

**Scrinium: Journal of Patrology,
Critical Hagiography and Ecclesiastical History**

7–8

Editorial Committee

B. Lourié (Editor-in-Chief), St. Petersburg
D. Nosnitsin (Secretary), Hamburg
D. Kashtanov, Moscow
S. Mikheev, Moscow
A. Orlov, Milwaukee
T. Senina, St. Petersburg
D. Y. Shapira, Jerusalem
S. Shoemaker, Eugene

Secretariat

T. Senina, St. Petersburg
E. Bormotova, Montreal

Scrinium. Journal of Patrology, Critical Hagiography, and Ecclesiastical History, established in 2005, is an international multilingual scholarly series devoted to patristics, critical hagiography, and Church history. Each volume is dedicated to a theme in early Church history, with a particular emphasis on Eastern Christianity, while not excluding developments in the Western Church.

Society of Byzantine and Slavic Studies
St. Petersburg

SCRINIUM

Journal of Patrology, Critical Hagiography
and Ecclesiastical History

Volume 7–8

ARS CHRISTIANA

In memoriam Michail F. Murianov
(21.XI.1928 – 6.VI.1995)

Part Two



Edited by
R. Krivko, B. Lourié, and A. Orlov

Axiōma
Gorgias Press
2011–2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Hymnographica & Liturgica

Roman KRIVKO. A Typology of Byzantine Office Menaia of the Ninth – Fourteenth Centuries	3
Tatiana A. SÉNINA (moniale Kassia). Remarques sur les canons en l'honneur des saints patriarches Taraise et Méthode de Constantinople	69
Радослава СТАНКОВА. Култ и химнография: служби за български светци в писмената традиция от XIII–XIV в.	82
Youhanna Nessim YOUSSEF. The litanies for the King in the Coptic liturgy	106
Олег Ф. ЖОЛОбОВ. К истории «уставных чтений»: древнеславянский <i>Паренесис</i> Ефрема Сирина	121
Khanna OMARKHALI. Yezidi Religious Oral Poetic Literature: Status, Formal Characteristics, and Genre Analysis. With Some Examples of Yezidi Religious Texts	144
Svetlana SHUMILO. The System of Divine Service Quotations in the Life of Stephen of Perm	196

Rossica, Varangica, Orientalia & Occidentalia

Анна А. ПИЧХАДЗЕ. Слав. <i>етерьъ</i> : к вопросу о группировке древнеславянских памятников	219
Elena DERJAVINA. Archiprêtre A. M. Derjavin et son étude du Ménologe de St. Dimitri Métropolitte de Rostov	237
Andrey KASATOV. An Original Thirteenth Century Charter from Monk Bretton Priory (Yorkshire) in the Archive of St. Petersburg Institute of History (RAS)	243

- Pavel V. LUKIN. Narration on the Varangian Martyrs
in the *Primary Chronicle* and in the Synaxarion (Prologue) 259
- Alexander TOEPEL. Ein Brief Papst Johannes' XXII.
an den koreanischen König 307
- Tatiana SÉNINA (moniale Kassia). La doctrine du hiéromoine Antoine
Boulatovitch sur les idées et sa théorie de la connaissance 314
- Fjodor USPENSKIJ. A new approach to the etymology
of the Old Norse Name of Kiev — *Könugarðr* (the thesis
of Elsa Melin on the Name given to Kiev in the Icelandic Sagas,
with an Excursus on *Kind* in Place-Names) 326

Bibliography

- Roman KRIVKO. Notes on the Description of the Office Menaia
in the "Catalogue of Greek Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts
in the Collections of the United States of America":
N. KAVRUS-HOFFMANN, *Catalogue of Greek Medieval and Renaissance
Manuscripts in the Collections of the United States of America* 341
- Tatiana A. SÉNINA (moniale Kassia). La Byzance tirée de la clandestinité:
Сергей А. ИВАНОВ, *В поисках Константинополя.
Путеводитель по византийскому Стамбулу и окрестностям*
[Serge A. IVANOV, *En quête de Constantinople.
Guide de l'Istanbul byzantin et de ses environs*] 349
- Hans ARNESON, Emanuel FIANO, Christine LUCKRITZ MARQUIS,
Kyle Richard SMITH (eds.), *The History of the Great Deeds
of Bishop Paul of Qeṇṭos and Priest John of Edessa* (B. LOURIÉ) 354
- МИХАИЛ А. БАБКИН, *Священство и Царство. Россия,
начало XX века — 1918 год. Исследования и материалы*
[Michail A. BABKIN, *Priesthood and Kingdom (Russia,
early 20th century — 1918). Researches and materials* (B. LOURIÉ) 356
- Gilbert DAGRON, Vincent DÉROCHE, *Juifs et chrétiens
en Orient byzantin* (B. LOURIÉ) 357

Maria DI SALVO, Giovanna MORACCI, Giovanna SIEDINA (a cura di), <i>Nel mondo degli Slavi. Incontri e dialoghi tra culture.</i> <i>Studi in onore di Giovanna Brogi Bercoff</i> (B. LOURIÉ)	357
Liudmila KHROUCHKOVA. <i>Les monuments chrétiens de la côte orientale de la Mer Noire. Abkhazie. IV^e–XIV^e siècles</i> (V. ZALESSKAJA)	358
Pierre MARAVAL, <i>Actes et passions des martyrs chrétiens des premiers siècles. Introduction, traduction et notes</i> (B. LOURIÉ)	363
New Romanian Publications on the Church History of Central Europe and Byzantium:	
1) Christian GASTGEBER, Ioan-Aurel POP, Oliver Jens SCHMITT, Alexandru SIMON (eds.), <i>Worlds in Change: Church Union and Crusading in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries;</i>	
2) Ana DUMITRAN, Loránd MÁDLY, Alexandru SIMON (eds.), <i>Extincta est lucerna orbis: John Hunyadi and his Time.</i> <i>In Memoriam Zsigmond Jakó</i> (B. LOURIÉ)	364
Syro-Arabica in <i>Simvol: Символ. Журнал христианской культуры, основанный Славянской библиотекой в Париже. Париж — Москва.</i> [<i>Symbol. The Journal of Christian Culture Established by the Bibliothèque slave in Paris</i>] № 55 and 58 (2009 and 2010) (B. LOURIÉ)	367

**Hymnographica
&
Liturgica**

A TYPOLOGY OF BYZANTINE OFFICE MENAIA OF THE NINTH – FOURTEENTH CENTURIES*

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1. The Research Goal and Classification Criteria

This article aims at describing the structure of Byzantine office Menaia of the 9th–14th cc. from a historical point of view. The typological classification of sources will be based on *a)* genre content, and *b)* structure, i. e. the order in which the genres are arranged. The following classification criteria are taken into consideration: 1) the use of

(*) This article was written as a part of the research project “Sprache der altkirchenslavischen liturgischen Denkmäler” carried out at the Seminar für Slavische Philologie der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (2009-2010) and financed by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. For the invitation to Göttingen and for every support provided during my research stay in Göttingen, I am deeply grateful to Prof. em. Dr. Dr. h.c. Werner Lehfeldt. The manuscripts from the collections of the Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana were consulted according to the microfilms held by the Vatican Film Library – Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at St. Louis University (St. Louis, MO, USA); the research in the Vatican Film Library was supported by the NEH – National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship (October 2008). For numerous bibliographical consultations regarding Vatican manuscripts I am obliged to Dr. Susan L’Engle (St. Louis, MO). The Slavonic manuscripts held by the monasteries of Mt. Athos were consulted according to the microfilms preserved at The Hilandar Research Library – The Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies at The Ohio State University (Columbus, OH, USA) with the support of the Summer Stipend of the Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies. For their help with my visit to the Center I am grateful to Dr. William Veder, emeritus professor (Deerfield / Chicago, IL), Dr. Predrag Matejić, and Helene Senecal (Columbus, OH). For remarks, discussions, and substantial corrections, I am in debt to Dr. Alexandra Nikiforova (Moscow, Russia) and Asst. Prof. Dr. Apostolos Spanos (Kristiansand, Norway).

monostrophic chants called *κάθισμα εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος* or *τροπάριον εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος*, *τροπάριον τῆς ἑορτῆς* or *ἀπολυτίκιον*; 2) the use of *makarismoï* (μακαρισμοί) — monostrophic hymns chanted at the liturgy after each of the Beatitudes; 3) the use of *kontakion* and 4) *exapostelilarion* (ἑξαποστειλάριον) or *photagogikon* (φωταγωγικόν); 5) rules of arrangement and combination of different *kanons* chanted on the same day; 6) the ordering of the chants, either by their liturgical position or by genre; 7) the presence of biblical pericopes and 8) the Synaxarion; 9) the division of the office into the Great and the Little Vespers; 10) the use of *theotokia* (sg., θεοτοκίον) with *kathismata* after the third ode of the *kanon*; and 11) the use of *staurotheotokia* (σταυροθεοτοκίον) and 12) *kathismata* after the 50th Psalm and the *polyeleos* (πολύελεος). The loss of the second ode in the originally nine-ode *kanons* and the interpolation of the second ode into the eight-ode *kanons* by John Damascene and Kosmas of Mayouma will not be examined in this article because of the special complexity of the issue.¹ Typological groups

(1) L. BERNARD, *Der Ausfall der 2. Ode in byzantinischem Neunodenkanon*, in: TH. MICHELS (ed.), *Heuresis. Festschrift für Andreas Rohrer* 25 Jahre *Erzbischof von Salzburg* (Salzburg: Müller, 1969) 91–101; Θ. Ε. ΔΕΤΟΡΑΚΗ, *Κοσμάς ὁ Μελωδός. Βίος καὶ ἔργον* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1979) (Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων, 28) 126–128; see also: Π. ΤΡΕΜΠΕΛΑ, *Ἐκλογή ἑλληνικῆς ὀρθοδόξου ὑμνογραφίας* (Ἀθήναι, 1949) 301; Ε. Ι. ΤΩΜΑΔΑΚΗ, *Ἰωσήφ ὁ Ὑμνογράφος. Βίος καὶ ἔργον* (Ἀθήναι: Τυπογραφεῖον ἀδελφῶν Μυρτίδη, 1971) (“Ἀθηνᾶ” σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Σειρὰ διατριβῶν καὶ μελετημάτων, 11) 107–203; Μ. Φ. ΜΟΥΡΥΑΝΟΒ, *Славистические маргиналии к книге грузинского византолога*, in: *ИДЕМ, Гимнография Киевской Руси* (Москва: Наука, 2003) 395–400 (first published in: *Известия Академии наук Грузинской ССР, серия языка и литературы* 4 (1982), 168–178 [the journal title is in Georgian and in Russian]); for details and further references see the most recent publication: Θ. ΚΟΛΛΥΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Ἐκδοσι τῶν β΄ ᾠδῶν οἱ ὁποῖες ἐξέπεσαν ἀπὸ τοὺς ἐκδιδομένους κανόνες στὰ λειτουργικὰ βιβλία καὶ τὰ ΑΗΓ, ΕΕΒΣ 51 (2003) 404–479. Giuseppe Schirò erroneously affirmed that the second ode had often been included in the *kanons* by Kosmas of Mayouma: G. SCHIRÒ, *Caratteristiche dei canoni di Andrea Cretese. Studio su alcune composizioni inedite del melode*, *Κρητικὰ Χρονικὰ* II/15–16 (1961–62) 133. This declaration was supported by no evidence, therefore Theocharis Detorakes called this “ἀληθινὰ περίεργη”, since indeed no available *kanon* by Kosmas of Mayouma contains the second ode (“σὲ κανένα ἀπὸ τοὺς γνωστοὺς κανόνες τοῦ Κοσμά δὲν ὑπάρχει δευτέρα ᾠδή”); see: ΔΕΤΟΡΑΚΗ, *Κοσμάς ὁ Μελωδός...*, 126; on the interpolation of second odes into the originally eight-ode *kanons* by John Damascene and Kosmas of Mayouma: R. ΚΡΙΝΚΟ, *К истории второй песни**

of Menaia revealed on the basis of these criteria are described below through a consideration of the dates of the manuscripts, which makes it possible to uncover the correspondence between the chronological and the typological features of the sources.

I.2. The Source Basis

For the present study I have examined Byzantine office Menaia from the collections of the Vatican Apostolic Library, St. Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai, the Great Laura of Mt. Athos, the Greek Abbey of St. Mary of Grottaferrata, the National Library of France, the National Library of Spain, the SS. Cyril and Methodios National Library of Bulgaria, the Austrian National Library, the Bodleian Library, the Russian National Library, and the Ivan Dujčev Centre for Slavo-Byzantine Studies (Sofia, Bulgaria).²

гимнографического канона: утраты и интерполяции [Zur Geschichte zweiter Ode hymnographisches Kanons: Ausfälle und Interpolationen], in: D. CHRISTIANS, D. STERN, V. TOMELLERI (eds.), *Bibel, Liturgie und Frömmigkeit in der Slavia Byzantina, Festgabe für Hans Rothe zum 80. Geburtstag* (München: Otto Sagner, 2009) (Studies on Language and Culture in Central and Eastern Europe, 3) 229–242 (in Russian with a summary in German). In my article (КРИВКО, К истории...) I did not mention a Syriac-Melkite hymnography, in which the interpolated second ode is attested in the kanon for Epiphany translated from Greek into Syriac. The original Greek text of the Syriac version was uncovered by Heinrich Husmann in cod. *Sin. gr. 598* (H. HUSMANN, Die melkitische Quelle der syrischen Qanune iaonaie, *OCP* 41/1 [1975] 24). The scholar published the incipita of the troparia of the interpolated second ode, which turned out to be identical to those of the Tropologion *Sin. gr. NE MG 5*. The Greek text of the interpolated second ode has been published in full by the author of this article (КРИВКО, К истории...). So the interpolation of the second ode features archaic Greek Palestinian, Old Georgian, Old Syriac-Melkite, early Constantinopolitan Studite, and early Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) hymnographic traditions.

(2) Unless otherwise specified the dates of the manuscripts are reported as in the catalogues: E. STEVENSON SENIOR, *Codices manuscriptorum graeci Reginae Suecorum et Pii Pp. II Bibliothecae Vaticanae descripti praesidia I. B. Cardinali Pitra episcopo portuensi S. R. E. bibliothecario* (Romae: Ex Typographico Vaticano, 1888); E. FERON, F. BATTAGLINI (rec.), *Codices manuscriptorum graeci Ottoboniani Bibliothecae Vaticanae descripti praesidia ALPHONSO cardinali Capucelatro archiepiscopo Capuano S. R. E. bibliothecario* (Romae: In typographico Vaticano, 1893); S. DE RICCI, Liste sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliotheca Barberina, *Revue des bibliothèques* 17 (1907) 81–125 (the more updated catalogues of the Bibliotheca Barberina do not cover the co-

I.3. A Survey of Previous Scholarship

Typological studies of Byzantine and Church Slavonic office Menaia were initiated by Vatroslav Jagić in his introduction to the edition of the earliest precisely dated Slavonic Menaia for September, October, and November (AD ca. 1095–1097) of Old Russian provenance.³ The Byzantine Menaia he consulted made it possible to establish certain

dices Vaticani Barberini consulted for the present study; appropriate bibliographic information is available in: J.-M. OLIVIER (éd.), *Répertoire des bibliothèques de manuscrits grecs de Marcel RICHARD*. Troisième édition entièrement refondue [Brepols, Turnhout: Corpus Christianorum, 1995] 231–233; R. DEVRESSE, *Codices Vaticani graeci III: Cod. 604–866* (Vatican: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1950); C. GIANELLI, *Codices Vaticani graeci: Cod. 1485–1683* (Vatican: In Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1950); P. CANART, *Codices Vaticani Graeci: Cod. 1745–1962*, t. I: *Codicum enarrationes* (Vatican: In Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1970); Π. Γ. ΝΙΚΟΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Τὰ νέα εὐρήματα τοῦ Σινᾶ* (Ἀθήναι: Ὑπουργεῖο Πολιτισμοῦ – Ἴδρυμα Ὁροῦς Σινᾶ, 1998); V. GARDTHAUSEN, *Catalogus codicum graecorum sinaïticorum* (Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1886); K. W. CLARK, *Checklist of Manuscripts in St. Catherine's Monastery, Mount Sinai, microfilmed for the Library of Congress, 1950* (Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1952); SPYRIDON of the Laura, S. EUSTRATIADIS (eds.), *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Laura on Mount Athos with Notices from other Libraries* (Cambridge, MA, 1925) (Harvard Theological Studies, 12 (reprint: New York, 1969)); D. HARLFINGER, D. R. REINSCH, A. M. SONDERKAMP, *Specimina Sinaitica: die datierten griechischen Handschriften des Katharinen-Klosters auf dem Berge-Sinai; 9. bis 12. Jh.* (Berlin: Dietrich Reiner Verlag, 1983); A. ROCCHI, *Codices Cryptenses, seu Abbatiae Cryptae Ferratae in Tusculano* (Tusculani: Typus Abbatiae Crypto Ferratae, 1883); A. MANCINI, *Codices graeci Monasterii Messanensis S. Salvatoris* (Messanae, 1907); A. OMONT, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale I: Ancien fonds grec, Théologie* (Paris, 1886); R. DEVRESSE, *Le Fonds Coislin* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1945); G. DE ANDRÈS, *Catálogo de los códices griegos de la Biblioteca Nacional* (Madrid: Min. de Cultura, Dir. Gen. del Libro y Bibliotecas, 1987); М. СТОЯНОВ, *Опис на гръцките и други чуждозични ръкописи в Народната библиотека "Кирил и Методий" (София, 1973); H. HUNGER, O. KRESTEN, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 3/1: Codices theologici 1–100* (Wien, 1976) (Museion, N.F. 4, 1/2); N. G. WILSON, D. STEFANOVIĆ, *Manuscripts of Byzantine Chants in Oxford* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1963); D. ГЕТОВ, *A Catalogue of Greek Liturgical Manuscripts in the "Ivan Dujčev Centre for Slavo-Byzantine Studies"* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2007) (OCA, 279).*

(3) V. JAGIĆ, *Menaia septembris, octobris, novembris, ad fidem vetustissimorum codicum* (Petropoli: Издание Отдѣленія русскаго языка и словесности Императорской Академіи наукъ, 1886) (Памятники древнерусскаго языка, I) XLIX–LXXVI.

structural similarities between the Slavonic and the Byzantine sources, although an exact typological counterpart of the Slavonic version has not been discovered.⁴ The description of the genre content of the so-called Jagić Menaia was performed once again almost a century later by Dimitrije Stefanović, who, however, was also unsuccessful in revealing the Byzantine typological pattern of the earliest Old Russian Menaia.⁵ Without taking into consideration the work of Vatroslav Jagić, Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus noticed that offices (*akolouthiai*, ἀκολουθίαι) in Menaia of the 10th c., the codes or shelfmarks of which he did not mention, always start with kathisma (or kathismata, the number of which depends on the significance of the feast) followed by *stichera* and *kanon*,⁶ an observation that partially supports Jagić's work. Papadopoulos-Kerameus' conclusion is of great significance for the typology of the early Byzantine office Menaia, though for more than half a century after his publications, scholars have not made any efforts to examine more deeply the typology of the early Byzantine office Menaia on the basis of more representative material. Moreover, Jagić's edition containing an extensive research chapter was neglected by some Western scholars, whose enlightened ignorance is justified by the global rule *russica non leguntur*.

The impressive examples of the neglect of Slavic literary and scholarly tradition by the editors of *Analecta hymnica graeca e codicibus eruta Italiae inferioris*⁷ were reported by such an outstanding expert in both Byzantine and Slavonic liturgical traditions as Christian Hannick: "Die Methode der Mitarbeiter von G. SCHIRÒ sei am besten an Hand eines Beispiels dargelegt: Der häufig Theophanes zugeschriebene Kanon auf den hl. Ionas am 22. September, den A. Debiasi Gonzato <...> nach zehn Handschriften herausgibt, ist keineswegs ein Specificum der Magna Graecia. V. Jagić fand eine slavische Version im Menaion Nr. 294 der Sinodal'naja Biblioteka (A. D. 1095–96) und fügte bereits <...> die griechische Vorlage aus einem weiter nicht genau definierten Menaion der Sammlung Uspenskij (12. Jh.) hinzu. <...> Dieses Beispiel

(4) JAGIĆ, *Menaia*..., LII–LXXIII.

(5) D. STEFANOVIĆ, The Development of the Slavonic Menaia Manuscripts, *Musica Antiqua* 5 (Acta scientifica. Materiały naukowe z V Międzynarodowej sesji muzikologicznej "Musica Antiqua Europae Orientalis", Bydgoszcz, 1978) (1978) 211–220.

(6) Α. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΣ, Σχεδιάσμα περί τῶν λειτουργικῶν μηναιῶν, *BB* 1 (1894) 360.

(7) AHG.

zeigt deutlich das Fluktuieren des Begriffs ‘süditalienisch’ und die relative Unsicherheit, die aus der strengen Auswahl der Handschriften in den AHG entsteht”.⁸ Michail Murianov noticed later that the series *Analecta hymnica graeca* contains eight kanons allegedly published by Giuseppe Schirò and his colleagues for the first time, although these texts had already been edited by Vatroslav Jagić in the supplemental part of his book⁹ which he wrote in Latin: “При первом же случае, когда книга И. В. Ягича могла бы принести реальную пользу, — византологам, готовившим под руководством кардинала Ж. Питра римское издание греческих Минеи (1888–1901), — ее не использовали, хотя русский академик, зная бытующее на Западе правило *russica non leguntur*, весь авторский текст главы «Указатель греческих источников» написал на латинском языке. Покажем только на одном примере, что потеряли итальянские византологи. В их издании, как и во всех греческих, принято одни и те же ирмосы, если они применяются неоднократно, давать полным текстом не каждый раз, а для экономии места ограничиваться кратким зачалом — в расчете на то, что текст или общеизвестен, или в крайнем случае может быть найден на другой странице. <...> Отсутствие системы отсылок не могло не привести к издержкам: случилось так, что на каком-то этапе традиции полный текст одного ирмоса был вместе со всем канонном исключен из Минеи, а зачал этого ирмоса в других местах осталось невосполненным. Это произошло с ирмосом первой песни восьмого гласа (четвертого плагального, по греческому счету), имеющим зачалο Τῷ ἐκτίναξάντι. Оно фигурирует в минейной службе на 2 сентября и в предтеченском каноне Октоиха во вторник утра. Налицо дефект и Минеи, и Октоиха — зачал ирмоса не есть ирмос, а ирмоса нигде нет! Его полный текст можно было найти только в аппарате книги И. В. Ягича <...> ученый сумел обнаружить полный греческий текст — в рукописной греческой Минеи XII в. Петербургской Публичной библиотеки (в книге — с. 585). <...> византология датирует его открытие 1932 годом — появлением публикации С. Евстриадиса. Неведение о книге И. В. Ягича остается в силе и поныне, изданная Римским университетом 12-томная серия «*Analecta Hymnica Graeca*»

(8) Ch. HANNICK, *Studien zu liturgischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* (Wien—Köln—Graz: In Kommission bei Hermann Böhlaus Nachf., 1972) (*Byzantina Vindobonensia*, 6) 26.

