



## Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite

Robert F. Taft

*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 42. (1988), pp. 179-194.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0070-7546%281988%2942%3C179%3AMAALCI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C>

*Dumbarton Oaks Papers* is currently published by Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/doaks.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite

ROBERT F. TAFT, S.J.

## INTRODUCTION

Hagiorite liturgy is not an overworked field. Of the twenty-seven hundred entries in the 132-page Athos bibliography at the end of Chevetogne's millennium volumes, only twenty-seven deal with liturgy, most of them little more than descriptions of actual practice.<sup>1</sup> We still lack those specialized studies that can only be done painstakingly, leaf after leaf, by a phalanx of caterpillars, to borrow Ihor Ševčenko's metaphor.<sup>2</sup> This is not surprising when one considers the formidable obstacles that immediately confront one who delves into the sources of Byzantine monastic liturgy.

These difficulties are not new. Already in the eleventh century, Nikon of the Black Mountain (ca. 1025–post 1088), a monk of the Theotokos monastery on the Μαύρον ὄρος north of Antioch in Syria and something of an embryonic student of comparative liturgy, saw the problem.<sup>3</sup> In his Ἐν τάξει διαθήκης, a spiritual testament by way of preface to his typikon, he recounts, *inter alia historica et biographica*: "I came upon and collected different typika, of Stoudios and of Jerusalem, and one did not agree with the other, neither Studite with another Studite one, nor Jerusalem ones with Jerusalem ones. And, greatly perplexed by this, I

interrogated the wise ones and the ancients, and those having knowledge of these matters and seasoned in things pertaining to the office of ecclesiarch and the rest, of the holy monastery of our holy father Sabas in Jerusalem, including the office of hegumen . . . (*Preface*, 9)."<sup>4</sup> After informing himself on the "order (*taxis*) of the church and the psalmody," and on the various traditions oral and written, he adapts them for his own purposes in his typikon (*Taktikon*, I).

That sums up both the way in which Byzantine monastic liturgy developed and the consequent problems its extant manuscripts pose for the scholar today. Monastic legislators, compilers, and copyists sifted through the sources from a plethora of related usages, picking and choosing what suited them, not haphazardly but within the parameters of basic fidelity to a tradition that was in their blood, much as a writer fully in command of his mother tongue and its literary forms brings forth from his storehouse what is at once old and new. The role of Mount Athos in this process is the subject of this article.

## THE SOURCES

Like everything else in cultural history, liturgies of the past are recuperable, at least in part, via their extant monuments, literary and archeological: documents that contain (service books), regulate (typika, diataxeis, canonical legislation), or describe (mystagogia, ekphraseis, histories, pilgrim

An abridged version of this paper was read at the Dumbarton Oaks Symposium on Mount Athos, 1–3 May 1987.

<sup>1</sup>I. Doens, "Bibliographie de la Sainte Montagne de l'Athos," *Le millénaire du Mont Athos, 963–1063: Etudes et mélanges* (Chevetogne, 1964), II, 337–483.

<sup>2</sup>I. Ševčenko, "Two Varieties of Historical Writing," in idem, *Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World* (London, 1982), I.

<sup>3</sup>On Nikon see I. Doens, "Nicon de la Montagne Noire," *Byz 24* (1954), 131–40; J. Nasrallah, "Un auteur antiochien du 11<sup>e</sup> siècle, Nicon de la Montagne Noire (vers 1025–début du XII<sup>e</sup> s.)," *POC 19* (1969), 150–61; A. Solignac, "Nicon de la Montagne-Noire," *DSp 11*, cols. 319–20; and the further bibliography cited in these works.

<sup>4</sup>V. N. Benešević, ed., *Taktikon Nikona Černogorca: Grečeskij tekst po rukopisi No. 441 Sinajskago monastyra sv. Ekateriny*. Vypusk I, Zapiski Ist.-Filol. Fakul'teta Petrogradskago Universiteta, čast' 139 (Petrograd, 1917). References to the internal divisions of this document in this edition will be given in the text of the article. See also idem, *Opisanie grečeskich rukopisej Monastyra sv. Ekateriny na Sinae* (St. Petersburg, 1911), I, 561–601.

accounts) the celebrations; and what remains of the edifices built to house them. I shall be concerned here with the literary documents. Particular studies, especially those by J. Mateos (typikon, psalter, orthros, canon),<sup>5</sup> G. Bertonière (Easter Vigil),<sup>6</sup> and M. Arranz (typikon, Divine Office, especially the "sung office," and other services of Hagia Sophia),<sup>7</sup> have thrown considerable light on the types, nature, and development of Byzantine liturgical manuscripts. A taxonomy of these documents, contextualized within the history of Studite, Sabaitic, and hagiote monasticism, is basic to an understanding of the role of Mount Athos in the fixation of the final Byzantine synthesis during the hesychast ascendancy.

Liturgical books are of two kinds: (1) liturgical texts actually used in the services; (2) books that regulate how those texts are to be used. Category 1, the texts themselves, comprises two levels of ele-

<sup>5</sup>*Le Typikon de la Grande Eglise*, 2 vols., OCA 165–66 (Rome, 1962–63); "La psalmodie variable dans le rite byzantin," *Societas Academica Dacoromana, Acta philosophica et theologica* 2 (Rome, 1964), 327–39; "Quelques problèmes de l'orthros byzantin," *POC* 11 (1961), 17–35, 201–20.

<sup>6</sup>*The Historical Development of the Easter Vigil and Related Services in the Greek Church*, OCA 193 (Rome, 1972).

<sup>7</sup>I shall cite only those that concern the Divine Office: *Kak molilis' Bogu drevnie vizantijsky: Sutočnyj krug bogosluženija po drevnim spisokam vizantijskogo euhologija* (Leningrad, 1979); "La liturgie des heures selon l'ancien Euhologe byzantin," *Eulogia: Miscellanea liturgica in onore di P. Burkhard Neunheuser*, *Studia Anselmiana* 68, *Analecta Liturgica* 1 (Rome, 1979), 1–19; "Le sacerdoce ministériel dans les prières secrètes des vêpres et des matines byzantines," *Euntes docete* 24 (1971), 186–219; "Les grandes étapes de la Liturgie Byzantine: Palestine-Byzance-Russie: Essai d'aperçu historique," *Liturgie de l'église particulière et liturgie de l'église universelle*, *BiblEphL*, *Subsidia* 7 (Rome, 1976), 43–72; "Les prières presbytérales de la 'Pannychis' de l'ancien Euhologe byzantin et la 'Panikhida' des défunts," *OCF* 40 (1974), 314–43, 41 (1975), 119–39; "Les prières presbytérales de la Tritoefti de l'ancien Euhologe byzantin," *OCF* 43 (1977), 70–93, 335–54; "Les prières prebytérales des matines byzantines," *OCF* 37 (1971), 406–36, 38 (1972), 64–115; "Les prières presbytérales des Petites Heures dans l'ancien Euhologe byzantin," *OCF* 39 (1973), 29–82; "Les prières sacerdotales des vêpres byzantines," *OCF* 37 (1971), 85–124; "L'office de l'Asmatikos Hesperinos ('vêpres chantées') de l'ancien Euhologe byzantin," *OCF* 44 (1978), 107–30, 391–412; "L'office de l'Asmatikos Orthros ('matines chantées') de l'ancien Euhologe byzantin," *OCF* 47 (1981), 122–57; "L'office de la veillée nocturne dans l'Eglise grecque et dans l'Eglise russe," *OCF* 42 (1976), 117–55, 402–25; "N. D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil in the Greek Church and in the Russian Church," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 24 (1980), 83–113, 169–95 (trans. of the previous title); ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine: Codex Messinensis Gr. 115, A.D. 1131*, OCA 185 (Rome, 1969). On the *asmatikē akolouthia* see also C. Hannick, "Etude sur l'akolouthia asmatikē (avec quatre figures)," *JÖB* 19 (1970), 243–60; O. Strunk, "The Byzantine Office at Hagia Sophia," *DOP* 9–10 (1955–56), 175–202. For a complete bibliography see R. Taft, "Select Bibliography on the Byzantine Liturgy of the Hours," *OCF* 48 (1982), 358–70.

ments, the *ordinary* and the *proper*. The ordinary of an office is the basic skeleton that remains invariable regardless of the day, feast, or season. The proper comprises those pieces that vary according to the calendar. The ordinary is the bearer of each service's immutable thrust: vespers remains evening, prayer at sundown to close the day, be it Christmas or any simple feria. The propers nuance this basic thrust with festive and seasonal coloration.

There are two liturgical books for the ordinary of the Byzantine offices (euchology, horologion) and several others for the propers, of which only the psalter and antiphonarium need concern us here. Two further books regulate the use of the above library: the typikon or ordinal which controls the meshing of the conflicting cycles of the propers; and the diataxis, a ceremonial or manual of rubrics telling the celebrants what to do when.<sup>8</sup>

Since the hagiotes had little impact on the development of the liturgical texts, especially of the proper, we can concentrate on the typikon and diataxis, and, to a lesser extent, on the two books of the ordinary, the euchology or sacramentary, and the horologion or book of hours. An examination of the earliest manuscripts of the latter two books shows that they originate in two distinct and initially unrelated liturgical traditions. The euchology is the prayer book of the rite of Hagia Sophia; it contained the prayers and diakonika for the cathedral services of the capital. Its earliest manuscript, Barberini 336, dates from the middle of the eighth century.<sup>9</sup> For the celebration of the hours, the services would be filled out with psalms, refrains, and lections from the antiphonarium and prophetologion, for Constantinople had no separate book of hours. The main Byzantine office book in use today, the horologion, is not Byzantine at all. It comes from Palestine, and its earliest extant manuscripts, Sinai gr. 863 and 864, date from the ninth century.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup>On these books see the bibliography in Taft, loc. cit.; also idem, *The Great Entrance*, 2nd ed., OCA 200 (Rome, 1978), xxxi–xxxviii.

<sup>9</sup>Description in A. Strittmatter, "The 'Barberinum S. Marci' of Jacques Goar," *EphL* 47 (1933), 329–67; critical edition by A. Jacob is in preparation for ST.

<sup>10</sup>J. Mateos, "Un horologion inédit de S. Sabas: Le Codex sinaitique grec 863 (IX<sup>e</sup> siècle)," *Mélanges E. Tisserant*, III, ST 233 (Vatican City, 1964), 47–76; Sr. Maxime (Leila) Ajjout, Basilienne Chouéirite, *Le Codex Sinaiticus Gr. 864 (IX<sup>e</sup> s.)*. *Horologion*, I: *Introduction et traduction française*, II: *Texte grec et index*, diss. (Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, 1986). This important dissertation, directed by M. Arranz, will be published in SC. Cf. also Arranz, "Les grandes étapes," 57.

This double tradition is confirmed by the existence of two distinct Byzantine liturgical psalters. A *liturgical psalter* is not just the *biblical psalter* or 150 psalms as found in the Bible—in this case, according to the Greek Septuagint text. It is, rather, the biblical text arranged in liturgical units according to the exigencies of a particular liturgical tradition. How these units are then distributed throughout the offices of the liturgical cycle is called the *pensum* or quota of psalmody: so many units per office, per day, per week, according to the season.

