

Tatyana Afanasyeva

Problems in Textological Analysis and Publishing of Slavic Liturgies*

1. Introduction

The textual criticism of Slavic translations of liturgies is based on the method used to study the Slavic translation of the Holy Scripture that has been in development since the 19th century. The last summative work of A.A. Alekseev (1999) takes into account all of the possible nuances, on which any editing process or change in the text depend on. The aim of the following article is to describe particularities in textology of the Slavic liturgy in comparison with the textology of the Holy Scripture and hymnography.

The textological analysis of liturgical texts has particular methodological features of research and description. The textology of hymnographic texts is currently actively being studied, which can be seen from the amount a large bibliography of works on Slavic hymnography (Krivko 2004: 203-233). At the same time, certain papers dedicated to the study of euchological (prayer) texts, which are significantly different from hymnographic ones, were included in this bibliographic list. The main difference is in the fact that the 1) *Euchologion* (in Slavic tradition — *Služebnik* and *Trebnik*) is not connected to *Typikon*. It has been forming in parallel with the *Menaion*, *Triodion* and *Typikon*, and has an independent place within the system of Byzantine liturgical books. 2) Furthermore, prayers, as opposed to hymnographic texts, are not poetic texts in their original language, since they do not have a metre or any melodic characteristic (tone). 3) The structure of the liturgy differs from services in hymnographic books. All of this shows the need to correct the methods of studying the Holy Scripture for the *Euchologion* as well as that its textual criticism is still in its formative stage. This article tries to formulate basic positions, which characterize methodological features of studying liturgy as an euchological text.

2. Components of the Divine Service

The liturgy is a service, which consists of several elements. According to Anton Baumstark's theory (Baumstark 1953), a liturgical service (*ἀκολουθία*, *ordo*) consists of the following components:

* The article was written with financial support from the Russian Science Foundation, grant № 16-18-10137.

- 1) prayers
- 2) ektenias, doxologies and short formulas (prières litaniques et formules brèves)
- 3) hymnography (poésie liturgique)
- 4) psalmody and the reading of the Holy Scripture
- 5) liturgical actions (actions liturgiques).

The Divine Liturgy service includes prayers, ektenias and liturgical actions. Hymnography, psalmody and readings from the Holy Scripture are not fixated within the text of the liturgy and are only mentioned in references and incipits. The *Cherubikon*, one of the main liturgical hymns, for example, has never been recorded in the ancient liturgy service texts; it only becomes fixed in the Slavic tradition by the end of the 14th century when priests begin to read it.

The reasons for the heterogeneity of texts in the liturgy service are said to be the following:

1) THEY ARE SAID BY DIFFERENT PEOPLE. Priest says prayers, deacon proclaims ektenias. Doxologies can be proclaimed by the priest or the deacon. Sometimes words that are to be said by the people or the incipits from hymns (*Cherubikon* or “O Gladsome Light”, for instance) performed by the choir are inserted into the service. The liturgical rubrics describe the actions of clerics.

2) THE TEXTS WITHIN THE SERVICE ARE READ DIFFERENTLY. Most prayers are read silently and the parishioners do not hear them. Prayers are the only component that is written out fully within the liturgical ordo. Ektenias and doxologies are read out loud; in most ancient manuscripts they are not fully written out. These texts have always been recited by memory and have existed in oral tradition. Thus, they were recorded in the Euchologion in the form of incipits. The liturgical actions recorded in the rubrics are not uttered at all. The texts of rubrics usually are different in each manuscript, which might attest to the fact that they were composed during the creation of the codex and are genetically not connected with the text of prayers. Rubrics, especially the ones from ancient manuscripts, remain outside of tradition and do not date back to a stable text, the origins of which could be somehow established. The situation changes only at the turn of 13th-14th cc., when the order of *Proskomedia* from the Serbian *Kormčaja* gets inserted into the text of the liturgy. In addition, at the end of the 14th century the *Diataxis* of Patriarch Philotheus is translated and its rubrics are also inserted into the text of the liturgy.