(9) JAGIĆ, *Menaea*...

(1966–1980) на некоторых своих страницах выглядела бы иначе, если бы не открывались заново первоисточники, найденные И. В. Ягичем. Так, в соответствии с принятым в этой серии принципом не брать каноны, где-либо публиковавшиеся, можно было не включать в издание каноны св. Сусанне и пророку Ионе (АНГ I), Петру Капитолийскому, Евлампии и Евлампии, Карпу и Папиле (АНГ II), Акепсиму, Галактиону и Иоанну Милостивому (АНГ III) — все эти восемь обширных произведений опубликовал И. В. Ягич по рукописным греческим Минеям Петербурга и Москвы”.¹⁰

While the classical investigations by Carsten Høeg of Denmark, Egon Wellesz of Great Britain, Miloš Velimirović and Oliver Strunk of the USA, Enrica Follieri of Italy, Christian Hannick of Austria and Germany, and Michail Fyodorovich Murianov of Russia covered numerous problems of musical, literary, hagiographical, liturgical, and symbolic content of Byzantine and Slavic liturgical poetry,¹¹ even such a great scholar as Fr. Robert Taft was unaware of the date of the earliest manuscript containing the office Menaion even in 1991, when he wrote: “The first systematic *menaia* with hymnography for each day of the year appear only in MSS of the 11th–12th C”.¹² Indeed, the struc-

(10) М. Ф. Мурьянов, О работе И. В. Ягича над Службными Минеями 1095–1097 гг., in: ИДЕМ, *История книжной культуры России. Очерки*, т. 2 (Санкт-Петербург: Мирь, 2008) 58 (first published in: *Вопросы языкознания* 5 (1981) 93–105).

(11) See the publications of the series *Monumenta Musica Byzantinae* founded by Carsten Høeg: <http://www.igl.ku.dk/MMB/pub.html>; classical bibliography on the state of the issue: J. SZÖVÉRFY, *A Guide to Byzantine Hymnography: A Classified Bibliography of Texts and Studies*, vol. I–II (Brookline, MA, 1978–1979) (Medieval classics: Texts and studies, 11–12); for more references see the surveys: СН. HANNICK, Zur Entwicklung der Forschungen zur byzantinischen Liturgie, in: M. A. МОМИНА, N. TRUNTE (eds.), *Triodion und Pentekostarion nach slavischen Handschriften des 11.–14. Jahrhunderts I* (Paderborn—München—Wien—Zürich, 2004) (Abhandlungen der Nordrheinwestfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 110; *Patristica Slavica*, 11) 361–369; D. TOULIATOS, Research in Byzantine Music Since 1975, *Acta Musicologica* 60/3 (1988) 205–228.

(12) R. TAFT, Menaion, in: A. P. KAZHDAN (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C., 1991) 1338. The earliest available office Menaia are dated to the end of the 9th – first half of the 10th cc. (see below). For further detailed criticism of this remarkable mistake by Fr. Robert Taft, see: А. Ю. НИКИФОРОВА, Рождение Минеи. Греческие Минеи IX–XII вв., *Вес-*

tural development of this hymnographic book in the 9th–14th cc. as a whole was not at all understood. It is noteworthy that even in 2002 Elena Velkovska's survey of Byzantine and Church Slavonic office Menaia was limited to one paragraph consisting of four lines with no bibliographical references,¹³ although in 1978 and 1982 Dimitrije Stefanović described at least two Old Church Slavonic and two Byzantine types of office Menaia of the 11th–13th cc.¹⁴

In 2005 Alexandra Nikiforova of Moscow defended her Ph.D. dissertation covering the topic of the present article and thereafter prepared several publications and delivered a few papers dedicated to the history and typology of early Byzantine Menaia in comparison with the archaic hymnographic manuscripts newly discovered on Mt. Sinai in 1975, which she consulted *de visu*.¹⁵ The scholar convincingly argues

тник Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета, Серия 3: Филология 4/22 (2010) 103–122 (<http://pstu.ru/download/1294824265.nikiforova.pdf>).

(13) Е. ВЕЛКОВСКА, Система на византийските и славянските богослужбени книги в периода на възникването им, in: V. GYUZELEV, A. MILTENOVA (eds.), *Medieval Christian Europe: East and West. Traditions, Values, Communications* (s.l., 2002) 230: “<М>иней: съдържат променливите химнографски елементи за празниците от неподвижния слънчев цикъл на месеците <...> Най-старите запазени миней са от IX в.” (neither codes nor shelfmarks of manuscripts were reported).

(14) D. STEFANOVIĆ, The Development... ; IDEM, Greek Daily Menaia Manuscripts, *Musica Antiqua* 5 (Acta scientifica. Materiały naukowe z VI Międzynarodowego Kongresu Muzikologicznego “«Musica Antiqua Europae Orientalis», Bydgoszcz, 1978”) (1982) 251–263; cf.: E. GUERGOVA, Old Slavic Menaia: Structure and Content, in: C. GRIBBLE, P. МАТЕЈІС (ed.), *Monastic Traditions. Selected Proceedings of the Fourth International Hilandar Conference* (The Ohio State University, 14–15 August 1998) (Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2003) 143–152; П. СИМИЋ, Структура и редакције словенских минеја, *Богословље* 18/1–2 (1974) 67–108.

(15) А. Ю. НИКИФОРОВА, Проблема происхождения служебной миней: структура, состав, месяцеслов греческих миней IX–XII вв. из монастыря святой Екатерины на Синае, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Moscow: Gor'ky Literature Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences) 2005 (extensive summary in Russian (“avtoreferat”) is available on line: <http://librarius.narod.ru/autor/nikiforova.pdf>). For further information see the publications: ЕАДЕМ, К истории исчезнувшего гимнографического жанра. Праздничные блаженны из греческих Миней IX–XII веков библиотеки монастыря вмц. Екатерины на Синае, *Богословский сборник* 10 (2002) 155–171; ЕАДЕМ, Проблема происхождения и формирования служебной Миней. Структура, состав,

that the complete daily office Menaion was compiled on the basis of the Byzantine Tropologion of the younger type in the second half of the 9th c. The Tropologion had long been available only in Syriac and Georgian manuscripts¹⁶ until its Greek version was uncovered in 1975

месяцеслов греческих Миней IX–XII вв. из монастыря вмч. Екатерины на Синае, in: *Россия — Афон: тысячелетие духовного единства. Материалы международной научно-богословской конференции, Москва, 1–4 октября 2006 г.* (Moscow: St. Tichon Orthodox University for the Humanities, 2008) 380–389; the article dedicated to the structure and the content of the archaic hymnographic books, including the newly discovered Tropologia *Sin. gr. NE MG 5* and *56* as well as the office Menaia of the 9th–14th cc.: ЕАДЕМ, Рождение Миней...; see also: ЕАДЕМ, Оpozнание разбитых статуй. От Тропология к Минее, in: *Первая ежегодная конференция “Современная православная гимнография” (к 100-летию со дня кончины А. В. Попова)* (Москва: Издательский совет РПЦ, in press, free on-line access to the full text: <http://www.ror.ru/news/news/2011/02/Nikiforova.pdf>); ЕАДЕМ, “Сокрытое сокровище”. Значение находок 1975 года в монастыре вмч. Екатерины на Синае для истории служебной Миней, in: *Гимнология 6* (Москва: Московская консерватория, 2011) 8–31; ЕАДЕМ, “Синайская сокровищница”: структура последований греческого Тропология VIII–IX вв. и ранних Миней IX–XII вв. (in press). The newly discovered hymnographic sources from St. Catherine’s Monastery have been described in the monograph which Alexandra Nikiforova prepared in 2009 under the preliminary title *Из истории Миней в Византии: Гимнографические памятники VIII–XII вв. из собрания монастыря св. Екатерины на Синае*; the monograph was officially approved for printing by the scholarly council of the Gor’ky Literature Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow). I am grateful to Dr. Alexandra Nikiforova for the chance to read her unpublished texts.

(16) “Die ältesten Hss. des georg.<ischen> T.<ropologions> (Tbilisi H-2133, Sin. iber. 18, 40, 41) stammen aus dem 9.–10. Jh. ... seine liturg.<ische> Tradition auf das Jerusalemer Lektionar zurückgeht” (Ch. HANNICK, Tropologion, *LMA 8* [1999] 1045); on the oldest Tropologion: H. LEEB, *Die Gesänge im Gemeindegottesdienst von Jerusalem: vom 5.–8. Jahrhundert* (Wien: Herder, 1970) (Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie, 28); E. MET’REVELI, C. Č’ANKIEVA, L. XEVSURIANI, *uzvelesi iadgari (The Oldest Iadgari)* (Tbilisi, 1980); H. MÉTRÉVÉLI, Ts. TSCHAN-KIEVA, L. KHEVSOURIANI, Le plus ancien tropologion géorgien, *Bedi Kartlisa 39* (1981) 55–62; A. WADE, The Oldest Iadgari. The Jerusalem Tropologion, V–VIII c., *OCP 50* (1984) 451–456 (a comprehensive review of the above-mentioned edition by E. MET’REVELI, C. Č’ANKIEVA, L. XEVSURIANI (*uzvelesi iadgari*) and description of *iadgari*’s structure and content); 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) (Hereditas. Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte, 23); C. RENOUX (transl., introd., ed.), *Les hymnes de la Résurrection. 1. Hymnographie liturgique*

and briefly described by Panagiotes Nikolopoulos (codd. *Sin. gr. NE MG 5*, 8th–9th cc., and *Sin. gr. NE MG 56*), and then much more precisely by Stig Frøyshov;¹⁷ the most extensive description by far of the newly discovered Byzantine Tropologion *Sin. gr. NE MG 5* was published by the author of this article.¹⁸

géorgienne. Textes du Sinaï 18. (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000) (Sources liturgiques, 3); IDEM, Hymnographie géorgienne ancienne et hymnaire de Saint-Sabas (V^e–VII^e siècle), *Irénikon* 8/1 (2007) 36–69; IDEM (intr., transl., ed.), *L'Hymnaire de Saint-Sabas (V^e–VIII^e siècles): le manuscrit géorgien H 2123. I. Du samedi de Lazare à la Pentecôte* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008) (PO 50/3); T. CHRONZ, Das griechische Tropologion-Fragment aus dem Kastellion Kloster und seine georgischen Parallelen, *Oriens Christianus* 92 (2008) 113–118 (further references; the classification of the Greek fragment consisting of a few troparia seems problematic because of the typologically insignificant extent of the preserved text); see also: E. METREVELI, Les manuscrits liturgiques géorgiens des IX^e–X^e siècles et leur importance pour l'étude de l'hymnographie byzantine, *Bedi Kartlisa* 36 (1978) 48 (on the second, or younger, version of the Georgian Tropologion). See the analytical review: P. JEFFERY, The Earliest Christian Chant Repertory Recovered: The Georgian Witnesses to Jerusalem Chant, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 47/1 (1994) 1–38; the most recent and comprehensive study: S. S. FRØYSHOV, The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy: New Sources and Studies, in: *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship. Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Rome, 17–21 September 2008* (Leuven–Paris–Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2012) (*Eastern Christian Studies*, 12) 227–268.

(17) ΝΙΚΟΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Τὰ νέα εὐρήματα...*, 144; P. GÉHIN, S. FRØYSHOV, Nouvelles découvertes Sinaïtiques: à propos de la parution de l'inventaire des manuscrits Grecs, *RÉB* 58 (2000) 172, 178–179; "Le Tropologion était l'hymnaire qui contenait l'abondante production poétique de l'Église de Jérusalem. Au début, tous les stichères, les canons et les cathismes, appartenant à tous les cycles liturgiques, étaient rassemblés dans un seul livre. Ensuite, avec la multiplication des hymnes, le Tropologion global fut divisé en plusieurs parties, une pour chaque cycle liturgique" (*ibid.*, p. 178).

(18) Р. Н. КРИВКО, Синайско-славянские гимнографические параллели, *Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета. Серия 3: Филология* 1/11 (2008) 59–60, 84–89 (free on-line access: <http://pstgu.ru/download/1222152433.krivko.pdf>). Svetlana Kuyumdzhieva (С. КУЮМДЖИЕВА, Химнографска книга Трополог: извори и идентификации, *Palaeobulgarica / Старобългаристика* 33.3 (2009) 41–68; ЕАДЕМ, The Hymnographic Book of the Tropologion: Sources and Identifications, in: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Sofia, 22–27 August 2011, II: Abstracts of round table communications* (Sofia, 2011) 187–188) examined *Sin. gr. NE MG 5* according to the fragments published by Panagiotes

After the publications by Alexandra Nikiforova, it is no longer possible to assume that “the earliest Greek Menaia were the so-called fest <sic, instead of *festal* — R. K.> Menaia” and that “<t>hey <the festal Menaia — R. K.> were compiled in the seventh and eighth centuries at the time when the special services <sic, instead of *the most significant offices* — R. K.> were written for the great festivals and the great saints”,¹⁹ while it is still absolutely correct to argue that “<t>he rise of the hymnographic activity after the end of the Iconoclast controversy (843) led to the compilation of the daily Menaia at the end of the ninth century”.²⁰ It was Egon Wellesz who was the first to propose the correlation between the Constantinopolitan Synaxaria and the early office Menaia: “We may assume that the calendar of the lives of the saints which are nowadays collected in the Synaxarium originally formed

Nikolopoulos and the article by Stig Frøyshov (P. ГЕ́ИИИ, S. ФРӨЙШОВ, Nouvelles découvertes...). Her observations are influenced by a misunderstanding of the hymnographic term *Tropologion*, which can be applied to different types of books (Menaion, Triodion, and even Kondakarion): “Первые триоды, повидимому, назывались общим именем древних сборников однородных пѣснопѣний — тропологіями <...> Точно такое же название — трополо́γιον носили и древнія минеи и октоихи” (И. КАРАБИНОВЪ, *Постная Триодь: Историческій обзоръ ея плана, состава, редакцій и славянскихъ переводовъ* (Санктпетербургъ, 1910 (<http://www.mzh.mrezha.ru/lib/karabinov/krb1910a.pdf>) 207); for further detailed observations see: H. HUSMANN, *Hymnus und Troparion. Studien zur Geschichte der musikalischen Gattungen von Horologion und Tropologion, Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz* 1971 (Berlin, 1972) 7–86 (without references to: КАРАБИНОВЪ, *Постная Триодь...*, 207); the article by Heinrich Husmann is mentioned by Svetlana Kuyumdzhieva, whose conclusions, however, totally contradict the results achieved by Husmann and thus mislead readers. Although Svetlana Kuyumdzhieva mentioned one of my articles dedicated to the structure and the content of the newly discovered hymnographic Sinaitic sources (P. Н. КРИВКО, *Синайские унциальные гимнографические сборники и их значение для славянской традиции*, in: W. MOSKOWICH, S. NIKOLOVA, M. TAUBE, V. ŽELJAZKOVA [eds.], *The Holy Land and the Manuscript Legacy of Slavs* (Sofia—Jerusalem, 2008) (Jews and Slavs, 20) 317–339), she stated that no information about the structure and the content of this manuscript was available to her (“<з>а съжеление няма информация за подребата на репертоара в него”; КУЮМДЖИЕВА, *Химнографска книга...*, 44).

(19) STEFANOVIĆ, *The Development...*, 211.

(20) Ibid.

the kernel of the Menaia".²¹ Egon Wellesz' assumption was confirmed by Jakov Kulić²² and later on by Alexandra Nikiforova,²³ who proved the "kernel of feasts" ("эортологическое ядро" according to Nikiforova) of the earliest office Menaia to have been shaped by the calendar of the Constantinopolitan Synaxaria, which clearly indicates the Menaion's place of origin.²⁴ Unfortunately, none of the earliest Constantinopolitan Menaia of the 9th c. have been preserved or uncovered to date, therefore the most archaic Byzantine office Menaia available for scholars are the provincial sources.

I.4. The Genres Included in the Earliest Menaia and the Younger Tropologion

A comparison of the younger Tropologion with the Menaion proves the most important hymnographic genres (that is, kanon and stiche-

(21) E. WELLESZ, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962; reprint, special ed. for Sandpiper Books Ltd.: 1998) 135.

(22) J. KULIĆ, *Ricercha sulle commemorazioni giornaliere bizantine nei minei*, Tesi di dottorato (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientale, 1992).

(23) "Исследование месяцесловов боле чем ста служебных Миней IX–XII вв. показало, что они имели единое ядро — общевизантйский пространнй календарь, близкий календарю КС и отличавшийся существенным образом от месяцеслова древнейшего Тропология, включавшего в себя немногие праздники преимущественно палестинского ареала <...> се греческие Миней IX–XII вв. имели: 1) общевизантйское эортологическое ядро, близкое месяцеслову КС, 2) локальную эортологическую специфику (византино-палестинскую, южно-итальянскую и т.д.), 3) особую для каждого комплекта программу" (А. Ю. Никифорова, *Проблема происхождения служебной Миней: структура, состав, месяцеслов греческих Миней IX–XII вв. из монастыря св. Екатерины на Синае*, Автореферат диссертации ... кандидата филологических наук (Москва, 2005) 10, 13, <http://librarius.narod.ru/autor/nikiforova.pdf>).

(24) Cf.: N. PATTERSON-SHEVCHENKO, Canon and Calendar: The role of a ninth century hymnographer in shaping the celebration of the saints, in: L. BRUBAKER (ed.), *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive? Papers from the thirtieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1996* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998) (Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 5) 101–114; the book was reviewed by: Д. Е. Афиногенов, [Review], in: *Христианский Восток* 3/9 (2002) 488–497; these articles have been cited by Alexandra Nikiforova to confirm her own observations on the Constantinopolitan origin of the kernel of the Menaion calendar (Никифорова, *Проблема...*, 10).

ron) to have been adopted by the archaic Byzantine Menaion from the Tropologion. Makarismoι as a genre of Palestinian origin²⁵ were also included in the earliest Constantinopolitan Menaia.²⁶

In comparison with the Tropologion, the early Menaia of the 9th–11th cc. contain several innovative genres of Constantinopolitan origin represented neither by Georgian, Syriac, and Greek Tropologia nor by other hymnographic books, scrolls, miscellanies, and fragments which were discovered on Mt. Sinai:²⁷ festal kathisma, kontakion, festal exaposteilaria, and *troparion* (kathisma εις Θεος Κύριος, τροπάριον τῆς ἐορτῆς, ἀπολυτίκιον).

1.4.a. Festal Kathismata

Alexandra Nikiforova argues that “<г>лавное изменение в жанровом составе Минеи в сравнении с Тропологием — это появление на каждый день особых праздничных седальнов. Общие седальны были известны и раньше, из приложений к Тропологию. <...> Это общие седальны «воскресные» (греч. ἀναστάσιμα), «богородичные» (греч. θεοτοκία), «святым мученикам» (греч. μαρτυρικά)” etc.²⁸ The festal kathismata discussed by Nikiforova are preserved in all of the Menaia and therefore cannot be considered to be a classifying criterion for this liturgical book. At the same time, they testify positively to the non-Palestinian origin of the Byzantine Menaion time and again, and thus provide witness to an innovative hymnographic tradition in comparison to the Tropologion and the typologically comparable manuscripts of Palestinian origin.

(25) For the history of this genre and numerous references see: А. М. ПЕНТКОВСКИЙ, М. ИОВЧЕВА, Праздничные и воскресные блаженны в византийском и славянском богослужении VIII–XIII вв., *Palaeobulgarica / Старобългаристика* 25.3 (2001) 31–60.

(26) НИКИФОРОВА, К истории...; ЕАДЕМ, Рождение Минеи..., 113–114. See also below.

(27) This observation is based on the following sources which I have consulted *de visu*: *Sin.gr. NE MG* nn° 4 (9th–10th cc.); 5 (8th–9th cc.); 15 (9th–10th cc.); 20 (9th–10th cc.); 24 (9th–10th cc.); 37 (9th–10th cc.); 56 (9th c.); 80 (9th c.); and 84 (9th–10th cc.).

(28) НИКИФОРОВА, Рождение Минеи..., 114.

***I.4.b. Troparion (kathisma, katabasia) εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος
and τροπάριον ἀπολυτικίον***

Two other innovative genres observed in Menaia but missing in the Tropologion are the troparion (= *kathisma, katabasia*) εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος and the troparion apolytikion (τροπάριον ἀπολυτικίον).²⁹ The terms *troparion* εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος, *kathisma* εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος, and *katabasia* εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος are not observed in the available Menaia younger than the 12th c. According to the Sinaitic Kanonarium of the 10th–11th cc. (*Sin. gr.* 150), the τροπάριον εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος and the τροπάριον εἰς τὴν ἀπόλυσιν (troparion apolytikion) often represent the same chant with different liturgical positions, cf.: “εἰς τὴν ἀπόλυσιν ἦχος β΄. τροπάριον· Ὁ πάσης δημιουργὸς τῆς κτίσεως. Τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς τὸ, Θεὸς Κύριος καὶ εἰσοδικὸν εἰς τὴν λειτουργίαν... εἰς τὴν ἀπόλυσιν [τοῦ ἔσπερινου] τροπάριον ἦχος α΄. Ἡ γέννησίς σου, Θεοτόκε. Τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ εἰς τὸ, Θεὸς Κύριος καὶ ἀπόλυσιν [τοῦ ὄρθρου καὶ εἰσοδικὸν εἰς τὴν λειτουργίαν]”³⁰ etc.

The τροπάριον εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος is attested twice in *Sin. gr.* 607³¹ *sub diem* Forty Martyrs of Sebastia and on the Annunciation of the Theotokos (*Sin. gr.* 607, ff. 32v, 92v). The troparia have been written out completely. The same chant for the Annunciation of the Theotokos appears in the Menaion preserved in the Russian National Library (St. Petersburg), cod. *Petrop. gr.* 553 (*РНБ, Греч.* 553), 11th c., f. 14r.; in this manuscript, however, the chant is not called τροπάριον but rather κάθισμα εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος. And finally, one of the Menaia preserved in the Sevastjanov collection of the Russian State Library (Moscow) (*РГБ, Сев.* 480), 12th c., contains καταβάσια εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος chanted on the Nativity of the Theotokos (*sub diem* 8th of September). In modern liturgical usage the same chant is called *troparion apolytikion* and it is dedicated to the same feast.³²

(29) Никифорова, *Проблема...*, 16.