The antiphonarium or liturgical psalter of the cathedral office of the Great Church—the ἀσματοῦ ἀκολουθία or “sung office,” as it was called—grouped the biblical psalter into antiphons of psalms, seventy-four or seventy-six depending on the manuscript.<sup>11</sup> Sixty-eight of these antiphons, comprising 140 of the 150 psalms, O. Strunk called “The Distributed Psalter,” because they were movable, distributed throughout the offices according to a set cycle.<sup>12</sup> The rest of the antiphons pertained to the ordinary and had a fixed place in the structure of certain hours.<sup>13</sup> The psalms of this psalter were subdivided into 2,542 verses, each of which was followed by a refrain.<sup>14</sup> In addition, the antiphonarium appended to the biblical psalms fifteen “odes,” all biblical canticles save two, the eighth and fifteenth.<sup>15</sup> These odes were also distributed throughout the hours according to a set system. The earliest extant manuscript of the antiphonarium is the famous Lobkov or Chludov Psalter in the ninth-century Moscow Gosudarstvennyj Ordena Lenina Istoričeskij Muzej Codex 129Δ.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup>On the psalter of the *asmaticos* office see M. Arranz, “L’office de l’Asmatikos Hesperinos, II<sup>e</sup> partie: La psalmodie,” *OCP* 44 (1978), 391–419; also idem, “Les prières sacerdotales des vèpres byzantines,” 109–122; “L’office de l’Asmatikos Orthros,” 137–46; Strunk, “The Byzantine Office at Hagia Sophia,” 175–202.

<sup>12</sup>Strunk, “The Byzantine Office at Hagia Sophia,” 180–202 passim, esp. 200–201. The distribution of psalms in the *asmaticos* psalter is attributed to Patriarch Anthimos (535–536); Arranz, “Les grandes étapes,” 50.

<sup>13</sup>Strunk loc. cit., and, in greater detail, the articles of Arranz cited above, note 11.

<sup>14</sup>For the verse count here and in the Palestinian psalter below, I am indebted to M. Arranz. For the refrains, see the works cited above, note 11.

<sup>15</sup>See below, note 19.

<sup>16</sup>On this ms. see Archimandrit Amfilochij (Sergievskij), *Archeologičeskija zametki grečeskoj psaltiri, pisannoj v konce IX veka i perepisannoj počti vsej v XII veke s miniatjurami X–XII veka, prinadležasčej dejstvitel’nomu členu Obščestva Drevnerusskago Iskusstva pri Rumjancevskom Moskovskom Muzei i drugih Obščestv A. N. Lobkovu . . .* (Moscow, 1866); N. P. Kondakov, *Miniatjurny grečeskoj rukopisi*

The other Byzantine liturgical psalter is the ψαλτήρ(ιον) or Jerusalem psalter, called “of the Anastasis.”<sup>17</sup> Its 150 psalms in 4,882 verses are divided into twenty sections with three groups, called στάσεις or δόξαι, of (ideally) three psalms each.<sup>18</sup> Here, too, biblical canticles, eleven of those found in the odes of the antiphonarium, are grouped into a “canon” of nine “odes” to form an appendix to the psalmody.<sup>19</sup> This Palestinian litur-

*psaltiri IX veka iz sobranija A. I. Chludova v Moskve* (Moscow, 1878); Marfa V. Ščepkina, “Issledovanie licevogo kodeksa IX v. (Chlud. 129-d),” *Slavia* 36 (1967), 601–4; and esp. the facsimile edition, idem, *Miniatjurny Chludovskoj Psaltiri: Grečeskij illjustrirovannyj kodeks IX veka* (Moscow, 1977). N. Malickij seems to have been the first to recognize the cathedral character of this psalter, in his study “Le psautier byzantin à illustrations marginales du type Chludov est-il de provenance monastique?” *L’art byzantin chez les Slaves*, 2me recueil, Orient et Byzance 5 (Paris, 1932), 235–43.

<sup>17</sup>“Psaltēr” is also used for the antiphonarium: cf. Mateos, *Typicon*, II, 327–28. In liturgy, as elsewhere, Byzantine technical terms are multiple and fluid.

<sup>18</sup>See the tables in *La prière des heures: Ὁρολόγιον, La prière des Eglises de rite byzantin 1* (Chevetogne, 1975), Appendice II: Composition des cathismes du psautier (pp. 481–83); Répartition des cathismes du psautier (pp. 483–85).

<sup>19</sup>The odes of both psalters are as follows:

Constantinople (Chludov 129 Δ)	Jerusalem
1. Ex 15:1–19	1
2. Dt 32:1–43	2
3. 1 Kings (= 1 Sam) 2:1–10	3
4. Hab 3:1–19	4
5. Is 26:9–20	5
6. Jonah 2:3–10	6
7. Is 38:10–20	—
8. “Prayer of Manasse”	—
9. Dan 3:26–45(?)	7: Dan 3:26–56
10. Dan 3:52–56(?)	
11. Dan 3:57–88	8
12. Lk 1:46–55 ( <i>Magnificat</i> )	9: Lk 1:46–55, 68–79
13. Lk 1:68–79 ( <i>Benedictus</i> )	
14. Lk 2:29–32 ( <i>Nunc dimittis</i> )	—
15. <i>Gloria in excelsis</i> and <i>Kataxioson</i> ( <i>Dignare, domine</i> )	—

Since the *Nunc dimittis* and *Gloria* with *Kataxioson* are found, respectively, in vespers and matins (lauds) of the Byzantine monastic office, which uses the Jerusalem psalter (R. Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West: The Origins of the Divine Office and Its Meaning for Today* [Collegeville, Minn., 1986], 279, 281); and the nonbiblical “Prayer of Manasse” is used in Great Compline of the same tradition (*La prière des heures*, 446–47; Greek text as ode 12 in A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta*, 8th ed. [Stuttgart, 1965], II, 180–81); only ode 7 of the Constantinopolitan list is not common to both systems.

The above list of Chludov odes is Arranz’s reconstruction (“L’office de l’Asmatikos Orthros,” 140 note 36) on the basis of the description of Arch. Amfilochij (pp. 15–16) and the facsimile edition of Ščepkina (fols. 148v–164v), both cited above, note 16. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, II, 164–83, gives the Greek text of all the odes, dividing them into *Novem odae ecclesiae graecae* (the Jerusalem nine-ode canon) and *Odae aliae* (the rest). This results in an arbitrary numbering of the odes that does not correspond to either liturgical system.

gical psalter would be adopted as the Byzantine monastic psalter and is the only one still in use in the Byzantine liturgy today. Its earliest manuscript, Leningrad 216, dates from 862.<sup>20</sup> In this codex the twenty major divisions of the psalter are not yet called *kathismata*, since that was originally the name of the poetry chanted after each set of three *doxai*.

#### THE STUDITE SYNTHESIS

How these traditions meld into one is the history of the present Byzantine Rite. To understand how this all began we must turn to Constantinople at the beginning of the ninth century. It is only with the iconoclast struggle and its aftermath that Byzantine monks begin to play a significant role in the government of the Church of Constantinople<sup>21</sup> and in the history of its liturgy. In 799 some monks of Sakkoudion in Bithynia take refuge in the capital and install themselves in the dying Monastery of Stoudios. From this momentous event their abbot St. Theodore (d. 826) acquired the sobriquet by which he is known to us.<sup>22</sup> He summoned to the capital some monks of St. Sabas to help combat iconoclasm, for in the Sabaitic chants Theodore discerned a sure guide of orthodoxy, he writes to Patriarch Thomas of Jerusalem.<sup>23</sup> So it was the office of St. Sabas, not the ἀκολουθία τῶν ἀκοιμητῶν then currently in use in the monasteries of Constantinople,<sup>24</sup> which the monks of Stoudios would synthesize with material from the *asmatikē akolouthia* or cathedral office of the Great Church to create a hybrid "Studite" office,<sup>25</sup> the ancestor of the one that has come down to us to this day: a Palestinian horologion with its psalmody and hymns grafted onto a skeleton of litanies and their collects from the euchology of the Great Church. Like the fusion of Anglo-Saxon and French in the formation of English, this unlikely mongrel would stand the test of time.

This new Studite synthesis of Constantinopoli-

<sup>20</sup> Arranz, "Les grandes étapes," 57–58.

<sup>21</sup> H. G. Beck, *Das byzantinische Jahrtausend* (Munich, 1978), 210–11.

<sup>22</sup> See J. Leroy, "La réforme studite," *Il monachesimo orientale*, OCA 153 (Rome, 1958), 181–214; further bibliography in Taft, "Select Bibliography," 358–59.

<sup>23</sup> *Ep.* II, 15, PG 99, cols. 1160–64; also II, 16, PG 99, cols. 1164–68. Cf. N. Egender, "Introduction," *La prière des heures*, 36.

<sup>24</sup> On these "sleepless monks" and their office see Taft, "Select Bibliography," nos. 3, 9, 19, 20, 23–26, 79.

<sup>25</sup> Arranz, "La liturgie des heures selon l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," 2, calls this the "tradition of the Byzantine West" (Athos, Georgia, Rus', S. Italy) to distinguish it from the neo-Sabaitic Palestinian monastic usage treated below.

tan and hagiopolite usages adds to the more sober, desert prayer of Palestine a ritual solemnity to give it what Arranz calls "a strong Byzantine coloration, a certain taste for the cathedral traditions, an importance assigned to chant to the detriment of the psalter, etc."<sup>26</sup>—all of which would become permanent characteristics of the Byzantine hours.

Meanwhile, with the completion of the synaxarion or cycle of fixed feasts in Constantinople by the ninth century,<sup>27</sup> from then through the twelfth century the series of offices for these feasts (later gathered in the menaion) is composed and added to the already existing weekly (oktoechos) and paschal (triodion, pentekostarion) propers of the mobile cycle that revolves around the date of Easter.<sup>28</sup> It is only in this period, at the beginning of the second millennium, that typika begin to appear, at first rudimentary, to regulate the interference of these three conflicting cycles of the proper.<sup>29</sup> In Byzantine monasticism the earliest instances are the *Hypotyposis of Stoudios*<sup>30</sup> and, from Mount Athos, its closely related descendant, the *Hypotyposis of Athanasius of the Great Laura*.<sup>31</sup>

#### THE STUDITE RITE ON MOUNT ATHOS

##### *The Hypotyposis of St. Athanasius the Athonite*

It is at this point that Mount Athos enters liturgical history, when Athanasius the Athonite adopts the Studite rule and succeeds in instituting cenobitism definitively at Lavra after the death of Em-

<sup>26</sup> "Les prières presbytérales des matines byzantines, II: Les manuscrits," *OCF* 38 (1972), 85.

<sup>27</sup> Mateos, *Typicon*, I.

<sup>28</sup> Arranz, "Les grandes étapes," 52–63.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 59–70. On the nature of the typikon, a term of monastic vintage, see 62–63, and idem, "L'office de l'Asmatikos Hesperinos," *OCF* 44 (1978), 401–2. Older Russian studies of the typikon, while still retaining considerable value, require updating on the basis of Arranz's far more nuanced conclusions: I. Mansvetov, *Cerkovnyj ustav (Tipik), ego obrazovanie i sud'ba v grečeskoj i ruskoj cerkvi* (Moscow, 1885), with the important review by A. Dmitrievskij in *Christianskoe čtenie* (1888), no. 2, 480–576; M. Skaballanovič, *Tolkovyj Tipikon, Ob'jasnitel'noe izloženie Tipikona s istoričeskim vvedeniem*, 3 vols. (Kiev, 1910–15); A. Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (New York, 1966).

