными клобуки *и тако оугадавшє* поидоша». Далее (стб. 428), судя по всему, также речь идет о некоем совещании: троица князей «повелѣша Володимироу поити... и тако нарядѣ створше . в собѣ кнѣзи и дружина . и чернии клобоуци . и кияне . и тако *не оудоумаша*». Здесь П. В. Лукин оборвал цитату. В третьем случае речь также идет о совете (стб. 426): «Вячьславъ же и Изяславъ и Ростиславъ . съзвавше бра^тю свою . и почаша доумати . Изяславъ... всегда хотяшеть противу имъ бится . дружина же... оустягывахоуть от того...». П. В. Лукин снова «укоротил» цитату. Между прочим, черные клобуки (стб. 426) говорят князю: «...а тобѣ боудет *оставяче своѣ пѣшьцьѣ* поѣхати», — т. е., по крайней мере, «пешци», находившиеся в войске, в состав совещавшихся не входят. Кстати, по неизвестной причине рецензент считает, что свидетельством того, что черные клобуки не могли входить дружину, должны быть их советы князю, обнаруживающие «нежелание воевать». Но подобные советы «дружины» не бросаться безрассудно в бой в летописях обычны, начиная с советов князю Игорю, сыну Рюрика (о последнем сюжете см. с. 77, прим. 297).

уковъ» (стб. 427);⁶⁵ «кнзи и дружина (и чернии клобоуци, и кияне)» (стб. 428). Основание для этого следующее. Речь идет о совещаниях, а в Киевском своде находим множество иных эпизодов, где говорится о совещании князей с «дружиной», но состав при этом подробно не расписывается. Сопоставление известных позволяет сделать вывод, что «дружина» — общее, включающее понятие.

Что касается того, что «свои поганые» (берендеи, торки и пр.) не могли входить в состав дружины. Сравним два текста. Первый — речь «берендичей» Мстиславу Изяславичу, под 1159 г.: «аже ны хоцещи любити . яко же ны есть любиль оць твои . и по городу ны даси по лепшему...». Второй — речь «галицких мужей» князю Ярославу Володимирковичу, под 1153 г.: «галичський же мужи почаша молвити кнзю своему Ярославу ты еси . молодь . а поеди прочь и нас позоруи . како ны будеть оць твои кормиль и любиль...»⁶⁶

Таким образом, моя ошибка, вызванная использованием факсимильного издания Хлебниковского списка, на самом деле не влияет существенно на интерпретацию, поскольку истолкование текста в книге опирается не на сокращение фрагмента Киевского свода, а на комплекс многочисленных и существенных свидетельств. Тем временем, рецензент, пытаясь доказать обратное, не только упускает из виду этот комплекс известий, но всячески «укорачивает» даже разбираемые им свидетельства, дабы иметь возможность определять их как описания войска, тогда как на деле речь идет о совещаниях. Вдобавок, он игнорирует известия Киевского свода, где за середину и 2-ю половину XII в. масса сведений о «своих поганых» и «дружине», и ПВЛ, содержащей множество сообщений о совещаниях князей с «дружиной».

5) На с. 426–427 П. В. Лукин пишет о вече 1255 г. В книге отмечается то обстоятельство, что новгородские войска, конники и пешие, стояли в двух разных местах на окраинах города, тогда как в центре собиралось вече, причем в НПЛ упоминаются «старѣишие» и «меншии». Рецензент считает, что при нападении на Новгород горожанам не нужно было находиться на определенном месте, они «без особых

(65) Рецензент расставляет современные знаки препинания иначе, никак не обосновывая свое решение. Кстати, то, что П. В. Лукин проставил их строго по своему вкусу, выглядит показательно в свете его заявления, что исследователь должен выставлять их «максимально невыгодно для себя» (с. 421).

(66) ПСРЛ, т. 2, стб. 466, 501. Под 1159 г. описывается такая ситуация: князь пытается договориться с лучшими «мужами» берендичей, помогающих его сопернику, и переманить их на свою сторону.

затруднений» могли отправиться в центр города, и ссылается на «подобные случаи». ⁶⁷ На самом деле имеется в виду всего лишь один «подобный случай», из описания похода 1217 г., притом, обстоятельства разнятся кардинально. В НПЛ под 1255 г. описывается нападение Александра, когда князь с войском находился на околицах Новгорода. Новгородский «полк» должен был «стоять» три дня «за правду новгородскую». Если бы так легко было оголить фронт и отправиться всем скопом на Ярославово дворище в центр города, то с тем же успехом новгородцы могли сидеть по домам, «выставив дозор». Приведенный пример с походом 1217 г. касается иной ситуации: в НПЛ читается о движении войск по «пересеченной местности», где они еще не видели друг друга, и вполне могли даже «минуться в лесех» (разойтись в лесах, не встретив друг друга). Внезапное нападение чуди на новгородский лагерь и объяснялось тем, что новгородцы не знали, где находится войско противника. Но в 1255 г. речь фактически шла об осаде Новгорода. Таким образом, П. В. Лукин «филигранно смешивает» разнородные явления.

6) На с. 431, разбирая известие Лавр. 1178 г. (в книге о нем см. с. 147), рецензент пишет о том, что никаких противоречий в тексте нет, и что автор книги, предполагая в этом месте редактирование, предлагает читателям «совершенно искусственное и бездоказательное объяснение». ⁶⁸ Между тем, в книге на с. 147, прим. 132, сделана от-

(67) На с. 426–427 рецензии: «В 1255 г. новгородцы ожидали нападения на город Александра Невского с войском и поставили полки «за Рождеством Христовом в конци» (имеется в виду церковь Рождества на кладбище) и «от святого Ильи противу Городища» (имеется в виду церковь Ильи на Славне). Далее говорится о вече у Николо-Дворищенского собора. Т. А. Вилкул усматривает тут противоречие и основание искать «какой-то иной код для прочтения» (с. 245). Но для человека, хотя бы раз бывавшего в Великом Новгороде и представляющего себе расстояния от указанных пунктов до Ярославова дворища, «иной код» не требуется: новгородцы (взрослые мужчины-воины) без особых затруднений могли прийти на вече, выставив дозор, как это делалось в подобных случаях, а потом вернуться обратно».

Кстати, предполагается, что автор книги не мог бывать в Новгороде Великом, и не имеет представления о реальных расстояниях. Небольшая ремарка личного характера: в бытность студенткой я работала на Трицком раскопе в экспедиции В. Л. Янина, и неплохо представляю себе расстояния в городе и округе.

(68) «Между тем, совершенно эксплицитно сказано (как и в НПЛ): «Князь же Всеволодъ взя городъ Торжекъ...», отличие только в том, что в Лавр, где повествование более подробно, говорится специально о роли

ссылка к первой главе, с. 80, прим. 316, где отмечена несовместимость грамматических конструкций в тексте:

«Ср.: "...а сам перебравъ дружины нѣколикѡ, ѿха (ед. ч.) к Ламьскому Волоку, и пусти на воропъ, и пригнавшѣ дружина, яша (мн. ч.) князя Мстиславича Ярослава, сыновця ему, а городъ пожже (ед. ч.), а людье бяху выбѣгли, а жита пожгоща (мн. ч.) и до всего. Князь же Всеволодъ възвратися в Володимерь"; 387Л. Помимо всего прочего, конструкция с повторяющимся союзом "а" не предполагает вводных предложений, и чередуются сегменты с союзом "и" и союзом "а". Все это также косвенно указывает на редактирование».

Кроме того, выше, на с. 146 приведен обширный фрагмент Лавр. В данном месте в суздальском своде обильное цитирование Библии, присущее пространным повествованиям, сочетается с формульным летописным нарративом, характерным для лаконичных сообщений летописей — напр., для НПЛ за начало-середину XII в. Кажется бы, человека, читавшего летописи и знакомого с особенностями так называемых «летописных повестей» и летописных кратких известий (при всей условности этих обозначений), такое сочетание должно навести на размышления. Наконец, анализируя это известие, неплохо было бы заметить и такое обстоятельство, что в Лавр. перевернута последовательность событий: поход на Торжок — смерть Мстислава Ростиславича (в книге см. с. 147).⁶⁹ То, что П. В. Лукин всего этого не заметил, вызывает вопрос: следует ли замечание рецензента о «бездоказательности и искусственности» отнести на счет его квалификации в области текстологии и лингвистики, или же это очередное сознательное искажение.

