

# THE RITE OF THE EUCHARISTIC LITURGY IN THE OLDEST RUSSIAN *LEITOURGIKA* (13<sup>TH</sup>-14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURIES)

Michael ZHELTOV

## PRELIMINARY REMARKS

In this article I shall present the main results of my research of the prayers and other euchological elements peculiar to the oldest extant Russian Leitourgika (*Sluzhebnyki*) manuscripts of the 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> centuries. These antedate the Russian liturgical reform of the turn of the 14-15<sup>th</sup> centuries, when new translations of liturgical texts, including the *Diataxis* of Philotheos Kokkinos and corresponding new redactions of the eucharistic formularies, were introduced into Russian worship. One can find the details of this research in a series of my Russian articles: ‘The Rite of the Divine Liturgy in the Oldest (11<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup>-centuries) Slavonic Euchologia’<sup>1</sup> (in this article one can also find a full bibliography on the topic), ‘The Prayers During Clergy Communion in the Old-Russian Leitourgika’,<sup>2</sup> ‘The Priestly Prayers before the Beginning of the Divine Liturgy in the Old-Russian Leitourgika’,<sup>3</sup> and ‘Additional Prayers at the End of the Divine Liturgy According to the Slavonic Leitourgika of the 11-14<sup>th</sup> centuries’.<sup>4</sup> What follows is but a brief résumé of the results I reached in those studies.

There are thirty-two manuscripts of the oldest — I will call them pre-Philothean — Russian redactions of the eucharistic formularies of St Basil (BAS) and St John Chrysostom (CHR).<sup>5</sup> These exclude four

<sup>1</sup> M. Zheltov [М. Желтов], ‘Чин Божественной литургии в древнейших (XI–XIV вв.) славянских Службениках’, *Богословские труды* 41 (2007) 272-359.

<sup>2</sup> *Idem*, ‘Молитвы во время причащения священнослужителей в древнерусских Службениках XIII–XIV в.’, *Древняя Русь: вопросы медиевистики* 35 (2009) 75-92.

<sup>3</sup> *Idem*, ‘Священнические молитвы перед началом литургии в древнерусских Службениках’ (in print).

<sup>4</sup> *Idem*, ‘Дополнительные молитвы славянских Службеников XI–XIV вв. в конце литургии’ (in preparation).

<sup>5</sup> A complete list of them is given in Zheltov, ‘Чин Божественной литургии’ (see n. 1), pp. 281-285. It counts 33 manuscripts, but two of them — *Saint-Petersburg, Russian National Library* O. n. I. 4 and *Baltimore, Walters Art Museum* W. 548, — as Anatoly Turilov has recently pointed out, are in fact just two parts of one and the same codex.

late-14<sup>th</sup>-century witnesses which already contain the *Diataxis* of Philotheos and any later manuscripts (though many of these could still preserve this or that element of the pre-Philothean practice). What one finds in these sources is by no means a pure Constantinopolitan redaction of the liturgies of CHR, BAS and the Presanctified liturgy (PRES). Of course, this classical set of the three liturgies still consists here of the same prayers as everywhere — i. e., the Prothesis prayer, the prayer of the first antiphon, etc. But the oldest Russian Leitourgika also contain many other prayers, which are not to be found in the famous Constantinopolitan Euchologia. One could compare this phenomenon with other ‘peripheral’ redactions of CHR, such as the South Italian ones studied by André Jacob, and, more recently, by Stefano Parenti.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, there are some points of similarity between the South Italian sources and the pre-Philothean Russian Leitourgika, but there are also many differences.

#### ALTERNATIVE PRAYERS OF SOUTH ITALIAN CHR IN THE OLD-RUSSIAN BAS

As Jacob has shown, the most characteristic of the ancient South Italian redactions of CHR is the set of three prayers of Oriental provenance which are used instead of normal Constantinopolitan prayers of, respectively: the Prothesis, the Trisagion and the Little Entrance.<sup>7</sup> Besides these prayers, one often finds in the South Italian manuscripts of CHR other alternative prayers, namely: of incense, of the *skeuophylakion* (at the end of the liturgy), of the Great Entrance, of the Elevation, — as well as many festal *opisthambonoi* prayers and additional prayers during clergy communion.

According to Jacob, in the oldest stage of development of manuscript formularies of CHR and BAS, it was BAS that was always written first and in full. CHR was written after BAS and in the earliest manuscripts was not a complete, but an abbreviated, formulary; it contained only

<sup>6</sup> See a survey of studies on the history of manuscript tradition of CHR and BAS, which includes the works of the two mentioned as well as other scholars (Alexey Dmitrievsky, Sergey Muretov, Juan Mateos, Robert Taft, to name but a few), in: Zheltov, ‘Чин Божественной литургии’ (see n. 1), pp. 347-359.

<sup>7</sup> A. Jacob, ‘La tradition manuscrite de la liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome (VIII<sup>e</sup>-XII<sup>e</sup> siècles)’, in *Eucharisties d’Orient et d’Occident (Conférences Saint-Serge: 1<sup>er</sup> Semaine liturgique de l’Institut Saint-Serge)*, vol. 2, Lex Orandi 46 (Paris, 1970), pp. 109-138. This article is a brief résumé of his unpublished and invaluable doctoral dissertation, defended in 1968.

those prayers that were peculiar to CHR. In Constantinople they just filled the lacunae in CHR with the corresponding prayers from BAS, but in South Italy they eventually filled the lacunae in CHR with some prayers taken from the Oriental liturgies of St Mark (MK) and St James (JAS). I have already mentioned that there were several such prayers, but the most prominent feature of the ancient South Italian redactions was the use of three Oriental prayers instead of the Constantinopolitan prayers of the Prothesis, the Trisagion and the Little Entrance in the rite of CHR.

These three prayers are presented in the pre-Philothean Russian Sluzhebnyki as well, but here they do not form a three-prayer set, belonging to CHR. Instead, two of these three prayers (those of the Prothesis and of the Trisagion) belong to BAS, not CHR. In BAS they form a four-prayer set, which also includes particular incense and *opisthambonos* prayers. So there is some resemblance between South Italian and Old-Russian traditions, but they are not identical.

I will give the Slavonic texts of these four prayers in full, providing the corresponding Greek texts and some comments. One should keep in mind that in the oldest Slavonic Leitourgika the texts are even less stable than in the Greek Euchologia. I will cite these and the other prayers according to the Leitourgikon *Jaroslavl' Museum* 15472, ca. 1328-1336 AD, which has never been published.