<sup>30</sup> Edited from the 13th–14th-c. codex Vatopedi 322 (956) by A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgičeskich rukopisej chranjaščichsja v bibliotekach pravoslavnago vostoka*, 3 vols. (Kiev, 1895, 1901; Petrograd, 1917), I, xii–xxxii, 224–38, with variants from Vatican gr. 2029 (= A. Mai, *Nova patrum bibliotheca*, V.4 (Rome, 1849), 111–25 and PG 99, cols. 1704–20, which Bertonière, *Easter Vigil*, 165–66, says is an older redaction, closer to the Athanasian typikon (see the following note). I am indebted to Prof. Timothy Miller for making available to me his version of this text, prepared for the Dumbarton Oaks typika project.

<sup>31</sup> Editions from codex Ivron 754 (228), 16th c.: Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, 246–56; P. Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athoskloster* (Leipzig, 1894), 130–40. On these edi-

peror Nikephoros II Phokas, 11 December 969.<sup>32</sup> Theodore of Stoudios apparently wrote no rule himself, but in his *Great Catechesis*, I, 1 and 33, he refers to the κανόν of the cenobitic life as well as to a *Diatyposis of Theodosius the Cenobiarch* (*Cat.*, I, 53 and *Carm.*, III, 40), and after his death the Studite rule or Hypotyposis was codified by his followers.<sup>33</sup> For the beginnings of this cenobitic movement on Athos we have the two *Vitae* of St. Athanasius,<sup>34</sup> as well as the three writings attributed to him, listed here in chronological order:<sup>35</sup>

1. The Ὑποτύπωσις or rule, the Urtext of which was composed by Athanasius soon after the foundation of the Lavra in 962–963.<sup>36</sup>
2. The Τυπικόν or Κανονικόν, written during the reign of Emperor John I Tzimiskes (11 December 969–10 January 976).<sup>37</sup> This is the charter

tions and the mss. consulted see Bertonière, *Easter Vigil*, 165–66. To these early Byzantine monastic sources one could also add the rudimentary *Typos* of St. Sabas in codex Sinai gr. 1096, ed. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, 222–24 and E. Kunz, *BZ* 3 (1894), 167–70. I am grateful to my confrère Prof. George Dennis, S.J. for making available to me his version of the Athonite Hypotyposis prepared for the Dumbarton Oaks typika project.

<sup>32</sup>*Vita A*, 114–28, esp. 123, ed. J. Noret, *Vitae duae antiquae Sancti Athanasii Athonitae*, CCSG 9 (Turnhout, 1982), 54–62. See J. Leroy, “La conversion de St. Athanase l’Athonite à l’idéal cénobitique et l’influence studite,” *Le millénaire du Mont-Athos* (note 1 above), I, 101–20. Further bibliography on Studite life and liturgy in Taft, “Select Bibliography.”

<sup>33</sup>Leroy, “La réforme studite,” 208–9, and notes 218, 220 (see p. 186 note 43 on Leroy’s system of referring to the *Catecheses*; where no edition is cited, the *Catechesis* in question is unedited). Cf. also I, 14 in A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, ed., Τοῦ ὁσίου Θεοδώρου τοῦ Στουδίτου Μεγάλῃ Κατηχήσις (St. Petersburg, 1904), 95. On the confusing issue of Theodore’s *Great* and *Little Catecheses*, which still await a critical edition, see J. Leroy, “Les Petites Catéchèses de S. Théodore Studite,” *Le Muséon* 71 (1958), 329–58.

<sup>34</sup>Ed. Noret (above, note 32). On the relative precedence of the *Vitae* see *ibid.*, chap. 3 and the review by J. Darrouzès, *REB* 42 (1984), 305; also P. Lemerle, “Chronologie de Lavra des origines à 1204,” in *idem*, A. Guillou, N. Svoronis, and D. Papatryphon, eds., *Actes de Lavra, I: Des origines à 1204, Texte*, Archives de l’Athos 5 (Paris, 1970), 24–30 (hereafter *Lavra*, I). Noret and Darrouzès opt with Lemerle, against Leroy and J. Mossay, for the priority of A. A. Kazhdan argues against the absolute priority of A and raises the possibility of an *Urvita* as source of both A and B (“Hagiographical Notes,” *Byz* 53 [1983], 538–44).

<sup>35</sup>On these documents and their relation to one another and to *Vita A*, see J. Noret, “La Vie la plus ancienne de S. Athanase l’Athonite confrontée aux écrits laissés par le saint,” *AB* 100 (1982), 545–66; Lemerle, *Lavra*, I, 13–22; J. Leroy, “S. Athanase l’Athonite et la Règle de S. Benoît,” *Revue d’ascétique et de mystique* 29 (1953), 111 ff.

<sup>36</sup>Editions cited above, note 31; for the date of the Hypotyposis see Noret, “La Vie la plus ancienne,” 547, against Lemerle, *Lavra*, I, 21; for the foundation of Lavra, *ibid.*, 36.

<sup>37</sup>Ed. Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, 102–22. For the date see Noret, “La Vie la plus ancienne,” 551–52, against Lemerle, *Lavra*, I, 17, who argues for ca. 973–975.

of the Great Lavra, and refers to Athanasius’ conversion to cenobitism.<sup>38</sup>

3. The Διατύπωσις or last will and testament of Athanasius, written sometime after December 984 (Lemerle), or perhaps even later than September 993 (Noret), and before the author’s death in the first years of the eleventh century.<sup>39</sup>

The liturgical information in the *Vitae*, especially *Vita B*, 26, is too general and mostly descriptive to be of much use to us except to confirm that orthros began, as now, with the *doxa* versicle of Luke 2:14.<sup>40</sup> But the Hypotyposis is another matter. Though copied in later manuscripts as simply a continuation of the Testament,<sup>41</sup> the earliest codex with the Hypotyposis, the eleventh-century Lavra Skeuophylakion 1, gives it separately under the lemma that summarizes well its contents: “On the sacred offices, on the quantity of food and drink, on the discipline at table, and on certain other rules and counsels.”<sup>42</sup>

The present redaction of the Hypotyposis is from the Lavra within a generation of Athanasius, and it clearly represents his heritage.<sup>43</sup> For in both his *Typikon* and *Diatyposis* Athanasius alludes to his authorship of a rule,<sup>44</sup> and the abandonment of so venerated a founder’s patrimony shortly after his demise would hardly have gone unchallenged and unnoticed in the annals of the Holy Mountain!

The first part of this precious document, our earliest source for the liturgy at the origins of Athonite cenobitism, manifests in every place its unmistakable dependence on the Studite Hypotyposis, of which, indeed, it is simply a light Athonite retouching of no substantial import in the history of Byzantine liturgical development.<sup>45</sup>

More important for the history of the liturgy is

<sup>38</sup>Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, 115.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, 123–30; Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, 246–56. For the date, Lemerle, *Lavra*, I, 20; Noret, “La Vie la plus ancienne,” 564. Noret notes (*ibid.*, 565) that the *Diatyposis* is cited in *Vita A* 214:4–9 (ed. Noret, 105 = Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, 124:10–15).

<sup>40</sup>Ed. Noret, 154.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, 238–46, 246–56.

<sup>42</sup>Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, 272.

<sup>43</sup>Leroy, “S. Athanase l’Athonite et la Règle de S. Benoît,” 113 ff.

<sup>44</sup>Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, 115:21–116:9, 124:20 ff. Lemerle takes both texts as referring to the Hypotyposis (*Lavra*, I, 21).

<sup>45</sup>Leroy, “S. Athanase l’Athonite et la Règle de S. Benoît,” 115, gives some examples that show the sort of process under way here. *Vita B*, 26 (cf. A, 84) attributes to Athanasius the institution of two epistimonarchoi, one for each choir; of an ἀφυσινπτης to keep the monks awake during the offices; and of porters to control the traffic in and out of church and keep the monks from leaving the services early. It is such minor prescriptions that distinguish the Athanasian Hypotyposis (Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, 135) from its Studite sources.

the development in this same period of the full Studite typikon to regulate the synthesis of Sabaitic and Constantinopolitan practices. This fusion, completed by the twelfth century, will spread to Athos and as far as Italy, and even to the monasteries of Palestine.<sup>46</sup> Still extant typika of Southern Italy, Russia, Georgia, and Athos remain as monuments to this shortlived Studite Golden Age, soon to give way to another wave of Sabaitic influence.<sup>47</sup>

The first developed Studite typikon<sup>48</sup> was composed by Alexis, patriarch from 1025–43 and earlier hegumen of Stoudios, for the monastery he founded near Constantinople.<sup>49</sup> It is this typikon, extant only in Slavonic,<sup>50</sup> that St. Theodosius Pečerskij translated into Slavonic in the eleventh century and introduced as the rule of the Kievo-Pečerskaja Lavra or Monastery of the Caves in Kiev, cradle of Orthodox monasticism among the East Slavs.<sup>51</sup> From Ukraine it passed to the whole of Rus' and Muscovy. There are six extant Slavonic manuscripts of this document, dating from the eleventh to fifteenth centuries.<sup>52</sup> This same usage appears in Magna Graecia at the beginning of the

twelfth century, as witness the *Typikon of S. Salvatore of Messina* (A.D. 1131) edited by my colleague Miguel Arranz, S.J.<sup>53</sup>

*From Hagiopolites to Hagiorites. Georgia and the Athonite Connection*

The earliest evidence for the developed Studite usage on Mount Athos comes from Iviron. Arab incursions into Palestine in the ninth and tenth centuries disrupt once again the monastic life that had flowered anew in the renaissance following the Persian onslaught of 614, and "at the end of the tenth century the center of Georgian literary activity shifts from Palestine to Athos. The Athonite Iviron Lavra becomes the source from which the new, fresh current of liturgical life pours into Georgia."<sup>54</sup>

*1. St. Euthymius*<sup>55</sup>

Iviron, first Iberian monastery on Athos, was thrust into liturgical history by its second abbot, Euthymius, hegumen from 1005–16 and founder of the Athonite Georgian literary movement. He completed most of his prodigious literary activity before his abbacy, though he resumed it from his retirement until his death on 13 May 1028.<sup>56</sup>

It is with this movement that we first encounter a major Athonite role in the history of Byzantine liturgy. For it is precisely in the eleventh century, through the influence of Iviron, that we see clear evidence of the Byzantinization of Georgian liturgy.<sup>57</sup> Not of course that there were no Byzantine

<sup>46</sup> Arranz, "Les grandes étapes," 63 ff; "Les prières presbytérales des matines byzantines," *OCP* 38 (1972), 85 ff, 91 note 2; "Les prières presbytérales des Petites Heures dans l'ancien Eucologe byzantin," 81; "L'office de l'Asmatikos Hesperinos," 109–16 (all cited above, note 7). Also A. Baumstark, "Denkmäler der Entstehungsgeschichte des byzantinischen Ritus," *OC* 24 = ser. 3, vol. 2 (1927), 22 ff.