7) На с. 431–432 утверждается, что в известии НПЛ 1218 г. не говорится об участии в вечерях «междоусобных столкновениях» детей, «но просто говорится: «и тако быша вѣча по всю недѣлю». Подобная интерпретация П. В. Лукина вновь отличается замечательной «простою». Если принять такое толкование, тогда окажется, что в летописи зачем-то сообщалось о посторонних событиях, но тревожные «вѣча»,

дружины. Т. Л. Вилкул цитирует эту фразу, но почему-то предлагает ей совершенно искусственное и бездоказательное объяснение, предполагая позднейшее редактирование (с. 147, сноска), хотя никаких противоречий в том, что при взятии города действуют и князь, и дружина, нет».

(69) Должно быть наоборот. Несоответствие отмечено Н. Г. Бережковым, и учтено при анализе параллельных известий НПЛ и Лавр в моей книге.

бывшие «по всю недѣлю»,⁷⁰ почему-то не описывались и результат возник «из воздуха». По-видимому, следует учитывать, что союз «и тако» часто обозначает итоговое состояние. Т.е. летописное «и тако быша вѣча во всю неделю» относится именно к тем столкновениям и убийствам, которые начались с того, что князь захватил одного из новгородцев, и «ониполовици» (жители «оного пола», т.е. Торговой стороны) «възвониша» и «поидоша... и до дѣтии в брѣняхъ». Кстати, в НПЛ не вполне идентичные, но подобные выражения встречаются позднее, и касаются вече: 1270 г. «и съзвониша вѣче на Ярославли дворѣ и убиша Иванка»; 1299 г. «и съзвонивше вѣче у стои Софьи кнѣзь Борисъ Андрѣви¹ со всѣми новгородци».

8) На с. 431 П. В. Лукин пишет о том, что автор не приводит никаких расчетов размеров и вместимости площадей древнерусских городов, «что делает довод [о небольших площадях — Т. В.] голословным». Рецензент называет «голословным» утверждение, которое идет в таком контексте:

(с. 221) На незначительность площадей вечевых собраний обращали внимание В. Л. Янин и П. П. Толочко. В. Л. Янин локализует новгородское вече на Ярославовом дворище, на месте, занимаемом сейчас одним из церковных строений, и считает, что там могли поместиться несколько сотен (а именно, 300) человек.²⁰ П. П. Толочко, полемизируя с И. Я. Фрояновым по поводу выражения «вси кияне от мала и до велика», справедливо отмечал, что на сравнительно небольшой двор киевской Софии вряд ли могли собраться все жители Киева²¹.

²⁰ В. Л. Янин опирается на упоминание в немецком источнике XIV в. «трехсот золотых поясов». Янин В. Л., Колчин Б. А. Археологии Новгорода — 50 лет. С. 117; Янин В. Л. Социально-политическая структура. С. 92 и др. Правда, сообщение о «300 золотых поясах» 1331 г., вероятно, не является известием о вече. См.:

(70) Привожу, с некоторыми купюрами, выдержку из НПЛ, ПСРД, т. 3, с. 58–59: «и възвониша у святого Николы ониполовици цересь ночь, а Неревьскыи коньчъ у Святыхъ 40, такоже копяче люди на Твѣрдислава. И бысть заутра, пусти кнѣзь Магѣя, учювь гѣлку и мятежь въ городѣ. И поидоша ониполовици и до дѣтии въ брѣняхъ, акы на рать, а неревляне такоже; а загородьци не вѣсташа ни по сихъ, ни по сихъ, нъ зряху перезора. Твѣрдиславъ же, позря на святую Софию, и рече ... и поиде съ Людинемъ концемъ и съ пруси. И бысть сеця у городьныхъ воротъ ... чюдо свади оканьнии дияволь... ся начаяша бити межи собою; и убиша муж прус, а концянь другыи, а оньхъполовиць Ивана Душильцевиця ... Бысть же се мѣсяця генваря... и тако быша вѣча по всю недѣлю».

Расмуссен К. «300 золотых поясов» древнего Новгорода // *Skando-Slavica*. Т. 25 (Copenhagen, 1979), 97; *Чебанова Е. И.* «300 золотых поясов»: проблемы интерпретации термина // *Проблемы социального и гуманитарного знания*. СПб., 1999. С. 166–182; *Гранберг Ю.* Совет господ Новгорода в немецких источниках // *ДГ* 1998. М., 2000. С. 78–87; *Андреев В. Ф.* О социальном составе новгородского веча // *Генезис и развитие феодализма в России*. Л., 1989. Вып. 11. С. 73–74. Тем не менее, мысль о небольшой вместимости вечевой площади, по-видимому, верна.

²¹ *Толочко П. П.* Киев и Киевская земля. С. 108–109. Согласно демографическим реконструкциям, в крупных древнерусских городах могло проживать от 10 до 50 тыс. чел. *Толочко П. П.* Древнерусский феодальный город. К., 1989. С. 201. В Новгороде, например, насчитывалось 4–5 тыс. дворов: *Андреев В. Ф.* О социальном составе. С. 77–78. НПЛ, описывая пожар, захвативший весь город, называет цифру в 4300 сгоревших дворов; НЛ, с. 52.

Как видим, в книге приведены ссылки на работы В. Л. Янина и П. П. Толочко, признанных специалистов в области древнерусской археологии; затронут вопрос о так называемых «300 золотых поясах». Между прочим, этих ссылок невозможно не заметить, и значит, в данном случае можно уже уверенно утверждать о сознательном искажении П. В. Лукиным содержания рецензируемой им монографии.

Примеры можно было бы продолжать, но, думается, этого достаточно. На последних страницах П. В. Лукин представляет своеобразное резюме:

«Хайден Уайт и другие, главным образом, заокеанские ученые не могут нести ответственность за то, как их “интерпретируют” на постсоветском пространстве. Однако в самом обращении таких авторов, как Т. Л. Вилкул, к “нарративизму” и “деконструкции” есть, как представляется, определенная закономерность... Мы имеем дело не с банальным “культурологическим” словоблудием, и не с научным исследованием в настоящем смысле слова, а с имитацией последнего, претендующей на то, чтобы “деконструировать” якобы устаревшую позитивную науку и подменить ее вульгарной идеологией» (с. 433–434).

Как уже отмечалось, рецензент не полемизирует с идеями моей книги и не освещает ее содержание. Ни одно основное положение ему опровергнуть не удалось. Если в рецензии пишется о некоем капитальном утверждении в книге, то на деле часто оказывается, что речь идет о примечании или части примечания. Далее,

П. В. Лукин позволяет себе значительное количество неверных утверждений, по его собственной терминологии — «с массой передергиваний и выборочного цитирования». Эти заведомо ложные высказывания вряд ли допустимы в профессиональной научной работе. Зачастую рецензент демонстрирует недостаточное знакомство с материалом, что ставит под вопрос его квалификацию для вынесения суждений по многим вопросам: «простые мысли», недочитывание текстов источников и текстологически некорректные интерпретации являются достоянием рецензии П. В. Лукина. Все это делает его претензии на освещение научности моей книги, мягко говоря, сомнительными.

Что касается того тезиса, что нормальная наука есть наука традиционная, новаторство же представляется рецензенту вульгарной идеологизирующей «лженаукой». Относительно новаторства, рискуя повториться, скажу, что тема веча чрезвычайно трудна для современного исследователя, поскольку очень многое сделано предыдущими поколениями историков. По сути, существуют два пути: искать новое либо же «забывать» сделанное другими и пытаться перелицовывать историографию.⁷¹ О «вульгаризации»: как я попыталась выше показать, к «простоте» и «простой мысли» часто апеллирует именно рецензент, тогда как на деле речь идет о достаточно сложных явлениях. «Идеологичность» проявляется еще более ярко. В ряде мест отчетливо видно, как П. В. Лукин манипулирует текстами и подстраивает их под собственные воззрения. Для оценки же качества идеологической риторики приводятся выдержки из его рецензии.