## 1. Alternative Prayers of Old-Russian BAS

### 1.1. Incense Prayer

ВЛАДКО ГН БѢ НАШЬ ·  
 ПРННМЪТИН АВЕЛЕВЪТИ ДАРЪТИ  
 · Н АРОНОВЪТИ Н НОЕВЪТИ ·  
 АВРАМОВЪТИ Н САМОНЛЕВЪТИ ·  
 Н ЗАХАРЬНИИ · Н ВСѢХЪ  
 СТЪИХЪ ТВОИХЪ · ТАКО Н  
 Ѡ РҮКЪ НАШНХЪ ПРННМН  
 КАДНЛО СНК ВЪ ВОИЮ  
 БЛГООУХАНЬА · Н ВЪ  
 Ѡ ДАНЬК ГРѢХОВЪ  
 НАШНХЪ · Н ВСѢХЪ  
 ЛЮДНН ТВОИХЪ · ЯКО  
 БЛГБНСА Н ПРОСЛАВНСА ·  
 ПРЕУТЪНОК Н БѢ ·

*The original Greek text (= one of incense prayers of JAS, MK and 11<sup>th</sup>-century Arabic version of CHR):*  
 Ὁ Θεός, ὁ προσδεξάμενος Ἄβελ τὰ δῶρα, Νῶε καὶ Ἀβραὰμ τὴν θυσίαν, Ἰσακ καὶ Ζαχαρίου τὸ θυμίαμα, πρόσδεξι καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς ἡμῶν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν τὸ θυμίαμα τοῦτο εἰς ὄσμην εὐωδίας καὶ ἄφεςιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ Σου· ὅτι εὐλογημένος ὑπάρχεις καὶ πρέπει Σοι ἡ δόξα τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. Ἀμήν.

## 1.2. Prothesis Prayer

Г̃Н̃ І̃С̃Е̃ Х̃Е̃ Х̃Л̃Ѣ̃Б̃Е̃ Ж̃И̃В̃О̃Т̃Н̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃  
 · П̃Р̃Е̃Л̃О̃Ж̃И̃В̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃ В̃Ъ̃ П̃Р̃С̃Т̃О̃К̃Е̃  
 С̃В̃О̃К̃Е̃ Т̃Ѣ̃Л̃О̃ Х̃Л̃Ѣ̃Б̃Ъ̃ · Н̃  
 П̃Р̃Е̃У̃Т̃В̃Ю̃ С̃В̃О̃Ю̃ К̃Р̃О̃В̃Ь̃ В̃Ъ̃  
 В̃Н̃И̃О̃ · З̃А̃ М̃Н̃Р̃Ь̃С̃К̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃  
 Ж̃И̃В̃О̃Т̃Ъ̃ · В̃Н̃И̃О̃Г̃Р̃А̃Д̃Е̃  
 С̃В̃Ѣ̃Т̃Е̃ Н̃С̃Т̃Н̃Н̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃ ·  
 П̃Р̃И̃З̃Р̃И̃ Н̃А̃ Д̃А̃Р̃Ъ̃ С̃Н̃А̃ ·  
 П̃Р̃И̃Н̃И̃М̃ В̃Ъ̃ Н̃Е̃Б̃С̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃ С̃В̃О̃Н̃  
 Ш̃А̃Т̃А̃Р̃Ь̃ В̃Ъ̃ В̃О̃Н̃Ю̃  
 Б̃Л̃Г̃О̃У̃Х̃А̃Н̃Ъ̃А̃ · П̃О̃М̃А̃Н̃И̃  
 У̃Л̃Ѣ̃К̃О̃Л̃Ю̃Б̃Ь̃У̃Е̃ П̃Р̃И̃Н̃Е̃С̃Ъ̃-  
 Ш̃А̃А̃ · Н̃ З̃А̃ Н̃А̃Ж̃Е̃ С̃У̃Т̃Ь̃  
 П̃Р̃И̃Н̃Е̃С̃Л̃И̃ · Н̃ Н̃А̃С̃Ъ̃  
 Н̃Е̃Ш̃С̃У̃Ж̃Е̃Н̃Ъ̃И̃ С̃Ъ̃Х̃Р̃А̃Н̃И̃ ·  
 Я̃К̃О̃ Ш̃С̃Т̃Н̃С̃А̃ Н̃  
 П̃Р̃О̃С̃Л̃А̃В̃Н̃С̃А̃ · П̃Р̃Е̃У̃Т̃Н̃О̃К̃Е̃  
 Н̃М̃А̃ Т̃В̃О̃К̃Е̃ С̃О̃ Ш̃Ц̃М̃Ь̃ Н̃  
 С̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃М̃Ь̃ Д̃Х̃О̃М̃Ь̃ Н̃ Н̃Ъ̃І̃<sup>П̃</sup> ❖

*The original Greek text (= Prothesis prayer in various Egyptian liturgies and in South Italian redactions of CHR. NB: known Greek redactions of the prayer differ substantially from the Old-Russian one; Coptic and Ethiopian redactions are noticeably closer):* Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, <Bohairic version of the same prayer: ΝΕΟΚ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΙΩΙΚ ΕΤΟΝ>, ὁ προθεῖς ἑαυτὸν ἄμνον ἄμωμον ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, ἔφιδε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιήσον αὐτὸ ἄχραντόν σου σῶμα καὶ τίμιόν σου αἷμα, εἰς μετάληψιν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων. "Οτι ἡγιασται καὶ δεδόξασθαι τὸ πάντιμον καὶ μεγαλοπρεπές·