Slavic texts of liturgy are translations from the Greek original. That is why the analysis of the Slavic liturgy has another aspect – a linguistic one. Translations of the Divine Service were made in different historical periods, each of which has particular language traits. The translations from the period of the First Bulgarian Empire can easily be pinpointed by looking at the texts of the Scripture: two important translational centers were established here and the description of language traits of the Ohrid and Preslav translations have a

long scholarly tradition. The translations made in the 14th century, among which are the Athonite and Tärnovo scribal schools, tell us about the new norms of language that the scribes applied and edited the text according to the Greek original.

One must also take into account that the language norms of prayer texts and rubrics differ. On the contrary, rubrics reflect the Church usage of a certain region; they grow closer to canonical literature and typikons in terms of language norms as well as include regional liturgical terminology. The text of rubrics is of later origin and dates back to the 12th-13th cc. The rubrics of South Slavic *euchologia* of the 13th-14th cc. reflect the church usage in different South Slavic territories in the 13th-14th cc. as well as local liturgical lexicon: *kaljaž'* (chalice), *platec'* (*eiliton*). In *služebniki* that were edited at the end of the 14th century, one can notice a tendency to unify liturgical terminology and get rid of localisms and archaisms. Unlike rubrics, prayers have higher norms and do not have any regional particularities. Prayers said by the priest are actually South Slavic translations from the First Bulgarian Empire period. In addition, prayer text is more conservative and preserves older forms longer than the texts of rubrics (Afanas'eva 2012: 250-266).

The main components of the Divine Service are prayers and ektenias. They constitute a large part of the service, that is why liturgy should be recognized as a euchological text. The rest of its components take up less space and are often recorded in other liturgical books. When conducting a textological research of the liturgy, one must take into account the heterogeneity of its components, each of which should be studied separately. It is exactly this approach it is possible to establish a historical transformation of the text. The editing of the text according to the Greek original stands out the most in the texts of prayers. However, it is not so easily traced in other components.

Changes in liturgical practice lead to a transformation in the text of liturgy, i.e. change in the content of rubrics and transformation in the structure of the service text. At the same time, changes in liturgical practice do not always lead to a new translation or redaction of prayer texts according to the Greek original. However, a new redaction of prayers always appears within the edited ordo. Thus, linguistic editing does not occur as often as liturgical editing, which allows scholars to trace the amount of times the liturgy was edited according to the Greek original. Editing of prayer texts turns out to be the most reliable criterion by which change in the liturgy can be detected. In our opinion, in order to detect the editorship of an euchological text, one must first compare the texts of the major prayers (more on major and additional prayers below) in all of its versions, and group them according to the stability repeated linguistic variants. The second stage is marked by finding liturgical particularities of the service within a particular copy group.

Prayers also have different statuses within the service. Liturgy has major prayers, which have long been written down and are very stable:

1. The censer prayer.
2. The offering prayer.

3. The antiphon prayers. There are three in the liturgy: first, second and third. In the liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great they coincide. Since the 14th c. the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts uses for such prayers those from the antiphons of the vespers.
4. Entrance prayer (Little Entrance).
5. Prayer of Feruent Supplication within the Augmented (*Sugubaja*) *Ektenia*.
- (6). Prayer before the Gospel reading; is only present in the copies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great liturgies from 14th century onwards; it is not present in the Liturgy of Presanctified gifts.
7. Prayer of the catechumens.
- (8). Prayer for those, who are preparing for Illumination; is only found in the ancient copies of the Liturgy of Saint Basil and the Presanctified Liturgy, going out of use after the 14th century.
9. Prayer of the Faithful 1.
10. Prayer of the Faithful 2.
11. Prayer of the *Cherubikon* (Great Entrance) or, in the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts – transfer of the Holy Gifts and the singing of “Now the Hosts of the Heavens”.
12. Prayer before the *Anaphora*.
13. The *Anaphora* is a eucharistic prayer, after which the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. This is the most ancient part of the liturgy, it’s backbone. It is not present in the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts, since it genetically originates from the vespers.
14. Prayer after the *Anaphora*.
15. Prayer at the bowing of heads.
16. Prayer of elevation “Hear me, O Lord”.
17. Prayer of thanksgiving.
18. Prayer behind the ambon. This is the only prayer, which the priest says out loud.
19. Prayer for the consumption of the Holy Gifts (in the *skeuophylakion*)