<sup>47</sup> Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales des matines byzantines," *OCP* 38 (1972), 85.

<sup>48</sup> On the Studite-type typikon mss. see Arranz, "Les grandes étapes," 64–65; Bertonière, *Easter Vigil*, 163–220; and passim in the articles of Arranz cited in note 7.

<sup>49</sup> Balsamon (PG 137, cols. 1041–43) says "Patriarch Lord Alexis built the monastery called 'of the Lord Alexis,'" and that is how R. Janin identifies it in *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, 1<sup>re</sup> Partie, tome III: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1969), 19. Mansvetov, *Cerkovnyj ustav*, 118, on the basis of the Slavonic mss. of the typikon, says it was named Dormition (*vo imja Uspenija Božiej Matere*) according to Moscow Synod Slav 333/381 (A.D. 1398), fol. 82v, and Theotokos (*vo imja Božestvennyja Matere*), in the 12th–13th-c. Moscow Synod Slav 330/380, fol. 196v. But Janin (pp. 156–244) knows no Koimesis monastery, nor does he associate any of the innumerable Theotokos monasteries of the capital with Alexis' foundation.

<sup>50</sup> M. Lisicyn, *Pervonačal'nyj slavjano-ruskij Tipikon: Istoričesko-arheologičeskoe izsledovanie* (St. Petersburg, 1911); Skaballanovič, *Tolkovij Tipikon*, I, 399–401; Bertonière, *Easter Vigil*, 167.

<sup>51</sup> See the *Povest' vremennyj let* for 1051, ed. D. S. Lichačev, Čast' pervaja: *Tekst i perevod* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), 107; Eng. trans. in S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *The Russian Primary Chronicle: Laurentian Text*, Mediaeval Academy of America Pub. 60 (Cambridge, Mass., n.d.), 142; and the *Vita* of Theodosius for the year 1064, in O. A. Knjazevskaja, V. G. Dem'janov, M. V. Ljapon, and S. I. Kotkov, eds., *Uspenskij sbornik XII–XIII vv.* (Moscow, 1971), 89. I am grateful to my colleague Prof. Sophia Senyk, O.S.B.M., for these references. Cf. Skaballanovič, *Tolkovij Tipikon*, I, 399–400.

<sup>52</sup> Arranz, "Les grandes étapes," 65 note 34, lists them.

<sup>53</sup> *Typikon* (cited above, note 7).

<sup>54</sup> K. Kekelidze, *Liturgičeskie gruzinskije pamjatniki v otečestvennyj knigočraniliščach i ich naučnoe značenie* (Tiflis, 1908), 478. On Georgian monks in Palestine see *ibid.*, 23, 61–64, 185; also G. Peradze, "An Account of the Georgian Monks and Monasteries in Palestine as Revealed in the Writings of Non-Georgian Pilgrims," *Georgica* 1, nos. 4–5 (1937), 181–237.

<sup>55</sup> On Euthymius and his work, see M. Tarchnišvili and J. Abfal, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur*, ST 185 (Vatican City, 1955), 126–54; *Vita* of John and Euthymius in I. V. Abuladze et al., eds., *Jveli k'art'uli agiograf'uli literaturis jglebi*, II (Tbilisi, 1967); Latin version, P. Peeters, "Histoires monastiques géorgiennes," *AB* 36–37 (1917–19), 8–68; French trans., *Irénikon* 6 (1929), 767–84; 7 (1930), 50–67, 181–96, 448–60.

<sup>56</sup> *Vita*, 24–26, 75; Tarchnišvili–Abfal, *Geschichte*, 128–29; on Iviron see *ibid.*, 70–72, and esp. J. Lefort, "Histoire du monastère d'Iviron, des origines jusqu'au milieu du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *idem*, N. Oikonomides, D. Papachryssanthou, and H. Métrévili, eds., *Actes d'Iviron*, I: *Texte*, Archives de l'Athos 14 (Paris, 1985), 3–91 (hereafter *Iviron*, I).

<sup>57</sup> Though much has been written on various aspects of the pre-Byzantine Iberian liturgy, there is no general synthesis. Especially useful among recent studies is the overview of M. van Esbroeck, "Eglise géorgienne des origines au Moyen Âge," *BK* 40 (1982), 186–99, esp. 195–96; to which must be added his "Le manuscrit sinaïtique géorgien 34 et les publications récentes

elements in Iberian usage before this date, but as M. Tarchnišvili and J. Abfalg affirm: "To the [Georgian] monks of Mount Athos is due the honor of having created practically all the biblical and liturgical *textus recepti* still in use among the Georgians. Their influence on the whole life of the Church, her culture and tradition, was so lasting and so general that Georgian Christianity since the eleventh century is hardly conceivable apart from the Athonite school."<sup>58</sup>

A reflection of the import and success of this momentous change of liturgical tradition, as well as a precise confirmation of its dating, is found in the *Questions and Responses* of Euthymius, number 6:

*Question:* What about the Liturgy of James? Is it authentic or not?

*Answer:* The Liturgy of James is indeed authentic, and originally was in use in the Greek Churches and among us [Georgians]. But since St. Basil and Blessed John Chrysostom composed their liturgies, the faithful preferred these because of their brevity. The Liturgy of James has fallen into oblivion, and all now make use of the Liturgy of Chrysostom, or in Lent that of Basil.<sup>59</sup>

It is obvious what is behind all this. The Byzantine takeover has disturbed Euthymius' interlocutor,<sup>60</sup> leading him to question the legitimacy of the older hagiopolite Georgian tradition in the face of contemporary Byzantine hagiorite usage. Euthymius' answer reflects exactly the relative precedence of the Constantinopolitan anaphoras at the turn of the century, when Chrysostom gained the upper hand over Basil to assume primacy as the main liturgy of the capital, and as first text in the new Constantinopolitan recension of the euchology.<sup>61</sup>

de liturgie palestinienne," *OCP* 46 (1980), 125–41; idem, "Les manuscrits de Jean Zosime Sin. 34 et Tsagareli 81," *BK* 39 (1981), 63–75; idem, "L'Hymnaire de Michel Modrekili et son sanctoral (X<sup>e</sup> siècle)," *BK* 38 (1980), 113–30; H. Metreveli, "Die georgischen Liturgie-Handschriften des 9. u. 10. Jahrhunderts und ihre Bedeutung für die Erforschung der byzantinischen Hymnographie," in H. Voigt, ed., *XX. Deutschen Orientalistentag*, ZDMG Suppl. 4 (Wiesbaden, 1980), 161–69; A. Wade, "The Oldest *Iadgari*: The Jerusalem Tropologion, V–VIII c.," *OCP* 50 (1984), 451–56; and the literature they refer to.

<sup>58</sup>*Geschichte*, 72; for earlier Byzantine liturgical influence, see p. 35. Cf. G. Peradse, "L'activité littéraire des moines géorgiens au monastère d'Iviron, au Mont Athos," *RHE* 23 (1927), 530–39.

<sup>59</sup>G. Peradse, "Ein Dokument aus der mittelalterlichen Liturgiegeschichte Georgiens," *Kyrios* 1 (1936), 77.

<sup>60</sup>On the problem of who this was, see Tarchnišvili-Abfalg, *Geschichte*, 330–31.

<sup>61</sup>A. Jacob, "La tradition manuscrite de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome (VIII<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècles), *Eucharisties d'orient et d'occi-*

From the list of books Euthymius is credited with translating, one can see the new synthesis under way: not only does he translate the synaxarion (i.e., typikon) and the Constantinopolitan euchology, but also the prayers and hours of the Palestinian horologion.<sup>62</sup> The typikon was doubtless a redaction of the Athanasian Diatyposis. Iviron was closely linked to the Great Laura, where Euthymius and his father John the Iberian, first hegumen of Iviron (979/80–1005),<sup>63</sup> were received by Athanasius himself ca. 963–969,<sup>64</sup> and became such favored disciples that in his Diatyposis Athanasius names them successive trustees (ἐπίτροπος) of Lavra, to oversee the choice of his successor as hegumen after his death.<sup>65</sup>

## 2. *The Synaxarion and Lectionary of St. George Mt'acmindeli*

But our most important Athonite liturgical document after the Athanasian Hypotyposis is a typikon from the hand of George III Mt'acmindeli (ca. 1009–d. 29 June 1065), that is, "the Hagiorite" (from *Mt'acminda*, "The Holy Mountain"), eighth hegumen of Iviron from ca. 1044 until his resignation in 1056.<sup>66</sup> His typikon, the so-called *Synaxarion of George Mt'acmindeli*, is extant in several Georgian manuscripts, the earliest of which are the eleventh-century codices Tiflis A-97 and A-193, along with Sinai Georgian 4.<sup>67</sup> Based on a Constantinopolitan Greek original that Bertonière dates before 906, it was translated between 1042 and 1044 when George was *dekanoz* (dean, i.e., ec-

*dent*, *Lex Orandi* 47 (Paris, 1970), 111–13; and more fully in idem, *Histoire du formulaire grec de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome*, diss. (Louvain, 1968), 43–56, where he cites Euthymius in this context (54).

<sup>62</sup>*Vita*, 25 and Tarchnišvili-Abfalg, *Geschichte*, 131–53, esp. 150–51. K. S. Kekelidze found a fragment of Euthymius' Synaxarion in codex Tiflis Ecclesiastical Archeological Museum 648, which he describes at length: *Ierusalimskij kanonar VII veka (Gruzinskaja versija)* (Tiflis, 1912), 38–39, 297–310.

<sup>63</sup>Not, however, the founder: see Lefort, *Iviron*, I, 19 ff, 93.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>65</sup>Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, 240; Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, 124–25. On this question see Lemerle, *Lavra*, I, 19–21, 45–46.

<sup>66</sup>On George and his works see Lefort, *Iviron*, I, 50 ff, 94; Tarchnišvili-Abfalg, *Geschichte*, 154–74; *Vita*, ed. Abuladze (note 55 above), II, and Peeters, "Histoires monastiques géorgiennes," 69–159.

<sup>67</sup>On this typikon and its mss., sources, date, etc., see M. van Esbroeck, "L'empereur Jean Tzimisces dans le calendrier de Georges l'Athonite," *BK* 41 (1983), 68–69; Bertonière, *Easter Vigil*, 115, 136, 141–43, 169–71; Kekelidze, *Liturgičeskie gruzinskije pamjatniki*, 483–506. Kekelidze gives a Russian trans. of the text from A-193 (*ibid.*, 228–72) with the missing lenten-Easter-Pentecost cycle filled in from the 12th-c. codex Tbilisi A-222 (*ibid.*, 272–313). The Georgian text is edited by E. Gabidzachvili in Abuladze (note 55 above), IV (Tbilisi, 1968).



clesiarch) of Iviron before becoming hegumen. Its title, *Synaxarion*, is enough to betray its Constantinopolitan antecedents. It is actually a complete typikon of the Studite heritage, dependent on the Hypotyposis of Stoudios and the Diatyposis of Athanasius, but filled out with a sanctoral (*synaxarion*) derived from the *Typikon of the Great Church*, an influence also reflected in the Holy Saturday and Easter celebrations.