## 1.3. Trisagion Prayer

С̃Т̃Е̃ С̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃Х̃Ъ̃ Б̃Е̃ Н̃А̃Ш̃Ь̃ ·  
 К̃Е̃Д̃Н̃И̃Ъ̃ С̃Т̃Ъ̃ Н̃А̃ С̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃Х̃Ъ̃  
 П̃О̃У̃Н̃Б̃А̃А̃ · С̃Т̃Ъ̃ К̃Е̃Н̃ Н̃Ж̃Е̃  
 Н̃Е̃Н̃З̃М̃Ѣ̃Р̃Н̃Ю̃ С̃Л̃А̃В̃У̃ С̃Е̃Б̃Ѣ̃  
 С̃Т̃А̃Ж̃А̃В̃Ъ̃ · С̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃ Б̃Е̃ Н̃Ж̃Е̃  
 С̃Л̃О̃В̃О̃М̃Ь̃ В̃С̃А̃У̃Ь̃С̃К̃А̃А̃  
 С̃Ъ̃С̃Т̃А̃В̃Н̃Е̃В̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃ · С̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃ Б̃Е̃  
 К̃Ю̃Г̃О̃Ж̃Е̃ У̃Е̃Т̃В̃Е̃Р̃О̃З̃Р̃А̃У̃Н̃И̃Н̃  
 Ж̃И̃В̃О̃Т̃И̃ Н̃Е̃П̃Р̃Е̃С̃Т̃А̃Н̃Ь̃Н̃О̃М̃Ь̃  
 Г̃Л̃А̃М̃Ь̃ С̃Л̃А̃В̃А̃Т̃Ъ̃ · С̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃ Б̃Е̃  
 Н̃Ж̃Е̃ Ш̃ М̃Н̃О̃Ж̃Ь̃С̃Т̃В̃А̃  
 С̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃Х̃Ъ̃ А̃Н̃Г̃Л̃Ъ̃  
 Н̃Е̃В̃И̃Д̃Ѣ̃Н̃Ь̃К̃М̃Ь̃ ·  
 Т̃Р̃Е̃П̃Е̃Щ̃Ю̃Щ̃И̃М̃Ъ̃ ·  
 П̃О̃К̃Л̃А̃Н̃А̃К̃М̃Ъ̃ Н̃  
 С̃Л̃О̃В̃О̃С̃Л̃О̃В̃И̃М̃Ъ̃ · С̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃ Б̃Е̃  
 Н̃Ж̃Е̃ М̃Н̃О̃Г̃О̃У̃Н̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃М̃И̃Н̃  
 Х̃Е̃Р̃О̃В̃И̃М̃Ъ̃И̃ Н̃Е̃М̃О̃Л̃У̃Ь̃Н̃Ъ̃И̃М̃И̃Н̃  
 Г̃Л̃А̃С̃Ъ̃И̃ · Н̃Е̃О̃У̃С̃Ъ̃И̃П̃А̃Ю̃Щ̃И̃М̃Ь̃  
 Ш̃К̃О̃М̃Ь̃ · П̃Р̃И̃К̃Л̃А̃Н̃А̃А̃ О̃У̃Х̃О̃ С̃В̃О̃К̃Е̃ ·  
 С̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃Н̃ Б̃Е̃ Н̃А̃  
 Ш̃Е̃С̃Т̃О̃К̃Р̃И̃Л̃А̃Т̃Ъ̃И̃Х̃Ъ̃  
 С̃Ѣ̃Р̃А̃Ф̃Н̃М̃Ѣ̃Х̃Ъ̃ С̃Ѣ̃Д̃А̃Н̃ · Н̃  
 О̃У̃Д̃А̃Р̃А̃Ю̃Щ̃Е̃

*The original Greek text (= prayer from the rite of sanctification of the Nile waters and a substitute Trisagion prayer in South Italian redactions of CHR):* "Ἄγιε ἁγίων ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν· ὁ μόνος ἅγιος καὶ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαύομενος· ἅγιος ὑπάρχεις· ὁ τὴν ἀνυπέρβλητον δόξαν ἐν αὐτῷ κεκτημένος· ἅγιος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ λόγος τὰ πάντα συστησάμενος· ἅγιος ὁ Θεὸς ὃν τὰ τετράμορφα ζῶα ἀκαταπαύστῳ φωνῇ δοξάζουσιν· ἅγιος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ὑπὸ πλήθους ἁγίων ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων ἄορασία τρεμόντων προσκυνούμενος καὶ δοξολογούμενος· ἅγιος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τοῖς πολυόμμασιν χερουβείμ τῆ ἀσιγήτῳ φωνῇ τῷ ἀκοιμήτῳ ὄμματι ἐπιβλέπων καὶ ἐπικλίνων τὸ οὖς σου· ἅγιος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τοῖς ἐξαπτερύγοις σεραφεῖμ ἐποχούμενος καὶ κροτούντων τὰς



ЦРКВАМЪ ТВОИМЪ Н  
 СЩЕ<sup>П</sup>НИКОМЪ · Н  
 БЛГОВЪРНЫМЪ КНАЗЕМЪ  
 НАШНМЪ · НМ<sup>А</sup> · БОЖМЪ ·  
 Н ВСЪМЪ ЛЮДЕМЪ  
 ТВОИМЪ · ТЪИ БО ЖСН  
 НСТНННЪИН БЪ НА ·  
 ЖНЕОТЪ ВЪУНЪИН · ТΕΒε  
 СЛАВУ ВЪИЛАКМЪ У<sup>П</sup>Ю ∴

παρρησίαν τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ φοβεροῦ  
 βήματος σου· <here comes an  
 insertion — a piece of the standard  
 oristhambonos prayer: Εἰρήνην τῷ  
 κόσμῳ σου δώρησαι, ταῖς  
 ἐκκλησίαις σου, τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, τοῖς  
 βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν, τῷ στρατῷ καὶ  
 παντὶ τῷ λαῷ σου.> Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ  
 ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ζωὴ  
 αἰώνιος· καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν  
 ἀναπέμπομεν·

Unlike the prayers of the Prothesis and the Trisagion, the prayer of the Little Entrance from the South Italian CHR is not used in the Old-Russian Leitourgika as an alternative prayer of BAS. Instead, it could be included either in CHR or BAS. And it does not function as an alternative, but as an additional prayer, i. e., it does not replace the corresponding Constantinopolitan prayer (as the four alternative prayers of BAS do), but is inserted into the formulary elsewhere and forms a completely new unit. Some manuscripts use this Little Entrance prayer at the beginning of the liturgy (in this case it is entitled, **ЗА ВХОДАЩАЯ ВЪ ЦЪРКВЬ** — '[A Prayer] for Those Entering the Church'); others attach it to the Great Entrance, but never use it to replace another prayer. It is, however, not characteristic of pre-Philothean Russian eucharistic practice; it is written in the manuscripts quite rarely, while the four prayers cited above are very common in the Old-Russian BAS.

Besides the four-prayer BAS set, in the pre-Philothean Russian Sluzhebnyki there is only one prayer that could be used as an alternative one. It is the alternate prayer during the Great Entrance. It is a variant redaction of the Great Entrance prayer of JAS and is sometimes found in the South Italian manuscripts in the same function. Among the pre-Philothean Russian Leitourgika it is found in just two manuscripts, i.e. it is very rare.

#### ADDITIONAL PRAYERS OF THE OLD-RUSSIAN EUCHARISTIC FORMULARIES

But alternative prayers of BAS are by no means the most conspicuous feature of the pre-Philothean Russian Leitourgika. These manuscripts are overloaded with many additional prayers, inserted here or there and forming absolutely new yet stable units in the eucharistic formulary.