Additional prayers are often added to the major ones. Additional prayers, unlike the major ones, are not present in all of the copies of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom, the Liturgy of Basil the Great and are also extremely rare in the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts; their place within the service can change. The majority of such prayers appear either in the beginning or at the end of the liturgy, which attests to the development of specific rites within the liturgy: preparation for the service, *proskomedie* and communion. All additional prayers can be divided according to their function into four categories.

1. Preparatory prayers before the service.
2. Ancient eastern prayers, i.e. those prayers that were in the original translation of the Divine Service.
3. Prayers that accompany the communion.
4. Prayers at the end of the service.

Additional prayers can differ, depending on liturgical practice; they are used at a particular time period and can go out of use after. However, in the 15th century some additional prayers came to be the major ones and started to be recorded in all of the Divine Service versions. Such was the case with the prayer before the reading of the Gospel, since in the 13th-14th cc. it was an additional prayer but later acquired the status of the major prayer.

Thus, unlike in the case of texts of the Holy Scripture, when studying the Divine Service one must keep in mind the heterogeneity of its compositional elements, which should be studied separately and in stages. Some elements change quickly and can tell us about local liturgical traditions, while others are more conservative, change less often and attest to the translational activity of Slavic scribes.

3. *Source Basis*

Unlike the manuscript tradition of the Slavic Gospels, the text of the Slavic liturgy has not been preserved well within the ancient sources. For instance, the Gospels are represented well in the Old Slavic manuscripts of the 11th century: Codex Marianus, Codex Zographensis, Codex Assemanius, Sava's book. The *Menaion* (both in the *Menaion Reader* and the Liturgical *Menaion*) and the Psalter are well represented; the manuscripts from the 11th century have been preserved until today. The copies of the *Triodion* have been known since the 12th century. The situation with copies of liturgy is much worse: we are only left with three folios with St. John's and St. Basil's liturgies of the Old Slavic period (10th-11th cent.). We only have full texts that date back to the 13th century onwards. There is only one copy of Pre-Mongolian period of all the three liturgies – the *služebnik* of Varlaam of Khutyn from the 20's of the 13th century. The rest of Russian copies are from the second half – end of the 13th century or younger. It is the same with South Slavic writing. The oldest complete texts of liturgy appear only from the 13th century onwards. The study used 93 service books from the 11th-15th cc., and, moreover, the oldest copies were used in their full capacity, while the copies from the end of the 14th to 15th cc. was only used partially.

The absence of the oldest copies of Slavic liturgy leads scholars to reconstruct the original look of liturgy, which is not easy to do. In such cases the Greek Liturgy of John Chrysostom is of great help, the textological analysis of which was carried out by André Jacob (1968). He was able to show what shapes the liturgy took in the 8th-9th cc., that is during the period, when the Slavic writing system was forming. It should also be noted that in paleoslavistics, one often encounters a situation, when the Greek original of the Slavic translation is unknown or has not been studied. Fortunately, in the case of the Liturgy of

John Chrysostom, such problem does not exist. Knowing which variants of the Greek version of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom, we can trace the history of its Slavic translation. In addition, the Liturgy of Basil the Great does change during this periods; its short versions start to appear from the 12th c. onwards. The Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts becomes in the 12th c. a Lenten liturgy and is no longer seen as an evening service.

4. *Results of the Textological Analysis*

The results of textological analysis are the same in the case of all three liturgies. All copies can be divided into three groups according to chronological periods. The oldest texts belong to the first period; they are the two oldest redactions of the liturgy: West Bulgarian and Preslav. They have not been preserved until today and are reconstructed based on the archaic qualities in the later Slavic manuscript tradition as well as on the Greek originals of 8th-11th cc.