(30) А. Дмитриевский, *Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся в библиотеках Православного Востока*, т. 1: Типика, ч. 1: Памятники патриарших уставов и ктиторские монастырские Типиконы (Киев, 1895; Nachdruck: Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung) 194.

(31) Никифорова, *Рождение Минеи...*, 111.

(32) The use of the liturgical terms *troparion, kathisma,* and *katabasia* εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος in codd. *Sin. gr.* 607, *РНБ, Греч.* 553, and *РГБ, Сев.* 480 has been described by Alexandra Nikiforova: “Постепенно в Минеи формировались новые жанры. Еще не окончательно определившийся в терминологи-

The variety in the liturgical terms *κάθισμα*, *τροπάριον* and *καταβάσια εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος* is observed in cod. *Reg. gr. 54* of the 12th c. (for content of this manuscript see below): *τροπάρι(ο)ν εἰς τ(ὸ) Θ(εὸ)ς Κ(ύριος)ς* ff. 1, 28v; *κάθ(ισμα) εἰς τὸ Θεὸς Κ(ύριος)ς* ff. 3v, 15v), *ἀπολυτίκιον* · *ἔτοιμάζου Βη(θλεέμ) f. 7v*, and *troparion* (f. 42v).

1.4.c. Kontakion and Exaposteilarion

The typologically most significant innovative hymnographic genres of Constantinopolitan origin attested by Menaia are the kontakion and exaposteilarion.

José Grosdidier de Matons was the first to argue that **the kontakion** had originally been intended for the cathedral rite and was unknown at the monastic office:³³ “Au VIe siècle donc, le kontakion a atteint son plein développement, et il est encore complètement étranger à l’orthros monastique. Son cadre est celui de la vigile cathédrale”.³⁴ In researching the liturgical history of the kontakion, Grosdidier de Matons examined only its stylistic and poetic features and neglected the liturgical evidence itself,³⁵ which brought him to the following conclusions: “C’est sans doute au VIII^e siècle que l’annexion du kontakion par l’orthros s’est opérée,³⁶ peut-être parce qu’à cette époque la vigile a perdu sa forme traditionnelle et que le kontakion n’y a plus trouvé place. <...> Cette assimilation a certainement favorisé l’usage de faire du kontakion un mésodion du canon, comme le canon avait été d’abord

ческом отношении «тропарь» (греч. ἀπολυτίκιον) в большинстве Минеи IX–XII вв. именовался «седален на “Бог Господь”» (греч. *κάθισμα εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος*): напр., 4-го гласа «Днесь спасения нашего главизна» (РНБ. Греч.553. XI в. Лл.14. 25 марта. Благовещение). Это же песнопение в Sinait. Gr. 607 (IX–X вв.) передано как «тропарь на “Бог Господь”» (греч. *τροπάριον εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος* Лл. 92 об.). В РГБ.Сев.480 (XII в.) тропарь на Рождество Богородицы (8 сентября) назван «катавасия на “Бог Господь”» (греч. *καταβάσια εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος*)” (ibid.). See also: НИКИФОРОВА, Рождение Минеи..., 111.

(33) J. GROSDIDIER DE MATONS, *Kontakion et Canon. Piété populaire et liturgie officielle à Byzance*, *Augustinianum* 20 (1980) 191–203 (a short survey); for more details see: IDEM, *Liturgie et hymnographie: kontakion et canon*, *DOP* 32 (1980–1981) 31–43, esp. 42.

(34) GROSDIDIER DE MATONS, *Liturgie...*, 36.

(35) Ibid., 40.

(36) Cf.: “A quel moment le kontakion a-t-il commencé à servir de μεσώδιον? Nous ne pouvons le dire, même approximativement” (Ibid., 105).

une série de *mésôdia* des cantiques scripturaires”.³⁷ A more precise analysis of liturgical data leads to the conclusion that “it is no longer possible to maintain that the hymns of Romanos and the other early melodies were replaced by kanons in the seventh or eighth century. On the contrary, kanons had no place at all within the Constantinopolitan cathedral worship but were a prominent feature of the Palestinian monastic rite imported by St. Theodore the Studite <...>.³⁸ It was only through the Studite monks’ rapid assimilation of cathedral forms that the kontakia attained its present place within Sabbaitic orthros.”³⁹ Thus, the “development in Byzantine hymnography from Romanos to John, from the kontakion to the canon, is therefore not in the least linear. First of all, the kontakion did not drop out of use, when the canon emerged, for they belonged to different services — the canon to the monastic service of orthros, the kontakion to the *asmatike akolouthia* of the cathedral office <...>. The passage from the kontakion to the canon is therefore, certainly, an aspect of growing monasticization of the Byzantine liturgy, but this was a quite gradual process. It is very likely that, as cathedral office and monastic office grew <...> they jostled with one another for time, both services were squeezed, and in that pro-

(37) GROSSEIDIER DE MATONS, *Liturgie...*, 42.

(38) This is by all means a mistake possibly caused by an uncritical reproduction of Fr. Robert Taft’s concept of “Studite synthesis”. The hymnographic kanon as a genre of Palestinian origin was imported into Constantinople much earlier, which is testified by hymnographic kanons attributed to Patriarch Herman (630–650 and 653–658 — † before 754), who lived before St. Theodore the Studite († 826); see: N. ΤΟΜΑΔΑΚΗ, *Η βυζαντινή ὑμνογραφία καὶ ποίησις* (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1993) 160. For further information on Herman’s hymnographic legacy see: А. Ю. НИКИФОРОВА, Неизвестное гимнографическое наследие Константинопольского патриарха Германа, *Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета* 4/26 (2011) 29–43 (<http://pstgu.ru/scientific/periodicals/bulletin/III/archives/>); the issue is also covered in the forthcoming monograph: ЕАДЕМ, *Из истории служебной Минеи (на материале гимнографических памятников VIII–XII вв. из собрания монастыря святой Екатерины на Синае)* (Москва).

(39) А. LINGAS, The Liturgical Place of the Kontakion in Constantinople, in: С. АКЕНТИЕВ (ed.), *Liturgy, Architecture, and Art in [the] Byzantine World: Papers of the XVIII International Byzantine Congress (Moscow, 8–15 August 1991) and Other Essays Dedicated to the Memory of Fr. John Meyendorff* (St Petersburg: Byzantinorossica, 1995) (Byzantinorossica, 1) 56 (<http://byzantinorossica.org.ru/opensjvu.html?sources+byz1+p50–57.djvu>); cf.: А. LOUTH, Christian Hymnography From Romanos the Melodist to John Damascene, *The Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 2/57 (2005) 197.

cess fewer and fewer of the *ikoi* of the *kontakion* were performed, until finally, the *kontakion*, reduced to 'kontakion' and *ikos*, was finally slipped into the canon, in the place it occupies today. Secondly, as well as coming from different liturgical contexts <...> the *kontakion* and the canon had different geographical provenance: the canon originating in Jerusalem and the Holy Land, while the *kontakion*, whatever its Syriac roots was a feature of the religious life of Constantinople, and emanated from there. *Kontakion* and canon are therefore part of the complex story of the different influences exercised by Jerusalem and Constantinople in the development of the Byzantine liturgical office. And finally, the passage from *kontakion* to canon is more than a change in genre in liturgical poetry; it represents a shift from what I would call poetry as proclamation to poetry as meditation, from poetry used in the service of the proclamation of the gospel, to poetry as a way of meditating on the truths of the faith, and that again is another facet of the shift, already noticed, from lay orientation to monastic inspiration in the Byzantine liturgical office".⁴⁰ If the attribution of numerous *kontakia* to the Studite hymnographers is correct,⁴¹ then the *kontakion* was introduced into the monastic Matins in Constantinople not later than in the 8th c. As to the monastic rite in Palestine, Stephano Parenti maintains that in the most archaic liturgical books of Jerusalemite origin, a hymnographic *kanon* is always represented without any insertions ("в най-архаичните йерусалимски книги канонът винаги се дава цял, без прекъсвания").⁴² It is not only the earliest Horologion, *Sin. gr. 864* (9th c.), that testifies to the absence of the *kontakion* in the monastic rite in Palestine and Sinai until the second half of the 9th and probably the beginning of the 10th cc., but also the *Tropologia Sin. gr. NE MG 5* (8th–9th cc.) and *Sin. gr. NE MG 56* (9th c.) as well as the archaic fragments of codices and scrolls *Sin. gr. NE MG 4* (9th–10th cc.); 15 (9th–10th cc.); 20 (9th–10th cc.); 24 (9th–10th cc.); 37 (9th–10th cc.);

(40) LOUTH, *Christian Hymnography*... 199–200.

(41) G. WOLFRAM, *Der Beitrag des Theodoros Studites zur byzantinischen Hymnographie, Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 53 (2003) 117–125.

(42) С. ПАРЕНТИ, Върху историята на ексапостилярия, in: М. ЙОВЧЕВА (ed.), *ПЪВНИЕ МАЛО ГЕВЪРГИЮ. Сборник в чест на 65-годишната на проф. д-рн Георги Попов* (София: Издателски център "Боян Пенев", 2010) 290; with references to: LINGAS, *The Liturgical Place*..., 50–57, and Sr Maxime (Leila) АЖЖОВ, avec la collaboration de J. PARAMELLE (éd.), *Livre d'Heures du Sinai (Sinaiticus graecus 864). Introduction, texte critique, traduction, note et index* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2004) (Sources Chrétiennes, 486).

80 (9th c.); 84 (9th–10th cc.). No liturgical position for the kontakion is attested by such archaic sources as the Oldest Iadgari and the Armenian Lectionary.⁴³

Despite the opinion of Jean-Baptiste Pitra, who assumed that the tradition of kontakion poetry existed in Palestine, too,⁴⁴ Grosdidier de Matons came to the opposite conclusion, considering the attribution of a few kontakia to the Jerusalemite patriarch Sophronios (633/634–639) to be unreliable.⁴⁵ “L'école sabaïte, en ce qui concerne le kontakion, n'existe pas”.⁴⁶ The attribution of the Dormition kontakion Τὴν ἐν πρεσβείαις ἀκοίμητον θεοτόκον,⁴⁷ the acrostic of which contains the name *Kosmas* (Τοῦ ταπεινοῦ [sic!] Κοσμά ὕμνος), to Kosmas of Mayouma⁴⁸ was denied by Constantinos Trypanis⁴⁹ and José Grosdidier de Matons.⁵⁰

The earliest witnesses of the liturgical use of the kontakion in Palestine are Syriac-Melkite manuscripts of Sinaitic provenance. The Tropologion *Sin. syr. 261* contains one kontakion “der Totenmesse” in

(43) LEEB, *Die Gesänge...*; MET'REVELI, Č'ANKIEVA, XEVURIANI, *u3velesi iadgari...*; MÉTRÉVELI, TSCHANKIEVA, KHEVSOURIANI, *Le plus ancien tropologion...*; SCHNEIDER, *Lobpreis...*; RENOUX, *Les hymnes...*; IDEM, *L'Hymnaire...*; IDEM, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121. I: Introduction. Aux origines de la liturgie hiérololymitaine. Lumières nouvelles* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969) (PO 35/1, n° 163); IDEM, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971) (PO 36/2, n° 168).

(44) I. B. PITRA, *Analecta Sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, I (Parisiis—Tusculi—Venetiis, 1876) XXXV–XLVI.

(45) Cf. the opposite opinion, though unproven by facts: G. BERTONIERE, *Four Liturgical Canons of Elias II of Jerusalem*, in: H.-J. FEULNER, E. VELKOVSKA, R. TAFT (eds.), *Crossroad of Cultures. Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler* (Rome, 2000) (OCA, 260) 95, f. 18 (the author did not pay attention to the observations made by J. Grosdidier de Matons).

(46) J. GROSDIDIER DE MATONS, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance* (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977) 63.

(47) The critical edition: C. A. TRYPANIS, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica* (Wien: In Kommission bei Hermann Böhlhaus Nachf., 1968) (Wiener byzantinische Studien 5) 117–125.

(48) PITRA, *Analecta...*, 527; C. EMEREAU, *Hymnographi byzantini* [III], *Échos d'Orient* 22 (1923) 20–22.

(49) TRYPANIS, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica*, 115–116.

(50) “Cette hypothèse, rejetée par le plus récent éditeur, C. A. Trypanis, est en effet très peu probable” (GROSDIDIER DE MATONS, *Romanos le Mélode...*, 57–58).

the supplemental part of the codex (“als Ergänzung”),⁵¹ while the archaic structure of Syriac-Melkite Matins (*orthros*) has no liturgical position for the kontakion at all.⁵² The kontakion designated as *syntomon* is attested by the “revised” (“revidierten”) manuscripts *Sin. syr. 27*, *Sin. syr. 261*, and *Sin. syr. 4*.⁵³ I shall try to prove below that the reduced liturgical use of kontakia or even their total absence from the liturgical rite is typical for some of the archaic Byzantine and Church Slavonic Menaia and Triodia,⁵⁴ which is caused by the peripheral origin of the sources less influenced by the Constantinopolitan hymnographic traditions than the central or the younger ones.

(51) H. HUSMANN, *Eine alte orientalische christliche Liturgie: altsyrisch-melkitisch*, OCP XLII/1 (1976) 162.

(52) As in Greek Palestinian hymnography, kanton odes in the Syriac-Melkite tradition were originally chanted without any additional hymnographic interpolations. It is noteworthy that the innovative manuscript *Sin. Syr. 746* (“Die Handschrift Sinai Syr. 746 ist keine Handschrift, die durch ihr Alter imponiert”, because it is dated to AD 1511, 1522, or 1528) attests to the special liturgical position for kathisma after the sixth ode only once: “Auf den über 800 Seiten läßt die Handschrift aber nur einmal erkennen, daß hier *ōdēn* zu ergänzen ist: auf f. 37v schreibt sie innerhalb des Kanons zwischen Ode 6 und Ode 7: *eita to m(a)r(tyrikon) ōdē z’*, «nun das Martyrikon, (dann) die 7. Ode»” (HUSMANN, *Eine alte orientalische christliche Liturgie...*, 166–167).

(53) HUSMANN, *Eine alte orientalische christliche Liturgie...*, 167, esp. 170–171.

(54) This feature has often been noticed and treated as an archaic one: ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΩΣ, Σχεδιάσμα... 360; Т. СУБОТИН-ГОЛУБОВИЋ, Упоредно проучавање структуре српских и византијских минеја старијег периода, in: П. ИВИЋ (ed.), *Проучавање средњовековних јужнословенских рукописа: Сборник радова са III Међународне Хиландарске конференције одржане од 28. до 30. марта 1989* (Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности, одељење језика и књижевности, 1995) 444; М. А. МОМИНА, Einführung, in: М. А. МОМИНА, N. TRUNTE (eds.), *Triodion und Pentekostarion nach slavischen Handschriften des 11.–14. Jahrhunderts I: Vorfastezeit* (Paderborn—München—Wien—Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2004) (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 110; *Patristica Slavica*, 11) *220, *248–*249; З. РАНКОВИЋ, Структура Братковога Минеја. Кратак преглед, *Археографски прилози* 26–27 (2004–2005) 116 (http://www.nb.rs/view_file.php?file_id=1583); Р. СТАНКОВА, Срџбски и български празнични Минеи от XIII век (Съпоставка на състав и структурата), *Recueil des travaux de l’Institut d’études byzantines* 46 (2009) 401 (<http://doiserbia.nb.rs/img/doi/0584-9888/2009/0584-98880946395S.pdf>).

Stephano Parenti argues that the festal exaposteilarion chanted at fixed feasts is the invention of Studite hymnographers of the 9th c., while the exaposteilarion for Great Lent and Sundays were known earlier in Palestine.⁵⁵ Below we will examine the correlation between the genres of Constantinopolitan origin, the kontakion and exaposteilarion, and the makarismoï originating in Palestine, as attested by the Menaia and partially by the Triodia of the 9th–12th cc.

I.5. Arrangement of Chants in Menaia and in the younger Tropologion

Besides the calendar containing feasts for each day of the year, the main typological distinction between the Byzantine Tropologion of the younger type and the earliest Menaia is the arrangement of chants. As opposed to early Menaia, chants in the younger Tropologion as well as archaic hymnographic books and fragments are placed according to their liturgical position:⁵⁶ stichera, kanon, and, as the final part of Matins, the stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴβους, whereas the early Menaia until the 11th–12th cc. are structured by genre, so that the lesser genres precede the kanon regardless of the liturgical positions of the chants (typologically significant deviations from the main trend are described below).

II. HISTORICAL AND TYPOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION OF MENAIA

On the basis of genre structure and content, Byzantine office Menaia of the 9th–14th cc. can be divided into four major groups: 1) archaic peripheral, 2) archaic central, 3) early innovative, and 4) neo-Sabbaitic. The terms “peripheral” and “central” are related to the origin of the hymnographic tradition as attested by a certain manuscript and not to the provenance of the manuscript itself. Therefore different Italo-Greek manuscripts can be classified as either peripheral or central depending on the extent to which they are influenced by the Constantinopolitan, that is the central, liturgical traditions.

(55) ПАРЕНТИ, Върху историята...

(56) *Sin. gr. NE MG n°n° 5* (8th–9th cc.); *Sin. gr. NE MG 56* (9th c.); *Sin. gr. NE MG 4* (9th–10th cc.); 15 (9th–10th cc.); 20 (9th–10th cc.); 24 (9th–10th cc.); 37 (9th–10th cc.); 80 (9th c.); and 84 (9th–10th cc.).

II.1. Archaic Peripheral Group: End of the Ninth – Eleventh Centuries.

II.1.a. *The Sources*

The three earliest Byzantine office Menaia known are written in an uncial script and share the same structural features. Two of them are dated to the end of the 9th – beginning of the 10th cc. and were copied on Sinai or in Palestine by the same hand. The identity of both hands has been verified by Alexandra Nikiforova.⁵⁷ The manuscripts are preserved on Mt. Sinai:

1. *Sin. gr. 607*, office Menaion for March–April, 9th–10th cc.

2. *Sin. gr. NE MG 28*, fragment of the office Menaion for May, 9th–10th cc.

In the catalogue, *Sin. gr. NE MG 28* has been erroneously defined as a Tropologion.⁵⁸ In order to avoid further misunderstanding, I reproduce below the complete content description of *Sin. gr. NE MG 28* according to my earlier publications,⁵⁹ and the calendars of both Menaia have recently been described by Alexandra Nikiforova,⁶⁰ who comprehensively listed the incipita of *Sin. gr. 607* as well.⁶¹ The sign * indicates published chants, the sign ** indicates incipita which have been reported by Enrica Follieri but whose complete texts remain unpublished.⁶²

(57) НИКИФОРОВА, Рождение..., 104–105.

(58) ΝΙΚΟΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Τὰ νέα εὐρήματα..., 146; КЮМДЖИЕВА, Химнографска книга..., 44–46.

(59) КРИВКО, Синайско-славянские гимнографические параллели... 97–100; ИДЕМ, Синайские унциальные гимнографические сборники..., 329–331.

(60) НИКИФОРОВА, Рождение..., 105–110.

(61) ЕАДЕМ, *Из истории Минеи в Византии: Гимнографические памятники VIII–XII вв. из собрания монастыря св. Екатерины на Синае* (unpublished monograph).

(62) H. FOLLIERI, *Initia hymnorum Ecclesiae Graecae*, I–V (1/2) (Città del Vaticano: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1960–1966) (Studi e testi, 211–215bis); cf.: E. FOLLIERI, *The "Initia Hymnorum Ecclesiae Graecae"* — Bibliographical Supplement, in: E. WELLESZ, M. VELIMIROVIČ (eds.), *Studies in Eastern Chant II* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971) 35–50.

f. 1r

Μηνὶ μαῖω α΄ τοῦ ἁγίου προφήτου Ἱερεμίου.

κάθ(ισμα) ἦχ(ος) πλ(ἅγιος) δ΄ προ(οσόμοιον) ἀνέστης ἐκ
νεκρῶν*

Προσέθηκέν σοι ὁ Υἱὸς ὁ Θεός.

Στιχ(ηρὰ) ἦχ(ος) πλ(ἅγιος) δ΄, προ(οσόμοιον) Κύριε, εἰ καὶ
κριτηρίω παρέστης.*

Κύριε, Σὺ πρὸ τοῦ πλασθῆναι...*

Κύριε, εἰ καὶ ἐν βορβόρῳ ἐβλήθη...*

f. 1v

Κύριε, Σοῦ ταῖς λαμπρωτάταις ἀκτίσι...*

Κύριε, εἰ καὶ θρηναῖς ἐλάλει...**

Τοῦ στίχου, ὄμ(οιον) καὶ αὐ(τῶ)?.

Κύριε, τὴν τοῦ Παρακλήτου Σου χάριν.**

Ὁ κανὼν, ὠδὴ α΄ ἦχ(ος) πλ(ἅγιος) δ΄.

[Hirmos of the first ode] Ὑγρὰν διοδεύσας...*

[Incipit of the first troparion] Πρὸ τοῦ σὲ πλασθῆναι...*.⁶³

f. 3v

Μην(ὶ) μαῖω β΄, μνήμη τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀθανασίου,
ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας.

f. 4r

κάθ(ισμα) ἦχ(ος) πλ(ἅγιος) γ΄, προ(οσόμοιον) τὴν ὠραιότητα τῆς
παρθ(ενίας) σου*

Τὴν τῶν αἰρέσεων πλάνην...*

Στιχ(ηρὰ) ἦχ(ος) πλ(ἅγιος) α΄, προ(οσόμοιον) χαίροις,
ἀσκητικῶν ἀληθ(ῶς)*.

Χαίροις, τῶν ἀρετῶν ὁ κανὼν...*

Χαίροις, πατριαρχῶν ἢ κρηπίς...*

f. 4v

Χαίροις, ἀρχιερέων τιμῆ...
Εἰς τὸν στίχον, ἦχ(ος) γ΄.

Τὸ μέγα κλέος τῶν ἱερέων...*

Ὁ κανὼν φέρων ἀκροστιχ(ίδα) τήνδε
Ἀθανάσιος ἔγχος ὀρθοδοξίας ἔφω

(63) FOLLIERI, *Initia...*, III, 370. There is no acrostic in the kanon so the author's name remains unknown, and the only possible attribution is provided by the manuscript described: in the left margin near the first troparion there is a short notice indicating Theophanes Graptos — Θεοφ(άνους).

f. 5r

Στεφ(άνου) Σαβαΐτ(ου).

ὠδὴ α΄, ἦχ(ος) πλ(άγιος) δ΄.