Напоследок, несколько пожеланий относительно ведения полемики. Видимо, было бы лучше, если бы П. В. Лукин не искажал положения книги, обсуждаемые в его рецензии. Представляется, что рецензенту следует корректно и полностью прочесть источники, прежде чем делать какие-либо высказывания по поводу неверной интерпретации. Неплохо было бы также, если бы П. В. Лукин не пытался выдать свое видение проблем, во многих случаях, весьма упрощенное и, зачастую — просто неверное, за единственно правильное.

(71) Кстати сказать, П. В. Лукин, как видно хотя бы из его недавней работы: раздела «Вече: социальный состав» в кн.: *Древняя Русь. Очерки политического и социального строя* (Москва, 2008), — избрал второй путь. В историографическом разделе его труда среди ученых 2-й половины XX – начала XXI вв. очень бегло названы В. Л. Янин (со ссылкой на одну (!) работу), П. П. Толочко (вообще без ссылок!), не назван М. Б. Свердлов (! тема веча рассматривается в нескольких книгах российского ученого) и другие.

Не говоря уже о том, рецензент должен был бы, по крайней мере, понимать содержание рецензируемого им труда. Разумеется, П. В. Лукину вольно ощущать себя блюстителем российской исторической науки. Однако, проводя свои «деконструкции», исследователь допустил массу разнообразных ошибок и прибег к сознательному подлогу, покусившись на суверенитет читателя и навязывая ему свое толкование содержания книги. Все это позволяет видеть иные мотивы рецензии, чем просто отстаивание истины... Какие это мотивы — личные, политические, идеологические — решать читателю монографии, рецензии на нее и двух ответов.⁷²

(72) (Это прим. написано после написания основного текста). Как мне стало известно, П. В. Лукин написал ответ на мой ответ, в марте этого года; московский коллега имел возможность работать с рукописью моего текста, любезно предоставленной ему издателем *Scrinium*. Позднее издатель любезно объяснил мне, что в редакции принято решение предоставить еще раз слово Лукину, и на этом полемику закрыть. Решение, как представляется, совершенно верное, совпадающее и с моими собственными намерениями. Кроме всего прочего, полемика с исследователем, пытающимся «проверить» древнеславянский текст по Синодальному переводу, может быть сколь угодно продолжительной, но, тем не менее, бесплодной. Итак, в следующем номере *Scrinium* продолжения не последует.

НУЖНО ЛИ НАМ «НОВАТОРСТВО»? (ОБ ОТВЕТЕ Т. Л. ВИЛКУЛ)

Ознакомление с ответом Т. Л. Вилкул вызвало у меня как ни странно в большей степени позитивные чувства. Во-первых, она отказывается от понятия «деконструкция» применительно к историческим исследованиям и даже признается, что он «появляется в высказываниях далеко не интеллектуальных персонажей». Правда, совсем недавно (в 2004 г.) украинская исследовательница обличала А. В. Назаренко именно за то, что он не использует в своих работах «деконструкцию».¹ Тем не менее, я с радостью принимаю это замечание и вношу необходимое изменение в текст моей рецензии: во всех случаях вместо слова «деконструкция» (кроме самого первого, в названии, которое теперь должно читаться «Деконструкция новаторства») следует читать «новаторство». Во-вторых, когда я прочитал книгу Т. Л. Вилкул, многие ее «новаторские» особенности я был склонен объяснять слишком сложным образом: как своего рода постмодернистскую игру, основанную на манипуляции источниками. Теперь же я вижу, что украинская исследовательница всерьез верит в свое «новаторство» и вполне искренне не понимает, почему у многих коллег оно вызывает скепсис, а иногда, — чего греха таить, — и плохо скрываемую иронию.

Убежденность Т. Л. Вилкул в своей правоте основывается на том, что она при знании множества второстепенных, хотя и важных вещей, просто плохо понимает древние тексты (причем не только на греческом и латыни, но и на церковнославянском и древнерусском языках); при определенной начитанности в области текстуальной критики, она не умеет последовательно и непредвзято сравнивать тексты; при завидной работоспособности и творческой плодовитости она подменяет научный поиск выстраиванием аргументации под заранее известные ответы. У меня нет возможности предложить здесь полный разбор *refutatio* украинской исследовательницы, я и так уже злоупотребил гостеприимством издателей журнала «Scrinium» (впрочем, не исключено, в другом месте такой разбор примечатель-

(1) См.: Т. Л. Вилкул, [Рец. на:] Назаренко А. В. Древняя Русь на международных путях, междисциплинарные очерки культурных, торговых, политических связей IX–XII вв. М.: Языки русской культуры, 2001. 784 с., в: *Средневековая Русь*, вып. 5 (Москва, 2004) 284.

ных «новаторских» мест из ее монографии будет предпринят). Однако я остановлюсь здесь на некоторых ярких примерах, любознательные же читатели и, прежде всего, сама Т. Л. Вилкул, смогут применить те же принципы разбора и к другим частям ответа (точнее было бы сказать, ко всем остальным, так как мне не удалось обнаружить ни одного случая, когда от каких-либо оценок, сделанных в рецензии, следовало бы отказаться).

Итак, сначала будет вкратце сказано о языках, затем о текстологии, и, наконец, об историческом анализе.

1. Афинские мужи в «Деяниях апостолов» или филологическое «новаторство». Надо полагать, что Т. Л. Вилкул, сочиняя ответ на рецензию, все-таки раздумывала над этим текстом. Об этом, в частности свидетельствует то, что она цитирует две разные рукописи. Что же у нее получается? Напомню, она стремится доказать, что «в речи ап. Павла в афинском ареопаге апостол обращается ко “всем афинянам”, хотя известно, что в Ареопаге были представлены не все, но избранные афинские граждане» (с. 47 монографии). Приведу для ясности небольшую таблицу (все цитаты принадлежат украинской исследовательнице,² для контроля и понимания того, что на самом деле представляет собой славянский текст в четвёртой и пятой колонках справа даётся этот же фрагмент соответственно по Христинопольскому апостолу сер. XII в. — древнерусскому, в отличие от привлечённых Т. Л. Вилкул более поздних южнославянских списков, и Септуагинте):

Монография (источник цитаты неизвестен)	Ответ (Матичин апостола)	Ответ (Струмицкий апостол)	Христинопольский апостол	Септуагинта
Поимъше же его на Ариев ледь вѣдоша ... Афинее же вси приходяще	...странъ-ныи . ни въ что же ино праздни бѣахоу гла̀ти . или	...страны : или гла̀ти чесо : слишати новое : став же	Поимъше же и на Ариевъ ледь, вѣдоша... Афинѣи же вси и пришьдъшеи странънии	ἐπιλαβόμενοι τε αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀρειον Πάγον ἤγαγον... Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πάντες καὶ οἱ

(2) Я не комментирую многочисленные lamentации Т. Л. Вилкул относительно того, что я не ознакомился с каким-то более широким контекстом ее работы или с какими-то дополнительными материалами. Рецензия написана именно на книгу, и последняя (как кажется) не представляет собой священного писания, непременно требующего специальной экзегезы. Как сказано, «еже писах — писах», читатели же не обязаны интересоваться «дополнительным контекстом» и тем, что автор «имел в виду».

и страннии (все афинские граждане и неафиняне – Т.В.) ... став же Павел посредѣ Ариева леда рече: мужие афинеистии...	<i>и слышати что новыѣ</i> . Став же Павел посре ^а Ариева леда рече ^а мужи атинѣ-исции <i>по всему яко хуудожаише вы виж^ою.</i>	Павель посрѣ ^а ариева леда рече ^а мажие афине-сти : <i>по встмү ꙗко хадо-жаиши ви виж^оа.</i>	ни въ что же ино праздни бѣахоу, нъ или глаголати что или слышати новое. Ставъ же Павль посредѣ Ариева леда, рече: «Мужии афинеистии! По всемоу яко многы богъ чтоуща вы вижю...». ³	ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἠὲ καίρου ἢ λέγειν τι ἢ ἀκούειν τι καινότερον. Σταθεὶς δὲ [ὁ] Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀρείου Πάγου ἔφη, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαι- μονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ.
---	---	---	---	---