George's *Vita Euthymii*, 80, 83–84, also written before 1044, already reflects the conflict between Byzantine hagiomite and older hagiopolite Iberian usages,<sup>68</sup> and with his typikon there is no longer any doubt to whom the victory will go. This extremely important document is the earliest extant detailed description of liturgical life on Athos. It shows that the earliest hagiomite liturgy is based on Studite usage, which by the time of our text was already an amalgam of Sabaitic uses (*Phōs hilaron* at vespers, Palestinian orthros with canon, etc.) with the rite of the Great Church. Indeed, as Bertonière has hypothesized, the sparse liturgical material in the earlier Athonite Hypotyposis and Diatyposis is so rudimentary probably because the needed material was already available to the monks in the liturgical books of the Great Church.<sup>69</sup> This is especially true for the Divine Liturgy. Only with the massive infusion of Sabaitic elements into the monastic offices of Stoudios, and the explosion of poetic compositions, do we see the gradual formation of anthologies of the proper (*oktoechos*, *triodion*, *pentekostarion*, *menaion*) to accommodate this new material, necessitating, in turn, complex *typika* to control the interference of the conflicting cycles.<sup>70</sup>

Gérard Garitte has shown this same shift from hagiopolite to hagiomite usage reflected in the manuscripts of the Iberian lectionary tradition.<sup>71</sup> The earliest Georgian manuscripts of the lectionary follow the ancient lection system of Jerusalem, before the Byzantinization of hagiopolite usage in the second millennium. But by the first half of the eleventh century, George had translated into Geor-

gian the Byzantine lectionary, of which manuscripts such as the contemporary Iviron Georgian 60, copied on Athos itself in 1043, are still extant.

It is from the same century, too, that our earliest extant Georgian version of the Chrysostom liturgy dates, Sinai Georgian 89, a Palestinian monastic manuscript, which shows how fast the movement affected the Georgian monasteries of the Holy Land.<sup>72</sup>

#### *Characteristics of the Studite Cursus*

It has become a *topos* for modern scholars solemnly to inform us that there was no such thing as a religious order in Byzantium. But the Studite confederation of nearly a thousand members in half a dozen monasteries under one rule and, what is more important, under the complete jurisdiction of the abbot of Stoudios, was as much like an order, call it what you will, as anything in the contemporary West.<sup>73</sup> Cenobitism means not just life together, but *common* life, that is, life under the same rule, and it was the Studite cenobitic rule and its liturgy that St. Athanasius adopted for his *laura*.

What are some of the characteristics of this Studite-hagiomite usage in the foundational period of Athonite monasticism? Nikon of the Black Mountain puts his finger on the main issue when he tells us in his *Taktikon*, I, 20, that his typikon does not have the Sabaitic all-night vigil for Sundays and feasts but follows rather the Studite and Athonite horarium of compline, *mesonyktikon*, and orthros, in accord with the *Ascetica* of Basil, the *Vita* of Pachomius, and the usage of Stoudios and the rest of the ancient coenobia: "It is necessary to know that according to the former typikon [of the Holy Fathers] there is no *agrypnia* the whole night through, neither on feasts nor on Sunday, but rather the order of the ritual (*akolouthia*) at the time of *apodeipnon* and of *mesonyktikon* and of orthros according to the *Typikon* of Stoudios and of the Holy Mountain and, in a word, according to the custom of the cenobitic *diataxeis*."

So the difference between Studite and Sabaitic usage concerns mainly the order of night prayer, and Nikon indicates the basis for this difference when he cites his sources, all cenobitic. Psalmody and vigils were the core of the prayer of the Pales-

<sup>68</sup> Peeters, "Histoires monastiques géorgiennes," 60–61, 63–64; for the date cf. G. Garitte in *Le Muséon* 71 (1958), 58.

<sup>69</sup> *Easter Vigil*, 171.

<sup>70</sup> Arranz, "Les grandes étapes," 52–63.

<sup>71</sup> G. Garitte, "Analyse d'un lectionnaire byzantino-géorgien des évangiles (sin. géorg. 74)," *Le Muséon* 91 (1978), 150–52; idem, "Un fragment d'évangélaire géorgien à la Bodléienne," *Le Muséon* 85 (1972), 144 and notes 17–18; R. B. Blake, "Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens de la bibliothèque de la Laure d'Iviron au Mont Athos," *ROC* 9 (29) (1933–34), 249–50, no. 60.

<sup>72</sup> A. Jacob, "Une version géorgienne inédite de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome," *Le Muséon* 77 (1964), 65–119. On the Georgian monks of Sinai see Tarchnišvili-Abfalg, *Geschichte*, 62–64, 69.

<sup>73</sup> Statistics from Leroy, "La réforme studite," 205–7.

tinian anchorites, and this agrypnia will be one of the main characteristics distinguishing the looser lavriote and hesychast organization from the tight cenobitism of the Studites, who, if we can believe Nikon, had a lighter *pensum* of psalmody and fewer offices, as well as the effrontery to sleep at night.

But although Nikon lists the differences between the uses of Jerusalem and Stoudios, and insists that a monk needs both *typika* to know the traditions of the Fathers (I, 23), a close reading of the *Taktikon*, I, 1–23, makes it obvious that he is contrasting not two totally distinct traditions but two variant uses of the same Palestinian rite. Both use the same Palestinian psalter of twenty *kathismata*—they just distribute the *pensum* differently. Both have, at orthros, stichera with lauds and aposticha, but the hagiopolites omit the stichera on ferias. Further, the Studites do not say little vespers before supper and great vespers after, as in the agrypnia, and there are differences in the use of the Great Doxology at orthros, though Nikon is wrong in claiming that the Studite office doesn't have it at all (I, 22).<sup>74</sup>

This issue of the night office will become a *crux interpretum* for following the trail of later Sabaitic infiltrations into the *typika*, where a taxonomy of the manuscripts is also demanded. A rule of thumb is immediately available: some *typika* open with Easter, others begin with the weekly agrypnia or all-night monastic vigil from Saturday night vespers until Sunday eucharist.<sup>75</sup> In other words, some follow the order of the temporal or mobile cycle of the Constantinopolitan church year, which begins with Easter orthros, whereas others, more purely monastic and less concerned with the liturgical cycles of the cathedral calendar, begin with what is dearest to the monks, the most important and characteristically monastic office of the weekly cycle, the vigil. The books that begin with Easter are Studite *typika*, books representing the Constantinopolitan monastic synthesis. Those that begin with the agrypnia represent a later reworking of this synthesis in the monasteries of the Judean desert between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea, probably in the period following the disruption of hagiopolite liturgy through the destruction of the Cathedral of the Anastasis by Caliph al-Hākīm in 1009. Let us call this the neo-Sabaitic synthesis.

<sup>74</sup> The *Gloria in excelsis* is not mentioned in the Hypotyposis, cf. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, 224–38, but other Studite *typika* have it: see Arranz, *Typicon*, 392.

<sup>75</sup> Arranz, "Les grandes étapes," 64.

#### THE NEO-SABAITIC SYNTHESIS

As Anton Baumstark said, it is of the very nature of liturgy to adapt itself to the circumstances of time and place.<sup>76</sup> So the eleventh-century Palestinian monks did not just adopt the readily available Studite synthesis; they modified it to suit their needs. Their positioning of the agrypnia at the head of the book, in place of the Easter Vigil, which opens the movable cycle of the liturgical year and so is found at the head of Byzantine lectionaries and Studite *typika*, doubtless betrays a conscious attempt at restoration. The agrypnia had probably fallen into disuse during the frequent disruptions of monastic life in Palestine. At any rate this Palestinian vigil, which characterizes the final generation of *typika* as first found in twelfth-century neo-Sabaitic manuscripts (Sinai gr. 1094, 1095, 1096, etc.), represents a return to more austere monastic usage.<sup>77</sup>

#### *The Agrypnia*

According to the *Vita* 32, it was Sabas himself who first instituted at the laura that "there an agrypnia be held, uninterruptedly from evening until morning, in both the churches [of the laura] on Sundays and dominical feasts."<sup>78</sup> And his short testament, come down to us in a twelfth-century manuscript, insists on the duty of all monks to come in from their solitude for the Saturday night agrypnia.<sup>79</sup>

Palestinian monastic life was lavriote, not strictly cenobitic, "monk" was more a job description than a permanent address, and *koinonia* was a precarious business at best. The Saturday night agrypnia was of great importance in this system: as in Lower Egypt, the brotherhood assembled for common synaxes only on the weekend. The hundreds of anchorites who lived in small groups or as solitaires in scattered huts and grottoes came in from the

<sup>76</sup> *Comparative Liturgy* (Westminster, Md., 1958), 18.

<sup>77</sup> For a general history of the agrypnia see the lengthy article by N. D. Uspenskij, "Čin vsenošćnogo bdenija (*Hê agrypnia*) na pravoslavnom vostoce i v Ruskoj Cerkvi," *Bogoslovskie Trudy* 18 (1978), 5–117, 19 (1978), 3–69. The chapters in vol. 18 cover the origins of the neo-Sabaitic agrypnia and its spread to Athos; see also Arranz, "Les grandes étapes," 69; idem, "N. D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil," 174 ff. The term "agrypnia" alone betrays a Palestinian influence; the Constantinopolitan term for vigil was "pannychis": Mateos, *Typicon*, II, 311; Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la 'Pannychis,'" *OCP* 40 (1974), 314–15, 342–43; 41 (1975), 135 ff.

<sup>78</sup> Kyrillos von Skythopolis, *Leben des Sabas*, ed. E. Schwartz, TU 49.2 (Leipzig, 1939), 118.

<sup>79</sup> Codex Sinai 1096, ed. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, 223.

wilderness for the vigil in droves, overflowing the Church of St. Sabas into the courtyard and surrounding chapels (the Armenians had their own) so that the λυτή at which bread was blessed and distributed to sustain the brethren during their all-night watch had to be celebrated in several places.<sup>80</sup> The overriding importance of the vigil in early anchoretic monasticism is confirmed by the fact that in the early monastic sources, visions during monastic prayer almost always take place at the night vigil.<sup>81</sup>

The agrypnia of the Sabaitic monks is described in the account of a visit paid by the Abbots John and Sophronios to the Abbot Nilos of Sinai, a Greek source of the late sixth or early seventh century preserved in the *Hermēneiai* of our intrepid collector Nikon of the Black Mountain.<sup>82</sup> The vigil comprised hagiopolite vespers, followed by the *hexapsalmos*, undoubtedly of orthros, and then the entire psalter, divided into three staseis of fifty psalms each. Each stasis concluded with the Our Father, *Kyrie eleison* fifty times, and a New Testament reading (from the epistles of James, 1–2 Peter, and 1–3 John). After the third stasis came all nine odes of the canon, with the Our Father and *Kyrie* after the third and sixth. The service ended with lauds (*ainoi*), as in schema I.

#### Schema I: THE AGRYPNIA

<i>Hexapsalmos</i>		(Pss 3, 37, 62, 87, 102, 142)
Our Father		
Psalmody	Stasis I	Pss 1–50 Our Father <i>Kyrie eleison</i> 50 times Lesson from James
	Stasis II	Pss 51–100 Our Father <i>Kyrie eleison</i> 50 times Lesson from 1 or 2 Peter
	Stasis III	Pss 101–150

<sup>80</sup> *Vita*, 20, 32, ed. Schwartz, 105, 117; cf. Arranz, "N. D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil," 175–78.