This is unparalleled in the South Italian witnesses. It should be noted that Greek originals of many of these additional prayers are unknown. These additional prayers of the pre-Philothean Russian Leitourgika are found in four places of the formulary:<sup>8</sup>

- before the liturgy [always];
- during the Great Entrance [sometimes];
- during clergy communion [always];
- at the end of the liturgy [nearly always].

There are also some festal *opisthambonoi* prayers (used indiscriminately in both CHR and BAS<sup>9</sup>), a couple of prayers intended for an episcopal liturgy (peculiarities of the episcopal rite are described in two of the extant pre-Philothean Russian Sluzhebnyki), and a few prayers found in unique manuscripts only (either at the same positions as listed, or during the prothesis, or before the gospel reading<sup>10</sup>). Some of the additional prayers before and at the end of the liturgy, and during clergy communion are widespread, others are not. In general, contents of the Russian pre-Philothean Leitourgika are extremely variable. To a person accustomed to the standard printed editions of liturgical books this could even look like some sort of chaos. Nevertheless, there clearly are some patterns here.

Before discussing these patterns I should say a few words about the role of BAS in the Russian pre-Philothean Leitourgika. Here BAS is already a secondary formulary. Although in two manuscripts BAS comes first,<sup>11</sup> even here its secondary role is clear. In both manuscripts CHR is more complete than BAS, and instead of filling the lacunae in BAS the scribes just refer the reader to the formulary of CHR. One is tempted to

<sup>8</sup> One could note how astonishingly this confirms the idea of Robert Taft concerning the so-called ‘soft points’ of the Byzantine Eucharist: R. Taft, ‘How Liturgies Grow: The Evolution of the Byzantine “Divine Liturgy”’, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 43 (1977) 8-30.

<sup>9</sup> While the alternative *opisthambonos* prayer of BAS cited above is a fixed element of the formulary of BAS.

<sup>10</sup> Except the unique witness of *Moscow, State Historical Museum, Synodal Collection 598 (datirovka)*, pre-Philothean Russian Leitourgika do not contain a prayer before the gospel reading — as do not the Greek Euchologia prior to the turn of the 14-15<sup>th</sup> centuries. See J. Mateos, *La Célébration de la Parole dans la liturgie byzantine*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 191 (Rome, 1971), pp. 139-140.

<sup>11</sup> Namely, *Moscow, State Historical Museum, Synodal Collection 604* and *Saint-Petersburg, Russian National Library, Solovetskoje collection 1017/1126*. Both belong to the 13<sup>th</sup> century.

state that the secondary role of BAS hints that the Slavonic translation dates from the 11<sup>th</sup> century and not earlier, but that would not be correct: in the famous Glagolitic Sinai Leitourgikon,<sup>12</sup> — despite Nachtigal and others — BAS also comes after CHR,<sup>13</sup> and this witness contains a 10<sup>th</sup>-century Slavonic text. Rather, the secondary role of BAS means that the Slavonic translation of eucharistic formularies was of monastic origin: the monks could have already made CHR to be the first formulary in a translated text without touching their Greek models.<sup>14</sup> In the Old-Russian Leitourgika BAS often forms a block not with CHR, but with PRES. More precisely, besides the manuscripts containing the combination CHR+BAS+PRES, there are many which consist only of CHR, or only of BAS+PRES, and in a few CHR is separated from BAS+PRES by a number of non-eucharistic rites.

The secondary role of BAS resulted in abbreviating its written text. Sometimes it was copied in full, with all the standard prayers plus the additional ones, but more often the scribe provided only those prayers which differ from CHR, including the block of four alternative prayers described above, sometimes also abbreviated. Therefore I conclude that the absence of this or that additional prayer from an Old-Russian manuscript of BAS without CHR does not prove that this or that prayer was not in use. Moreover, many manuscripts are fragmentary, and their lacunae do not allow one to conclude that an additional prayer has or has not been present at the corresponding place of the formulary. Taking these two facts into account, I have noticed that while some non-standard additional prayers are found in the manuscripts inconsistently, others are found virtually everywhere.<sup>15</sup> While the

<sup>12</sup> I. e., a few Glagolitic folia from Sinai now kept at Saint-Petersburg (*Russian National Library, Glagolitic 2 and Library of the Academy of Sciences* 24. 4. 8). The handwriting is of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, but the philologists consider the manuscript's contents to be of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. The question of identity of the Sinai Glagolitic Leitourgikon with the Sinai Glagolitic Euchologion is an open one, but scholars often take them to be the parts of one manuscript.

<sup>13</sup> See T. Afanasyeva [Т. Афанасьева], 'К вопросу о порядке следования листов и составе Синайского глаголического Служебника XI в.', *Palaebulgarica* 29: 3 (2005) 17-35.

<sup>14</sup> Concerning the probable reasons of giving CHR prevalence before BAS, see S. Parenti, 'La "vittoria" nella Chiesa di Costantinopoli della Liturgia di Crisostomo sulla Liturgia di Basilio', in *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years After Anton Baumstark: Acts of the International Congress*, eds. R. F. Taft and G. Winkler, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 265 (Rome, 2001), pp. 907-928; S. Alexopoulos, 'The Influence of Iconoclasm on Liturgy: A Case Study', in *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighboring Christian East*, ed. R. R. Ervine, *AVANT Series* 3 (New York, 2006), pp. 127-137.

<sup>15</sup> 'Virtually' here means that either a prayer is present, or there is a lacuna at its place, or what do we have is BAS, which is often abbreviated.

prayers found virtually everywhere should belong to the original core of the pre-Philothean Russian redaction of the eucharistic formularies, the others could have been added later, or were omitted from this core at an early date.<sup>16</sup>

## 2. Additional Prayers of the Old Russian CHR and BAS

### 2.1. Priestly Prayers before the Liturgy

Among the priestly prayers before the liturgy presented in the pre-Philothean Russian Leitourgika, two belong to the original core (there are three more, two of which could be also used in the context of the Great Entrance). Greek originals of both are unknown, here are the texts of them:

#### 2.1.a

Влѣко г҃н вседержителю · не хота съмрти грѣшникомъ · но шеращенькѣ давъши ны · и показа намъ путь новъ и стѣ · шеразъ показа показанью древнимъ блудникомъ · древнимъ разбонникомъ · древнимъ мытонмъцемъ · подавъ блудницѣ источникъ слезъ · тѣмже влѣко и мене съподобен · не помнана монахъ бещисленыхъ соблазнь · но мнмоведа моя прегрѣшенья · едннъ бо еси безъгрѣшенъ · млардъ и премлѣтнвъ · кааса ш зълобахъ улѣуьскыхъ приѣмла поклонанькѣ ѿ всеа тварн хвалнмъи непрестанно · неимн слами страшенъ сы херовномомъ и шерафномомъ · и ѿ твхъ служеву неизреченну приѣмла · и пакы на земли собою шцю жертву взнесъ заколенкѣ приимши яко агна незлобно · и свою кровью шщъ всь мнръ · и повелѣвъ намъ недостонимъ · твоа ѿ твоихъ тебѣ приносити · ты и нынѣ влѣко · презра моя прегрѣшенья раздвнгни оуста моя · исполни я твоего хваленья · сердце ѹто созижди во мнѣ · и дхъ

<sup>16</sup> As a comparison with the South Slavonic sources shows, actually they should be later additions.