Прежде всего, мы видим три разных и по-разному цитируемых текста. Непонятно, какой текст цитируется в монографии. В ней есть ссылка на Матичин и Струмицкий апостолы, но цитата не соответствует ни тому, ни другому. Во всех трех случаях цитируемые фразы аграмматичны и почти лишены смысла, но не славянским переводчиком, а Т. Л. Вилкул. В тексте из монографии во втором предложении (точнее, обрубке) отсутствует сказуемое. В цитате из Струмицкого апостола выпущена целая фраза, в т.ч. также со сказуемым, — между словами «страны» и «или» нужно читать: «ні въ чтоже ино праздни бѣахъ».⁴ В цитатах из обоих Апостолов в ответе отсутствует первое подлежащее и, собственно, начало предложения: «атинѣи же вси пришедшеи» (Матичин), «атинѣне же вси пришедшеи» (Струмицкий). Прояснению смысла может помочь не новое увлечение украинской исследовательницы — попытка буквального воспроизведения текста, без раскрытия титл и с сохранением всех его особенностей, — а адекватное цитирование и корректная интерпретация; тем более, что точное воспроизведение все равно не дается Т. Л. Вилкул: в маленькой цитате из Матичина апостола допущено пять ошибок: вместо «Павел» надо читать «павль» (сразу две ошибки в одном слове), вместо «посре^а» — «посрѣ^а», вместо «мужии» — «мужы», вместо «всему» — «всемоу». То же самое касается графики и «несовременных» знаков препинания — допущено три неточности: в слове «праздни» не отмечена как выносная буква «д», слова «ариева» и «павль» в оригинале написаны с прописных букв, после «павль»

(3) Христинопольский апостол. Л. 14 об.–15 (<http://lhm.lviv.ua/projects/apostol-v1.djvu>).

(4) Е. Блахова, З. Хауптова (подг.), Струмички (Македонски) апостол. Кирилски споменик од XIII век (Скопје, 1990) 90.

пропущена точка.⁵ Итого: в одной цитате — 8 орехов, в другой — из-за пропуска сказуемого фраза превратилась в бессмысленный набор слов. Немудрено, что Т. Л. Вилкул «смеет предполагать» получившийся текст «достаточно сложным». Оригинал же никаких особенных сложностей не содержит. Текст Апостола совершенно прозрачен в грамматическом отношении. Из него, как и из греческого оригинала и из корректного русского перевода, однозначно следует: в тексте два предложения, в одном говорится об обычаях афинян и «гостей столицы», в другом о речи ап. Павла в ареопаге перед какими-то афинянами, которые не именуется «всеми». Возможно, Т. Л. Вилкул испытала сложности со словосочетанием «ни въ чтоже ино праздни бѣахоу», но тут можно было бы заглянуть в словарь (который дает отсылку как раз на это место Апостола) и узнать, что это перевод греческого εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἠκαίρου, где ἠκαίρου — impf. от глагола ἠκαίρω (εἰς τι) — «иметь досуг, время (на ч.-л.)».

Но самое удивительное заключается не в этой путанице, а в том, что Т. Л. Вилкул в стремлении защитить свою априорную точку зрения использует взаимоисключающие доводы и, более того, в зависимости от необходимости, исходит из взаимоисключающих оснований. Поясню на этом же примере. В книге украинская исследовательница утверждает, что древнерусский читатель, знакомый со славянским Апостолом, заимствовал из него отождествление «всех афинян» и элиты-членов Ареопага, и даже сообщает, что состав Ареопага (настоящего, древнегреческого) был «аристократический» и т.д. и т.п. (монография, с. 47, сноска). Этот тезис, естественно, основывается на предположении (несомненно, ложном) о том, что переводчик *знал*, что такое древнегреческий Ареопаг как политический институт. В ответе же она пишет: «Из текста ... неясно, что в первой фразе речь идет о жителях Афин, а во второй — о собрании в Ареопаге. Тем более, что даже перевод последнего слова неверен — «Ариевъ ледъ». Первое замечание, как было показано, неверно, второе — вероятно, справедливо,⁶ но, если древнерусский книжник думал, что Ареопаг — это не холм, а нечто ледяное или мороженое (буквально «Ариев ледъ» означает «Аресов мороз»), то почему он должен был знать, что это — «древний афинский суд», а Солон ввел туда бывших архонтов (сомни-

(5) Р. КОВАЧЕВИЋ, Д. Е. СТЕФАНОВИЋ (прир.), *Матичин Апостол (XIII век)* (Београд, 1979) (Српска Академија наука и уметности. Зборник за историју, језик и књижевност српског народа. I одељење. Књига XXIX) 42.

(6) Причиной путаницы стала омонимия греческого πάρος (см. подробнее: А. А. АЛЕКСЕЕВ, *Текстология славянской библии* (Санкт-Петербург, 1999), <http://ksana-k.narod.ru/Book/alekseev/02/40.htm>).

тельный исторический комментарий оставляю на совести Т. Л. Вилкула)? Интерпретация славянского текста ошибочна, но даже в рамках этой, ошибочной интерпретации отсутствует всякая логика.

Чаще мы встречаемся в ответе украинской исследовательницы с какой-нибудь одной из проблем: либо непониманием текста, либо с отсутствием логики. Первое хорошо заметно в случае с житием Авраамия Смоленского. Здесь не понят текст (правда, несколько более сложный, чем в случае с афинским эпизодом в «Деяниях»). «Полная цитата» (по Т. Л. Вилкула) такова: «Събраша же ся вси от мала и до велика *весь градъ* на нь: инии глаголють заточити и, а инии къ стѣнѣ ту пригвоздити и зажещи, а друзии потопити и, проведше въсквозе градъ. Всѣм же собравшимся на дворъ владычень, игуменомъ же и попомъ, и чернцемъ, княземъ и бояромъ, диаconi и вси церковници, внегода послаша по блаженаго, уже всѣмъ собравшимся. Посланныя же слугы, емше, яко злодѣя влачяху, овии рутахуся ему, инии же насмехахуся ему и бесчинная словеса кыдающе, и *весь градъ* и по торгу, и по улицамъ — вездѣ полна народа, и мужи же, глаголю, и жены, и дѣти, и бѣ позоръ тяжекъ видѣти». Комментарий (в ответе) такой: «из Жития Авраамия не следует, что к судившим святого словосочетание «весь градъ» не применяется — «все» *предварительно обсуждали и «все» собрались*» (курсив мой. — П. Л.). Украинская исследовательница, очевидно, совершенно искренне не понимает, что второе (выделенное ей курсивом) «весь градъ» относится отнюдь не к судившим святого, а к городу Смоленску и всем его жителям, насмехавшимся над ним и кидавшим ему «бесчинные словеса». Судили его — «все», собравшиеся на архиерейском дворе; этими «всеми» ниже оказываются клир и светская знать, «весь град» в связи с судом не упоминается. То обстоятельство, что св. Авраамий сначала обратил «весь град», а потом тот же «весь град» насмеялся над ним, не должно вызывать удивления: разве не та же ситуация описана в довольно известном памятнике церковной письменности I в. от РХ (Неделя Ваий и «распи Его!»)?

Второе (отсутствие логики) характерно, например, для полемики вокруг слова «прѣтити». Т. Л. Вилкула весьма убедительно доказывает, что Волга впадает в Каспийское море (наличие слова в говорах не означает его исключительно устного бытования). Но суть моего замечания состояла совсем не в том, что слово «прѣтити» — не «книжное» (кстати, не очень понятно, что украинская исследовательница имеет в виду под «книжным словом»), а в том, что оно не может быть «редким» и соответственно свидетельствовать о том, что понятие «гражанинь/горожанинь», рядом с которым оно встречается в одной летописной статье, принадлежит к «книжной топице» (монография, с. 51). Ссылка на словарь Макса Фасмера, в котором указывается, что

глагол «прѣтити» фиксируется не только в древнерусском, но и в других славянских языках (болгарском, сербохорватском, словенском и даже нижнелужицком — не самом, надо сказать, книжном славянском языке!),⁷ показывает, что украинская исследовательница, увлекшись спором, не заметила, как дезавуировала свою же собственную позицию. А факт проникновения слова в народные говоры полностью снимает вопрос о его «редкости» и ясно свидетельствует о бытовании в устной речи.