<sup>81</sup> E.g., the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, Rufinus' additions, 23; Cassian, *Institutes*, II, 5–6; *Vita B*, 28, of St. Athanasius the Athonite, ed. Noret, 156–57; *Vita* of St. Stephen the Sabaite, 162–65 (see below, note 82).

<sup>82</sup> A. Longo, "Il testo integrale della *Narrazione degli abati Giovanni e Sofronio* attraverso le *Hermēneiai* di Nicone," *RSBN* 12–13 (1965–66), 233–67. The agrypnia is described in lines 5–30, with further details *passim* throughout. Less detailed description also in the *Vita* of St. Stephen the Sabaite (d. 31 March 794), Greek recension, 162–65, *ActaSS Julii*, III, 3rd ed. (1867), 570–71; Georgian recension, 162–65, esp. 162:8, 163:3, 165:3, ed. G. Garitte, "Un extrait géorgien de la Vie d'Etienne le sabaïte," *Le Muséon* 67 (1954), 83–90. See also Arranz, "N. D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil," 174–78.

Our Father  
*Kyrie eleison* 50 times  
Lesson from 1, 2, or 3 John

Nine Odes of Biblical Canticles, with Our Father  
and *Kyrie eleison* after the 3rd and 6th

The *Ainoi* Pss 148–150

*Gloria in excelsis*

Creed

Our Father

*Kyrie eleison* 300 times

Concluding Prayer

#### The Canon

Henceforth this agrypnia, whose origins and development I need not detail here since they are not part of Athonite liturgical history, will form the centerpiece of Byzantine monastic liturgy, on which further developments of the neo-Sabaite synthesis will depend. For instance, this is why the Byzantine *pensum* of psalmody still begins its weekly cycle with Psalm 1 at Saturday vespers, regardless of the season. It is also why orthros, initially only on Sunday, later every day, acquired the entire canon of nine odes. At first, of course, this canon comprised the *biblical canticles*<sup>83</sup> with refrains or troparia, not the *poetic odes* which later substituted for them. The earliest manuscripts with troparia for biblical canticles are the seventh-century Egyptian papyrus Rylands 466 and the fragment Heidelberg 1362, and by the eighth century the nine odes and their refrains have been systematized.<sup>84</sup>

Although this nine-ode poetic canon is the characteristic centerpiece of present-day Byzantine orthros,<sup>85</sup> it is difficult to imagine that such an enormous quantity of ecclesiastical poetry, covering each day page after page in the oktoechos, triodion, pentekostarion, and menaion, could have been destined for daily matins. In fact, during the earlier period of the Studite hymnographers, *triōdia*, or canons of only three odes, were composed for ferial days, and *tetraōdia* for Saturdays. Mateos, analyzing the Byzantine office documents against the backdrop of the broader tradition, has

<sup>83</sup> See above, note 19, right column. On the later suppression of ode 2 except in Lent, see L. Bernhard, "Der Ausfall der 2. Ode im byzantinischen Neunodenkanon," T. Michels, ed. *Heuresis: Festschrift für A. Rohrer* (Salzburg, 1968), 91–101.

<sup>84</sup> H. Schneider, "Die biblischen Oden seit dem sechsten Jahrhundert," *Biblica* 38 (1949), 261–63.

<sup>85</sup> See Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, 281–83.

concluded that initially the canticles of the canon were distributed throughout the week, two per day, one variable, one fixed (the ninth: *Magnificat-Benedictus* of Luke 1:46–55, 68–79), with three on Sunday because of the cathedral vigil.<sup>86</sup> Ode 1 was reserved for the Sunday cathedral vigil. The rest ran through the week, Monday to Sunday, as below in Schema II, Stratum 1.

The present nine-ode daily canon—except in the season of the triodion which, following Baumstark's famous law, "Das Gesetz der Erhaltung des Alten in liturgisch hochwertiger Zeit,"<sup>87</sup> that is, the law of the liturgical conservatism of high seasons, retains an older structure—is the result of the Sunday agrypnia, keystone of the Sabaitic week. We can see this growth already under way in one of our two Georgian documents of the Studite period, the ninth-century codex Leningrad 11 described by K. S. Kekelidze under its old pressmark Tiflis H 2123.<sup>88</sup> Only the feast of St. Basil on January 1, and Theophany on January 6, have all nine odes at orthros. Lesser feasts have one, two, or three odes, though not in the order of Mateos' reconstruction. Here is a sampling:

Feast	Odes
St. Stephen (Dec. 27)	1, 9
St. Abo (Jan. 7) & octave	8, 9
St. Anthony (Jan. 17)	1
Holy Fathers (Jan. 28)	1

Especially interesting are the Lenten and Holy Week rubrics, which I give complete, in the sequence in which they appear:

6th Sat. Lent	1
7th Mon. Lent	1, 8–9
7th Tues. Lent	2, 8–9
7th Wed. Lent	3, 8–9
7th Thurs. Lent	4, 8–9
Good Fri.	5, 8–9
Holy Sat.	4, 7, 9
Thomas Sun.	1

Though not found in the ordering of Mateos' reconstruction, the odes in this source indicate that he was on the right track: here not only two but three odes, one variable, two fixed, were destined for daily orthros, and all nine for Sunday. For in

<sup>86</sup>"Quelques problèmes de l'orthros," 31–32; "La psalmodie variable," 337–38. On the origins of this "cathedral vigil" and its integration into later eastern offices, see Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, "Sunday resurrection vigil" in the index, 421; for its place in Byzantine Sunday orthros, *ibid.*, Schema 2, 280–81 (right column), and 288–89.

<sup>87</sup>Article with this title, *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 7 (1927), 1–23; Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy*, 27–30.

<sup>88</sup>*Liturgiĕskie gruzinskie pamjatniki*, 350–72.

this second stratum of development, Sunday orthros is integrated into the neo-Sabaitic agrypnia with the entire psalter plus all nine odes, and the original Sunday three-ode system is extended to the rest of the week, beginning with Monday, as in Schema II, Stratum 2.

#### Schema II: DEVELOPMENT OF THE NINE-ODE CANON OF ORTHROS

Day	Stratum 1 (hypothetical)	Stratum 2 (9th c. Leningrad 11)	Present usage
	Odes	Odes	Odes
Sun.	1, 8–9	1–9	1–9
Mon.	2, 9	1, 8–9	1–9
Tues.	3, 9	2, 8–9	1–9
Wed.	4, 9	3, 8–9	1–9
Thurs.	5, 9	4, 8–9	1–9
Fri.	6, 9	5, 8–9	1–9
Sat.	7, 9	6, 8–9	1–9
Monastic agrypnia: 1–9			

Both this second stratum and the origins of the daily nine-ode canon in the agrypnia *pensum* are confirmed by the fact that Psalm 50, traditional invitatory psalm of cathedral matins, which now precedes the entire canon, is found at Easter in the older typika of Stoudios and the Great Laura, and in some other pre-neo-Sabaitic sources, only after the first six odes.<sup>89</sup> This shows that orthros itself had only three odes; the first six were seen as part of the vigil *pensum*.

But why bother with such speculations and hypothetical reconstructions in the first place? Why not just accept this presumed "second" stratum as the original triodion? Because ode 1 is the paschal canticle of Moses, *Cantemus Domino* of Exodus 15:1–20, which, along with ode 8, the *Benedicite* of Daniel 3:57–88, are classic Sunday canticles right across the traditions. So Mateos' hypothesis that originally they could not have been anywhere but Sunday is by no means presumptuous.<sup>90</sup>

At any rate it does seem that the entire nine-ode canon was not meant originally for daily use, and appears daily only in the neo-Sabaitic reform. Its very name betrays its origins in the vigil: when Cyril of Scythopolis' *Vita* of St. Sabas refers to the night canon,<sup>91</sup> or *Vita B*, 71, of Athanasius the Athonite to the "canon of orthros" (τοῦ ὀρθρινού

<sup>89</sup>Mateos, "La psalmodie variable," 338; Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales des matines byzantines," *OCP* 38 (1972), 70 note 1.

<sup>90</sup>"Quelques problèmes de l'orthros," 31–32.

<sup>91</sup>*Vita*, 18, 28, 32, 43, ed. Schwartz, 102:7, 26; 113:9, 16; 117:21; 133:20.

κανόνος),<sup>92</sup> they do not mean “canon” in the present, technical sense of the nine odes, but simply the vigil psalmody *pensum* or, by hendiadys, the vigil *tout court*, as in the Russian adverb *nakanune*.<sup>93</sup>

#### *The Psalter*<sup>94</sup>

Neo-Sabaitic developments are also clearly reflected in the evolution of the *pensum* of psalmody. I have already noted that the Byzantine monastic psalter is divided into twenty *kathismata* of (ideally) nine psalms each, grouped into three *doxai* of (again, ideally) three psalms apiece. This psalter was used in all the Byzantine monastic traditions that I have been discussing—Sabaitic, Studite, neo-Sabaitic—except for that of the *akoimetoï* or “sleepless monks” of the capital. But not all these monastic usages employed the psalter in the same way. The *pensum* of psalmody at Stoudios, Evergetis, and other monasteries of Constantinople before the Fourth Crusade, as well as at the Great Laura of St. Athanasius on Mount Athos, was distributed in a way different from our current, neo-Sabaitic usage. In summer the psalter was spread over three weeks, with only one *kathisma* at nocturns during these short nights. Vespers had a *kathisma* on Saturday. But only in winter, with two *kathismata* at nocturns and one at vespers, was the psalter got through in one week. During Lent the *pensum* was increased to completing the whole psalter twice a week, as today. Since we see this distribution in Southern Italy, which never adopted the neo-Sabaitic reform, it must represent general Studite usage anterior to the neo-Sabaitic revival.

What the neo-Sabaitic reform did was (1) suppress the older, mitigated summer *pensum* by moving the winter weekly psalter into the summer period; and (2) create a new winter system of three *kathismata* at nocturns by adding the former vespéral *kathisma* to the two traditional *kathismata* of nocturns, and chanting *kathisma* 18 at vespers daily, as today. We see the beginnings of this shift already in the typikon of Nikon of the Black Mountain in his *Taktikon*, I, 21, where the summer and Lenten *pensum*, to which he attributes hagiopolite provenance, already have the neo-Sabaitic system, whereas the winter *pensum*, called the usage of

Stoudios and Athos, adds only an extra lection to the summer stichology.

Both here and in the canon, we see the same dynamic at work: the *pensum* is made more burdensome by the simple device of eliminating its lightest phase, shifting into that slot the next lightest burden, and adding a heavier burden in the vacuum created by that shift. Such slight turns of the dial will appear banal or insignificant only to the unschooled eye. Recall what Baumstark once said: “Die Entwicklung der Liturgie nur aus Sonderentwicklungen entsteht”;<sup>95</sup> the evolution of the liturgy is only a series of individual developments, just as a necklace is no more than a string of individual beads.