ПРАВЪ ШЕВОВИ ВО ОУТРОБѢ МОИИ · Н ПРИИМИ МА  
 ДЕРЗАЮЩА ВХОДИТИ ВЪ СТѢНЦЕ ТВОЕ · Н ВОЗНЕСИ  
 ТЕБѢ ТВОЯ  $\bar{W}$  ТВОИХЪ · ЯКОЖЕ ПРЕДАЛЪ ЕСИ СТѢМЪ  
 ТВОИМЪ ОУНИКЪМЪ · Н МЫ  $\bar{W}$  ТѢХЪ ПРИИМЪШЕ ·  
 ТАКИЕ ТВОИ ШЕЩНИЦИ БЫВАЕМЪ · НЕ ПО НАШЕМУ  
 НЕДОСТОИИСТВУ · НО ТВОЕГО РАДИ МЛРДЫА ·  
 ШМЫИ ВЛКО ГНУСЪ  $\bar{W}$  ДУША МОИА · Н ВСЕГО МА  
 ШТНИУДЪ ШТИ · СИЛОЮ ТВОЮ НЕВИДИМОЮ · Н  
 ДХВНОЮ ДЕСНИЦЮ ТВОЮ · НЪ БО ВЕЩИ ОУТАИШИСА  
 $\bar{W}$  ТЕБЕ НО ВСА ШЕНАЖЕНА ЯКЪ НАГА · ПРЕДО  
 ШУИМА ТВОИМА СУТЬ · ВЪДЪ ЖЕ ВЛКО ЯКО  
 НЕСДЕЛАННЫХЪ МОИХЪ ЗРИТА ШУИ ТВОИ · Н ВЪ  
 КНИГАХЪ ВСА НАПИСАЮТСА · ТЕМЪЖЕ НЕ ШМЕРЗИ  
 МОЕГО НЕДОСТОИИСТВА · НИ ЛИЦА ТВОЕГО  $\bar{W}$  ВРАТИ  
 $\bar{W}$  МЕНЕ · ДА НЕ ВРАЩЮСА СМЪРЕНШИ ПОСАМЪЛЕНЪ  
 · Н СТУДЕНЪ  $\bar{W}$  ТЕБЕ · НО СПОДОБИ МА ПОРАБОТАТИ  
 СТѢМЪ ТВОИМЪ ТАКИМЪ · ЯКО ПОДОБАЕТЪ ТИ  
 ВСАКА СЛАВА УТЬ Н ПОКЛОНЕНИЕ ·

## 2.1.b

ВЛКО ГИ БѢ НАШЪ · ИЗИЕ ХОТАЩА ПРИСТУПИТИ  
 · КЪ ЧЮДНЫИ СЕИ Н СТРАШНЫИ ТАКИЕ · СТРАХОМЪ  
 ШДЕРЖИМЪ · НЕ СМЪЮ НА НЕБО ШУЮ ВЪЗВЕСИТИ · НИ  
 РЪ ВЪЗДЕТИ НА ВЫСОТУ БИЮ · НИ ОУСТИУ  $\bar{W}$  ВЕРСТИ  
 НА МЛТВУ · НИ ВНИТИ В ДОМЪ БИИ · БО НИ  
 КДИИ ТОЛИКО НЕРЪ · КДИНОЮ ЛЪТА ВХОЖАШЕ  
 СЛУЖБУ ТВОРИТЬ · КМУЖЕ БЫХЪ Н АЗЪ ХОТЕЛЪ  
 ОУПОДОБИТИСА · НО НЕ СЪМЪЮ ПРИБЛИЖИТИ · КЪ  
 СТВЪИ СЕИ Н СТРАШНЫИ ТРАПЕЗЪ · НА НЕЖЕ ХОЩЕТЪ  
 ВЪЗЛЕЩИ · КДИНОУАДЪИИ СЪ БИИ · ГЪ ИСЪ ХЪ · Н  
 РАЗДРОБИТИСА НА ОУДЪИ · ПОДАИАСА ВЪРНИМЪ НА  
 ШСТАВЛЕНЬКЕ ГРЕХОВЪ · Н НА ЖИЗНЬ ВЪУИЮ · НО СЕГО  
 РАДИ ДЕРЗАЮ · НА СНО СЛУЖБУ · ПОНЕЖЕ ТЫ ПРИА  
 ВЛКО БЛУДНАГО СНА ПОКАИВШАСА · ПОНЕЖЕ ПРИА  
 БЛУДНИЦЮ РАСКАИВШЮСА · Н СЛЕЗАМИ ШМЫИШИ  
 СКВЕРНЫ СВОЮ · ПОНЕЖЕ ПРИАТЪ РАЗБОИИИКА ВОПИЮЩА  
 · ПОМАИИ МА ГИ ВЪ ЦРТВИИ ТВОИМЪ · Н ТЫ НЕ  
 ПОНОСИ КМУ ВСЕ СЕБЛАЗЪНЪ · НО ВВЕДЕ И В РАИ ·  
 ДА ТЕМЪЖЕ МЛРДЪИИ Н НАМЪ ПОДАИ ЖЕ СВОЮ МЛТЬ  
 · Н ПРИИМИ ИЗИЕ ХОТАЩАА ПРИЧАСТИТИСА СТВЪИ  
 ТВОИИ ЖЕРТВЪ · ИИ МОЛЮ ТА ВЛКО ШУТИ ПРЕЖЕ