The second period from end of 12th to the first half of the 14th century is represented by the manuscripts of 13th-14th cc., which can be grouped for practical purposes in the following manner

1. Old Russian redaction that goes back to the Preslav redaction (most of the Russian vellum service books from 13th-14th cc. belong to it).
2. Group of manuscripts, which has preserved the features of the Old West Bulgarian translation: α) bulgarian manuscript from the Xludov collection of the State Historical Museum, Moscow, end of 13th c. (*Xlud. 117*); β) serbian manuscript from the Main Collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, end of 13th c. (*Q.n.I.68*) and γ) serbian manuscript from the collection of the Uvarov Collection of the State Historical Museum, Moscow, first half of 14th c. (*Uvar. 574*).
3. Čudov redaction represented only by several Russian manuscripts of the turn of the 14th-15th cc: α) MS from Pogodin Collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg (*Pogod. 36*); β) MS from Synodal typography Collection of Russian State Historical archive, Moscow (*Syn.typ. 42*) and MS from the Library of Russian Academy of Science in Saint Petersburg (*BAN, 17.12.1*).
4. Group of manuscripts close to the edited in 14th cent. versions: α) Bulgarian MS from the collection of SS. Cyril and Methodius National Library, Sofia, first half of 14th c. (*NBKM 590*); β) convolute MS from the Main Collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, 13th-14th cc. (*Q.n.I.48*); γ) bulgarian MS from the collection of the Uvarov Collection of the State Historical Museum, Moscow, beginning of 14th c. (*Uvar. 46*); δ) serbian MS from Pogodin Collection of the National Library of Russia, Saint Petersburg, third quarter of 14th c. (*Pogod. 37*) and ε) russian MS from the Collection of the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius' (Sacristy) of the Russian State Library, Moskow, third quarter of 14th c. (*TSL III.8*).

The Third period (end of the 14th-15th c.) is represented by edited versions of liturgies: Euthymius of Tărnovo redaction, Athonite redaction and redaction of Cyprian. The redaction of Euthymius of Tărnovo is known by two Bulgarian manuscripts, the Athonite one by Serbian, Bulgarian and Russian manuscripts, Cyprian's is only represented by Russian manuscripts.

5. *Publishing of Liturgy*

When putting together an edition of Slavic liturgy, it is impossible to take all of the nuances of textual changes into account. That is why a critical edition of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom and the Liturgy of Saint Basil the Great was meant to present its most important stages, i.e. changes in the Slavic translation and in the structure of the service (Afanas'eva 2015). We have also published a diplomatic edition of the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts with exemplars of each redaction in accordance with a particular copy (Afanas'eva 2004).

The first edition consists of two parts: a critical edition of liturgical prayers and tables, which show the order structure of each copy of liturgy. Critical edition of Slavic translations of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom and the Liturgy of Saint Basil is based on the manuscript *Pogod. 37* from National Library of Russia (Saint Petersburg). This manuscript was chosen due to the following reasons. First, the ancient text of liturgy is almost lost, while the Preslav correction, present in the Old Russian redaction has also not been preserved in its pure form and is of hybrid nature. That is why a text, edited in the 14th century, has been taken as a basis for the edition. The critical apparatus includes variant readings through which one can make a general impression of the text from the Old Slavic period. Secondly, the *Pogod. 37* manuscript is the only one, where the text of liturgy practically has no regulatory commentaries. That is why it allows to present only the sacred text, said by a priest or a deacon, which does not include any additions of a non-euchological character. Thirdly, this version is exemplary in every way. It was written by a professional of a high caliber – calligrapher Simeon; the quality of the manuscript allows scholars to trust the quality of the text. In addition, the manuscript is localized: it was written in Athos (in Karea of the Hilandar monastery), where the editing work took place.