#### THE NEO-SABAITIC USAGE ON MOUNT ATHOS

For reasons not altogether clear, this new Palestinian monastic liturgy soon becomes popular elsewhere. Early in the twelfth century, by the time of the essentially Studite Typikon of Evergetis,<sup>96</sup> we already see a large infiltration of second-generation Sabaitic material into the monasteries of Constantinople.<sup>97</sup> The authors of several other twelfth-century typika borrow heavily from the Evergetis code, and the Typikon of St. Sabas for the Serbian Monastery of Hilandar on Mount Athos, which dates from ca. 1199, is little more than a Serbian translation of it, as John Thomas has pointed out.<sup>98</sup> Later Athonite typika, from the fifteenth century on, are all of neo-Sabaitic provenance.<sup>99</sup> From Athos the new usage spread everywhere but Southern Italy in the train of Athonite hesychasm.<sup>100</sup>

<sup>95</sup>I recall this from my reading of Baumstark’s work but have been unable to retrace the source.

<sup>96</sup>Ed. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, 256–656. This huge liturgical codex is not in the new edition of G. Gautier, “Le Typicon de la Théotokos Evergétis,” *REB* 40 (1982), 5–101. On this monastery see Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, I, iii, 178–84.

<sup>97</sup>Arranz, “Les prières presbytérales des matines byzantines,” *OCP* 38 (1972), 91 note 1; idem, “N. D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil,” 181–83.

<sup>98</sup>“The Evergetis Monastery at Constantinople as a Center of Ecclesiastical Reform,” Eleventh Annual Byzantine Studies Conference, *Abstracts of Papers* (1985), 18.

<sup>99</sup>Arranz, “Les grandes étapes,” 67; “Les prières sacerdotales des vêpres byzantines,” 123; “Les prières presbytérales des matines byzantines,” *OCP* 38 (1972), 86 note 1; “Les prières presbytérales de la ‘Pannychis,’” *OCP* 40 (1974), 331–32, cf. 342; “L’office de l’Asmatikos Hesperinos,” 113 and note 20. Earlier Athonite typika, as Arranz shows in these references, followed Studite usage. Numerous neo-Sabaitic typika are edited in Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, III. On these documents see also Bertonière, *Easter Vigil*, Part II.

<sup>100</sup>On S. Italy see Arranz, “Les prières presbytérales des matines byzantines,” *OCP* 38 (1972), 91 note 2; *Typicon*, xxvi.

<sup>92</sup>Ed. Noret, 206:38. Cf. also Longo, “Il testo integrale della *Narrazione degli abati Giovanni e Sofronio*,” 232 and 251:10.

<sup>93</sup>On the meaning of “canon” see Leroy, “Les Petites Catéchèses” (above, note 33), 354 note 116, and the references given there.

<sup>94</sup>See Mateos, “La psalmodie variable.”

*Philotheos Kokkinos and the Hesychast Ascendancy*

Except for the Iberian connection, it is only with the hesychast ascendancy in the fourteenth century that Mount Athos will occupy center stage in Byzantine liturgical history. In the history of Byzantine monasticism, Athos represents the victory of hesychasm over the more rigorously cenobitic organization of the Studites.

Modern studies emphasize not only the doctrinal and spiritual aspects of hesychasm. They have also set in relief its impact as an ecclesiastical sociopolitical movement.<sup>101</sup> Vindicated by the synods of 1347 and 1351, which made their doctrine obligatory, the hesychasts saw themselves as winners in a long struggle for hegemony and sought to place their followers in important positions in the Orthodox hierarchy. Hesychast candidates controlled the patriarchal throne of Constantinople throughout the rest of the century. The most celebrated of these was Philotheos Kokkinos (d. 1379), twice patriarch (1353–55, 1364–76), and an intimate friend, disciple, and biographer of Gregory Palamas (1300–1379).<sup>102</sup> Born in Thessaloniki around 1300, Philotheos received his monastic initiation at St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, transferring later to the Great Laura on Mount Athos, where he was hegumen before becoming bishop of Heraclea in 1347. On his second accession to the patriarchal throne Philotheos' pan-Orthodox hesychast policy inaugurated a period of intense relations between the Phanar and the local Orthodox Churches beyond the Greek-speaking world.

*Philotheos' Diataxis tēs Hierodiakonias*

Athos owes to Philotheos its influence not only in the imposition of the neo-Sabaitic typikon throughout Orthodoxy, but also in the canonization of Athonite rubrics for the eucharist and vespers. For it was during his abbacy at the Great Laura that Philotheos composed his Διάταξις τῆς

ἱεροδιακονίας.<sup>103</sup> Though little known today, this ceremonial had a permanent influence on the present ordo of the Byzantine Divine Office. Miguel Arranz, who knows Byzantine office manuscripts better than anyone dead or alive, has grouped the office euchologies into several manuscript families that can be reduced basically to four, which reflect the history that I have been describing:<sup>104</sup>

1. Early (eighth to twelfth century) euchologies like Barberini 336, Leningrad 226, Sevastianov 474, Grottaferrata Gb I, Paris Coislin 213, and the oldest Sinai manuscripts, all of which give the unadulterated cathedral *asmatikē akolouthia* of Constantinople. The zenith of this patriarchal rite of the Great Church is reached in the eleventh/twelfth-century codex Grottaferrata Gb I, only to be brusquely interrupted by the Fourth Crusade and never resumed. From iconoclasm until 1204, the period of the popularization of Sabaitic usages by the Studites, this rite coexists at Constantinople with those in the next two categories. The first sign of these Studite incursions is observable in vespers of the tenth-century euchology Grottaferrata Gb VII (fols. 137–144).
2. Later, Constantinopolitan-type offices, which already betray in the suppression of certain prayers the effects of outside influences. Manuscripts of this type stretch from the tenth to the sixteenth centuries.
3. In the same period we also find Studite euchologies like Patmos 105 that present a full-blown synthesis of Palestinian monastic usages with the Constantinopolitan euchology. No two of these manuscripts are alike. This synthesis is found in several Athonite manuscripts, such as the fourteenth-century Lavra B 7 and Vatopedi 113 before the Philothean reform.
4. In the final, neo-Sabaitic stage, seen in sources from the fourteenth–sixteenth centuries, manuscripts juxtapose the two traditions, giving the Constantinopolitan prayers in one block at the start, but distributing the litanies and ekphrases throughout the rest of the office, which is the unadulterated *akolouthia* of the Palestinian horologion.

It is this neo-Sabaitic usage, the triumph of hesychast spirituality over the urban Studite variety, that will replace all others after the Byzantines re-

<sup>101</sup> A. A. Tachiaos, "Le mouvement hésychaste pendant les dernières décennies du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Klêronomia* 6 (1974), 113–30. For the effects of the hesychast victory and Philotheos' policies in Kievan Rus' and Muscovy, see J. Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1981), chaps. 5–8 and app. 2, esp. chap. 8; also D. Obolensky, "A *philorhomaïos anthropos*: Metropolitan Cyprian of Kiev and All Russia (1375–1406)," *DOP* 32 (1978), 83 ff.

<sup>102</sup> On Philotheos, whose works deserve more attention than they have received, see V. Laurent, "Philothée Kokkinos," *DTC* 12.2, cols. 1498–1509.

<sup>103</sup> Ed. J. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον sive Ritualet Graecorum*, 2nd ed. (Venice, 1730), 1–8 = PG 154, cols. 745–66.

<sup>104</sup> "L'office de l'Asmatikos Hesperinos," 109–16.

turn to Constantinople in the restoration of 1261. It also represents the hagiote solution, codified by Philotheos, and found in most Athonite manuscripts from the fifteenth century on, the sources on which the first, Venetian editions of Byzantine liturgical books were based.<sup>105</sup> This, basically, is the usage still in force today. The fact that there are very few Italo-Greek manuscripts of this type shows that the Athonite Philothean usages for the office, as for the eucharist, reached the Byzantine liturgical hinterlands beyond Greece and Constantinople only gradually. Indeed, in Southern Italy Studite usage held its own until 1587 when the new Typikon of St. Sabas was adopted at St. Savior in Messina by order of the pope.<sup>106</sup> And Slavonic manuscripts reflect these developments with one or two centuries delay.

#### MOUNT ATHOS AND THE BYZANTINE DIVINE LITURGY

##### *Philotheos' Diataxis tēs Theias Leitourgias*

Another, more famous ceremonial from Philotheos' pen while abbot of the Great Lavra is his *Διάταξις τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας*, of which we have numerous extant manuscripts. One of them, Panteleimon 770, edited by P. Trempelas,<sup>107</sup> is practically contemporary with the work's composition, copied before Philotheos became patriarch of Constantinople in 1353, as the title itself informs us: "Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy, in which are also the diakonika, composed by His Holiness my Lord of Heraclea Kyr Philotheos, who was named hegumen in the holy and pious and virtuous monastery of the Laura of Athanasius the Great on Athos, where he composed this."

The definitive history of Byzantine rubrics remains to be written, but from what we know, the early Constantinopolitan-type euchologies, almost totally rubric-free, were little more than a list of

prayers, sometimes numbered.<sup>108</sup> Where they were to be inserted into the course of the service was indicated at most by a rudimentary title. Whatever else the presbyter or bishop was supposed to do during the celebration, and the diakonika of the deacon,<sup>109</sup> were left to oral tradition and praxis. This is why the argument from silence in liturgical manuscripts is worth even less than it is elsewhere.

But by the tenth century we begin to get our first evidence of a codification of rubrics among the Byzantines. In manuscripts from Magna Graecia, rubrical directions begin to be incorporated into the liturgical text itself, along with the text of the diakonika. In Constantinople, however, the old, rubricless euchology text continues to be copied right up until the advent of printing, though with the insertion of diakonika, while the rubrical tradition develops independently, codified in a separate manual, the diataxis. André Jacob has identified the first extant Constantinopolitan diataxis rubrics in the material that Leo Tuscan inserted into his twelfth-century Latin translation of the Chrysostom liturgy.<sup>110</sup>

From that time until Philotheos, I know of six other complete diataxeis, one an archieratikon detailing the eleventh-century ceremonial of the patriarchal rite of the Great Church, which I have edited from the twelfth/thirteenth-century codex British Library Add. 34060;<sup>111</sup> and five others, all of them monastic: Athens Ethn. Bibl. 662 (12th–13th c.);<sup>112</sup> Moscow Synod 275 (381) (A.D. 1289–1311);<sup>113</sup> Vatican gr. 782, fols. 215r–219r; the roll Esphigmenou 34 (A.D. 1306);<sup>114</sup> and a codex in the private library of A. A. Dmitrievskij.<sup>115</sup> The unedited Vatican gr. 782<sup>116</sup> and the Dmitrievskij codex are apparently Palestinian monastic manuscripts; the others, probably from Athos and its environs, are predecessors to that of Philotheos.

One need not look far for the reason behind this new development. From the twelfth century the

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 113 ff; idem, "Les prières presbytérales des matines byzantines," *OCP* 38 (1972), 79–80, 84. On the Venetian editions, see A. Raes, "Les livres liturgiques grecs publiés à Venise," *Mélanges E. Tisserant*, III, ST 233 (Vatican City, 1964), 209–22; N. B. Tomadakis, "Ἡ ἐν Ἱταλίᾳ ἔκδοσις ἑλληνικῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν βιβλίων (κυρίως λειτουργικῶν) γενομένη ἐπιμελεῖα Ἑλλήνων ὀρθοδόξων κληρικῶν κατὰ τοὺς 16–17 αἰῶνας," *Ἑπ. Ἐτ. Βυζ.* Σπ. 37 (1969–70), 3–33, rpr. in *La Chiesa Greca in Italia dall' VIII al XVI secolo*, Atti del Convegno Storico Intereclesiale, II (Bari, 30 aprile–4 maggio 1969), Italia sacra. Studi e documenti di storia ecclesiastica 21 (Padua, 1972), 685–721.