Что касается штудий Т. Л. Вилкул в области классических языков, то они ничего, кроме чувства неловкости, вызвать не могут. Отрадно, что украинская исследовательница обратила внимание на словари, но, помимо них, существуют еще грамматики и учебники (последнее, вероятно, было бы в данном случае даже полезнее). Ознакомившись с ними, она поняла бы, например, то вполне элементарное обстоятельство, что греческое словосочетание *ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ* — предлог+артикл+существительное в дательном падеже никак не может быть *формой* существительного *βουλευτήριον*, и демагогия про «поморфемный перевод» делу тут не поможет (в источнике, разумеется, перевод правильный: «въ вѣчи», «поморфемный» же — или «новаторский»? — перевод мы видим только в монографии Т. Л. Вилкул). Оказывается для того, чтобы узнать, что *alter* — это не «старший», а «другой (из двух)» (ср. слово «альтернатива»), нужно сверяться с какими-то русскими переводами (как же лучше перевести это сложнейшее слово, по-московски или по-петербургски?). Украинской исследовательнице, очевидно, не приходит в голову, что этой «премудростью» овладевают уже на I курсе Исторического факультета МГУ.

2. «Сѣдь на Ракомѣ» или текстологическое «новаторство». То же отсутствие логики характерно и для текстологических представлений украинской исследовательницы. С одной стороны, она в своем ответе заявляет, что «наличие вставок — материя дискуссионная», а книжники могли не только «наращивать» противоречия, но и «устранять» их. С другой, анализируя соотношение Лавр. и Ип., почему-то забывает об этом и использует (правда, в основном неудачно) такие традиционные критерии, как «швы» и «противоречия». Это — классическая аргументация *ad hoc* (а по-русски, «куда повернул, туда и вышло»), позволяющая во всех случаях приходиться к «нужным» выводам. Но это, как выясняется, отнюдь не нарративная стратегия, а следствие искренних убеждений автора. Вот что пишет сама Т. Л. Вилкул: «В целом, летописеведы делятся на тех, кто считает, что

(7) М. ФАСМЕР, *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, пер. с нем. и дополнения О. Н. Трубачева, т. 3 (Москва, 1987) 361.

в поздних летописях сохранились фрагменты ранних сводов, и тех, кто полагает, что поздние сводчики могли «творить» историю при помощи комбинирования имевшихся в их распоряжении источников, и, так сказать, дописывать их. Оба «лагеря» имеют свои аргументы, я принадлежу ко второму». Я благодарен украинской исследовательнице за то, что она столь четко прояснила свою позицию. Здесь любопытно все. И убежденность в том, что в летописеведении есть какие-то «лагеря» (ср. также забавное рассуждение Т. Л. Вилкул о «московской» и «петербургской» школах, она, по-видимому, не заметила, что моя рецензия была опубликована именно в петербургском журнале⁸). И само представление о «ранних» и «поздних» летописях

(8) Сюда же нужно отнести и рассуждения о «конкуренции», «жгучем желании уничтожить», идеологических, политических и даже личных (!) разногласиях (мне искренне хотелось бы узнать, в чем они заключаются), каком-то «суверенитете читателя», которому кто-то что-то «навязывает», «подлоге» и т. п. Я рад также интересу украинской исследовательницы к моему собственному творчеству, но, раз уж она обратилась к коллективной монографии, соавтором которой я являюсь, в поисках упоминаний В. Л. Янина, П. П. Толочко и М. Б. Свердлова можно было бы заглянуть не только в краткое по необходимости введение к разделу, но и хотя бы в именной указатель. Особенно курьезно в рамках этого «отвлекающего маневра» выглядит предположение о том, что идею о постоянном характере словосочетания «в вѣчи» я заимствовал у Ю. Гранберга. Во-первых, я эту идею отнюдь не разделяю и считаю ее ошибочной даже для XIV–XV вв., о чем украинская исследовательница может прочитать в моей рецензии на книгу Ю. Гранберга; см.: П. В. Лукин, Терминологический анализ: плюсы и минусы (по поводу монографии Юнаса Гранберга о древнерусском вече), в: *Средневековая Русь*, вып. 8 (Москва, 2009). Во-вторых, никакого изменения моей позиции по этому вопросу никогда не было: и в тезисах, и в позднейшей статье о нелетописных упоминаниях вече ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ переводится одинаково — единственно возможным образом. В-третьих, Т. Л. Вилкул не заметила, что в этом вопросе Ю. Гранберг ссылается именно на мои тезисы (это особенно пикантно, учитывая участие украинской исследовательницы в переводе работы Ю. Гранберга на русский) (см.: Ю. ГРАНБЕРГ, Вече в древнерусских письменных источниках: функции и терминология, в: *Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы. 2005 г. Политические институты Древней Руси* (Москва, 2006) 162–163). Все это в общем понятные, вызванные эмоциями *argumenta ad personam* (хотя вообще-то за каждое из таких голословных обвинений следует отвечать), но лучше бы Т. Л. Вилкул меньше интересовалась противостоянием мифических «школ» и околону научными дрызгами, и больше — древними и новыми языками, а также нормальной, а не «новаторской», критикой источников. А научная полемика, нравится это кому-то или нет, будет продолжаться.

(что такое «ранние» и «поздние»? откуда известно, является ли летопись «ранней» или «поздней»? Изначально может идти речь только о ранних или поздних списках, но тогда надо, скажем, рассказ о Любечской битве в НПЛ ст. однозначно предпочесть рассказу ПВЛ, сохранившемуся в более поздних списках, чего Т. Л. Вилкул почему-то не делает. А если записанный в более позднее время текст может отражать более раннюю редакцию — что вообще-то азбука текстуальной критики⁹ — то в чем же тогда разница между «лагерями»? И идея о том, что ученый сначала, *a priori* выбирает себе позицию, а потом подыскивает аргументы для ее защиты (вероятно, так бывает, но подобная «наука» не представляет большого интереса). Разумеется, в науке (а не «науке») никаких «лагерей» не существует, а соотношение между текстами устанавливается в результате их непредвзятого анализа, а не с помощью агрессивной пропаганды априорных идей или абстрактных рассуждений о «ранних» и «поздних» текстах.

Как работает методика Т. Л. Вилкул? Естественно, путем подгонки под априорную концепцию. Так, она считает, что ПВЛ первична по отношению к НПЛ м., а Киевский свод в составе Ип., наоборот, вторичен по сравнению с соответствующему тексту Лавр. Не вдаваясь в обсуждение сути дела (хотя, на мой взгляд, в обоих случаях украинская исследовательница неправа), посмотрим, какие в обоих случаях используются аргументы. В качестве примера возьмем обсуждавшиеся в рецензии и ответе на нее эпизоды.

Обсуждая конфликт варягов и новгородцев в 1015 г., Т. Л. Вилкул практически полностью игнорирует аргументы, свидетельствующие в пользу большей древности рассказа НПЛ м. Новгородское село называлось именно Ракомо или Ракома (кстати, Т. Л. Вилкул неверно цитирует НПЛ м.: «сѣдь на Ракомѣ» вместо «сущу» или «бѣше» на Ракоме), что свидетельствуется, во-первых, данными письменных источников, во-вторых, данными лингвистики, согласно которым топоним *Ра́комо (-а)* произведен при помощи суффикса *-ом-* и восходит к прасл. **raka*.¹⁰ Чтение ПВЛ «на Рокомѣ» явно ошибочно (смена не

(9) См. замечание Б. Мещера о том, что некоторые минускульные рукописи НЗ сохранили более раннюю традицию, чем некоторые унциальные: Б. МЕЩЕР, *Текстология Нового Завета. Рукописная традиция, возникновение искажений и реконструкция оригинала*. Пер. с англ.: В. С. Кузнецов, Д. В. Дмитриев, О. Ю. Самарин, научн. ред. игум. Иннокентий (Павлов) (Москва, 1996) 204.

(10) См.: В. А. ВАСИЛЬЕВ, Из славянской топонимической архаики русского Северо-Запада («рифмованный сегмент» на *-комо*), в: *Славяноведение* (2009) № 2.