[Hirmos of the first ode] Ἀρματηλάτην Φαραῶ ἐβύθισε.*

[Incipit of the first troparion] Ἀθανασίῳ προσκομίζων
ἔπαινων...^{*64}

f. 8r

Μη(νὶ) μαῖῳ γ΄ τῶν ἀγίων μαρτύρων Τιμοθέου καὶ Μαύρας
κάθ(ισμα), ἦχ(ος) α΄, πρ(οσόμοιον) χορὸς ἀγγελικὸς*.

Τιμήσαντες Θ(εὸ)ν ἀπημαύρωσαν πλάνην...*

Στιχ(ηρὰ) ἦχ(ος) δ΄, πρ(οσόμοιον) ὡς γενναῖον ἐν
μ(ά)ρ(τυσι)*.

Τοὺς γενναίους ἐν μάρτυσιν...*

Τοὺς στερεῶς ἐναθλήσαντας...

Τὰς στρεβλώσεις τοῦ σώματος...*

f. 8v

Φωτοβόλοις λαμπρότησιν τὸν ἐχθρόν...*

Ὁ κανὼν φέρων ἀκροστιχ(ίδα) τήνδ(ε).

Τιμοθέου Μαύρας τε τοὺς πόνους σέβω. Ἰωσήφ.*

ὠδὴ α΄, ἦχ(ος) πλ(άγιος) β΄.

[Hirmos of the first ode:] Ὡς ἐν ἠπέιρῳ.

[Incipit of the first troparion:] Τῶν ἱερέων ἀθλοφόρων...*

3. *D gr 350*, Office Menaion for December, January, and February, 10th c., is preserved in the Ivan Dujčev Research Centre.⁶⁵ “The Canon for each feast is preceded by one kathisma (for greatest feasts: two kathismata) plus three (or more) stichera”⁶⁶ with no other genres. This manuscript transmits the second-earliest Byzantine office Menaion. It is a palimpsest, with the Menaion preserved as the earliest layer and

(64) According to *Menaion Romanum* (Μηναια τοῦ ὅλου ἐνιαυτοῦ [Ἐν Ῥώμῃ, 1896], t. 3, 279) the author of the kanon is Theophanes Graptos, although *Sin. gr. NE MG 28* attests another name: Στεφ(άνου) τοῦ Σαββαΐτου?; both authors belong to the Palestinian hymnographic tradition (Theophanes spent the majority of his life in Palestine): H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959) (Byzantinisches Handbuch im Rahmen des Handbuchs der Altertumswissenschaft, XII 2/1) 165, 265, 310, 507–508, etc.

(65) ΓΕΤΟΥ, *A Catalogue...*, 482–489.

(66) *Ibid.*, 482.

written in a “sloping uncial style” (*majuscola ogivale diritta*)⁶⁷ dated to the 10th c.; its provenance is undefined.

4–15. A complete set of office Menaia of Italian provenance comprising the volumes for almost the whole fixed ecclesiastical year is dated to the end of the 10th – beginning of the 11th cc.⁶⁸ The manuscripts are preserved at the St. Catherine Monastery on Mt. Sinai and the Russian National Library (St. Petersburg); the parts of the set held in Russia have been identified by Alexandra Nikiforova:⁶⁹ *Sin. gr.* 579; *Sin. gr.* 563; *Sin. gr.* 570; *Sin. gr.* 578 + *PHB* (Russian National Library, St. Petersburg), *Греч.* 89; *Sin. gr.* 595; *Sin. gr.* 610; *Sin. gr.* 613; *Sin. gr.* 614; *Sin. gr.* 624; *Sin. gr.* 631; and *PHB*, *Греч.* 351.

The manuscripts share the same typological features as those mentioned above. The offices consist of kathismata, stichera, and kanons. The remarkable feature of this set is the regular use of makarismoι, which are attested by *Sin. gr.* 607, also (*sub diem* Annunciation, f. 94). The application of makarismoι in *Sin. gr.* 607 and in the set from the 10th–11th cc. has been described by Alexandra Nikiforova: the makarismoι are attested in *Sin. gr.* 579 (8th of September, Nativity of the Theotokos; 14th of September, Exaltation of the Holy Cross; 26th of September, commemoration of St. John the Theologos); *PHB*, *Греч.* 89 + *Sin. gr.* 578 (6th of December, commemoration of St. Nikolas;⁷⁰ 24th–25th of December, Christmas Forefeast and Christmas Feast; 27th of December, commemoration of St. Stephanos; 30th of December, Christmas Afterfeast); *Sin. gr.* 595 (1st of January, Circumcision of Jesus Christ and commemoration of St. Basil the Great; 6th of January, Epiphany; 7th and 9th of January, Epiphany Afterfeast; 17th of January, St. Anthony; 25th of January, St. Gregorios the Theologos; 27th of October, St. John Chrysostom); *Sin. gr.* 614 (23rd of April, St. Georgios;

(67) ГЕТОВ, *A Catalogue...*, 490.

(68) The hands of the Sinai manuscripts have been identified and the set has been dated by: HARLFINGER, *Specimina...*, 26–28.

(69) НИКИФОРОВА, *Проблема...*, (passim).

(70) В. В. ВАСИЛИК, *О неизвестной службе святителя Николая*, in: *Правило веры и образ кротости: Образ святителя Николая, архиепископа Мирликийского, в византийской и славянской агиографии, гимнографии и иконографии* (Москва: ПСТБИ, 2004) 285–336.

26th of April, St. Basil); and *Sin. gr.* 631 (15th of August, Dormition of the Theotokos).⁷¹

Among numerous office Menaia dated to the 11th c. — beginning of the 12th c. there are at least three manuscripts which are typologically close to those listed above:

16. *Vat. gr.* 2, office Menaion for September–December, 11th c. (mutilated at both its beginning and ending), copied in Campania.⁷² The structure and the content of this Menaion is exactly the same as that of *Sin. gr. NE MG 28* and *D gr 350*: the offices consist of stichera, kathismata, and kanons.

17. *Vat. gr.* 2008, office Menaion for January–April, AD 1101–1102. The codex was copied in Italy.⁷³ It contains a part of a Kontakarion which was attached to the Menaion as a structurally independent part and was copied by another hand: “Le cas de [Vat. gr. 2008 — R. K.] est particulier. C’est un exemplaire de Ménées de janvier à avril, dans lequel sont été reliés (f. 172–176) cinq feuillets provenant d’un kontakarion du XI^e siècle, dont la perte est fort regrettable. Il en subsiste 29 pièces allant du 27 décembre au 24 février, dont le 1^{er} hymne de l’Épiphanie et celui de l’Hypapantè, de Romanos, qui sont les seuls complets. Le texte proche de celui de CV et la présence du saint sicilien Jean Thériste (24 février), inconnu des autres kontakaria, rendent vraisemblable l’origine italienne de ce recueil”.⁷⁴ The scribe or editor of *Vat. gr.* 2008 seems to have been undecided on the appropriate position for the kontakion; as a result, he attached the supplemental Kontakarion from the independent source to the main codex.⁷⁵

(71) А. Ю. НИКИФОРОВА, Праздничные блаженны из греческих Миней IX–XII веков библиотеки монастыря великомученицы Екатерины на Синае, *Богословский сборник* 10 (2002) 155–171.

(72) R. DEVRESSE, *Les manuscrits grecs de l’Italie méridionale (histoire, classement, paléographie)* (Città del Vaticano: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1955) (Studi e testi 183) 33.

(73) DEVRESSE, *Les manuscrits grecs...*, 11, 38–39.

(74) GROSIDIER DE MATONS, *Romanos le Mélode...*, 69–70, n. 17.

(75) A text without any genre indication is attested once in *Vat. gr.* 2008, and its musical and metrical structure is obscure: Δυὰς φωτοειδῆς σήμερον ἀπαστρέψασα φαειρότερον τοῦ ἡλίου πάσαν τὴν κτίσιν φωτίζει. Τιμόθεος ὁ ἔνδοξος· τῶν ἀποστόλων σύνθρονος· ὁ θεῖος Ἀναστάσιος· τῶν μοναστῶν ἡ τερπνότης· καὶ τῶν μαρτύρων τὸ κλέος (f. 20v). The text is not reported by Follieri.

18. *Crypt. gr. Δ α XXIII*, office Menaion for July–August, 11th c. The manuscript originally did not contain kontakia, the abridged texts of which have been written in the upper margins by a different hand: ff. 151r, 154v, 164r, 180r, etc.

19, 20, 21. The set of three manuscripts preserved at the Great Laura on Mt. Athos: Λάυρα Μεγίστη Γ 14, Γ 16, and Β 21. They are the earliest Menaia available in the Athonite collections, and all of them are dated to the 11th c. The structure and content of these manuscripts have been described by Tatjana Subotin-Golubović.⁷⁶ To judge by her description, these Menaia belong to the same typological group as the above-listed sources. The unique feature of this group of Menaia is that the offices for different feasts celebrated on the same day are completely separated from each other, so that “combined” offices of this kind begin with the lesser chants (stichera and kathismata) dedicated to one feast or saint followed by the kanon for the same feast, after which follow the lesser hymns for the next feast preceding the kanon for this next feast, etc. According to the order more frequently observed in the above-listed Menaia, the “combined” offices containing more than one commemoration begin with the lesser genres regardless of their dedication, followed by the kanons. Tatjana Subotin-Golubović reports on only two kontakia in these manuscripts, both preserved in *B21 sub diem* 1st and 8th of November.⁷⁷

II.1.b. A Centrally Influenced Archaic Peripheral Source with Innovative Features

22. *Sab. gr. 71*, an office Menaion for August dated to the 11th c., contains kathismata, stichera, and kanons which are not combined. This structure perfectly fits that of cod. *Vat. gr. 2* (11th c.) described above, however, two offices represented by *Sab. gr. 71* are structurally exceptional. In the offices for the Transfiguration and the Dormition of the Theotokos, the appropriate kontakia consisting of one prooimion and one oikos are included. Moreover, the same offices contain the pericopes from the Old Testament, which is the earliest example of this kind of text in the Byzantine office Menaia. Cod. *Sab. gr. 71* testifies to the innovative features in the offices for the liturgically most significant feasts of the month.

(76) Т. СУБОТИН-ГОЛУБОВИЋ, Одвојене службе светима у грчким минејима XI века, *Археογραφски прилози* 9 (1987) 317–320.

(77) *Ibid.*, 318.

II.1.c. Analysis

Except for the complete calendar, which covers all days of the fixed ecclesiastical year, and also with the exception of the function of the Menaion, which is intended for the celebration of the fixed feasts (while the Triodion and Octoechos contain the chants for the yearly movable and the weekly liturgical cycles sequentially), the significant structural innovations of the archaic peripheral Menaia in comparison to the younger Tropologion are the arrangement of chants by genre regardless of liturgical position and the use of daily kathismata, as Nikiforova noted. The lesser genres (kathismata, stichera, and, occasionally, makarismoi and kontakia, the application of which is described below) precede the kanon, and the exact number of chants depends on the significance of the feast or the hymnographic programme of a specific manuscript.

The absence of the festal troparion or troparion apolytikion from the office Menaia is a regular trend which archaic and peripheral sources follow. Instead of these genres, such an archaic peripheral manuscript as *Sin. gr. 607* attests the τροπάριον εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος chanted on the feasts of the Forty Martyrs of Sebastia and the Annunciation of the Theotokos (*Sin. gr. 607*, ff. 32v, 92v). The troparia have been written out completely in this manuscript.

If multiple kanons are to be chanted on the same day, their texts are not combined, and they follow each other.

Makarismoi are widely spread throughout the group of archaic peripheral Menaia. However, the peripheral character of this group is defined by the absence or the reduced use of two genres of Constantinopolitan origin: kontakion and festal exaposteilaria.

The peripheral hymnographic sources from the Byzantine liturgical sphere follow the trend toward a reduction in the use of the kontakion following Palestinian liturgical practices before the second half of the 9th c. and Italian traditions before the second half of the 11th c. (for an evaluation of the Italo-Greek and Slavonic data, see below).

The kontakion is absolutely absent from *D gr 350*, *Vat. gr. 2*, *Crypt. Δ α XXIII*, and *Λαύρα Μεγίστη Γ 14* and *Λαύρα Μεγίστη Γ 16*, while the cod. *Λαύρα Μεγίστη Β 21* attests kontakia only for two dates, 1st and 8th of November. The absence of kontakia in *Sin. gr. NE MG 28* can, however, be explained by the fact that this codex has been preserved only in fragments. Cod. *Sin. gr. 607*, a part of the same set to which *Sin. gr. NE MG 28* belongs, was written by the same hand and contains two kontakia: one on the Forty Martyrs of Sebastia Πᾶσαν στρογατιὰν

τοῦ κόσμου (f. 33r) and one on the Annunciation of the Theotokos Τῆ ὑπερμάχῳ στρατηγῶ (f. 92v). Both kontakia are abridged to one prooimion, and even the term κοντάκιον is attested in this manuscript only once, in the right margin near the kontakion for the Forty Martyrs of Sebastia (f. 33r). No genre identification of the monostrophic chant Τῆ ὑπερμάχῳ Στρατηγῶ in *Sin. gr. 607* (f. 92v) is observed, in spite of the fact that this text is the well-known second prooimion of the *Acathistos Hymnos*.⁷⁸

The use of kontakia in the above-listed Sinaitic manuscripts (*Sin. gr. 579*; *Sin. gr. 563*; *Sin. gr. 570*; *Sin. gr. 578 + PHB, Γρεχ. 89*; *Sin. gr. 595*; *Sin. gr. 610*; *Sin. gr. 613*; *Sin. gr. 614*; *Sin. gr. 624*; *Sin. gr. 631*; and *PHB, Γρεχ. 351*) has not been properly described; however, Alexandra Niki-forova, who examined the whole set of these Menaia, kindly informed me that the kontakia are rarely observed (“почти не встречаются”) in the above-listed sources. The only manuscript of this collection I consulted *de visu* is *Sin. gr. 631*. It contains one abridged monostrophic kontakion consisting of the first prooimion of the well-known hymn for the Dormition of the Theotokos: Τὴν ἐν πρεσβείαις ἀκοίμητον θεοτόκον (f. 46r).⁷⁹ This is comparable to the archaic Triodion *Vat. gr. 771* (11th c.) of Italian provenance⁸⁰ which contains one alphabetical kontakion chanted at the offices chanted on Good Friday (f. 182v; prooimion and oikoi with the incipita beginning with the letters α, ε, ι, ν, ρ, and φ having been preserved); on f. 174v, *sub diem* Good Friday, one kontakion is

(78) ΤΡΥΠΑΝΙΣ, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica*, 29.

(79) *Ibid.*, 117.

(80) On the archaic typological characteristics of the Triodion *Vat. gr. 771* and its Italian (Campanian) provenance see: КАРАБИНОВЪ, *Постная Триодъ...*, V, 107, 206, 207, 208, 211 et pass. (it was a mistake to assert that “въ ватиканской триоди № 771 нѣтъ еще ни одного кондака”, p. 211; see below); G. BERTONIERE, *The Sundays of Lent in the Triodion: the Sundays without a Commemoration* (Roma, 1997) (OCA, 253) 88, 95 et pass.; MOMINA, *Einführung...*, passim; DEVRESSE, *Les manuscrits grecs...*, 31–33 (“Faute d’une dénomination plus exacte, j’appellerais «campaniens» un certain nombre de manuscrits du milieu du X^e siècle à la fin du XI^e; ils portent des traits que nous avons reconnus dans la facture des vieux *Cryptenses* antérieurs à la fondation de Nil, dans le «tyrrhéniens» et dans les gréco-lombards cassiniens”, p. 32); cf.: “Il Vaticano gr. 771 ed il Crypt. Δ.β. XVII sono invece stati copiati ed utilizzati proprio nel monasterio criptense e rappresentano la prassi liturgica più antica ivi vogente” (S. PARENTI, *La celebrazione delle Ore del Venerdì Santo nell’Eucologio Γ. β. X di Grottaferrata [X–XI sec.]*, *Bolletino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata*, n. s., 44 [1990] 120).

indicated: καὶ εὐθ(ὺς) τὸ κονδ(άκιον) · ὄν· (the complete text is absent). On f. 185 another kontakion was added to the main text by a different hand: Κονδ(άκιον) τῆ ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη παρασκευῆ ἡχ(ος) πλ(άγιος) δ'· Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς σταυρωθέντα... etc. On f. 251r (*sub diem* third Sunday after Easter), a short notice is written down by a different hand in the margin after the sixth ode of the kanon: ζῆτ(ει) τὸ κονδ(άκιον) εἰς τ(ὸ) τέλ(ος) τοῦ βιβλίου.

It would have been reasonable to assume that the absence or the reduced use of kontakia in the earliest Byzantine Menaia was caused by the existence of Kontakaria, because there should have been no reason to place kontakia in the Menaia when they were transmitted by another hymnographic book. However, the reduced use or the absence of kontakia in hymnographic sources of Palestinian or Sinaitic provenance before the 10th c. and in at least some of the Italo-Greek Menaia and Triodia in the 11th c. seems natural, because provincial sources are expected to better preserve archaic features than central manuscripts. The earliest evidence for the liturgical use of the kontakion in the Italo-Greek rite(s) are the hymnographic works by St. Nilus of Rossano (910–1004), to whom several kontakia are ascribed.⁸¹ So there are no grounds to claim that the kontakion was a part of the Italo-Greek monastic Matins before Nilus' time, and if it was, then it was only an abridged monostrophic chant intended for the most significant feasts.

The decisive argument for the “reduced” use of the kontakion in some branches of Byzantine tradition beyond Palestine in the 9th–11th cc. is testified by early Church Slavonic Menaia.

It is well known that Kontakaria existed only in Old Russian hymnography, whereas in the Old and Middle Bulgarian and Old Serbian traditions, Kontakaria were absent and kontakia were transmitted only in Menaia, Triodia, and Octoechoi.⁸² There are three East and South

(81) On St. Nilus of Rossano's hymnographic works see: S. GASSISI, *Innografi italo-greci: Poesie di San Nilo Iuniore e di Paolo Monaco, abbatì di Grottaferrata, Oriens Christianus* 5 (1905) 26–82; E. FOLLIERI, *Poesia e innografia nell'Italia bizantina*, M. SIMONETTI (ed.), *La cultura in Italia fra Tardo Antico e Alto Medioevo; atti del Convegno tenuto a Roma, C.N.R., dal 12 al 16 nov. 1979*, t. II (Roma: Herder, 1981) 513–522.

(82) М. А. МОМИНА, Проблема правки славянских богослужебных гимнографических книг на Руси в XI в., *ТОДРЛ* 45 (1991) 201; “Весьма показательно отсутствие этих книг в сербских списках XIII–XIV вв., в целом лучше сохраняющих древнейшую традицию, чем болгарские. Кондакарь (ненотированный), помещенный в дополнении к сербскому Прологу нач.

Slavonic Menaia which do not contain kontakia: 1) Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (Российский Государственный архив древних актов, РГАДА, Moscow), the collection of the Synodal print shop (Синодальная типография), Тип. № 131, festal Menaion for the first half of the ecclesiastical year known as the Book of Iija (*Iljina Kniga*), 11th–12th cc., Old Russian provenance (the text version goes back to the early Old Bulgarian period of the end of the 9th – beginning of the 10th c.);⁸³ 2) Mt. Athos, cod. *Zografensis slavicus* 53 (*Zogr.* 53), office Menaion for September–November, Serbian provenance, first half of the 13th c.;⁸⁴ 3) National Library of Serbia (Народна библиотека Србије), Belgrade, cod. *Belgradensis slavicus* 647 (*Belgr.* 647) known as the Menaion of Bratko (*Bratkov Minej*), the earliest part of which (office Menaion for September–November) does not contain kontakia and is dated to 1234–1243, Old Serbian provenance.⁸⁵ These sources are archaic linguistically, typologically, or both. The Old Russian Book

XIV в. (ГИМ, Хлуд. 189, лл. 251–282), явно восходит к русскому списку, т. к. включает в себя песнопения Борису и Глебу и на перенесение мощей Николы. Рукопись НБКМ № 898 названа Ирмологием по ошибке, т. к. из описания следует, что это Октоих <...>. Болгарский Энинский Стихирарь второй половины XIV в. <...>, в сущности, представляет Праздничную Минею <...>. Особое место занимает достаточно экзотический и древний Парижский Стихирарь кон. XII – нач. XIII в. <...>, содержащий только стихиры на 1–14 сентября, написанные на полях греческого сборника сочинений Платона <...>. Нотированные <...> южнославянские рукописи почти отсутствуют. До XIV в. можно указать лишь отдельные песнопения” (Б. Н. Флоря, А. А. Турилов, С. А. Иванов, *Судьбы кирилло-мефодиевской традиции после Кирилла и Мефодия* (Санкт-Петербург: Алетейя, 2000) 128–129, прим. 2).

(83) The manuscript has been published: В. Б. Крысько (изд.), *Ильина книга. Рукопись РГАДА, Тип. 131. Лингвистическое издание, подготовка греческого текста, комментарии, словоуказатели* (Москва: Индрик, 2005); Е. М. Верещагин, *Ильина книга. Древнейший славянский богослужебный сборник. Факсимильное воспроизведение рукописи, билинейно-спатическое издание источника с филолого-богословским комментарием* (Москва: Индрик, 2006) (see the editions also for further references and information on linguistic and typological characteristics of the source).

(84) Б. Райков, С. Кожухаров, Х. Миклас, Х. Кодов, *Каталог на славянските ръкописи в библиотеката на Зографския манастир в Света Гора* (София: СІВАЛ, 1994) 53, № 53; А. А. Турилов, Л. В. Мошкова, *Славянские рукописи афонских обителей* (Фессалоники: SS. Cyril and Methodius Centre for Cultural Studies, 1999) 151, № 367.

(85) Љ. Штављанин-Ђорђевић, М. Гроздановић-Пајић, Л. Цернић, *Опис ћирилских рукописа Народне библиотеке Србије* (Народна библиотека

of Ilja does not contain kontakia at all, the Menaion of Bratko attests to their use only once, and *Zogr. slav. 53* includes five kontakia, three of which was certainly incorporated from a secondary source.⁸⁶ Because Kontakaria were unknown among the South Slavs, the absence of kontakia in at least South Slavonic Menaia cannot be justified on the basis that these hymns were transmitted in Kontakaria. This implies that the Middle Bulgarian and the Old Serbian Menaia and Triodia as well as the East Slavonic archaic Festal Menaion (*Zogr. slav. 53*, the Menaion of Bratko and the Book of Ilja) are structurally modelled on one of the Byzantine liturgical traditions with no kontakia in the monastic Matins. The earliest Greek Menaia and the Triodion of either Palestinian or early Italo-Greek origin as well as the linguistically archaic Book of Ilja also testify to the peripheral and archaic character of this tradition. (This proves that historical linguistic analysis of Slavonic manuscripts can be an important tool to study Byzantine tradition.)