СМЪІСЛЪ МОН · Н ѠМЪІН ГНУСЪ Ѡ ДША МОКІА · Н  
СКВЕРЬНУ Ѡ ПЛОТН МОКІА · Н ВСЕГО МА СЪПРОСЛАВН  
· Н СПРОСТА ШСТН СІЛОЮ ТВОЮ · ДА БЕЗЪ ШСУЖЕНЬА  
ТВОЮГО ПРЕДЪСТАВЪ · ПРЕДЪ ЛНЦЕМЪ СЛАВЫ ТВОІА  
· НЕГЛН ДОСТОИИЪ БУДУ ШКРНЕНЬА · КДННОУАДАГО  
СНА ТВОЮГО БА НАШЕГО · КМУЖЕ КСТЬ СЛАВА СЪ  
ШЦМ Н СЪ ПРСТЪІМЪ БЛГНМ ·

Additional prayers before or after the Great Entrance do not belong to the original core of the pre-Philothean Russian eucharistic formularies.<sup>17</sup>

## 2.2. Additional Prayers During Clergy Communion

Among the additional prayers during clergy communion (twelve such prayers are witnessed) there are four which belong to the original core. Greek originals of three of them are not established, and I have discovered the original of the fourth one among the prayers of JAS. Here are their texts:

### 2.2.a

ДАН ЖЕ НАМЪ ГН ІСѢ ХѢ БѢ · НЗБАВНТЕЛЪ РОДА  
УЛБУА · СТОН ТѢЛО Н КРОВЬ · НЕ ВЪ СУДЪ НН ВО  
ШСУЖЕНЬК · НО ВО ШПУЩЕНЬК ДШН МОКН · НДЕЖЕ  
САМЪ ЖНЕШН · Н ЦРТВУКШН СО ШЦМЪ Н СТМЪ ДХМЪ  
Н НЫНА Н ПРН ·

### 2.2.b

БУДН МНЪ ГН ВО ѠДАНЬК ГРѢХОВЪ · НДЕЖЕ СТІА  
Н ПРУТА ВОШЛА СУТЬ СЦНЬА · ТУ НН КДННЪ ЖЕ  
ГРѢХЪ НЕ ШСТАНЕТЬ · МЛРДЬА РАДН БѢ · Н  
КДННОУАДАГО СНА ТВОЮГО ГА НАШЕГО ІСА ХА · СЪ  
ННМЖЕ БЛГВНЪ КСН · СЪ ПРСТМЪ Н БЛГНМЪ ·

<sup>17</sup> In the Russian 13-14<sup>th</sup>-century Leitourgika one can count four such prayers. They form two stable pairs. The first one could also be placed among the priestly prayers before the beginning of the liturgy, and includes a prayer which in the Greek sources is known as an alternative Little Entrance prayer, and a prayer without a known Greek original. The second one consists of a prayer from JAS (where it could be used in various ways) and a prayer from the rite of 'reconciliation of the warring'.

## 2.2.c

ТѢЛО Н КРОВЬ ЮЖЕ ПРНѦХЪ ВЛѦКО · ДАН ЖЕ ДА НѢ  
 БУДЕТЬ ВЪ ГРѢХЪ НН ВО УСУЖЕНЬКЕ НО НА ПОТРЕБЛЕНЬКЕ  
 ГРѢХОВЪ · Н НА УУНЩЕНЬКЕ ДШН Н ТѢЛУ · ЯКО  
 ТВОѦ ДЕРЖАВА Н ТВОКЕ ЦРѢТЕНКЕ · Н СНА Н СЛАВА  
 УЦѦ :

## 2.2.d

ВЪ МНОЖЬСТВЕ ГРѢХОВЪ  
 ΜΟΝΧЪ · ΝΕ ΞΒΒΡЪΖΗ ΜΕΝΕ  
 ВЛѦКО БѢ ΜΟΙ · ΝΖІНА ВО  
 ПРНХОЖЮ КЪ УЮДЕСНОУМОУ  
 Н ΝΕСНОМОУ ΤΑΝΝΣΤΕУ  
 ΝΕ ЯКОЖЕ ДОСТОННЪ СЪІ ·  
 ΝΟ НА ТВОЮ ВЪЗНРАѦ  
 ВЕЛНКОУЮ БЛГѢСТЬ СНО ·  
 ПРОСТЪРЪ ГЛАСЪ СВОИ ·  
 ΝΕСМЪ ДОСТОННЪ  
 ВЪЗЪРѢТН НА ПОДОБНОУЮ  
 Н ДХОВЬНОУЮ СНО  
 ΤΡΑΠΕΖΟΥ · НА ΝΕΝЖЕ БЪ  
 НАШЪ · ГЪ ІСЪ ХЪ · Н  
 ΚΕΔΗΝΟΥΑΔΖІН СНЪ · Н  
 ВСЕЮ СКВЪРНОЮ  
 УСКВЪРΝΗΣЮ ΜΗ ΣΑ ·  
 ΤѢΜЪЖЕ ΛΕЖНТЪ НА  
 ЖЪРТВОУ СДРОБЛЕНЪ ·  
 ΤѢΜЪЖЕ Н ΜΟΛНТВОУ  
 ПРННОШЮ ΤΕΒΕ · Н ПРОШЮ  
 ΟΣΤΑΒΛΗΝΝѦ ГРѢХОВЪ ·  
 ДА БЪІ ΜΗ ПРНШЪЛЪ  
 ΟΥΤѢШНТЕΛЪ · Н  
 ΟΥΝΣΤЪЛЪ ГРѢХОВЪ ΜΟΝΧЪ  
 · СНАΛΝΖІН СΤЪІН ΤΒΟИ  
 ДХЪ · ΟΥΚΡΕΠΛΑѦ ΜΑ Н  
 ΟΥΤΒЪРЖАѦ · ДА У  
 УЮДНѢН СЛАΒНѢН  
 ЖЪРТВЪ · ΧΒΑΛΟΥ ΤΕΒΕ  
 ВЪІΛΑΚΜЪ ΟΥЮ Н СНОУ Н  
 СΤМОУ ДХΟΥ Ι :

*Greek text (= priestly prayer in the beginning of JAS):* Ἐν πλήθει ἁμαρτιῶν μεμολυσμένον μὴ με ἐξουδενώσῃ, Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν· ἰδοὺ γὰρ προσῆλθον τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἐπουρανίῳ μυστηρίῳ σου οὐχ ὡς ἄξιος ὑπάρχων, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν σὴν ἀφορῶν ἀγαθότητα· ἀφήμι σοὶ τὴν φωνήν, ὁ Θεὸς ἰλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ· ἡμάρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ οὐκ εἶμι ἄξιος ἀνοφθαλμῆσαι τῇ ἱερᾷ σου ταύτῃ καὶ πνευματικῇ τραπέζῃ, ἐφ' ἧ ὁ μονογενὴς σου Υἱὸς καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐμοὶ τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ καὶ κατεστιγμένῳ πάσῃ κηλίδι, μυστικῶς πρόκειται εἰς θυσίαν. Διὸ ταύτην σοὶ τὴν ἱκεσίαν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν προσάγω τοῦ καταπεμφθῆναι μοι τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ Παράκλητον ἐνισχύον καὶ καταρτίζον με πρὸς τὴν λειτουργίαν ταύτην καὶ τὴν παρὰ σοῦ μοι τῷ λαῷ ἐπαγγελθεῖσαν φωνὴν ἀκατακρίτως ταύτην ἀποφθέγξασθαι καταξίωσον ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, μεθ' οὗ εὐλογητὸς εἶ σὺν τῷ παναγίῳ, ἀγαθῷ, ζωοποιῷ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ σου Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων. Ἀμήν.