просто буквы, а звука под ударением и падежа). Не исключено, как предполагал А. А. Шахматов, и то, что составитель ПВЛ вообще не понял, что «Ракома» — топоним и поэтому изменил все предложение, в результате чего из топонима получилось наречие «нароком».¹¹ Украинской исследовательницей данные письменных источников отбрасываются на основании принципа «а почему бы и не...» (ни одного примера, где был бы зафиксирован топоним «Рокомъ», не приводится) лингвистические данные примитивизируются и фактически игнорируются. Численность войска Ярослава в ПВЛ (41 тысяча) абсолютно нереальна с фактической точки зрения. Если допускать уменьшение этой цифры в позднем тексте из большей в раннем, неясен мотив. В противоположном случае он очевиден: в начале XII в., когда сформировался культ свв. Бориса и Глеба, было понятно, что сторонников их главного «защитника» Ярослава должно быть много. Т. Л. Вилкул напрасно приписывает мне отрицание возможности уменьшения цифр в более поздних источниках.¹² Важно то, что в приводимых ей примерах достоверными в принципе могут восприниматься обе цифры, или речь идет о произведениях, типа «Александрии», применительно к которым вопрос о достоверности вообще не стоит. Агиография тут вообще не при чем: рассказ о Ярославе и новгородцах возник явно ранее письменной фиксации агиографической традиции о Борисе и Глебе, и во всяком случае не имеет к ней прямого отношения.¹³ Разумеется, и сакральная цифра 40000 (если ей придавать такое значение) могла появиться именно в агиографическом контексте (как и паримийные 36000 с явно недостоверными 3000 варягов).¹⁴ И, нако-

(11) См.: И. И. Срезневский, *Материалы для Словаря древнерусского языка* (Санкт-Петербург, 1895) Стб. 323; *Словарь русского языка 11–17 вв.*, т. 10. 218–219. Примечательно, что Т. Л. Вилкул в своем стремлении передавать все особенности текста почему-то не идет до логического конца и сохраняет пробелы между словами, а ведь, если дисквалифицировать НПЛ мл. как поздний источник и исходить только из ПВЛ, несуществующий топоним «Роком» взять просто неоткуда (см., например: *Радзивилловская летопись* (Санкт-Петербург, 1994) Л. 79 об.).

(12) Ср.: П. В. Лукин, События 1015 г. в Новгороде. К оценке достоверности летописных сообщений, *Отечественная история* (2007) № 4, 13.

(13) Только что это было убедительно обосновано С. М. Михеевым, см.: С. М. Михеев, «Святополкъ съде в Киевѣ по отци». *Усобица 1015–1019 годов на Руси в древнерусских и скандинавских источниках* (Москва, 2009) 28–49.

(14) Появление в более поздних летописях 30000 вместо 40000 (например, в Ермолинской или Типографской (ПСРЛ, т. 23, 18; т. 24, 47) объясняется, конечно, не сознательным сокращением, а тем, что соответству-

нец, шедевр логики Т. Л. Вилкул. Она в своем ответе упоминает книгу известного библеиста Брюса Мецгера. Но почему-то не в этом пункте. А зря. Ведь там прямо назван принцип, согласно которому, чтение «вои славны тысяща» НПЛ м.л. надо предпочитать «нарочитым мужам» ПВЛ: «Обычно предпочтение должно отдаваться более трудному варианту чтения, особенно, когда поверхностное чувство ошибочно и более глубокое рассмотрение его подтверждает правильность».¹⁵ Причем вариант НПЛ м.л. — не просто трудное чтение, а гапакс (это очевидным образом явствует из того, что ни одна летопись, отразившая более поздний Новгородско-Софийский свод, не сохранила его), и все не идущие к делу рассуждения Т. Л. Вилкул о «тысящах» и «славных» не могут отменить этого неприятного для нее факта.

В результате вся аргументация украинской исследовательницы в этом сюжете сводится к уже упомянутому незатейливому принципу «а почему бы и не...». Ведь *теоретически* возможно, что новгородский летописец поменял всем понятных «нарочитых мужей» на «воев славных тысячу»? Имея перед глазами наречие, зменил его на подлинное название княжеской резиденции? Заменял «сакральные» 40 тысяч достоверными 4-мя? Уточнил, что вече в Новгороде происходило на «поле», хотя в его время оно проходило исключительно в самом Новгороде?¹⁶ Наконец, разве *теоретически* не возможно представить себе, что две одинаковых фразы в ПВЛ «и поиде Святополк», между которыми располагается прямая речь Ярослава, представляет собой более раннее чтение по сравнению с НПЛ м.л., где просто сказано: «И поиде на нь», а дублировка отсутствует?¹⁷ Теоретически все это возможно (в рамках той возможности, о которой писал Марк

ющие славянские цифры очень легко спутать при чтении рукописного текста.

(15) МЕЦГЕР, *Текстология Нового Завета...*, 204–205. См. такое рассмотрение в: Лукин, *События 1015 г....*, 16–17.

(16) Кстати, вероятнее всего, в ПВЛ слова «на поле» были сняты именно потому, что киевский летописец не понял, что такое «Ракомо», и заменил этот топоним на «нароком», очевидно, думая, что Ярослав не ушел за город, а пришел к себе на княжеский двор в городе, куда, как это «положено», и вызвал «нарочитых людей». В этом контексте «поле» было, конечно, совершенно не нужно.

(17) И это еще не все. В своей речи Ярослав говорит о возмездии Святополку за то, что тот «прольа кровь Борисову и Глѣбову», но откуда он узнал о гибели Глеба? Ведь, согласно ПВЛ, Предслава наисала ему, что «Святополкъ съдигъ ти Киевѣ, оубивъ Бориса, а на Глѣба посла (курсив мой. — П. Л.)» (ПСРЛ, т. 1, стб. 140–141). В НПЛ м.л. это противоречие отсутствует.

Блок: «В абсолютном смысле слова отнюдь не “невозможно”, что “Дар Константина” подлинный, а “Германия” Тацита ... подложна. В этом же смысле нет ничего “невозможного” и в предположении, что обезьяна, ударяя наугад по клавишам пишущей машинки, может случайно, буква за буквой воспроизвести “Дар” или “Германию”». ¹⁸

Т. Л. Вилкул сетует, что я не уделил достаточного внимания ее «новаторскому» сопоставлению Лавр. и Ип. Но все дело в том, что ни предпосылки, на которых оно основывается, ни, разумеется, его результаты, мягко говоря, не убеждают. В рецензии уже говорилось, что сложный характер Киевского свода, наличие в нем «швов и противоречий», более поздних вставок, в т.ч. числе более поздних, чем текст, отразившийся в Лавр., факты давно известные, и с тем, что это так, никто спорить не собирается. Украинская исследовательница должна была бы показать, что очищенный от этих (в частности, черниговских и галицких) вставок текст Киевского свода в Ип. младше, чем соответствующий текст Лавр., в которой при этом отсутствуют противоречия, отмеченные ей в Ип. Между тем, дело обстоит совершенно иначе. Вот пример, приведенный ей в ответе: в Ип. вроде бы не совсем понятно, как Святослав Ростиславич сначала бьется за отца, а потом, оказывается, что он бежал вместе с Мстиславом Изяславичем (тут так и хочется, конечно, порассуждать о неприменимости при текстологическом анализе «здравого смысла» и о том, что «книжники, работавшие в период позднего средневековья и имевшие большой опыт работы с компиляциями, могли не только «наращивать», но и устранять противоречия, делая изложение более внятным и «рациональным»; почему НПД мл. могла «устранять противоречия» своего источника, а Лавр. нет?). Однако в Лавр., которой украинская исследовательница приписывает первоначальный характер, также негладко выходит со Святославом Ростиславичем, который появляется в ее повествовании, как *deus ex machina*, в самом конце известия. При этом складывается впечатление, как будто выше должно было говориться о его участии в битве: «А Мстиславъ и Святославъ Всеволодичъ бѣжаста г Києву (Святослав Ростиславич не упомянут. — П. Л.), тогда же яша Всеволодича Половци, а Мстиславъ оутече с Ростиславичем и с Святославом (кстати, Лавр. список дает основания понимать так, что последний Святослав — какой-то другой, а не Святослав Ростиславич. — П. Л.)». ¹⁹ В общем, Мстислав побежал со Святославом Всеволодичем, а убежал со Святославом Ростиславичем, появившимся неизвестно откуда, ви-

(18) М. Блок, *Апология истории или Ремесло историка*. Пер. с франц. Е. М. Лысенко (Москва, 1986) 76.

(19) ПСРЛ, т. 1, стб. 343.