The structural features of the peripheral archaic group are not strict rules but rather represent a stable trend. However, the deviations from the common trend are also noteworthy for either their archaic origin or peripheral provenance.

1) The placement of the stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴβους according to their liturgical position. The only exception to the rule of non-liturgical order of chants is witnessed by *Sin. gr. 607*, in which there are three examples of the stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴβους, arranged according to their liturgical position at Matins after the kanon.⁸⁷ This exception is by no means an innovation, but rather an archaic relict influenced by the Tropologion (*Sin. gr. NE MG 5*, 8th–9th cc., *Sin. gr. NE MG 56*, 9th c.) and archaic hymnographic books such as the “proto-Menaion” *Sin. gr. NE MG 4*, 9th–10th cc., which contains the additional offices (stichera and kanons) absent in the Tropologion.⁸⁸ In all these archaic books the

Србије. Опис јужнословенских ћирилских рукописа, т. II) (Београд: Народна библиотека Србије, 1986) 340–345 (№ 163).

(86) Т. СУБОТИН-ГОЛУБОВИЋ, Упоредно проучавање..., 444; Ранковић, Структура...; Р. Н. КРИВКО, Древнерусская версия кондака вмч. Димитрию и её южнославянские параллели, in: А. М. Молдован, Е. А. Мишина (ред.), *Лингвистическое источниковедение 2010–2011* (Москва: Древлехранилище, 2011) 301–304.

(87) НИКИФОРОВА, Рождение Минеи..., 111.

(88) On the structure and content of the Tropologion *Sin. gr. NE MG 5* and the “Proto-Menaion” *Sin. gr. NE MG 4* see: КРИВКО, Синайско-славянские гимнографические параллели..., 83–84, 87–89, 92–95; ИДЕМ, Византийские

chants are arranged according to their liturgical position and not by genre, unlike the early office Menaia of the 10th–11th cc. Other examples of the arrangement of the stichera εἰς τοὺς αἶνους after the kanon are attested in the younger Menaia dated not earlier than the 11th–12th cc., all of the chants in which are arranged according to their liturgical position (see below).

2) The “reverse” order of chants in Byzantine and Slavonic traditions. The lesser genres normally precede the kanon in the earliest Menaia. Three remarkable exceptions to this rule have been uncovered. The earliest example of the so-called “reverse” order of chants, according to which the kanon precedes the lesser genres, was revealed by Alexandra Nikiforova in *Sin. gr. 607*, ff. 196–198 (Prophet Michaias commemoration, *sub diem* 21st of April, whereas in all of the younger sources the feast is celebrated on the 14th of August).⁸⁹ Alexandra Nikiforova’s observation was published after another, younger, case of the “reverse” order of chants had been reported by the author of this article.⁹⁰ It was uncovered in *Vat. gr. 2*, f. 142r–142v, *sub diem* 24th of November, commemoration of St. Gregory, Bishop of Agrigento (which is located on the southwestern coast of Sicily). As one can see from the example below, the title of the office is immediately followed by the kanon, while the stichera are placed after the kanon:

Μηνὶ νοεμβρίῳ · κδ΄ κανὼν τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου
 Ἀγγραγαντ(ίνων?)... / φέρων ἀκροστιχίδα · τὸν θαυματουργὸν
 Γρηγόριον θαυμάσω Ἰωσήφ · ἦχος πλάγιος δ΄.

источники славянских служебных миней, in: *Письменность, литература и фольклор славянских народов, XIV Международный съезд славистов (Охрид, 10–16 сентября 2008 г.), доклады российской делегации* (Москва: Индрик, 2008) 88–89; А. Ю. НИКИФОРОВА, “Синайская сокровищница”: структура последований греческого Тропология VIII–IX вв. и ранних Миней IX–XII вв., in: *Флорилегий: Чтения по позднеантичной и средневековой христианской литературе* (Москва: ИМЛИ, in press).

(89) ЕАДЕМ, Рождение..., 109: “Даты некоторых празднований [in *Sin. gr. 607* — R. K.] еще не установились окончательно. Служба прор. Михею помещена 21 апреля (вместо принятого позднее 14 августа)”.

(90) R. N. KRIVKO, Hymnographic Manuscripts from Mt. Sinai and their Place in the History of Byzantine Liturgical Poetry, a paper delivered at the international conference “Codex Sinaiticus. The Manuscript in Contemporary Informational Space” (St Petersburg, Russian National Library, November 11–12, 2009).

᾿Ωιδὴ α΄

Τῶ συντριψαντι πολέμους. //

(f. 142v)

Ταῖς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀκτίσι πυροσεύμενος...

The handwritten note made by a different hand in the right margin of the page near the incipit of the kanon indicates that the “reverse” order of chants was unusual in Byzantine Menaia: ζ(ή)τ(ει) τὸ κάθ(ισμα) / καὶ τὰ στιχ(ηρὰ) εἰς / τ(ὸ) τέ(λος) τ(οῦ) κανόνος (f. 142r). Nevertheless, it is testified by one more hymnographic manuscript, *Vat. gr. 771*, which is dated to the 11th c. as well and which contains the most archaic and peripheral type of Triodion.⁹¹ The “reverse” order of chants in *Vat. gr. 771* is observed in almost all the offices (*akolouthiai*), which implies that the exceptional cases of *Sin. gr. 607* and *Vat. gr. 2* are not occasional deviations or textual corruptions, but rather the evidence of a tradition to be defined on the basis of the paleographic data. While *Sin. gr. 607* was written in Palestine or on Sinai, both of the Vatican manuscripts, *Vat. gr. 2* and *Vat. gr. 771*, are of Campanian provenance,⁹² and thus the rare and exceptional “reverse” order of chants in the archaic office Menaia and Triodion testifies to peripheral branches of Byzantine tradition.

The peripheral origin of the “reverse” order of chants is important for the reconstruction of that part of the Byzantine liturgical legacy on which the earliest Old Slavonic hymnography was patterned. It has been established by Vatroslav Jagić and later on by Michail Fyodorovich Murianov, Natalia Alexandrovna Nečunaeva, and then by Evgeny Michailovich Vereščagin that the “reverse” order of chants is a characteristic of the linguistically and typologically archaic Old Church Slavonic Menaia and Triodia which had originated in the First Bulgarian Kingdom in the first half of the 10th c. and which are preserved in a

(91) КАРАБИНОВЪ, *Постная Триодь...*, V, 107, 206, 207, 208, 211 et passim; МОМИНА, *Einführung...*, passim; PARENTI, *La celebrazione...*, 120.

(92) On the provenance of *Vat. gr. 771*, see the remark by Robert Devreesse: “Liber accurate perscriptus. Inscriptiones, ornatus, litterae initiales coloribus fervidis rubro, caeruleo et flavo distincta ea ratione qua delectabantur Italo-Graeci” (IDEM, *Codices Vaticani graeci III: cod. 604–866...*, 287); on the provenance of *Vat. gr. 2* and *Vat. gr. 771* see for details: DEVREESE, *Les manuscrits grecs...*, 31–33.

few younger Old Russian and Middle Bulgarian manuscripts dated to the 11th–13th cc.⁹³

From the historical and cultural point of view, the most remarkable example of the “reverse” order of chants in Slavonic hymnography is the office for the first Russian saints, the holy martyrs Boris and Gleb († 1015). The hymnographic kanon for their veneration had originally been written in Greek by the Kievan Metropolitan John I (before 1039) or John II (1076/1077–1089) and then was translated into Church Slavonic in Kievan Rus', but it was not preserved in any Byzantine manuscript.⁹⁴ One of the earliest witnesses of the office was studied by Michail Murianov,⁹⁵ who succeeded in establishing some of the incipita of the original Greek text and who noticed that it contained the second ode, which had been eliminated before the earliest available witness of the Church Slavonic translation was copied.⁹⁶ The chants of this particular version of the office are arranged in the “reverse” order, as Michail Murianov reported.⁹⁷ In addition to the office for SS. Boris and Gleb, all the other offices in the same manuscript retain the regular structure according to which lesser genres precede the kanon. This order became

(93) ЈАГИЋ, *Менаеа...*, LXVII–LXVIII; Н. А. НЕЧУНАЕВА, *Минея как тип славяно-греческого средневекового текста* (Tallinn: TPÜ Kirjastus, 2000) (Tallinna pedagogikaülikooli humanitaarteaduste dissertatsioonid / Таллиннский педагогический университет, диссертации по гуманитарным наукам, 3) 55, 102–110; М. Ф. МУРЬЯНОВ, *Гимнография Киевской Руси* (Москва: Наука, 2003) 55–56; ВЕРЕЩАГИН, *Ильина книга...*

(94) М. Ф. МУРЬЯНОВ, Из наблюдений над структурой служебных Миней, in: В. П. ГРИГОРЬЕВ (отв. ред.), *Проблемы структурной лингвистики 1979* (Москва: Наука, 1981) 263–278. On the reconstruction and the sources of the Greek text of the office for the first Russian saints see: F. KELLER, Das Kontakion aus der ersten Služba für Boris und Gleb, in: *Schweizerische Beiträge zum VII. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Warschau, August 1973* (Luzern—Frankfurt a. Main: C. J. Bucher, 1973) (Slavica Helvetica 7) 65–73; В. Б. КРЫСЬКО, О греческих источниках и реконструкции первоначального текста древнерусских стихир на Борисов день, in: Ф. Б. УСПЕНСКИЙ (сост.), *Miscellanea Slavica, Сборник статей к 70-летию Бориса Андреевича Успенского* (Москва: Индрик, 2008) 92–108.

(95) Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (Российский Государственный архив древних актов, РГАДА / RGADA, Moscow), the Synodal press shop collection (Тип.), № 121, office Menaion for July, 11th–12th cc.; see: МУРЬЯНОВ, Из наблюдений..., 269–270.

(96) МУРЬЯНОВ, Из наблюдений..., 271.

(97) Ibid., 269–270.

the rule for the Old Russian Menaia not later than in the second half of the 11th c., when the Typikon of the patriarch Alexius the Studite had been translated and introduced in Kievan Rus',⁹⁸ therefore the version of the office on for SS. Boris and Gleb as attested by the earliest manuscript must go back to the earlier period: "В Минее № 121 на 24 июля стоят две службы — св. Христине и поставленная на второе место борисоглебская. Различие между ними в том, что в службе св. Христине канон стоит на обычном последнем месте, а в борисоглебской службе — на первом, перед стихирами и кондаком, как это принято только в Путятиной Минее, что считается одним из ее архаизмов, восходящим к X в. (Ягич 1886, с. LXVII–LXVIII). Это говорит в пользу древности старшей редакции борисоглебской службы, ее возможной принадлежности к эпохе Иоанна I".⁹⁹

It is undisputed that the commemoration of the first Russian saints was considered to be of the highest liturgical significance for Eastern Slavs. Consequently, the "reverse" order of chants in the office appears to be a classical example of one of Anton Baumstark's well-known liturgical laws stating that on the most solemn days, the most ancient and solemn rituals tend to be retained. This implies that the "reverse" order of chants, which in the Byzantine tradition is attested by the archaic sources of peripheral provenance, became a prestigious model for Old Church Slavonic hymnography at the earliest stages of its development and was retained by Old Russian translators of the office for SS. Boris and Gleb, which had been patterned according to the influential Old Bulgarian structural prototypes. The Old Bulgarian influence on the office for SS. Boris and Gleb is indicated by the fact that the kanon for this feast was composed according to the same *heirmoi* as the general kanon for Martyrs as attested by the General Menaion by St. Clement of Ochrid († 916).¹⁰⁰

(98) On the history of Patriarch Alexius the Studite's Typikon, and for its publication see: А. М. ПЕНТКОВСКИЙ, *Типикон патриарха Алексия Студита в Византии и на Руси* (Москва: Издательство Московской Патриархии, 2001).

(99) Мурьянов, *Из наблюдений...*, 271.

(100) Мурьянов, *Из наблюдений...*, 269: "Мы ограничимся констатацией тождества ирмосов древнейшего борисоглебского канона и канона мученикам в древнейшей Минее общей, входящей в состав южнорусского сборника XII–XIII вв. — Cod. slav. 37 Австрийской национальной библиотеки <...> При огромном числе возможных вариантов сочетаний это совпадение трудно признать случайным". The publication of the Old

The correlation of the “marked” features in the archaic peripheral Byzantine Menaia is described by two rules:

1) if the Menaion contains makarismoï (an archaic genre of Palestinian origin) and does not contain festal exaposteilaria (“innovative” in comparison to the Tropologion genre of Constantinopolitan origin), it testifies to the reduced use of the kontakion (also “innovative” in comparison to the Tropologion genre of Constantinopolitan origin), which is represented, if at all, in the abridged monostrophic form; however, the reduced usage of kontakia does not imply the presence of makarismoï;

2) if chants in a specific manuscript in at least one of the offices are arranged in the “reverse” order, the same manuscript bears witness to the reduced liturgical use of kontakia.

These rules cover Byzantine practice but not the typologically archaic Middle Bulgarian, Old Serbian, and East Slavonic material. The most remarkable exception to these rules is observed in the Old Russian translation of the office for SS. Boris and Gleb, which was originally written in Greek by the Kievan Metropolitan John (most probably John I, based on the liturgical parallels with the archaic sources) and which contains a kontakion, although the chants of this office are arranged in the “reverse” order. However, this exception is explained by Anton Baumstark’s law of retaining archaic features in the rituals at the liturgically most significant dates.

II.1.d. Exceptions: Younger Witnesses to the Archaic Tradition

23. *Reg. gr. 65*, office Menaion for May, 12th c. According to the microfilm, the manuscript currently comprises 63 folia of parchment and not 68, as reported by Stevenson.¹⁰¹ The manuscript is difficult to classify both typologically and historically. The offices consist of kathismata, stichera, and kanons (with no kontakia or any other chants), which correlates with the genre structure and content of the archaic

Bulgarian text of the general office for Martyrs according to the best of two preserved copies, cod. *Vind. slav.* 37 (13th c.), in: К. СТАНЧЕВ, Г. ПОПОВ, *Климент Охридски. Живот и творчество* (София: Университетско издателство “Климент Охридски”, 1988) 204–208. The new edition of the General Offices by Clement of Ochrid with German translation has been published recently but unfortunately remains unavailable to me: А. КАМФ, *Kliment von Ohrid (Klemens von Achrida) — Kanones für das Commune Sanctorum. Studie und Text, Materialien* (Berlin: LIT, 2010) (Münstersche Texte zur Slavistik, 5).

(101) STEVENSON, *Codices...*, 54.

peripheral group; however, the kanons placed under the same date can on occasion be combined, so that the troparia of the first ode of one kanon follow immediately after the troparia of the first ode of another kanon, even if the *heirmoi* of both the kanons are different. I am unaware of any attempt to suggest an alternative date for the manuscript or to establish its provenance. The Menaion *Reg. gr. 65* appears to be an intermediate link between the archaic type and the innovative type described below, in which the combination of kanons is normal. On the other hand, the occasional and probably erroneous incorporation of troparia of one kanon into the odes of another is witnessed by the early Church Slavonic Menaia,¹⁰² which makes it possible to assume the isolated examples of the combination of kanons in *Reg. gr. 65* to have been influenced by scribal error or textual corruption. A definite strain of innovations in *Reg. gr. 65* is manifested by the consistent omission of the second odes, none of which has been preserved in this manuscript.

24. *Reg. gr. 63*, office Menaion for November dated 1259/1260 AD. Despite Stevenson's observation that kathismata in this manuscript are placed after the third ode of the kanon and the kontakion is followed by the Synaxarion after the sixth ode,¹⁰³ the latter genre is testified only once in the abridged monostrophic form written in the margin (f. 76) whereas kathismata sometimes precede the kanon, as the stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴθουρας always do regardless of their liturgical position. Two indisputable innovative features of this Menaion are the combination of kanons and the absence of the second ode.

The manuscript was copied for the monastery's superior, Father Joseph, by the monk Barlaam of Galesion (located close to Ephes). Barlaam worked together with another scribe, named Athanasios, who is known for producing the manuscript *Par. gr. 857*.¹⁰⁴ The musical notation preserved in *Reg. gr. 63* is similar to that of the Triodion *Reg. gr. 59* dated to the 11th–12th c. and the provenance of which is assumed to be provincial, either from Palestine or Cyprus.¹⁰⁵

(102) Л. В. Мошкова, Два комбинированных канона на Успение Богородицы (принципы объяснения), *Palaeobulgarica / Старобългаристика* 24.1 (2000) 53–76.

(103) STEVENSON, *Codices...*, 53.

(104) *Codici bizantini di origine provinciale alla Biblioteca Vaticana, Catalogo della mostra* (Città del Vaticano: Salone Sistino, 1988) 5.

(105) *Ibid.*

25. Great Laura, Mt. Athos, *Laur. Δ 17*, office Menaion for July–August, dated according to the catalogue to the 13th c. Despite such a young date this Menaion contains kathismata, stichera, and kanons with no kontakia according to the archaic peripheral tradition. The kanons chanted on the same date are not combined, and second odes are numerous. Exceptionally, two offices for different feasts celebrated on the same day are totally separated (*sub diem* 16th of August, commemoration of St. Diomides and Translation of the Holy Ikon of the Lord not Made with Hands), as in the above-mentioned manuscripts from the Athonite collections, *Γ 14*, *Γ 16*, and *B 21*, 11th c. The single example of katabasia (καταβασία), a monostrophic chant whose liturgical function and position in the archaic tradition remains to be examined in the archaic tradition, is unique in this manuscript.

The significant archaic feature of *Laur. Δ 17* is the use of the makarismoi in the office for Transfiguration (*sub diem* 6th of August, no foliation in this section of the manuscript), their existence at this feast has not been reported by scholars: ἔμορφώθησ δι' ἡμᾶς...; τὴν ἔσομένην μυστικῶσ τῆσ καθ' ἡμᾶσ σαρκὸσ μεταμόρφωσιν...; ὁ ἐν τοῖσ κόλποισ τοῦ Πατρός...; τὴν μητέρα σοῦ, Χριστέ (near the last makarismos there is a marginal note — the letter θ, indicating that this stanza is a makarismos dedicated to the Theotokos [Θεοτόκοσ], i. e. makarismos-theotokion). Because of the structure and the content of the manuscript *Laur. Δ 17*, its date as proposed by Lambros seems to be doubtful. Although I am by no means a paleographer, however, according to my impression from the handwriting of *Laur. Δ 17*, the manuscript could be dated to the first half or even the beginning of the 12th c., and even a date in the 11th c. seems plausible. The provenance of *Laur. Δ 17* might have been related to Asia Minor: the scribe considered it necessary to note in the lower margin at the beginning of the office for the Apostle Matthias (*sub diem* 9th of August) that the commemoration of St. Theodosios, the Father Superior of Orovon (a region of Ephesus), is celebrated on the same day. The archaic peripheral office Menaion for August *Sin. gr. 631* (10th–11th c.) described above contains the only available kanon, that is *textus unicus*, dedicated to this saint.¹⁰⁶ The intention of preserving this rare commemoration implies that *Laur. Δ 17* represents one of the local and probably peripheral traditions related

(106) On the hymnography for St. Theodosios of Orovon see: Ε. ΠΑΠΑΗΛΙΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ-ΦΩΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Ταμείων ἀνεκδότων βυζαντινῶν ἁσματικῶν κανόνων seu Analecta Hymnica Graeca e Codicibus eruta Orientis Christiani*, 1 (*Κανόνες Μηναίων*) (Αθήναι, 1996) 265–266 (n° 829).

to the region where St. Theodosios of Orovon flourished. The typologically close indication of a local but significant commemoration not represented by the main text of the manuscript and noted in the margin is testified by cod. *Sin. gr. 633* (office Menaion for August, 14th c.), in which the commemoration of the Prophet Aaron is prescribed by the marginal note on fol. 22r *sub diem* 8th of August.¹⁰⁷ Numerous Arabic marginalia preserved in *Sin. gr. 633* testify to the Sinaitic or Palestinian provenance of the manuscript.

II.2. The Archaic “Central” Group of the Eleventh – Twelfth Centuries.

II.2.a. *Classifying Features*

The shared features of both archaic groups are 1) the arrangement of chants by genre regardless of liturgical position, and 2) the separate placement of multiple kanons chanted on the same day, so that each kanon is placed one after another and neither individual troparia nor the complete odes of the kanons are combined or interwoven. The first distinctive characteristic of the so-called central group is a regular use of kontakion consisting of at least two or more stanzas or even represented in its entirety. The exclusive use of an abridged monostrophic kontakion is a characteristic of only the peripheral archaic group of Menaia. The second peculiarity of the central group are the festal exaposteilaria, which are not observed as regularly as kontakia but still represent Constantinopolitan impact. Unlike other chants, exaposteilaria stand only after the kanon according to their liturgical position. The third feature of the archaic central group is an occasional indication of the festal troparion, or apolytikion, which is not observed in the archaic peripheral Menaia.

Unlike the kontakion, neither the exaposteilarion nor the festal troparion are *necessarily* preserved in the manuscripts of the central group. The correlation between these genres is described by the following rules: if the manuscript contains festal exaposteilaria or festal troparia, it contains kontakia which are not abridged to one prooimion. With the exception of *Crypt. gr. Δ α XII* (see below) the reverse rule is also true: if a specific manuscript does not contain abridged kontakia, it contains either festal troparia indicated with an incipit or exaposteilaria. The interdependency among these genres testifies to the gradual

(107) The manuscript was consulted *de visu* at the St. Catherine Monastery.

emergence of the centrally influenced liturgical traditions of Constantinopolitan origin which became dominant in the 11th c. (again, with the exception of *Crypt. gr. Δ α XII*). The “reverse” order of chants is not attested by the central group. Some of the manuscripts of the central type contain festal makarismoi, which consequently turn out to be a not-uncommon phenomenon in the Byzantine Menaia of the 10th–11th cc. regardless of their peripheral or central background, though in the manuscripts younger than the 12th c. they are not observed (except in the case of *Δ 17*, due to questions about its date; see above).