When putting together an edition of the Slavic translation of liturgies, we followed the principles of making editions of the Slavic translation of the Gospels, developed by A.A. Alekseev (Alekseev *et al.* 1998: 39-44). The main copy is presented with a preserved orthography. The words, however, have been separated. The critical apparatus includes variant readings in fourteen manuscripts — the main exemplars of redactions, established in the study. References include variant readings with a normalized orthography, according to the norms of the Old Slavonic dictionary (Cejtlin *et al.* 1994).

The second part consists of comparative tables, in which the composition of the service of the first and second types are written out in detail. It is impossible to include this important part of Slavic liturgy in the critical apparatus, hence it is included separately.

The liturgies of the third type are not included in the tables, because their composition is homogeneous and corresponds to the *Diataxis* of Patriarch Philotheus. Tables demonstrate the composition of each copy of liturgy, the code of which is given in the top row. Additional prayers are given with a Slavonic type, while the Russian type is used for conventional names of the major prayers of liturgy. Tables also demonstrate which additional prayers are present in each manuscript.

The conducted textological analysis showed that editing of liturgies coincides with the major correction stages of all of the Slavic liturgical books: the Ochrid and Preslav redactions from the period of the First Bulgarian Empire, the period of restoration of South Slavic writing after the Byzantine conquest (1st half of the 13th c.), the period of correction of liturgical books of the second half of the 14th c. (Athonite and Tarnovo redactions). The Čudov redaction doesn't occur in other liturgical books but it is also present within New Testament redactions.

Bibliography

- Alekseev *et al.* 1998: A.A. Alekseev *et al.* (eds.), *Evangelije ot Ioanna v slavjanskoj tradicii*, SPb. 1998.
- Alekseev 1999: A.A. Alekseev, *Tekstologija slavjanskoj Biblii*, SPb. 1999.
- Afanas'eva 2004: T.I. Afanas'eva, *Slavjanskaja liturgija Preždeosvjaščennyx Darov. Tekstologija i jazyk*. SPb. 2004.
- Afanas'eva 2012: T.I. Afanas'eva, *Liturgičeskaja terminologija v slavjanskix služebnikax XIII-XV vv: èvoljucija literaturnoj normy i cerkovnogo uzusa*, "Russkij jazyk v naučnom osvjaščenii", XXIII, 2012, 1, pp. 250-266.
- Afanas'eva 2015: T.I. Afanas'eva, *Liturgii Ioanna Zlatousta i Vasilija Velikogo v slavjanskoj tradicii (po služebnikam XI-XV vv.)*, M. 2015.
- Baumstark 1953: A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée. Principes et méthodes pour l'étude historique des liturgies chrétiennes*, Paris-Chevetogne 1953.
- Jacob 1968: A. Jacob, *Histoire du formulaire grec de la liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome*, thèse non-publiée, Louvain 1968.
- Krivko 2004: R.N. Krivko, *Slavjanskaja gimnografija IX-XII vv. v issledovanijax i izdanijax 1985-2004 gg.*, "Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch", L, 2004, pp. 203-233.
- Cejtlin *et al.* 1994: R.M. Cejtlin, R. Večerka, E. Bláhová (eds.), *Staroslavjanskij slovar' po rukopisjam X-XI vv.*, M. 1994.

Abstract

Tatyana Afanasyeva

Problems in Textological Analysis and Publishing of Slavic Liturgies

This article describes the results of textological analysis of Slavic translations of liturgies from the oldest period (11th-14th cc.): the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, the Liturgy of Saint Basil the Great and the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts. It also describes methods of analyzing liturgy based on Slavic manuscripts, taking into consideration the structure of its text, historic and liturgical tradition as well as special features of its translation. The article presents a classification of Slavic manuscript copies and a diagram that illustrates the relation between the different redactions. In addition, the author substantiates the principles of publishing Slavic liturgy: it must consist of two parts – a critical edition of the Slavic translation of liturgy and a table, which shows the composition of the Divine Service.

Keywords

Textual Criticism of the Slavic Liturgy; Publishing Principles; Slavic Euchologia.