## 2.3. Additional Prayers at the End of the Liturgy

Finally, the additional prayers at the end of the liturgy are somewhere after clergy communion; mostly, but not necessarily, after the *opistham-bonos* prayer. The Greek originals of these six prayers, when known, are invariably *skeuophylakion* prayers intended to be read in place of the standard one. But in the Russian sources they never replace the *skeuophylakion* prayer and form new units in the formulary instead. The Old-Russian Leitourgika have six such prayers,<sup>18</sup> two of which belong to the original pre-Philothean core. The Greek original of one of these two comes from JAS, whereas for the other one is not known. Here are the texts:

## 2.3.a

Г҃Н Б҃Е НАШЬ · ПРННМН ОУМАЛЕНУЮ СНЮ НАШЮ  
 СЛУЖЕУ Н ХВАЛУ ЯКО РАБН НЕДОСТОННІ С҃УЩЕ ·  
 ꙗже тн бѣхомъ должнн творити · сътворихомъ  
 · за немощь нашу · н за оумноженьє грѣхъ  
 нашн · никтоже бо ксть достоннъ · по лѣпотѣ  
 тѣ восхвалямъ · тѣ бо едннъ еси кроме грѣха  
 · тебѣ славу вѣсѣи ·

## 2.3.b

ПРНХОДАЩАѦ Ѡ СЛѢЗИ ВЪ  
 СЛѢЗУ · МЪЗ ГРѢШННН · Н  
 НЕДОСТОНННН РАБН ТВОИ ·  
 ВОСПѢВАЕМЪ ЦР҃ТВНН  
 ТВОЕ ·

*Greek text (= prayer in the end of JAS, widespread in South Italian redactions of CHR and BAS; the text of the prayer has many variations):*  
 Ἐκ δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν  
 πορευόμενοι ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ  
 [ἐνθα τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων  
 ἀποτίθονται] <ὑμνοῦμεν τὴν  
 βασιλείαν σου> νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ  
 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.  
 Ἀμήν.

<sup>18</sup> In a unique manuscript, *Moscow, Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts, Synodal Typography* 40, the liturgy ends with an additional prayer to the Mother of God, to be read before eating the *prospora* which was offered in her name.

PRE-PHILOTHEAN RUSSIAN EUCHARISTIC FORMULARIES: A WITNESS TO SOME LOST GREEK TRADITION?

To sum up, the pre-Philothean redactions of the Russian eucharistic formularies contain a number of peculiar prayers, most of which are used as additions to the standard formulary. In other words, only a few prayers actually replaced the standard ones; these are the four alternative prayers in BAS and the festal *opisthambonoi* prayers. All the others were inserted alongside the standard prayers and formed new units in the formularies. Many of these prayers were added around the turn of the 14<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>19</sup> But there is also a complex of prayers, consisting of four alternative prayers of BAS (which is already a secondary formulary) and eight additional prayers of both CHR and BAS: two before the beginning and two at the end of the liturgy, as well as four prayers during clergy communion. This complex of prayers was introduced into Russian practice not later than the turn of the 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>20</sup>

This Old-Russian distinguished prayer complex has some resemblance to the various South Italian Greek traditions, as well as to the Palestinian tradition (there are some prayers from JAS), but it is by no means identical to either. In Russian practice these peculiar prayers were used in a very special way, and a half of them are found neither in the South Italian Euchologia, nor in the manuscripts of JAS. The crucial question is: did this complex form within the Russian tradition itself, or did it originate elsewhere? To answer this question one must turn to the early South Slavonic sources.

THE GLAGOLITIC SINAI LEITOURGIKON AND OTHER PRE-PHILOTHEAN SOUTH SLAVONIC SOURCES

The Glagolitic Sinai Leitourgikon contains the oldest preserved text of a Slavonic translation of the Byzantine eucharistic formularies. This

<sup>19</sup> These are never present in the 13<sup>th</sup>-century manuscripts, but already appear in the Leitourgika of the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Interestingly, Greek originals of some of these are attested in the Athonite manuscripts. This localization together with the date of these additions suggests that they were an outcome of the liturgical activity of Serbs and Bulgarians on Athos in the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. This needs further investigation.

<sup>20</sup> This is the date of the oldest preserved Russian Leitourgikon, *Moscow, State Historical Museum, Synodal 604*.

text represents the Bulgarian recension of CHR and BAS of the 10-11<sup>th</sup> centuries and goes back to the Bulgarian translations of the turn of the 10<sup>th</sup> century.

What does one find here? Here is the list of characteristic features of the eucharistic formularies in the Sinai Glagolitic Leitourgikon:

1. The primary eucharistic formulary is CHR; BAS is written after it.
2. BAS — and not CHR! — contains the same alternative Prothesis prayer as do the Old-Russian sources (the rest of BAS is lost).
3. CHR contains additional prayers in exactly the same positions as in the pre-Philothean Russian Sluzhebniki: an additional prayer before the liturgy and an additional prayer at the end of it (alas, the communion section is lost, but we can suppose again that it also contained the additional prayers).
4. Moreover, the prayer at the end of the liturgy is precisely the prayer 2.3.a from the Old-Russian Leitourgika cited above; the prayer in the beginning, though, is not the same as any of the Russian prayers, although it has some resemblance to the prayer 2.1.b.

Obviously, this is something very similar to the pre-Philothean Russian eucharistic formularies. Yet, the language and the wording of the extant parts of the anaphora of CHR in the Glagolitic Sinai Leitourgikon are somewhat different from the Old-Russian redaction. Still, despite the differences, the main features of the Glagolitic Sinai Leitourgikon and of the pre-Philothean Russian Leitourgika are the same. This means that the Russian pre-Philothean redaction is a descendant of the Bulgarian translations of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, but at some point the Russians edited and corrected them, most probably in the 11<sup>th</sup> century in Kiev.