II.2.b. The Sources

1. *Coisl. gr. 218*, office Menaion for August, 11th c. The offices contain kathismata, stichera, kontakia with oikoi, and kanons; the exaposteilarion is placed at the very end of the office after the kanon. A monostrophic chant designated katabasia (καταβασία) with undefined liturgical position is also represented (89r), as well as the set of makarismoi for the Dormition of the Theotokos (ff. 93v–94v). This set as attested by *Coisl. gr. 218* shares no common chants with the above-mentioned *Sin. gr. 631*; *textus unici* among the festal makarismoi in the Menaia particularly dedicated to the Dormition of the Theotokos testify to no continuous or stable textual tradition for this genre, the development of which was eventually broken *in statu nascendi*. The cod. *Coisl. gr. 218* is noteworthy for its enormously rich content: no less than three commemorations and offices have been placed at each date in this Menaion. This is probably the reason why the manuscript is the earliest available example of the Constantinopolitan feast of the Procession of the Precious Life-Giving Cross (*sub diem* 1st of August), whereas the second early Menaion containing this feast is dated to the 12th or 13th cc., as can be observed on the basis of dozens of Menaia for August which I have consulted *de visu*.¹⁰⁸

2. *Sin. gr. 632*, office Menaion for August, 11th or 12th cc., retains not only the same genre structure as *Coisl. gr. 218*, but also testifies to the same scribe’s or editor’s goal of compiling as many commemorations, offices, and chants as possible under the same date, so that the manuscripts *Coisl. gr. 218* and *Sin. gr. 632* can be designated as Menaia of a *thesaurus* type. As in *Coisl. gr. 218*, the offices in *Sin. gr. 632* consist of kathismata, stichera, kontakia with oikoi, and kanons; makarismoi are represented once before the kanon (ff. 36v–38r), exaposteilaria are

(108) Кривко, Византийские источники..., 82.

placed after the last kanon at the very end of the office (43r, 92r bis); katabasia, whatever its meaning in the early period, is attested once (81v).

3, 4. *Lesb. Leim. 11*, office Menaion for June, second half of the 11th c., and cod. *Hierosolymitanus Sabbaiticus 70*, office Menaion for June of the same date. *Hieros. Sab. 70* is closely related to *Lesb. Leim. 11* both paleographically and from the point of view of structure and content. The offices in both the manuscripts are structurally similar and consist of kathismata, kontakion and oikos, stichera, kanons (kontakion and oikos can be absent). Neither single monostrophic festal troparia nor exaposteilaria nor makarismoi are observed in *Lesb. Leim. 11*. Cod. *Hieros. Sab. 70* was “owned at some stage by the famous monastery of Christ the Akataleptos in Constantinople, as its colophon states: «βιβλίον τοῦ Σωτήρος τοῦ Ἀκαταλήπτου», though it is not clear whether it was produced there. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, who examined it and dated it to the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century, noted that it has the structure of the «ancient Menaia»”.¹⁰⁹ Though the colophone of *Hieros. Sab. 70* does not indicate clearly the provenance of the manuscript, it testifies to Constantinopolitan usage of the Menaion.

5. *Mess. gr. 140*, office Menaion for August, 12th c. The most remarkable distinctive feature of *Mess. gr. 140* is a monostrophic chant titled *troparion* (τροπάριον) always rendered as an incipit without any further identification of its liturgical position, which is thus assumed to be clear enough to the manuscript user. An incipit refers the user to another source which contains the complete text of a specific chant. Thus, for example, the incipit of an *heirmos* is always a reference to the *Heirmologion*. The book that contained the complete texts of troparia to be chanted at the end of Matins, was the *Synaxarion*, the paralitur-

(109) A. SPANOS, *Codex Lesbiacus Leimonos 11: Annotated Critical Edition of an Unpublished Byzantine Menaion for June* (Berlin—New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010) (*Byzantinisches Archiv*, 23) 109. The entire manuscript *Lesb. Leim. 11* and its description by Apostolos Spanos are available on line on the official website of the Leimonos Monastery: http://84.205.233.134/library/index_en.php. The manuscript has been published completely and examined thoroughly: SPANOS, *Codex Lesbiacus Leimonos 11...* . For a description of cod. *Hieros. Sab. 70* and a comparison with cod. *Lesb. Leim. 11* see *ibid.*, 14, 109–112, 131–134.

gical book of Constantinopolitan origin.¹¹⁰ The indication of troparia with their incipita is observed in the Old Russian tradition, although there is no perfect correspondence between the incipits in the East Slavonic Menaia and Synaxaria (slav. *Prolog*).¹¹¹ And, finally, in *Mess. gr. 140* the term *photagogikon* (φωταγωγικόν), instead of *exaposteilarion*, designates the monostrophic chant following the kanon.

6. The text type witnessed by Old Russian office Menaia of the 11th–12th cc. composed according to Patriarch Alexius the Studite's Typikon on the basis of the earlier Old Bulgarian translations belongs to the archaic central group.¹¹² It is noteworthy that the Slavonic text structure is testified exactly by none of the available Byzantine sources.

(110) В. ЖЕЛЯЗКОВА, Тропарите в състава на Простия пролог, *Palaeobulgarica / Старобългаристика* 19.1 (1995) 78–90; Р. ПАВЛОВА, В. ЖЕЛЯЗКОВА (изд.), Станиславов (Лесновски) Пролог от 1330 година (Велико Търново: Фабер, 1999); В. Б. КРЫСЬКО (ред.), *Славяно-русский Пролог по древнейшим спискам* (Москва: Индрик, 2011).

(111) ЖЕЛЯЗКОВА, Тропарите...; КРЫСЬКО, *Славяно-русский Пролог...*

(112) See the description of structure: STEFANOVIĆ, *The Development...*; the editions of the manuscripts of the Alexius the Studite group and their signatures: JAGIĆ, *Menaia...*; *Gottesdienstmenäum für den Monat Dezember: auf der Grundlage der Handschrift Sin. 162 des Staatlichen Historischen Museums Moskau*, historisch-kritische Edition, nach den slavischen handschriften der Rus' des 12. und 13. Jh. Besorgt und kommentiert von D. CHRISTIANS et al., hrsg. von H. ROTHE, E. M. VEREŠČAGIN, Teil 1: 1. bis 8. Dezember; Teil 2: 9. bis 19. Dezember Teil 3: 20. bis 24. Dezember einschließlich der Sonntage vor Christi Geburt; Teil 4: 25. bis 31. Dezember einschließlich des Sonntags nach Christi Geburt, mit einem Nachtrag griechischer Vorlagen für Hymnen aus den Bänden 1–3, zusammengestellt von D. CHRISTIANS; Teil 5: *Facsimile der Handschrift Sin. 162 des Staatlichen Historischen Museums Moskau (GIM)*, mit einer paläographischen Beschreibung von E. V. ŠULGINA (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1996, 1997, 1999, 2000; Paderborn—München—Wien—Zürich: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 2006) (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 98, 99, 105, 106, 114; *Patristica Slavica*, 2, 3, 6, 7, 14); *Gottesdienstmenäum für den Monat Februar: auf der Grundlage der Handschrift Sin. 164 des Staatlichen Historischen Museums Moskau (GIM)*, historisch-kritische Edition, besorgt und kommentiert von D. CHRISTIANS u. a., hrsg. von D. CHRISTIANS, H. ROTHE, Teil 1: 1. bis 9. Februar; Teil 2: 10. bis 19. Februar; Teil 3: 20. bis 29. Februar; Teil 4: *Facsimile der Handschrift Sin. 164 des Staatlichen Historischen Museums Moskau (GIM)*, mit einer kodikologischen und paläographischen Beschreibung von E. V. ŠULGINA, hrsg. von H. ROTHE (Paderborn u. a.: Schöningh, 2003, 2006, 2009, 2010) (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 109, 113, 120, 122; *Patristica Slavica*, 10, 13, 17, 18).

The offices in Old Russian Menaia of the Alexius the Studite type consist of the “troparion of the feast” always indicated with an incipit as a reference to the Synaxarion-*Prolog*, kathismata, kontakion with oikos, stichera, and kanons not combined. It is of note that the use of the liturgical term “troparion of the feast” appears in Church Slavonic manuscripts approximately a century earlier than in the available Byzantine sources. Among the Byzantine Menaia listed above, the closest counterparts to the Old Russian Alexius the Studite Menaia are the codd. *Lesb. Leim. 11*, *Hieros. Sab. 70* (second half of the eleventh century) and *Mess. gr. 140* (12th c.): unlike the former, the Slavonic Menaia contain festal troparia, and as opposed to *Mess. gr. 140*, the Old Russian manuscripts normally contain neither exaposteilaria nor photagogika. The highest degree of typological uniformity represented by Old Russian Menaia is by no means the result of a historical development of Slavonic liturgical literature, but has been affected by the existence of a single Byzantine model of the particular branch of the tradition witnessed by East Slavonic hymnography. That source was obviously a lost or still undiscovered set of hymnographic books adopted from the Alexius the Studite monastery of Constantinople, on which the Old Russian Menaia were patterned in Kievan Rus’ in the second half of the 11th c.¹¹³

II.2.c. The Sources in which the Kontakion is Placed According to its Liturgical Position

Within the archaic central group, three manuscripts dated to the 11th c. are distinguished by the placement of the kontakion according to the liturgical position after the sixth ode of the kanon, while the other lesser chants, with the exception of the exaposteilaria (if they are represented at all) are set before the kanon. The earliest witness of such an arrangement of the kontakion is the Old Russian office Menaion for May known as Putjata’s Menaion (St. Sofia Cathedral in Novgorod, n° 202) dated to the 11th c.¹¹⁴ The text version of Putjata’s Menaion goes

(113) The liturgical tradition based on the Typikon of Patriarch Alexius the Studite has been preserved only in the Old Russian manuscripts. On this topic and for further references see: ПЕНТКОВСКИЙ, *Типикон...*

(114) The manuscript has been published three times; the *editio princeps* was prepared by Michail Fyodorovich Murianov: М. Ф. МУРЬЯНОВ (ИЗД.), ПУТЯТИНА МИНЕЯ НА МАЙ (1–9 МАЯ), *Palaeoslavica* 6 (1998) 114–208; ПУТЯТИНА МИНЕЯ НА МАЙ (10–17 МАЯ), *Palaeoslavica* 7 (1999) 136–217; ПУТЯТИНА МИНЕЯ НА МАЙ (18–31 МАЯ), *Palaeoslavica* 8 (2000) 123–221; see the two later editions,

back to an Old Bulgarian prototype of the middle of the 10th c. The Menaion is classified as an archaic peripheral source on the basis of the following criteria: 1) “reverse” order of genres observed throughout the manuscript; 2) reduced use of kontakion, which is attested four times in the abridged monostrophic form, and in two cases they are placed according to the liturgical position; and 3) content of the offices, which regularly consist of kanons, stichera, and kathismata (with the exception of six cases of monostrophic kontakia) with no exapostelaria or festal troparia.

7. *Crypt. gr. Δ α 12*, office Menaion for August dated to the 11th c. It contains the offices normally consisting of kathismata, stichera, kanon, kontakion and oikos placed after the sixth ode; if the kontakion is absent, the sixth ode is followed by kathisma (ff. 12r, 21r, 27v *et pass.*); exapostelaria are not observed except on f. 9r, on which one exapostelion is added by another hand in the upper margin. This codex contains the complete text of the kontakion for the Transfiguration, which is placed after the sixth ode of the kanon (ff. 42v–45r). The kontakion containing the acrostic εἰς τὴν μεταμόρφωσιν has been published by Constantinos Trypanis, who considered nine text witnesses excluding *Crypt. gr. Δ α 12*.¹¹⁵

The manuscript *Cr. gr. Δ α 12* is especially noteworthy for two liturgical positions of the kanon: one for Matins, which is trivial, and one for Vespers (ff. 23v, 33v *et pass.*: κανὼν ψαλλόμεν(ον) τῇ ἑσπ(ερινῇ), ff. 33v *etc.*), which offers unique evidence in the available Byzantine office Menaia and has remained unknown to scholars to date.¹¹⁶ This manuscript was copied in Grottaferrata by the well-known calligrapher hieromonk Sophronios, who worked at the end of the 11th — be-

supplied with scholarly articles with further references: Л. И. ЩЕГОЛЕВА, *Путьятина Минея (XI век) в круге текстов и истолкования, 1–10 мая* (Москва: Территория, 2001); В. А. БАРАНОВ, В. М. МАРКОВ (изд.), *Новгородская служебная минея на май (Путьятина минея), XI век: Текст. Исследования. Указатели* (Ижевск: Издательский дом “Удмуртский университет” 2003; on-line version: http://manuscripts.ru/mns/portal.main?p1=19&p_lid=2&p_sid=1). On the liturgical position of kontakia in Putjata’s Menaion see: М. ЙОВЧЕВА, *Предизвикателства на ранните славянски служебни минея, Palaeobulgariса / Старобългаристика* 26.4 (2002) 117.

(115) TRYPANIS, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica*, 107–113.

(116) Cf.: SPANOS, *Codex...*, 12–13.

ginning of the 12th c.,¹¹⁷ therefore the kanons at Vespers attested by *Crypt. Δ α XII* are witness to the local Italo-Greek rite. Among the office Menaia for August held by Grottaferrata, *Crypt. Δ α XII* is the only one which was intended for this monastery.¹¹⁸ This makes it possible to classify the Menaion *Crypt. Δ α XII* as the representative of the Italo-Greek typological subgroup of office Menaia which is modelled on the Constantinopolitan structural pattern and is characterized by such a specific local feature as the kanon for Vespers.

8. *Vat. gr. 1829*, office Menaion for September, 11th c. Paul Canart argued that the manuscript is of South-Italian provenance.¹¹⁹ The structure and genre content of *Vat. gr. 1829* is the same as in *Coisl. gr. 218* and *Sin. gr. 632*: kathismata, stichera, kontakion with oikoi,¹²⁰ kanons, and exaposteilaria always placed at the end of the offices after the kanons. Especially noteworthy in this manuscript are three kontakia. One of them is placed after the sixth ode of the kanon (ff. 25v–26) according to the liturgical position, and two others comprise the complete set of all proimnia and oikoi: the first one is the kontakion on the Nativity of the Theotokos (ff. 2r–3r) and the second one is dedicated to the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (ff. 42v–43r).¹²¹

9. *Bodl. Ms. Canon. Gr. 58*, second half of the 11th c., office Menaion for September,¹²² contains kathismata (from one to four), and stichera

(117) Sophronios copied three additional manuscripts, two of which are dated precisely; neither the manuscripts nor the copies were available to me: *Crypt. Δ α XI* (office Menaion for July), AD 1093/1094; *Crypt. Δ α V* (office Menaion for January), AD 1101/1102; *Crypt. Δ α I* (office Menaion for September), end of the 11th – beginning of the 12th cc. See for details: S. PARENTI, *Il Monastero di Grottaferrata nel medioevo (1004–1462): Segni e percorsi di una identità* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005) (OCA, 274) 415–417 (further references).

(118) ROCCHI, *Codices...*, 310; GROSDIDIER DE MATONS, *Romanos le Mélode...*, 69–70; PARENTI, *Il Monastero...*, 109, 415, 416.

(119) CANART, *Codices...*, 267.

(120) However, one abridged monostrophic kontakion has been preserved *sub diem* 9th of September (SS. Ioachim and Anna) on f. 12r: προσ(όμοιον) τὰ ἄνω ζητῶν. Εὐφραίνεται ἡ γῆ· ἡ Ἄννα τῆς στεριώσεως· λυθείσα δεσμῶν· καὶ τρέφει τὴν πανάχραντον· συγκαλοῦσα ἅπαντας· ἀνυμνήσαι τὸν δωρησάμενον· ἐκ τῆς νηδύος αὐτῆς τοῖς βροτοῖς· τὴν μόνην μητέρα· καὶ (ἀπ?)εἰράνδρον. No further information about this text is available.

(121) Both texts of the complete kontakia have been described: GROSDIDIER DE MATONS, *Romanos le Mélode...*, 69.

(122) STEFANOVIĆ, *Greek Daily Menaia...*, 251, 252–253.

with Coislin notation, *kanon* with *kontakion* and *oikos* after the sixth ode, *exaposteilaria* (“one-two, rarely three”¹²³) following the ninth ode; in this manuscript a set of eight *makarismoi* is attested (ff. 63v–64r) and the *kanons* are not combined.

II.3. Intermediate Conclusions

The peripheral and the central archaic groups of Byzantine office *Menaia* are distinguished by 1) the presence or the absence of the historically and typologically “marked” genres either of Constantinopolitan (*kontakion*, *exaposteilarion*) or Palestinian (*makarismoi*) origin, 2) the rules of arrangement of genres and the typologically significant exceptions from these rules, and 3) the rules of correspondence among the features mentioned under points 1) and 2). The genre content of the archaic peripheral group is close to that of the younger *Tropologion* of Palestinian origin, though substantially influenced by the Constantinopolitan hymnographic and calendar tradition, on the basis of which the office *Menaion* as a type of hymnographic book was shaped in the second half of the 9th c. The archaic feature of Palestinian origin peculiar to both of the early groups are the *makarismoi*, which are widely spread among the Byzantine manuscripts of the 9th–11th cc. The Constantinopolitan, i. e. the “central”, features in both groups are 1) the constant presence of *kathismata*, 2) the liturgical and hymnographic terminology not attested by the *Tropologion*, and 3) the arrangement of chants by genre but not by liturgical position, as opposed to the *Tropologion*. The peripheral archaic hymnographic usage is revealed by 1) the absence or the reduced use of *kontakia* and *exaposteilaria*, 2) the exceptional “reverse” order of chants, and 3) the liturgical position of the *stichera* εἰς τοὺς αἴθρους after the *kanon*, which is exceptional as well and was influenced by the liturgical order of the chants as attested by the *Tropologion*. The single *kontakia* occasionally observed in the *Menaia* of the peripheral group are represented as abridged monostrophic chants consisting of only one introductory stanza (*prooimion*), the genre identification of which can be absent.

The central group is first of all characterized by the presence of *kontakia*, which in none of the central manuscripts are comprised of one introducing stanza (*prooimion*) only, but are represented by at least two stanzas (*prooimion* and *oikos*) or are even preserved completely. In addition to the *kontakion*, the second, though not obligatory, typo-

(123) STEFANOVIĆ, *Greek Daily Menaia...*, 253.

logical feature of the central group are daily exaposteilaria. The correspondence between both of the genres of central origin is described by the following rule: if the Menaion contains exaposteilaria, it contains at least several kontakia, which are not abridged to one prooimion. The simultaneous emergence of these two genres stands as witness to the prevalence of the central Constantinopolitan tradition which became dominant in the area covered by the Byzantine rite at the end of the 11th c.

The third characteristic of the central group is the arrangement of chants by genre regardless of liturgical position so that the lesser genres always precede the kanon. Exceptional cases of the “reverse” order of chants are not attested in this group. The arrangement of chants by genre is a rule for all the hymns except the exaposteilaria, which always stand after the kanon in the final position of the office. The placement of the kontakion after the sixth ode of the kanon according to the liturgical position is exceptional for both the peripheral and central groups, although among the typologically provincial manuscripts it is testified by the Old Russian witness known as Putjata’s Menaion for May dated to the 11th c., which goes back to an undiscovered or lost Old Bulgarian source of the middle of the 10th c. In Greek sources, the liturgical position of kontakia is witnessed by three codices of the 11th c.: 1) *Crypt. Δ α 12*, an Italo-Greek Menaion copied in Grottaferrata and influenced by the local Italian liturgical tradition; 2) *Vat. gr. 1829*; and 3) *Bodl. Ms. Canon. Gr. 58*.

The indication of the so-called festal troparion (*apolytikion*, ἀπολυτικίον in modern liturgical usage) with the incipit testifies to the relationship with the Synaxarion, a paraliturgical book of Constantinopolitan origin. This is a stable characteristic of Old Russian Menaia compiled on the basis of the Old Bulgarian translation according to the liturgical rules of Patriarch Alexius the Studite’s Typikon. The same feature is observed in cod. *Mess. gr. 140*, which is dated to the younger period.

II.4. The Innovative Group: Eleventh – Fourteenth Centuries.

II.4.a. Classifying Features

Hundreds of Byzantine office Menaia are dated to the 11th–14th c. This period is characterized by gradually introduced structural innovations influenced by pragmatic intentions to arrange the chants according to their liturgical positions, which would make the actual use

of the book more convenient, and by the interaction with non-hymnographic liturgical and paraliturgical books such as the Synaxarion, Prophetologion, and Lectionary, which was obviously motivated by the same goal. In striving for “user comfort” the Menaion began to become a general liturgical book functionally similar to the Tropologion but intended for the fixed liturgical year and representing a different genre structure, calendar(s), and terminology. The Synaxarion was intended to be applied as private home reading, and the Lectionary as a sacred book has a special symbolic function in the liturgy, so they could not both disappear from the tradition, unlike the Kontakarion and Prophetologion, the content of which, though not completely, was finally integrated into Menaia.¹²⁴

The main typological difference of the innovative group in comparison to the two archaic groups is the trend to arrange the chants by liturgical position,¹²⁵ which was initially applied only to kontakia

(124) Cf.: “Основные тексты Минеи и Триодей [when the Jerusalemite, i. e., neo-Sabbaitic, Typikon was introduced — R. K.] <...> не претерпели существенных изменений, но <...> в этих книгах появились новые гимнографические сочинения и малая вечерня. Здесь же находились и ветхозаветные чтения, ранее входившие в состав Профитология, что привело к исчезновению этой архаичной богослужбной книги” (А. М. ПЕНТКОВСКИЙ, Иерусалимский Устав и его славянские переводы в XIV столетии, in: Л. ТАСЕВА (ред.), *Преводите през XIV столетие на Балканите, Доклади от международната конференция София, 26–28 юни 2003* (София: Издетелска къща “ГорексПрес”, 2004) 161).

(125) We should dispose of the obsolete concept, going back to Vatroslav Jagić, according to which the liturgical arrangement of chants in the Menaia features the so-called “Jerusalemite Menaia” or “Menaia of the Jerusalemite type” (see below, section II.5, The Neo-Sabbaitic Type); cf.: “традиционное деление миней на иерусалимские и студийские” (Н. А. НЕЧУНАЕВА, *Минейя...*, 31, further references). Vittorio Springfield Tomelleri convincingly argues that the concept of the Jerusalemite Menaia, which is based only on the liturgical order of chants, does not fit reality (“<т>акая классификация состава не соответствует сложной исторической действительности”), and, if it is incorrectly treated in isolation from the Byzantine background, only in exceptional cases does it help to classify a hymnographic source in the framework of Slavic tradition: V. S. TOMELLERI, О рукописной традиции восточнославянской декабрьской минейи, in: H. ROTHE, D. CHRISTIANS (Hrsg.), *Liturgische Hymnen nach byzantinischem Ritus bei den Slaven in ältester Zeit, Beiträge einer internationalen Tagung Bonn, 7.–10. Juni 2005* (Paderborn—München—Wien—Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2007) (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 117; Patristica Slavica, 15) 116.