<sup>106</sup> See above, note 100.

<sup>107</sup> P. Trempelas, *Αἱ τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie 15 (Athens, 1912), 1–16.

<sup>108</sup> On this question see Taft, *Great Entrance*, xxxii–xxxiii.

<sup>109</sup> There were also separate diakonika collections (ibid., xxxii note 44).

<sup>110</sup> A. Jacob, "La concélébration de l'anaphore à Byzance d'après le témoignage de Léon Toscan," *OCP* 35 (1969), 249–56, esp. 252–53; cf. Taft, *Great Entrance*, xxxv, 124–27.

<sup>111</sup> R. Taft, "The Pontifical Liturgy of the Great Church according to a Twelfth-Century Diataxis in Codex *British Museum Add. 34060*," *OCP* 45 (1979), 279–307, 46 (1980), 89–124.

<sup>112</sup> Ed. Trempelas, loc. cit. (above, note 107).

<sup>113</sup> Ed. N. F. Krasnosel'cev, *Materialy dlja istorii činoposedovanija Liturgii sv. Ioanna Zlatoustago* (Kazan, 1889), 18–29.

<sup>114</sup> Ed. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, II, 262–69.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., III, 117–21.

<sup>116</sup> Jacob, *Histoire du formulaire*, 439 note 6.

prothesis rite or preparation of the gifts before the Divine Liturgy grows apace,<sup>117</sup> and we have evidence that the proliferation of variant local usages was causing confusion among the lower clergy. Around 1120 an Orthodox parish priest, probably of Crete, wrote to Metropolitan Elias II of Crete, in residence at Constantinople, exposing his scruples about this matter.<sup>118</sup> The attention that monastic diataxeis give to the prothesis shows that they were aimed at putting an end to this anarchy.<sup>119</sup> As hegumen of the Great Laura, Philotheos could not be indifferent to this problem.

But his manual regulating the customs for his community might have remained just one among others were it not for his subsequent advancement. Upon his accession to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople in 1353, his *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* gained great prestige. It spread throughout the Greek Orthodox world, and was translated into Slavonic by Philotheos' contemporary, the Bulgarian hagiorite St. Euthymius of Trnovo, later Bulgarian patriarch from 1375–93.<sup>120</sup> Around

<sup>117</sup> Cf. O. Bârlea, "La proscomidie: L'offrande dans le rite byzantin. Son écho sur la communion," *Societas Academica Dacoromana, Acta philosophica et theologica* 2 (Rome, 1964), 26–28.

<sup>118</sup> V. Laurent, "Le rituel de la proscomidie et le métropolitain de Crète Elie," *REB* 16 (1958), 116–42. On the development of the prothesis the most recent study is G. Descoedres, *Die Pastophorien im syro-byzantinischen Osten: Eine Untersuchung zu architektur- und liturgiegeschichtlichen Problemen*, Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa 16 (Wiesbaden, 1983), 79–126.

<sup>119</sup> The prothesis rite occupies a disproportionately large part of the diataxeis—almost a third in Athens Ethn. Bibl. 662 and Philotheos, for instance: Trempelas, *Hai treis Leitourgiai*, 1–5. Of the twenty-five diataxeis known to me, several deal with the prothesis almost exclusively: Barberini gr. 316 (12th c.); Moscow Synod 321 (428) (14th c.), ed. S. Muretov, *K materialam dlja istorii činoposledovanija liturgii* (Sergeev Posad, 1895), 17–24; Sinai gr. 986 (15th c.), 987 (16th c.), ed. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, II, 602–6, 708–9; Panteleimon 5924 (19th c.), ed. Krasnosel'cev, *Materialy*, 6–16; and the diataxis in an 11th-c. letter of the patriarch of Constantinople to Bishop Paul of Gallipoli, ed. I. Cozza-Luzi, "Excerpta e Typico Casulano," A. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, X.2 (Rome, 1905), 167–71. Some later mss. simply insert a Philothean diataxis of the prothesis before the beginning of the liturgy: Esphigmenou 162 (A.D. 1545), ed. P. Syrku, *K istorii ispravlenija knig v Bolgarii v XVI veke*, Tom I, Vypuski 1–2 (St. Petersburg, 1889–90), I.2: *Teksty*, 149–54; Sinai gr. 986 (15th c.); Istanbul Metochion Panagiu Taphou 425 (16th c.); and Esphigmenou 120 (A.D. 1602), ed. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, II, 602–6, 817–22, 954–58.

<sup>120</sup> Ed. E. Kałużniacki, *Werke des Patriarchen von Bulgarien Euthymius (1375–1393)* (Vienna, 1901), 283–306; and Syrku, *K istorii*, I.2, 1–31. There is another Slavonic version by Kiprian, also a Bulgarian hagiorite and disciple of Philotheos, who ordained him metropolitan of Kiev at Constantinople in 1375. Cf. Syrku, *K istorii*, I.1, 252 ff; I. D. Mansvetov, *Mitropolit Kiprian v ego liturgičeskoj dejatel'nosti: Istoriko-liturgičeskoe izsledovanie* (Moscow, 1882); also in *Pribavlenija k izdaniju tvorenij svjatyh otcev v russkom perevode* 29 (1882), 152–205, 413–95. On the role of these Bulgarian hagiorites in Rus', see Meyendorff, *Byzantium*

1380 Demetrios Gemistos, deacon, notary under Philotheos and later protonotary of the Great Church, used the Philothean rubrics in his archieratikon regulating the ceremonial of the patriarchal rite of Hagia Sophia.<sup>121</sup> Another influence of Philotheos' diataxis on the present form of the Divine Liturgy, especially in monasteries, and among the Russians and Romanians, was the substitution of the typika (Pss 102, 145, and the Beatitudes) for the traditional antiphons,<sup>122</sup> a Palestinian usage first seen in the early Georgian text of the Chrysostom liturgy.<sup>123</sup> This usage was picked up with the introduction of neo-Sabaitic uses into the Studite monasteries of the capital, as witness the Typikon of Evergetis<sup>124</sup> which, as we have seen, had considerable influence on Athos.

The numerous manuscripts of Philotheos' diataxis (Athens Ethn. Bibl. 751, 752, 765, 766, 770, 771, 773, 779, etc.) in both Greek and Slavonic, and the varying redactions they reveal, show, however, that all evolution did not stop with his standardization of the Byzantine rubrics of the mass.<sup>125</sup> Like any living text—the commentary of Germanos is a perfect parallel<sup>126</sup>—the rubrics were adjusted to suit new developments and local peculiarities. In the course of the fifteenth century, though other diataxeis and usages continued to exist in competition with the Philothean handbook,<sup>127</sup> the latter gradually spread its influence throughout the patriarchate of Constantinople, and its rubrics were incorporated into Demetrios Doukas' *editio princeps* of the liturgies in 1526 (Rome).<sup>128</sup> Except

and the *Rise of Russia*, 129 ff, 197 ff, and chaps. 9–10; Obolensky, "A Philorhomaioi anthropos," 78–98; I. Talev, *Some Problems of the Second South Slavic Influence in Russia*, Slavistische Beiträge 67 (Munich, 1973); also studies on Athos and the Slavs in *Le millénaire*, I–II (above, note 1).

<sup>121</sup> Ed. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, II, 301–19; for other editions see Taft, *Great Entrance*, xxxvii–xxxviii.

<sup>122</sup> J. Mateos, *La célébration de la Parole dans la liturgie byzantine: Etude historique*, OCA 191 (Rome, 1971), 68–71.

<sup>123</sup> Jacob, "Une version géorgienne," 90–92, nos. 4, 5, 6.

<sup>124</sup> Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, I, 512, 515, 603, and passim.

<sup>125</sup> Laurent, "Philothée Kokkinos," col. 1507; further mss. in Krasnosel'cev, *Materialy*, 36–78; Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, II, passim; several unedited Sinai codices; etc.

<sup>126</sup> See R. Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie du VII<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, AOC 9 (Paris, 1966), 128–68.

<sup>127</sup> E.g., Vatican gr. 573 (14th–15th c.) and Sabas gr. 305, ed. Krasnosel'cev, *Materialy*, 80–114; Paris gr. 2509 (15th c.), ed. Goar, *Euchologion*, 78–83; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 540 (A.D. 1416); and the mss. cited above, note 119.

<sup>128</sup> On this edition see E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des grecs au XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1885–1906), I, 192–95, no. 76; A. Strittmatter, "Notes on the Byzantine Synapte," *Trad* 10 (1954), 75–76.



for a later reduction in the number of saints commemorated at the prothesis, a reworking of the peculiar Philothean redaction of the litany and prayers of the faithful, and a few other differences, it is these Philothean rubrics that still govern the celebration of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy today.

In general the monastic diataxeis opted for Constantinopolitan monastic usage in regulating the ritual, and local customs die out after this period except in Southern Italy, where the Italo-Greek *editio princeps* of 1601, printed in Rome for the use of Italo-Greek monks, still preserves at the prothesis a local Calabrian rite far simpler than that of Constantinople.<sup>129</sup> But by this time Philotheos' diataxis has spread the latter usage almost everywhere, even to the editions published in Venice from the sixteenth century on.<sup>130</sup>

With the ultimate victory of the Philothean usage, the history of the Greek redaction of the Byzantine liturgical books ceases to be of much interest, and the center of attention shifts to Romania and especially the Slavic lands, as Athonite hesychasm spreads north.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>129</sup> Jacob, *Histoire du formulaire*, 466; E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique . . . au dix-septième siècle*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1894–1903), I, 1–2, no. 1.

<sup>130</sup> See above, note 105.

<sup>131</sup> For the Slavic lands see the references above, note 120; for Romania see A. Scrima, "Les roumains et le Mont Athos," *Le millénaire* (above, note 1), II, 147.

## CONCLUSION

After all that, one can perhaps understand why the accusations of immobility commonly brought against eastern rites provoke only amusement among oriental liturgiologists. Closer to the mark is what Abbot Nicholas Egender has said: ". . . no rite of our Christian Churches has known such dynamism and so many changes as the Byzantine. The Roman Rite through all its history, even after the reform of Vatican II, has remained a rite singularly archaic in its structure and theology. The Byzantine Rite, on the contrary, has undergone multiple influences of place, persons, theological currents."<sup>132</sup>

In this process the liturgy of Mount Athos is derivative and largely unoriginal. In the formation of the Byzantine liturgical tradition, hagiorites were more curators than artists, more consolidators than innovators, not so much creators as borrowers, synthesizers, propagators. Their chief merit was to canonize and popularize the Byzantine monastic hours and eucharist in its (more or less) final form. They did their job well, for its results are still with us today.

Pontifical Oriental Institute

<sup>132</sup> "Introduction" (above, note 23), 88–89.