The Glagolitic Sinai manuscript is the only South Slavonic Leitourgikon of the 11<sup>th</sup> century. There are five South Slavonic Leitourgika of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and forty of the 14<sup>th</sup>.<sup>21</sup> Most of those from the 14<sup>th</sup> century date from the second half or even the last years of that century, and

<sup>21</sup> See the full list in: Zheltov, 'Чин Божественной литургии' (see n. 1), pp. 336-339. I should notice here that one manuscript in this list — *Belgrade, Patriarchal Library* 365, 14<sup>th</sup> century, — which I have not consulted until recently, is not a Leitourgikon, but contains only the rite of consecration of a church. It could be also noted that Radu Constantinescu mentions a few Slavonic Leitourgika of the 13-14<sup>th</sup> centuries which are not on my list. See R. Constantinescu, 'Euthyme de Tarnovo et la réforme liturgique au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Etudes balkaniques* 3 and 4 (1986) 62-78 and 53-80. However, his datings of these are not confirmed neither by their descriptions in the manuscript catalogues, nor by consulting them *de visu*.

they already contain the *Diataxis* of Philotheos. Most of the earlier manuscripts already show clear signs of standardization and ‘constantinopolization’ of the liturgy. But some earlier Bulgarian Leitourgika<sup>22</sup> still witness to the same peculiarities of the eucharistic formularies, which I have traced in both Old-Russian sources and in the Glagolitic Sinai Leitourgikon. This proves the Bulgarian origins of the Russian pre-Philothean complex of non-standard prayers of CHR and BAS. The same could be also shown on the rubrical and formulaic level: the Old-Russian Leitourgika contain a few very distinct rubrics and formulae, which are also found in the 13<sup>th</sup>-century South Slavonic sources.

### CONCLUSIONS

According to the results of my research, the history of the Russian eucharistic formularies began with an acceptance of the 10<sup>th</sup>-century Bulgarian translation of CHR, BAS and PRES. In this translation CHR already was the primary formulary, in BAS some standard prayers were replaced by alternative ones, and in both CHR and BAS there were also additional prayers, which formed new units in the formulary. This happened at the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. In the 11<sup>th</sup> century, presumably, the Russians did their own re-working of the eucharistic formularies, which existed until the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. In the 13-14<sup>th</sup> centuries new additional prayers were added to the formularies, some of them coming from the South Slavonic milieu, others probably being added by the Russians themselves. Finally, by the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century the Russians accepted a completely new translation of CHR, BAS and PRES, where CHR and BAS followed the *Diataxis* of Philotheos. All the peculiar prayers were gone.<sup>23</sup>

The peculiar features of the oldest pre-Philothean Slavonic redaction of the eucharistic formularies, which stand behind the Old-Russian and the most ancient Bulgarian manuscripts, are not attested in the classical Constantinopolitan sources. They bear some resemblance to the characteristic

<sup>22</sup> Namely, *Moscow, State Historical Museum, Khloudovskoye* 117 (13<sup>th</sup> c.), *Uvarovskoye* 46 (first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> c.), and *Synodal Greek* 484 (turn of the 13-14<sup>th</sup> centuries; here: fol. 1 and 314, used for binding a Greek manuscript).

<sup>23</sup> Yet in the 15-16<sup>th</sup> centuries this or that prayer from the ancient manuscripts accidentally happened to be introduced into the post-Philothean Russian Leitourgika. Only in the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century the Russian Sluzhebnik finally obtained its current form, based on the Ukrainian editions of the beginning of the same century. The latter, in their turn, were based on Greek editions printed in the 16<sup>th</sup> century in Italy.

features of the South Italian and Palestinian Greek traditions, yet they are different. Therefore, it is clear that the oldest Slavonic sources are witnesses to some other tradition, the corresponding Greek sources of which are lost (or, let us hope, have not been discovered yet). This should not be a surprise. Everyone knows that the ancient lectionary of Jerusalem is preserved only in Armenian and Georgian translations; the ancient Jerusalem Tropologion only in the Georgian manuscripts of *Udzvelesi Iadgari*; the Typikon of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Alexios the Studite, only in the Old-Russian translation, etc.

Concerning the tradition witnessed in the oldest Slavonic Leitourgika, it is not at all clear what ecclesiastical center it belonged to. I suggest that it was Thessalonica. First of all, it is natural to suppose that Bulgarian liturgical translations of the 10<sup>th</sup> century were made using the Thessalonian originals, because the Greek-Slavonic contacts at the time were the most intense exactly in the Thessalonian region. Secondly, Pentkovsky came to the same conclusions of a Thessalonian origin of the earliest Slavonic liturgy after he studied not the euchological, but the hymnographic and lectionary material.<sup>24</sup> Thirdly, even the late Thessalonian authors of the 14-15<sup>th</sup> centuries witness that the Thessalonian Church was observing its own distinct liturgical usages. St Nicholas Cabasilas even cites our prayer 2.3.b (this citation remained unnoticed by the editors of his commentary<sup>25</sup>).

If the Thessalonian theory is correct, then the oldest Slavonic Leitourgika present us with an invaluable picture of 9-10<sup>th</sup>-century Thessalonian eucharistic practice. But even if it is not correct, the oldest Slavonic material is a precious source for further study. In any case, the overall picture of Byzantine liturgical history is more complex than was thought of before. The so-called 'Byzantine rite' is not a single tradition, but a set of close traditions, both interfering with and/or originating from and influencing one another.

<sup>24</sup> A. Pentkovsky [А. М. Пентковский], 'Славянское богослужение и славянская гимнография византийского обряда в X веке', in *Liturgische Hymnen nach byzantinischem Ritus bei den Slaven in ältester Zeit*, eds. H. Rothe and D. Christians (Paderborn e.a., 2007), pp. 16-26; A. Pentkovsky and M. Yovcheva [А. Пентковский, М. Йовчева], 'Праздничные и воскресные блаженны в византийском и славянском богослужении VIII–XIII вв.', *Palaeobulgarica* 15: 3 (2001) 31-60; A. Pentkovsky and T. Pentkovskaia [А. М. Пентковский, Т. В. Пентковская], 'Синайский Апостол (Sin. slav. 39): История текста и история рукописи', *Лингвистическое источниковедение и история русского языка 2002-2003* (Moscow, 2003), pp. 121-171.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Nicolas Cabasilas, *Explication de la Divine Liturgie*, trad. et notes de S. Salaville, 2<sup>e</sup> éd. munie du text grec, revue et augmentée par R. Bornert, J. Gouillard, P. Périchon, Sources chrétiennes 4bis (Paris, 1967), p. 68.