(and definitely for exaposteilaria, which always stand at the end of the office even in the archaic group) and later for kathismata, which became the classifying feature of the innovative type before the 12th c. In the 11th c. this group was simply the result of the pragmatically conditioned revision of the central typological group demonstrating its emergence in the Byzantine rite. The pragmatic “user comfort” idea as well as the gradual emergence and the final prevalence of the Constantinopolitan hymnographic and paraliturgical genres determined the historical and cultural sense of the changes in the structure and the content of the Byzantine Menaia since the 11th c. (or even probably the end of the 10th c.), before the “neo-Sabbaitic synthesis”. The main trend toward the neglect of archaic features was patterned on Constantinopolitan traditions; thus, it caused makarismoi to be eliminated from the Byzantine rite after the 11th c., although typologically archaic Middle Bulgarian and Old Serbian manuscripts preserve them until the beginning of the 14th c., and it also caused the kontakion to become an invariable structural part of Matins. While makarismoi had disappeared by the 12th c., the Synaxarion was first attested at exactly that time. However, the earliest example of the pericope from the Old Testament is witnessed by the manuscript of the 11th c. (see above, II.1.b., n° 22, *Sab. gr.* 71). The earliest manuscripts attesting to the compositional combinations from different kanons chanted on the same day are dated to the 11th c. After the 13th century the second ode is not observed in the manuscripts.

II.4.b. *The Sources*

1–5. Codd. *Crypt.* Δ α XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, and XVII, dated to the 11th c., are a set of the Menaia for seven months, from October to April, written in five volumes by the same hand in Carbone. The structure of the manuscripts was comprehensively described by Dimitrije Stefanović:¹²⁶ the offices contain the troparion εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος, stichera prosomoia and idiomela both arranged by mode (ἦχος), supplied with notation, and followed by the kanons. Two kanons chanted on the same day are often combined so that the troparia of each ode of one kanon are followed immediately by the troparia of the same ode of another kanon. This is the earliest example of the combination of

(126) D. STEFANOVIĆ, *The Daily Menaia from Carbone*, *Bolletino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata*, n. s., 21 (1967) 41–46; IDEM, *Greek Daily Menaia...*, 254–256.

different kanons. The kanons are combined only if they are composed in the same mode. Kathismata (from one to six) follow the third ode of the kanon, while kontakion and oikos (up to four oikoi can be represented) follow the sixth ode.

6. *Reg. gr. 58*, Pentekostarion and office Menaion for March with late Byzantine notation, end of the 11th–12th cc., probably of Italian provenance.¹²⁷ In the catalogue the manuscript is erroneously dated to the 11th c.,¹²⁸ and this date was uncritically reproduced by the editors of the series *Analecta hymnica graeca*.¹²⁹ The Menaion contains stichera and kanons with kathisma after the third or sixth ode. The Synaxarion is observed in this manuscript in numerous cases and stands after the sixth ode, too; if the date 11th–12th cc. is correct, this manuscript is one of the earliest available Menaia, in which the Synaxarion is attested. The earliest example of the use of the Synaxarion in the Menaion has been uncovered by Apostolos Spanos in cod. *Ath. Laur. Δ 45* (liturgical miscellany containing the office Menaion for March–August) dated to the 11th c.¹³⁰ Thus the 11th c. appears to be the period during which the Synaxarion was for the first time introduced into the Menaion. It is highly remarkable that this took place specifically in a liturgical miscellany (*Laur. Δ 45*), which contains not only a Menaion but also a Psalterion, Triodion, Pentekostarion, Oktoechos, Exaposteilaria, and Doxastica Eothina.¹³¹ The introduction of the Synaxarion in the liturgical books is influenced by the pragmatic intent to compile a miscellany which was convenient to use for the offices (akolouthiai) of different types.

(127) STEVENSON, *Codices...*, 51. The Synaxarion as a part of the manuscript is not mentioned in the catalogue. On the basis of its notation the codex has been dated to the 11th–12th cc.: D. TOULIATOS-BANKER, Check List of Byzantine Musical Manuscripts in the Vatican Library, *Manuscripta: A Journal for Manuscript Research* 31/1 (1987) 25 (in Touliautos-Banker's check-list the manuscript is erroneously designated as a "Triodion"). J. Leroy dated the manuscript to the 12th c.: J. LEROY, Les manuscrits grecs d'Italie, in: A. GRUYS (red.) *Codicologica*, 2: *Eléments pour une codicologie comparée* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978) 58: "ces deux manuscrits [*Reg. gr. 58* and *Reg. gr. 59* — R. K.] sont du même scribe; <...> leur écriture n'est pas caractéristique, mais il est probable qu'ils sont aussi italo-grecs" (this article was not taken into consideration by Touliautos-Banker).

(128) STEVENSON, *Codices...*, 51.

(129) AHG, t. VII, VII.

(130) SPANOS, *Codex Lesbicus Leimonos 11...*, 114.

(131) *Ibid.*

The kontakion is represented in *Reg. gr. 58* only once, which is probably a result of the fact that the manuscript has been preserved only in fragments: *sub diem* 6th of March, commemoration of the Forty-Two Holy Martyrs of Amorium († 845): Τὸς νεοφανεῖς ὀπλίτας τῆς ἀληθείας; oikos: Ἀγαρηνῶν τὸ ἄθεον σέβας (f. 48). There is a lacuna in the manuscript between the offices for the 6th and the 16th of March, and the last office in the manuscript breaks off after the second troparion of the fifth ode of the kanon for Annunciation, 25th of March (f. 58v). The third ode of this kanon is followed by the kathisma. The pericope from the Old Testament, which is unique in this manuscript, is included in this office (f. 58).

7. *Sab. gr. 208*, office Menaion for August, 12th c., contains stichera and kanons with kathismata after the third ode and a kontakion after the sixth ode, and kontakia are followed by the Synaxarion; if the kontakion is absent, the kathisma is placed after the sixth ode, while the exaposteilarion follows the ninth ode. If there is more than one kanon in the office of the same day, they are combined regardless of the mode, and the *heirmoi* of each successive kanon are preceded by the notice “εἰρμὸς ἄλλος”; this Menaion is the earliest one in which the kanons are combined in this way, which becomes a regular practice in the younger manuscripts.

8. *Vat. gr. 1547*, festal Menaion for the whole year, 12th c., contains the same genres arranged in almost the same order as in *Sab. gr. 208*. Unlike *Sab. gr. 208*, kathisma can occasionally be placed before the kanon, while the stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴνους always follow it.

9. *Reg. gr. 54* is a liturgical miscellany dated to the 12th c. which includes the office Menaion for December, January, and February and the Octoechos. Its structure was described briefly by Stevenson: “Notandum, inter alia, in hoc codice, ut in omnibus vetustis, nusquam duplex praeberi officium vespertinum, sive parvum et magnum, sed unum tantum, quod in edd. Venetis τῶ μεγάλῳ ἐσπερινῶ respondet <...> Sextam odam sequitur Κοντάκιον”.¹³² Stevenson dated the manuscript to the 10th c., which was accepted by the editors of *Analecta hymnica graeca*.¹³³ If this date were correct, cod. *Reg. gr. 54* should have been treated as one of the earliest witnesses to the textual history of the Byzantine Synaxarion. However, the structural features of the Menaion as

(132) STEVENSON, *Codices...*, 46.

(133) AHG, t. VI, vi.

attested by *Reg. gr. 54* do not appear in the 10th c. In this manuscript, the Synaxarion is placed after the sixth ode of the kanon in numerous cases, and kathismata are positioned after either the third or the sixth ode; the kontakion with oikos and the Synaxarion, however, always follow the sixth ode. If the kontakion is absent, the kathisma stands after the sixth ode. If more than one kanon is chanted on the same day, they are combined in the manner described above, the kanon is followed by exaposteilaria and stichera εἰς τοὺς αἶνους. The Menaion part of this source contains numerous pericopes from the Old Testament, Lectionary, and Praxapostolos to be read at Matins and at the liturgy; the pericopes are arranged by their liturgical position. *Cod. Reg. gr. 54* is remarkable for the fact, that it contains τροπάρια and καθίσματα εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος, as well as apolytikion and troparion; for the latter, there is no further identification of the liturgical position (for the examples and the folio numbers, see above).

The of 10th-century date proposed by Stevenson and reproduced in *Analecta hymnica graeca* might have refuted the historical typology of the Byzantine office Menaia that I have proposed in the present article. Fortunately, Diane Touliatos of St. Louis (Missouri) has dated *Reg. gr. 54* to the 11th–12th cc. on the basis of its notation.¹³⁴ However, even this date is not precise enough: the scholar was seemingly unaware of the earlier studies by Enrica Follieri, who convincingly dated the manuscript to the 12th c. according to its paleographic features.¹³⁵ The typological characteristics of the manuscript fit this date perfectly.

10. *Matr. gr. 4694*, office Menaion for June–August (12th–13th cc.) contains festal troparia either indicated as an incipit or represented in full. Kathismata stand after the third and kontakia after the sixth odes of the kanons; kanons are followed by stichera εἰς τοὺς αἶνους and exaposteilaria, and kanons chanted on the same day are not combined.

(134) TOULIATOS-BANKER, Check List..., 25; the Menaion has not been mentioned as a part of this manuscript's content: "Parakletike — Great Octoechos" (p. 25); for a musicological analysis of this codex see also: O. STRUNK, *Specimina Notationum antiquiorum* (Hauniae, 1966) (Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae, VII) 176–178.

(135) E. FOLLIERI, La minuscula libraria dei secoli IX e X, in: J. GLÉNISSON, J. BOMPAIRE, J. IRIGOIN (ed.), *La Paléographie grecque et byzantine, Actes du Colloque International <...> à Paris du 21 au 25 octobre 1974* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1977) 140, f. 3.

11. *NBKM 22* (Narodna biblioteka sv. Kiril i Metodi / St. Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia, Bulgaria), office Menaion for August of the 12th–13th cc., has the same genre content as *Matr. gr. 4694* with some innovations: the kanons in this manuscript are combined regardless of the mode, the kontakion after the sixth ode is followed by the Synaxarion, and the biblical pericopes are attested.

12. *Reg. gr. 61*, office Menaion for March–May of the 12th–13th cc.,¹³⁶ has an unstable order and content of chants which probably results from scribal customs and different prototypes. In general, the manuscript contains kathismata, stichera, and kanons, which are never combined. The kontakion is absent in the first part of the manuscript, which comprises ff. 1r–39v. On the same folia (1r–39v), kathismata are placed before the kanons so that the structure and the content of the Menaion in the initial part of the manuscript looks more archaic. From f. 40r (new gathering) we have a second scribe,¹³⁷ who arranged the chants in a different way and placed kathismata after the third ode. The Synaxarion is regularly observed either after the third, sixth, or sometimes even after the ninth ode and the exaposteilarion. Between ff. 70v–71r the hands were changed again, but the structure of the offices was retained. The kontakion is represented in the manuscript only exceptionally in the part copied by the third scribe (ff. 98r, 124r, 127v).

13, 14. Office Menaia Codd. *Bodl. Lincoln College gr. 2* and *Bodl. Auct. E. 5. 2* (S.C.5778) are both dated to the 13th c. They contain stichera, troparion, kanon, kathismata placed after the third and kontakia with oikoi after the sixth odes; kanons are combined and followed by exaposteilaria.¹³⁸ Cod. *Bodl. Auct. E. 5. 2* (S.C.5778) contains a Synaxarion which was not mentioned by Dimitrije Stefanović.

15. *Par. gr. 245*, office Menaion for June–August dated to the 13th c., is similar to the previous Menaia; as in the cod. *Bodl. Auct. E. 5. 2*

(136) Stevenson dated the manuscript to the 12th c.: STEVENSON, *Codices...*, 52; according to Enrica Follieri the codex is younger (12th–13th cc.): E. FOLLIERI, *Santa Trifena di Cizico*, *AB* 89 (1971) 344; on the Synaxarion in this manuscript see: pp. 344–345, f. 5; p. 346, f. 4.

(137) The change of hands and gathering is probably the reason why the *akolouthia eis anomibgion*, which is not included in a Menaion, is placed after the office for the 31st of March. This office, which is normally copied in *Eucho-logia*, is followed by the *κανών παρακλητικός* (f. 38r). The scribe obviously intended to fill the blank folia of the gathering.

(138) STEFANOVIĆ, *Greek Daily Menaia...*, *passim*.

(S.C.5778), the Synaxarion is placed after the third or sixth odes of the kanon, while Gospel pericopes are set after the sixth ode; if the Synaxarion is set after the sixth ode, the pericope is observed after the exaposteilarion at the end of the office.

16, 17. *Sin. gr. 630*, office Menaion for June–August, 13th c., and *Vind. theol. gr. 33*, office Menaion also for June–August, 13th c. Both manuscripts are of the same format and were written in two columns by very similar hands. The genre content of these manuscripts is identical. Kanons in both sources are always combined and contain kathismata after third odes and kontakia after sixth odes. Sixth odes are followed by Synaxaria and then by pericopes of the Gospel and Praxapostolos to read at Matins; the kanons are followed by exaposteilaria, stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴνους, Apostol and Gospel to be read at the liturgy, stichera, and koinonikon. In addition to stichera, these manuscripts contain the festal troparion designated as ἀπολυτίκιον (f. 130). Among the sources available to me for the present study, this is the earliest example of the use of the liturgical term ἀπολυτίκιον as attested by Menaia.

18. *Vat. gr. 787* is an office Menaion for May–August dated to the 14th c.; it contains stichera and kanons always combined, kathismata placed after the third and kontakia with Synaxarion after the sixth odes. Kanons are followed by stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴνους, exaposteilaria, and the Gospel to be read at the liturgy.

19. *Barb. gr. 373*, festal Menaion for the second half of the liturgical year, the final part, comprising the offices for the dates after the 11th of June, has not been preserved; the Menaion is dated to the 13th c. and contains stichera, kanons always combined with kathismata after the third and kontakia after the sixth odes. Canons are followed by exaposteilaria and stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴνους.

20. *Ottob. gr. 392*, festal Menaion for September–December of the 13th c., was erroneously identified by Diane Touliatos as a Sticherarion.¹³⁹ The offices contain festal troparia titled ἀπολυτίκια or τροπάρια, stichera, kanons followed, after the sixth odes, by kontakia and oikoi, and biblical pericopes. The kanons are not combined. This Menaion would be classified as a merely “innovative” one if it did not contain theotokia at δόξα καὶ νῦν placed after the third ode before the kathisma, which is attested only in the neo-Sabbaitic Menaia described

(139) TOULIATOS, Check List..., 25.

below. I assume the codex *Ottob. gr. 392* to be a witness to neo-Sabbaitic structural influence on the earlier innovative group.

II.4.c. Preliminary Conclusions

Stable trends, although no specific rules, can be uncovered by analysis of the genre content and structure of the innovative Byzantine Menaia of the 11th–14th cc. Their features testify to the gradually increasing prevalence of the hymnographic traditions of Constantinopolitan origin. The main pragmatic trend of this period was to arrange the chants by their liturgical positions and thus to make the use of the Menaion more efficient. This became a strict rule by the 13th c. after the earlier genre content of Menaia had been enlarged by the Synaxarion and biblical pericopes. In addition to the exaposteilaria, which had always been positioned only at the end of the office after the kanon from the time they had been observed in the Menaia of the 11th c., the arrangement of chants by their liturgical position was applied to kontakia, which were occasionally placed after the sixth ode of kanons even in the archaic Old Russian source, Putjata's Menaion (11th c.). This is observed in two archaic Byzantine Menaia, too, in which the position of the kontakion after the sixth ode is the rule, while other genres are arranged regardless of their liturgical position (*Crypt. gr. Δ α 12* and *Bodl. Ms. Canon. Gr. 58*). One of those two manuscripts was copied in Grottaferrata and influenced by the local Italian liturgical tradition of chanting the kanon at Vespers, and the same Menaion is one of the few sources which contain complete texts of kontakia (*Crypt. gr. Δ α 12*). The second manuscript is noteworthy for the presence of makarismoï (*Bodl. Ms. Canon. Gr. 58*), which is the heritage of the archaic Palestinian tradition accepted in Constantinople.

No makarismoï are observed in manuscripts copied after the 11th c.; the manuscript *Great Laura Δ 17*, dated in the catalogue to the 13th c., remains a problematic chronological exception probably caused by an error in dating.

The oldest set of Menaia in which the chants were arranged by their liturgical positions is dated to the 11th c., and the manuscripts are of Campanian provenance (*Crypt. Δ α XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, and XVII*). This set is the earliest example of a combination of different kanons chanted on the same day.

The pericopes from the Old Testament are attested for the first time in *Sab. gr. 71*, dated to the 11th c. The earliest example of the Synaxarion in the office Menaion is dated to the 11th c. (*Laur Δ 45*) and to

the 11th–12th cc. (*Reg. gr. 58*), and the pericopes from the Gospels and Apostle are for the first time observed in the 12th c., according to the correct date of the manuscript *Reg. gr. 54* proposed by Enrica Follieri.

The innovative Menaion *par excellence* was structurally shaped between the 12th and the 13th cc. as testified by, for example, *Sin. gr. 630*, *Sab. gr. 208*, *Vat. gr. 1547*, *NBKM 22*, *Par. gr. 245*, *Sin. gr. 630*, and some younger manuscripts (e. g., *Vind. theol. gr. 33* of the 13th c. and *Vat. gr. 787* of the 14th c.), which contain stichera, combined kanons, kathismata, kontakia with oikoi, the Synaxarion, exaposteilaria, stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴθρους, and often biblical pericopes arranged by their liturgical position. Yet mediaeval “scribes and scholars” did not follow strictly the rules discovered by modern students of Byzantine office Menaia, therefore archaic traditions caused by peripheral provenance of the sources echo occasionally in the younger manuscripts *Reg. gr. 61*, and especially *Reg. gr. 63* and *Reg. gr. 65*, which are contemporary to the innovative group, but to a certain extent represent typologically earlier genre content.

II.5. The Neo-Sabbaitic Type

II.5.a. Classifying Features

The earliest traces of the neo-Sabbaitic Typikon are for the first time observed in liturgical sources of the 11th c.¹⁴⁰ The main and well-known typological characteristic of office Menaia structured on the basis of the neo-Sabbaitic Typikon is the division of stichera for Vespers on the most venerated feasts into those for the Great and the Little Vespers.¹⁴¹ The neo-Sabbaitic Menaia *par excellence* are the printed Menaia known as *Menaia Romana*.¹⁴² The chants in neo-Sabbaitic Menaia are arranged by liturgical position. In comparison to the earlier types, the neo-Sabbaitic Menaia contain the following previously unknown

(140) ПЕНТКОВСКИЙ, Иерусалимский устав..., 153–156 (references).

(141) С. КОЖУХАРОВ, *Миней*, in: П. ДИНЕКОВ (гл. ред.), *Кирило-Методиевска енциклопедия II* (София: Университетско издателство “Св. Климент Охридски”, 1995) 680.

(142) *Μηναῖα τοῦ ὄλου ἐνιαυτοῦ I–VI* (Ἐν Ῥώμῃ, 1888–1901); on this edition and its earlier Venetian sources see: С. КОРОЛЕВСКИЙ, *L'édition romaine des Ménées grecques 1888–1901 [I]*, *Bolletino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata* 3 (1949) 30–40, 153–162, 225–247; С. КОРОЛЕВСКИЙ, *L'édition romaine des Ménées grecques 1888–1901 [II]*, *Bolletino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata* 4 (1950) 15–16.

genres and liturgical positions: 1) theotokion and staurotheotokion (σταυροθεοτοκίον) as monostrophic chants independent from the kanon and positioned after the third ode of the kanon, together with kathisma; 2) staurotheotokion chanted after the kanon; 3) new liturgical position for the stichera εἰς τὴν λιτήν; 4) new liturgical positions for kathismata at the polyeleos and the 50th Psalm; 5) katabasia in its modern meaning; and 6) verse Synaxarion¹⁴³ preceding the usual prose one. All of these features including the division of stichera into those for the Great and the Little Vespers are variable in the manuscripts. A comprehensive description of the structurally unstable content attested by a specific manuscript of younger origin is not the goal of this article, which presents below several examples of such variety observed in neo-Sabbaitic Menaia.

II.5.b. Variety of Genre Content

1. *Sin. gr. 1627*, office Menaion for July–August, AD 1361. In the beginning of the manuscript the κανὼν παρακλητικὸς εἰς τὸν Παντοκράτορα (f. 1r) is placed out of calendrical order. The kathisma follows the third ode, while the stichera with no identified liturgical position stand after the kanon, so that this case is an additional, although occasional, example of the “reverse” order of chants. The regular Menaion offices consist of stichera, troparion, and kanons, in which the kontakion with oikos follow either the third or the sixth odes; the third ode of the kanon is followed by the stichera or theotokion εἰς τὸ δόξα and the staurotheotokion or theotokion εἰς τὸ καὶ νῦν, the kontakion and oikos follow the sixth ode of the kanon, while the exapostellarion stands at the end of it. The staurotheotokion follows the stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴνους, which are placed after the exapostellarion. The Great Vespers office (ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ ἔσπερινῷ, f. 25v) includes pericopes from the Old Testament and the stichera εἰς τὴν λιτήν (f. 27r).

2. *Vat. gr. 1515*, office Menaion for January–February, AD 1382. In addition to the genres attested by *Sin. gr. 1627*, this manuscript contains kathismata at the stichologia and at the polyeleon, which is chanted only at significant feasts according to the neo-Sabbaitic Typikon

(143) See the edition of the Middle Bulgarian version and further references: Г. ПЕТКОВ, М. СПАСОВА (изд.), *Търновската редакция на стихияния пролог. Текстове, лексикален индекс*, т. 1: *Месец септември*; т. 2: *Месец октомври*; т. 3: *Месец ноември* (Пловдив: Университетско издателство “Паисий Хилендарски”, 2008–2009).

(μετὰ δὲ τὸν πολυέλεον ἔτερον κάθ(ισμα), ff. 45v etc.). The verse and prose Synaxaria follow the sixth ode. The festal troparion is entitled ἀπολυτίκιον. The Menaion is intended for a monastery, as indicated by the liturgical regulation for Epiphany: μηνὶ τῷ αὐτῷ στ'· τὰ ἅγια θεοφάνεια τοῦ Κ(υρίου) καὶ Θ(εο)ῦ καὶ Σ(ωτῆ)ρος ἡμῶν Ἰ(ησο)ῦ Χ(ριστο)ῦ· περὶ ὧραν... ἰ' τῆς ἡμέρας σημαίνει τὸ μέγα· καὶ συναγόμεθα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· καὶ εὐλογοῦντος τοῦ ἱερέως ἀρχόμεθα τὸ λυχνικὸν κτλ. (f. 38v), and *sub diem* 30th of January: δοξολογία μεγάλη, δίδοται ... ἅγιον ἔλαιον τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (f. 166v).