димо, специально с целью побегать по Южной Руси (найти его как одного из активных участников сражения можно, конечно, в Ип., но этот вариант не подходит Т. Л. Вилкул по идейным соображениям).²⁰

3. Поганые дружинники или «новаторский» исторический анализ. В этой области вновь поражают, с одной стороны, наивность, с другой, удивительная внутренняя противоречивость, с которыми провозглашается «новаторский» подход. Всюду в своем ответе Т. Л. Вилкул требует точного воспроизведения текста и возмущается русскими переводами или расстановкой «современных» знаков препинания.²¹ Здесь же оказывается, что без современной расстановки знаков никак не обойтись. И это совершенно верно, потому точная передача текста важна для издания, а при его интерпретации обязательны: а) корректное его истолкование (или возможные варианты его истолкования); б) перевод на современный язык (и не «приблизительный», вроде того, что она дает в случае с вечем в Галиче — которое неизвестно почему надо считать не тем, чем оно называется в источнике, — а именно «абсолютно точный»). Т. Л. Вилкул только сэкономила бы место, если бы вместо загромождения своего ответа цитатами и копи-пэйстом

(20) Ср. также отмеченные А. Н. Насоновым дублировки в Лавр. (два сообщения о смерти Олега Святославича, два сообщения о мире между Ярополком Владимировичем и Всеволодом Ольговичем и т.д.), *отсутствующие* в Ип. (А. Н. Насонов, *История русского летописания XI – начала XVIII в. Очерки и исследования* (Москва, 1969) 81–82).

(21) Возмущается между тем она совершенно напрасно. Имея некоторое представление о Септуагинте и ее славянском переводе, я не стремился загромождать рецензию избыточной информацией или демонстрировать свои познания в древних языках там, где этого не требовала необходимость, — тем более, когда речь шла о хрестоматийных библейских сюжетах. В частности, рассказ об Авимелехе (Суд. 9), на каком языке его не читай, никак нельзя понять так, как предлагает в своей книге Т. Л. Вилкул («...в 1-й Книге Судей [sic!] одни и те же действия — избивание 70 братьев Авимелеха — приписаны сначала самому Авимелеху, а ниже — “мужам сикхемским”, принявшим его на царство» (с. 48 монографии). В славянской Острожской библии говорится, что Авимелех «ная ... мужевь младыхъ и лѣпыхъ» (ермнх. др. Рафаїл (Р. Торконяк) (опр. та приг. до друку). *Книга Ісуса Навина, Книга Суддів и Книга Руті (зі серії Острозька Біблія)* (Львів, 2003) 76). Где как не в Сихеме мог Авимелех нанять «младых мужей»? Жителей Сихема, поддержавших Авимелеха, а часть которых, очевидно, непосредственно принимала участие в избивании сыновей Гедеона, и (вполне логично) обвиняет потом Иофам: «избисте сынове его (Иероваома. — П. Л.)» (там же, 77). Приведенные в ответе пространные цитаты только подкрепляют такое понимание.

из собственной монографии, ограничилась в своем ответе исключительно вопросами интерпретации. Однако именно интерпретация, собственно исторический анализ — это самое слабое место в творчестве украинской исследовательницы (даже по сравнению с плохим знанием языков и текстологической путаницей). В этом смысле она целиком и полностью следует худшим традициям советской науки, позволявшим, как известно, «если надо», найти, скажем, рабовладельческий строй у древних хеттов или феодализм в Византии. Именно таким способом обнаруживается и «дружина-вече».

Рассмотрим ее ответ в этом пункте²² подробнее.

А) «во всех случаях в летописи описывается не «состав войска», а совещания. Говорится: «и тако оугадавше», «не оудоумаша», «почаша доумати». Т. Л. Вилкул даже предполагает, что я скрыл то обстоятельство, что речь идет о совещаниях. То, что речь идет о совещаниях, отчасти верно, и никто с этим не спорит (более того, я даже написал об этом в разделе о древнерусских «воях», по техническим причинам не вошедшем в упомянутую Т. Л. Вилкул коллективную монографию). О совещаниях, действительно, говорится, но, разумеется, именно о *военных* советах, и совещались лица, представлявшие именно *части войска*: «Вячьславъ же, и Изяславъ съ братомъ своимъ Ростиславомъ, и съ Изяславомъ Давыдовичемъ, и съ Ярославомъ братомъ своимъ, и с Городеньскимъ княземъ, и съ дружиною своею, и с Кияны, и с Черными Клобуку, и, тако оугадавше, поидоша по сеи странѣ Днѣпра по горѣ, а лодьѣ его по Днѣпроу же. Пришедше же и стаща на Витичевѣ оу Мирославскаго села противу собѣ, и ту стоящимъ, бяхуться, съѣздячяся в насадах, о бродѣ». Таким образом, участники совещания, «угадавше», участвуют затем в битве за брод. Далее: «Вячьславъ же, и Изяславъ, и Ростиславъ съзаваше братью свою и почаша доумати. Изяславъ же с братомъ своимъ Ростиславомъ всегда хотяшеть противу им битися. Дружина же Вячеславля, и Изяславля, и Ростиславля, и всех князии оустягывахоуть от того, и Кияне, наипаче же Чернии Клобоуци от того оустягоша, рекоуче: “Княже, не мочно ти поѣхати, зане ратнии наши вси на конехъ суть...”». Итак, совещались «ратнии», представлявшие войско. Что в этом «невыгодного» для интерпретации дружины, «киян» и черных клобуков как отдельных частей войска, — загадка. Никакого противоречия тут нет, и пафос украинской исследовательницы неоправдан. Но затем в летописи уже непосредственно говорится о диспозиции: «...Вячеславъ, Изяславъ, не ходяща в городъ, стаста товары перед Золотыми вороты оу Язины, а Изяславъ Давыдовичъ ста межи Золотыми вороты и

(22) ПСРЛ, т. 2, стб. 424–428.

межи Жидовскими противу Бориславлю двору, а Ростиславъ съ сыномъ своимъ Романомъ ста передъ Жидовскими вороты, и *многое множество с ними* [курсив мой, а Т. Л. Вилкул — повод поразмыслить, о том, кто это такие, если не киевляне, и не черные клобуки. — П. Л.], а Городеньский Борисъ оу Лядскихъ воротъ. Кияне же всими своими силами и на конѣхъ, и пѣши, и тако стаща, а промежи князи сѣмо стаща от Вячеслава, от Изяслава по правоу, оли до Изяслава и до Ростислава, а от Ростислава оли и до Олговы могилы, а по лѣвоу Вячслава и Изяслава, оли до Лядскихъ воротъ, и тако стаща около всего города *многое множество*. И ото чина же и Володимеръ приде съ всеми Черными Клобукуи и с вежами, и съ стады и скоты их и мно[го]е множество... И тако нарядъ створше в собѣ князи и дружина, и Чернии Клобуоуци, и Кияне, и тако не оудоумаша ити противоу имъ полкомъ ити биться, но припоустяче ѣ к собѣ, тоу же ся бити с ними». Ясно, что войско состоит (и это отражено даже в его расстановке) из трех частей: княжеских дружин, киевлян (которые стоят отдельно от княжеских сил) и черных клобуков, которых привел Владимир.

Б) «Я расставляю современные знаки препинания следующим образом: «съ дружиною своею: и с кияны, и с черными клобукуы» (Ипат., стб. 424); «дружина же оустягывахоуть... (и кияне, наипаче же чернии клобуоуци)» (стб. 426); «дружины своя: и киянь, и черных клобуоуковъ» (стб. 427); «кнѣзи и дружина (и чернии клобуоуци, и кияне)» (стб. 428). Основание для этого следующее. Речь идет о совещаниях, а в Киевском своде находим множество иных эпизодов, где говорится о совещании князей с «дружиной», но состав при этом подробно не расписывается. Сопоставление известий позволяет сделать вывод, что «дружина» — общее, включающее понятие». Выше уже было сказано, почему дружину в этих фрагментах нельзя отождествлять с киевлянами и черными клобуками: эти воинские формирования стояли в разных местах. Но здесь интереснее логика украинской исследовательницы: «Я расставляю современные знаки препинания следующим образом». Вот в этом-то вся и беда. Т. Л. Вилкул, как кажется, искренне не понимает, что она должна быть сама главным своим критиком и просто обязана (как уже говорилось в рецензии) расставить знаки препинания так, чтобы это было невыгодно для ее «новаторской» концепции и, если при этом результат объясняет существующую совокупность фактов (а это в данном случае так), от «новаторства» нужно решительно отказаться, как бы это ни было обидно.²³ То же самое относится и к «дружине-вечу» — она