The division of stichera into two groups is absent from *Vat. gr. 1515* for the Great and the Little Vespers — this division is considered to be a main feature of neo-Sabbaitic Menaia. This does not imply that there was no such division in the liturgical practice of the monastery for which the manuscript was copied, because in principle any stichera could be chosen to be chanted at the given portion of the office.

3. *Vat. gr. 1510*, office Menaion for March–May, AD 1431. The manuscript contains the typical neo-Sabbaitic genre content with no division of stichera into those for the Great and the Little Vespers. In *Vat. gr. 1510* there are no staurotheotokia, at the liturgical positions of which regular stichera are represented. The Menaion is remarkable for the inclusion of very extensive Synaxarion fragments. The kathisma at the polyeleos is represented only *sub diem* 25th of March (Annunciation), which testifies that this Menaion is of the neo-Sabbaitic type. In *Vat. gr. 1510* the polyeleos is attested one more time, at the commemoration of St. George: εἰς τ(ὸν) ὄρθρον... στιχ(ο)λ(ογία) καὶ ὁ πολυέλεος (f. 179v).

4. *Vat. gr. 1559*, office Menaion for July, AD 1545. The manuscript was copied after the earliest printed Greek office Menaia had been published in Venice.¹⁴⁴ However its structure and content differ from the earliest printed Menaia which I have consulted on microfilm or

(144) E. LEGRAND, *Bibliographie hellénique, ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des grecs aux XVe et XVI siècles* III (Paris, 1903) 305, 311–312, n°n° 279, 285, and 286 (office Menaion for September, 1526; office Menaion for October, 1527; and office Menaion for November, 1527). Cf.: E. FOLLIERI, *Su alcuni libri greci stampati a Venezia*, in: E. FOLLIERI, *Byzantina et Italograeca: studi di filologia e paleografia*, a cura di A. LONGO, L. PERRIA, A. LUZZI (Roma, 1997) (Storia e Letteratura, Raccolta di studi e testi, 195) 67–110 (first published in: *Contributi alla storia del libro italiano, Miscellanea in onore di Lamberto Donati* [Firenze, 1969] 119–164); E. FOLLIERI, *Il libro greco per i Greci nelle imprese editoriali romane e veneziane della prima metà del Cinquecento*, in: FOLLIERI,

de visu.¹⁴⁵ While the division of offices into the Great and the Little Vespers is attested in this manuscript (μηνὶ τῶ αὐτῶ κδ' τῆς ἀγίας ὀσιομάρτυρος Παρασκευῆς ... καὶ τῆς ἀγίας μάρτυρος Χριστίνης· στιχηρὰ ἐν τῶ μικρῶ ἔσπερινῶ τῆς ἀγίας Παρασκευῆς ἤχους πλ. δ' κτλ., f. 177v), neither polyeleos nor katabasia are represented in this source. Besides the Great and the Little Vespers, *Vat. gr. 1559* contains only theotokia and staurotheotokia at δόξα καὶ νῦν after the third ode and verse Synaxarion as typological features of neo-Sabbaitic Menaia.

II.5.c. Linguistic Variety of the Term σταυροθεοτόκιον

Remarkable variation is testified not only by the genre content of the neo-Sabbaitic group but by one of the innovative liturgical terms by which this type is distinguished. Thus the manuscript *Vat. gr. 1515* is noteworthy for the variation in the use of the term *staurotheotokion*, which is regularly represented as a composite word σταυροθεοτόκιον: στρ^οο' (ff. 82v, 87r) or στ(αυρ)οθ(εοτοκίον) (f. 88v). However the linguistic features of this term are changed at the end of the manuscript, in which the form στρ^οω' (ff. 210v, 221r, 258r, 267v, 268r, 270r, etc.) is attested. The change in usage might have been explained by the phonetic confusion between the letters omikron (ο) and omega (ω); however, the following examples make it possible to consider the abbreviation στρ^οω' to have been influenced by the word combination “τὸ τῶ σταυρῶ θεοτοκίον” or “θεοτοκίον τῶ σταυρῶ”, which is observed in *Vat. gr. 1559*: στ(αυ)ρῶ θ(εοτο)κί(ον) (ff. 4v, 213v [there is an accent sign over the omega]), cf. στ(αυ)ρῶ θ (f. 19v), θ(εοτο)κί(ον) / στ(αυ)ρῶ (ff. 160v [left margin], 188 [upper margin], and 188v [left margin]). Old Serbian Church Slavonic Menaia of the neo-Sabbaitic type represent the variation of the term *staurotheotokion* influenced by their Greek

Byzantina... 249–271 (first published in: *Atti del II Convegno internazionale di Storia della Civiltà Veneziana II* [Firenze, 1977] 483–508).

(145) Several Festal Menaia (Anthologia) printed in Venice are now held by the “Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen”: *Anthologion tou olou eniantou plousiwtaton* (Ἐνετήσιν, παρὰ Αντωνίῳ Πινέλλῳ, 1621); *Anthologion tou olou eniantou plousiwtaton* (Ἐνετήσιν, τυποθὲν μὲν παρὰ Αντωνίῳ τῶ Πινέλλῳ, 1630); *Anthologion tou olou eniantou plousiwtaton* (Ἐνετήσιν ἐκδοθὲν μὲν παρ' Ἀνδρέου Ιουλιανοῦ τοῦ Τυπογράφου, 1662). A comparison of the early and modern printed sources leads to the conclusion that the structural standard of the neo-Sabbaitic Greek office Menaia was formed at the time of the first printed editions and had not changed by the beginning of the 20th c.

sources, for example *Chil. 141* (AD 1355–1365)¹⁴⁶: и ѿнн · ѿ · и дроуꙗ крꙑтоуꙗ · ѿ ·
 ꙗ · еѿа ѿ дроуꙗ f. 13; и ѿнн · ѿ · крꙑтоуꙗ f. 13v; · ѿ · крꙑтоуꙗ f. 42v, f. 45v; · ѿ · крꙑтоуꙗ : /
 f. 45v; ѿ крꙑтоуꙗ : f. 172v, 177v.

III. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of Byzantine and Church Slavonic office Menaia dated mostly to the 9th–14th cc. and partially to the 15th–16th cc. made it possible to divide them into four major typological groups. Three of these groups are dated to the time of the emergence of the Studite Typikon or, more generally, Typikons of the Studite type, and their spread throughout the Byzantine Commonwealth. The office Menaion has been proven by Alexandra Nikiforova, to have originated in Constantinople on the basis of the Tropologion of the younger type and to have originally been influenced by the calendar of Constantinopolitan Synaxaria, the “heortological kernel” of which had formed that of office Menaia. Although the Menaion originated in Constantinople, its earliest witnesses are dated to the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th cc. and are of Palestinian or Sinaitic origin. Depending on the structural features based on either peripheral or central hymnographic traditions as attested by the earliest Menaia, the first two groups of sources have been defined accordingly as peripheral and central. Both groups are characterized by 1) the arrangement of chants by genre regardless of liturgical position, 2) shared genre content: (kathismata, stichera, kanons, and occasionally makarismoi), and 3) the practice that kanons chanted on the same day are not combined. While the

(146) See the description: Д. БОГДАНОВИЋ, *Каталог ћирилских рукописа манастира Хиландара* (Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности, Народна библиотека Србије, 1978) 92–93, n° 141; А. А. ТУРИЛОВ, Л. В. МОШКОВА, *Славянские рукописи афонских обителей*, под ред. А.-Э. Н. ТАХИАОСА (Фессалоники, SS Cyril and Methodius Centre for Cultural Studies, 1999); Р. СТАНКОВИЋ, *Водени знаци хиландарских српских рукописа XIV–XV века* (Београд: Народна библиотека Србије, 2007) (Опис јужнословенских ћирилских рукописа VII); see the short description of the manuscript in the check-list of microfilms held by the Hilandar Research Library — Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies at The Ohio State University (Columbus, OH): *Catalogue. Manuscripts on Microform of the Hilandar Research Library (The Ohio State University)*, I, Compiled and with an Introduction by Predrag МАТЕЈИЋ and Hannah ТНОМАС (Columbus, OH: The Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies, The Ohio State University in cooperation with the “Ivan Dujchev” Research Centre for Slavo-Byzantine Studies, 1992) 368.

kanon and stichera are witnessed already by the Tropologion, festal kathismata are an innovation that is not observed in the archaic hymnographic books of Palestinian origin and thereby are proven to be of Constantinopolitan origin. The presence of festal kathismata in all of the Menaia regardless of their typological features and provenance testifies once more to the Studite Constantinopolitan origin of this book. The influence of the Palestinian tradition on Studite practice is witnessed by makarismoι preserved in Menaia dated to the 10th–11th cc. regardless of the provenance of the manuscripts. The absence or the reduced liturgical use of the kontakion in the archaic peripheral group is explained by the fact that this genre of Constantinopolitan origin was unknown in the early liturgical tradition in Palestine and, probably, in Italy before the byzantinization of these areas. This archaic peripheral tradition is echoed in some Church Slavonic Menaia. The absence or the reduced liturgical use of the kontakion in the archaic peripheral group is explained by the fact that this genre of Constantinopolitan origin was unknown in the early liturgical tradition in Palestine and, probably, in Italy before the byzantinization of these areas. This archaic peripheral tradition is echoed in some Church Slavonic Menaia which go back to archaic Old Bulgarian origins.

The first, peripheral, archaic group includes the earliest office Menaia known so far and dated to the end of the 9th – beginning of the 10th cc., both written in uncial script: *Sin. gr. 607*, and *Sin. gr. NE MG 28*. Another Menaion of the peripheral archaic group was written in uncial script (*D. gr. 350*) in the 10th c. To the 10th–11th cc. is dated the set of provincial office Menaia of Sinaitic origin examined by Alexandra Nikiforova: *Sin. gr. 579*; *Sin. gr. 563*; *Sin. gr. 570*; *Sin. gr. 578 + PHB Греч. 89 (RNL, Gr. 89)*; *Sin. gr. 595*; *Sin. gr. 610*; *Sin. gr. 613*; *Sin. gr. 614*; *Sin. gr. 624*; *Sin. gr. 631*; and *PHB, Греч. 351 (RNL Gr. 351)*. The Italo-Greek Menaia *Vat. gr. 2* and *Vat. gr. 2008*, which are dated to the 11th c., belong to the same typological group, as well as the codices *Crypt. Δ α 23* and *Great Laura, Γ 14, Γ 16*, and *B 21*, which are of undefined provenance and are also dated to the 11th c. Two Church Slavonic Menaia of Old Russian provenance known as Putjata's Menaion (*RNB, Sof. 202*, 11th c.) and the Book of Ilja (*RGADA, Tip. 131*, 11th–12th cc.), which are both linguistically archaic and go back to Old Bulgarian prototypes of the 10th c., are distinguished by the same features. All of the archaic peripheral Menaia are characterized by 1) the absence of exaposteilaria, and 2) the absence or the reduced use of the kontakion, which is attested, if at all, only in the abridged monostrophic form. Both genres

originated in Constantinople, and the kontakion, moreover, was initially a part of the cathedral rite and was introduced into the monastic Matins by hymnographers of the Studite school not later than in the 8th c. Because of the absence of exaposteilaria and the reduced use of the kontakion, the genre system of the peripheral archaic group is close to that of the Palestinian Tropologion of the younger type as witnessed by *Sin. gr. NE MG 5* and *Sin. gr. NE MG 56*. The third, though rare, distinctive feature of the peripheral archaic group in comparison to the central one is the “reverse” order of chants, according to which the kanon precedes the lesser genres. This is attested by the archaic office Menaia *Sin. gr. 607* of Palestinian provenance and two codices of Italian provenance: office Menaion *Vat. gr. 2* and Triodion *Vat. gr. 771*, as well as by several typologically similar and linguistically archaic Church Slavonic sources. While the “reverse” order of chants in *Sin. gr. 607* and *Vat. gr. 2* is attested once in each manuscript and *Vat. gr. 771* testifies to this in the largest section of the book, the Church Slavonic Book of Ilja and Putjata’s Menaion both retain the “reverse” order of chants in every office.

Some of the archaic peripheral features can be observed in the younger manuscripts such as *Reg. gr. 65* (12th c.) of unknown provenance and *Reg. gr. 63* (1259/1260) copied in Asia Minor, neither of which contain kontakia.

The second, archaic, central group has been described on the basis of several manuscripts of paleographically undefined provenance dated to the 11th–12th cc.: *Coisl. gr. 218* (11th c.), *Crypt. Δ α XII* (11th c.), *Bodl. Ms. Canon. Gr. 58* (11th c.), *Vat. gr. 1829* (11th c.), *Lesb. Leim. 11* (second half of the 11th c.), *Hierosl. Sab. 70* (11th c.), *Sin. gr. 632* (11th or 12th cc.), and *Mess. gr. 140* (12th c.). The numerous Old Russian Menaia of the 11th–12th cc. containing the text version composed on the basis of Patriarch Alexius the Studite’s Typikon belong to this group, though its exact Byzantine structural counterpart remains to be revealed. The group is characterized by the use of kontakia, exaposteilaria, and festal troparia that are not identical to troparia εἰς Θεὸς Κύριος. None of these genres is included in the peripheral sources. Although the use of troparia and exaposteilaria is not witnessed by every source in this group, the correspondence between the three genres of Constantinopolitan origin can still be described by the following rules: 1) if the Menaion contains exaposteilaria or festal troparia, it contains kontakia that are not abridged to one stanza, and 2) if the Menaion con-

tains kontakia that are not abridged to one stanza, it preserves either exaposteilaria or festal troparia. The only exception to the second rule is represented by *Crypt. gr. Δ α 12*. The festal troparia attested by the central manuscripts are often indicated with an incipit which is proven to be a reference to the Synaxarion. No example of the “reverse” order of chants is witnessed by the manuscripts of this group.

There are notable exceptions to the rule of non-liturgical ordering of chants, all of which are testified by the provincial archaic sources.

The placement of the stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴνωνς after the kanon attested once by *Sin. gr. 607* is assumed to be influenced by the Tropologion. The position of abridged monostrophic kontakia in the Old Russian source Putjata’s Menaion (*RNB, Sof. 202*) after the sixth ode of the kanon is a witness to the early attempt to arrange some of the genres in the Menaion by their liturgical positions. Three Byzantine Menaia of the archaic but central group also contain kontakia placed after the sixth ode of the kanon: *Crypt. Δ α XII* (11th c.), *Vat. gr. 1829* (11th c.), and *Bodl. Ms. Canon. Gr. 58* (11th c.). The first two manuscripts of this subgroup are of Italian provenance and contain complete texts of kontakia, while the third source contains makarismoi, an archaic genre of Palestinian origin.

The liturgically restricted place of exaposteilaria after the kanon is the only possible position of this chant in office Menaia. Consequently, the arrangements of chants by genres regardless of their liturgical position was not a strict rule but rather a stable trend, and Menaia with the elements of liturgically influenced arrangement of genres always existed. This was caused either by the Tropologion or by pragmatic intentions aimed at “user comfort”: the scribes and editors obviously intended to help the user to properly apply in the office the genres that were innovative or uncommon in monastic Matins, at least in some of the branches of Byzantine liturgical rites at the end of the 9th–11th cc.

The different use of the kontakion in contemporary Italo-Greek manuscripts of the 11th c is noteworthy. While *Vat. gr. 2* as a peripheral archaic source does not contain any kontakia, codd. *Crypt. Δ α XII* and *Vat. gr. 1829* both preserve complete kontakia disposed according to their liturgical position. Codices *Crypt. Δ α XII* and *Vat. gr. 1829* are the important witnesses to the Italo-Greek hymnography, unlike *Vat. gr. 2*, which contains no traces of the Italo-Greek *repertorium* and therefore testifies to the earlier stage of Greek hymnography in Italy, before the local hymnographic tradition was established, and represents a merely peripheral hymnographic practice.

The coexistence of typologically archaic and innovative sources acting as witnesses to the historically caused “liturgical pluralism” (“литу́ргический плюрализм”, a phrase coined by A. E. Musin) is attested by the Old Russian tradition. The archaic part of this tradition is represented by the typologically peripheral Book of Ilja (11th–12th c.) and Putjata’s Menaion (11th c.) on the one hand, and, on the other hand, by the central group of numerous sources from the 11th and 12th cc. compiled on the basis of Patriarch Alexius the Studite’s Typikon. Structurally, the peripheral and linguistically more archaic Book of Ilja and Putjata’s Menaion represent Old Bulgarian traditions which were characterized by deliberate estrangement from Constantinopolitan liturgical influence; however the linguistically innovative Menaia based on Patriarch Alexius the Studite’s Typikon testify to the byzantinization of the Slavic liturgical rite initiated already in Bulgaria before the First Bulgarian Kingdom was finally destroyed by Basil the Bulgaroktonos in 1018, and was supported by liturgical reform of the second half of the 11th c. in Kievan Rus’.

The third typological group is an innovative one comprising the sources dated to the 11th–14th cc.: the codd. *Crypt.* Δ α XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, and *Sab. gr.* 71; in the 11th–12th cc. the source *Reg. gr.* 58; in the 12th c. the sources *Sab. gr.* 208, *Vat. gr.* 1547, *Reg. gr.* 54; in the 12th–13th cc. the sources *Matr. gr.* 4694, NBKM 22, and *Reg. gr.* 61; in the 13th c. the sources *Bodl. Lincoln College gr.* 2, *Bodl. Auct. E.* 5. 2 (S.C.5778), *Par. gr.* 245, *Sin. gr.* 630, *Vind. theol. gr.* 33, *Barb. gr.* 373, and *Ottob. gr.* 392; and in the 14th c. *Vat. gr.* 787. This group is characterized by the liturgical ordering of all the chants, the combination of different kanons chanted on the same date, the elimination of the makarismoι as an archaic genre as well as the elimination of second odes, which are not observed in manuscripts younger than the 13th c., and the gradually introduced structural innovations influenced by the Synaxarion, Prophetologion, and Lectionary. The Synaxarion was for the first time attested in the office Menaion in the 11th and 11th–12th cc. (*Ath. Laur.* Δ 45 and *Reg. gr.* 58), pericopes from the Old Testament were included in *Sab. gr.* 71 (11th c.), and the Lectionary is attested for the first time by *Reg. gr.* 54 (12th c.).

The innovative group reproduced the system of hymnographic genres represented by the archaic central type and expanded by Synaxaria, Lectionaries, and Prophetologia. In this way, the innovative group became a witness to the further emergence of the central hymnographic traditions in the Byzantine rite. The innovative trend toward the ne-

glect of archaic features caused makarismoι to be totally eliminated from the office beginning in the 12th c., when the Synaxarion was for the first time attested in Menaia and the kontakion became an unvariable structural part of the office Menaion.

The early history of the office Menaion reflects the interaction of Palestinian and peripheral hymnographic and liturgical traditions with those from Constantinople. The final prevalence of the so-called innovative type is a result of the emergence and the predominance of the central features over the peripheral ones.

The fourth typological group of Menaia is the neo-Sabbaitic group, which arose when the Jerusalemite (neo-Sabbaitic) Typikon was introduced into the Byzantine Commonwealth. Its representatives *par excellence* are the early and modern printed office Menaia which are all structurally the same. The neo-Sabbaitic Menaia are characterized by: 1) theotokion and staurotheotokion (σταυροθεοτοκίον), monostrophic chants independent from the kanon and positioned after the third ode of the kanon together with the kathisma(ta); 2) staurotheotokion chanted after the kanon, exaposteilarion, and stichera εἰς τοὺς αἴνους; 3) liturgical position for the stichera εἰς τὴν λιτήν; 4) liturgical positions for kathismata at the polyeleos and the 50th Psalm; 5) katabasia in the modern meaning; and 6) verse Synaxarion preceding the prose one.

SUMMARY

The classification of about sixty Byzantine office Menaia of the 9th–14th cc. is based on the system of liturgical genres represented by Menaia during the Studite era and the time of the byzantinization of peripheral rites in Palestine and Italy, as well as in the period of the development of the neo-Sabbaitic synthesis, when the so-called Jerusalemite Typikon was introduced into the Byzantine rite. The typologically significant genres originally represented only by Palestinian or only by Constantinopolitan traditions (makarismoι, exaposteilaria, kontakion, and festal troparion) have been revealed. The additional classification criterion applied in the article is the order of chants. This made it possible to describe the development of office Menaia of the Studite era as an interaction between the central (Constantinopolitan) and peripheral hymnographic traditions and liturgical rites as attested by Palestinian, early Italo-Greek, and early Old Bulgarian sources (although the content of the latter sources is to a certain extent a subject for critical and historical reconstruction).

The earliest office Menaia of the 9th–12th cc. have been divided into two groups.

The peripheral and the central archaic groups testify to the interaction between the centre (Constantinople) and the periphery of the Byzantine Commonwealth. The younger Menaia (12–14th cc.) are characterized by the rise and final prevalence of the central traditions, on the foundation of which the so-called innovative type of Menaion was established.

The peripheral archaic group is characterized by the absence or reduced liturgical usage of kontakia and the absence of the daily exaposteilaria (both genres are of Constantinopolitan origin). The Menaion of this type regularly consists of kathismata, stichera, and kanons arranged regardless of their liturgical position. Normally the lesser genres precede the kanon, while in a few cases the kanon can be found at the beginning of the office. The central peripheral group has the same genre content expanded by kontakia with more than one stanza, exaposteilaria, and, occasionally, festal troparia which are represented as incipita referring a user to the Synaxarion, a book of Constantinopolitan origin. Makarismoï are observed in both archaic groups, they are not, however, attested in manuscripts younger than the 11th c. The innovative group was established on the basis of the central archaic group, which testifies to the gradually achieved predominance of the liturgical practices originating in Constantinople. This group is characterized by the liturgical ordering of all of the chants, the combination of different kanons chanted on the same date, the elimination of the makarismoï as an archaic genre as well as the elimination of second odes, which are not observed in the manuscripts younger than the 13th c., and, finally, by the gradually introduced structural innovations influenced by interactions with the Synaxarion, Prophetologion, and Lectionary. The innovative trend toward the neglect of archaic features caused makarismoï to be eliminated from the Menaia after the 11th c., when the Synaxarion was for the first time attested in Menaia and the kontakion became an unvariable structural part of the office Menaion.

Neo-Sabbaitic office Menaia are characterized by the changes in the liturgical rite caused by the Jerusalemite Typikon, which was gradually introduced into the Byzantine Commonwealth in the 11th–14th cc. Through the number of genres and their liturgical ordering, the practical use of the Menaion became more efficient. This made the Menaion a kind of general liturgical book easy to apply at Vespers, Matins, and at the liturgy. Therefore the neo-Sabbaitic Menaia became functionally similar to the younger Tropologion. The best representatives of the neo-Sabbaitic office Menaia are printed ones, while the manuscripts attest to a remarkable variety of genre content and terminology.