(23) «Аргумент» о том, что, раз князья могли «любить», «кормить» и наделять городами не только дружинников, но и кочевников-федера-

представляет собой типичную мнимую реальность, которая *non est multiplicanda*. Украинская исследовательница сама признает, что у нее имеется единственное свидетельство (все остальное — чистое *wishful thinking*). Вот текст, где дружина якобы то же, что и вече (цитирую по ответу Т. Л. Вилкул): «заутра же собравъ избытокъ новгородецъ Ярославъ ре^ч. о любя моя дружина юже вчера избихъ а нынѣ быша надобѣ . и оутре слезъ . и ре^ч имъ на вѣчи». Как отмечает украинская исследовательница, «в основе интерпретации лежит следующий перевод: «о любимая моя дружина — та, которую я вчера посекаю», что предполагает наличие «всей дружины», аналогичное политической общности «новгородцев». Перевод — замечательный (благо, неправильно перевести эту короткую фразу сложно), но неполный (переведено не все предложение, а несколько слов). К кому «имъ» обращается Ярослав на вече? К уже убитой «дружине» (в памяти сразу возникает речь Арагорна к мертвецам во «Властелине колец»)? И откуда взялась какая-то «вся дружина», о которой ровном счетом ничего не сказано? «Любимую дружину» Ярослав посекал, а в настоящее время обращается на вече к *другим* новгородцам. Вот **все**, что нам известно. Рассуждения же о какой-то «политической общности» — не более, чем домыслы. Так что нет *ничего*: дружину под 1015 г. никак нельзя отождествить с вечею, а во всех остальных известиях о совещаниях (вроде владимирского съезда 1174 г.) вече, во-первых, вообще не упо-

тов, значит, последние тоже были дружинниками, не заслуживает даже обсуждения. Вообще, украинская исследовательница не понимает последствий своего волюнтаризма. Вот такое, например, перечисление есть в известии о том, как после разрешения конфликтов между князьями Мстислав Изяславич вокняжился в Киеве. Когда он, наконец, «въ Киевѣ вниде», «ту выидоша Кияне вси, и /въ/зма рядъ със /sic! — П. Л./ братьею, и с дружиною, и с Кияны въ ть днь». **Я** (допустим) расставляю знаки так: «с братьею: и с дружиною, и с Кияны». (ПСРЛ, т. 2, стб. 534). Получаем, что дружина и киевляне — это «братья» Мстислава, т.е. князя. Таких примеров, и еще более курьезных, можно привести сотни. То же относится и к доводу о том, что, раз в летописях есть упоминания о совещаниях князя с дружиной, во всех остальных совещаниях, где упоминается дружина, она должна считаться «общим, включающим понятием». По этой логике надо считать, что, если по поводу восстановления смертной казни Владимир Св. совещался с епископами (ПСРЛ, т. 1, стб. 126–127), то в предложении Святополка Изяславича и Владимира Мономаха Олегу «Гориславичу» (1096 г.) прийти в Киев и «положить порядъ» «пред епископы и пре игумены и пред мужи отець нашихъ и пре людми градъскими» (ПСРЛ, т. 1, стб. 229–230) игумены, мужи и люди градские входят в «общее, включающее понятие» «епископы». А почему нет? Неужели эта трактовка не походит Т. Л. Вилкул, потому что противоречит «здравому смыслу»?

минается²⁴, во-вторых, их можно (а значит, для Т. Л. Вилкул нужно, потому что *onus probandi* лежит на ней, а не на ее критиках) трактовать не как вече, а как, например, советы с участием исключительно знати. Это существенный методический вопрос, и размышление над ним может быть очень полезно для украинской исследовательницы. Упрощая, можно сказать, что заслуживающая внимания часть научной гипотезы — это то, что остается от нее, если исключить все, что можно объяснить без нее. В случае гипотез «дружина-поганые» и «дружина-вече» можно исключить все, и они тем самым отсекаются «бритвой Оккама»: имеющуюся совокупность фактов можно, а значит нужно, объяснять в рамках традиционной интерпретации.

Хотелось бы подчеркнуть: я вполне разделяю (зафиксированное даже в словарях) мнение о том, что у слова «дружина» было как широкое (все войско или все приближенные князя), так и узкое (собственно дружинники) значение.²⁵ Но и этот тезис украинская исследовательница не может ни доказать, ни даже правильно сформулировать. И, конечно, фантастическую «дружину-вече» следует отправить туда, где уже давно обитают различные бестелесные тени, вроде земского боярства или полянских феодалов-землевладельцев.

Заканчивая, мне хотелось бы сказать, почему я считаю ответ Т. Л. Вилкул, несмотря на то, что собственно ответом считать его не приходится, все-таки позитивным явлением. Во-первых, он показывает, что украинская исследовательница готова обсуждать дискуссионные вопросы и, следовательно, общенаучное поле есть шансы сохранить. Я, разумеется, не питаю наивных надежд на то, что после моей критики агнцы возлягут со львами, и мечи будут перекованы на орала, но некоторые оговорки в последних работах украинской

(24) Т. Л. Вилкул уже не первый раз приписывает мне точку зрения о том, что в контексте вече нужно рассматривать только прямые упоминания (ср., например: П. В. Лукин, Вече, «племенные» собрания и «люди градские» в начальном русском летописании, в: *Средневековая Русь*, вып. 4 (Москва, 2004) 71; он же, К вопросу о так называемом совете в домонгольской Руси, в: *Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы. 2003 г. Мнимые реальности в античных и средневековых текстах* (Москва, 2005) 141–142). Суть дела не в прямых или косвенных упоминаниях, а в том, является ли предположение о вече применительно к тому или иному совещанию единственно возможным или хотя бы наиболее убедительным.

(25) См.: П. В. Лукин, Вече: социальный состав, в: А. А. Горский, В. А. Кучкин, П. В. Лукин, П. С. Стефанович (ред.), *Древняя Русь: очерки политического и социального строя* (Москва, 2008) 70 (со ссылкой на литературу). Прекрасно известно и самое общее значение слова «дружина» — «сообщники», «спутники». Ломиться в открытую дверь тут не надо.

исследовательницы позволяют осторожно надеяться на определенную корректировку ее позиций, в чем нельзя не усмотреть и опосредованного влияния критики. Все-таки от предположений о том, что Владимир Мономах измыслил собственного брата Ростислава и идеи о том, что упоминание юного слуги при Андрее Боголюбском могло восприниматься на Руси как намек на гомосексуальные наклонности убиенного князя²⁶ до куда более осторожной интерпретации гипотетических «микрoзаимствований» в последних работах Т. Л. Вилкул лежит довольно большая дистанция²⁷ (правда, «косметический ремонт» в виде отказа от наиболее экстремистских трактовок и смягчения риторики здесь не поможет, требуется принципиальный пересмотр в корне неверных методических установок). Во-вторых (и это самое главное), как мне теперь представляется, ее «новаторство» связано не столько с попыткой постмодернистского (*à la post-soviétique*, разумеется) обесмысливания исторических исследований или стремлением к дешевым сенсациям, сколько с искренним непониманием научной (и обычной) логики, слабым знакомством с некоторыми специальными предметами, неблестящей языковой подготовкой. Но все это дело поправимое. При желании те полезные наблюдения, которые есть в других ее работах (да даже и в этой в целом крайне неудачной монографии), можно развить в нечто вполне интересное. И в рамках этого пути я готов ко всякому сотрудничеству и, пусть к острой, но конструктивной научной дискуссии.

(26) Это, увы, не анекдот; см.: Т. Вилкул, Полезный утопленник, в: *Родина* (1999) № 4; она же, Агиографический фильтр (о летописных известиях 1174/75 года, в: *Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье. Мнимые реальности в античной и средневековой историографии. XIV чтения памяти чл.-корр. АН СССР В. Т. Пашуто. Москва, 17–19 апреля 2002 г. Материалы конференции* (Москва, 2002) 38.

(27) См.: Т. Вилкул, «Капища» из Корсуня князя Владимира, в: *Ruthenica* 6 (2007). Я не обсуждаю здесь саму — в высшей степени спорную — концепцию о «микрoзаимствованиях».