



religions



Article

Byzantine Influence before Byzantinisation: The Tropologion Sinai Greek NE MΓ 56+5 Compared with the Georgian and Syriac Melkite Versions

Stig Simeon R. Frøyshov, Aleksandra Nikiforova and Natalia Smelova

Special Issue

Constantinople and its Peripheries: The Mechanisms of Liturgical Byzantinisation

Edited by


Dr. Stig R. Frøyshov



<https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14111363>

Article

Byzantine Influence before Byzantinisation: The Tropologion Sinai Greek NE MI 56+5 Compared with the Georgian and Syriac Melkite Versions

Stig Simeon R. Frøyshov ^{1,*}, Aleksandra Nikiforova ^{2,3}  and Natalia Smelova ¹¹ Faculty of Theology, University of Oslo, 0315 Oslo, Norway; natalia.smelova@teologi.uio.no² Institute of World Literature, Russian Academy of Sciences, 121069 Moscow, Russia; sashunja@yandex.ru³ Theological Department, St. Tikhon's Orthodox University, 127051 Moscow, Russia

* Correspondence: s.r.froyshov@teologi.uio.no

Abstract: The article examines a selection of hymns of potentially Byzantine origin in the eighth-to-tenth-century manuscripts of the New Tropologion, which was the hymnal of the Anastasis cathedral of Jerusalem and in churches that followed its rite. Such adoption in the rite of Jerusalem represented a Byzantine influence before the wave of liturgical Byzantinisation that started in the late ninth and tenth centuries. For the first time, three versions of the New Tropologion are studied together: the Greek original and the Syriac and Georgian translations. The Greek Tropologion Sinai MS NE MI 56+5 is the primary material, compared with Sinai MS Syriac 48 and several Georgian New Iadgari manuscripts from Sinai. The study identifies one certain Byzantine element in the New Tropologion: parts of the feast of St. John Chrysostom, archbishop of Constantinople, and several probable Byzantine elements: the interpolation of the second ode in three canons by Kosmas of Jerusalem and one by John, and parts of the stichera series Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις attributed to Romanos the Melodist. By contrast, the interpolated ode 1 in Kosmas' canon for Great Saturday seems to be of Palestinian origin, and therefore not a Byzantine loan, contrary to traditional views. The article shows that there is considerable variation between the different versions of the New Tropologion.

Keywords: Byzantine liturgy; liturgy of Jerusalem; Syriac Melkite liturgy; old Georgian liturgy; Byzantine hymnography; Palestinian hymnography



Citation: Frøyshov, Stig Simeon R., Aleksandra Nikiforova, and Natalia Smelova. 2023. Byzantine Influence before Byzantinisation: The Tropologion Sinai Greek NE MI 56+5 Compared with the Georgian and Syriac Melkite Versions. *Religions* 14: 1363. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14111363>

Academic Editor: Marina Montesano

Received: 27 September 2023

Revised: 17 October 2023

Accepted: 19 October 2023

Published: 27 October 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

In the first millennium, there was considerable liturgical exchange between various Christian centres and regions. Notably, there were mutual influences and loans between the liturgical rites of Jerusalem and Constantinople from the fourth century onwards. While the direction of such loans was strongest *from* Jerusalem in the early period, there was also a certain spread of Constantinopolitan liturgical use *to* Jerusalem. From the late ninth century onwards, the liturgical influence in the latter direction was massive, to the point that we speak of the “Byzantinisation”¹ of the Hierosolymitan² rite, as well as of other Melkite (Chalcedonian) rites. This essay, however, deals with the more modest Byzantine influence that took place before this time: scattered pieces in a Hierosolymitan liturgical book, borrowed from Constantinople in approximately the eighth and ninth centuries, before the real wave of Byzantinisation.

This liturgical book is the Tropologion, the hymnal of the rite of Jerusalem that was centred in the Anastasis or Resurrection cathedral, a book of the choir for all cycles—fixed annual, movable annual, and weekly.³ It is known in two main stages: 1. The Old Tropologion, covering mainly the fifth, sixth, and (into the) seventh centuries, and preserved in Georgian translation only (the Old Iadgari); 2. The New Tropologion, covering mainly the seventh to ninth centuries, and preserved in the Greek original and in Georgian (the New

Iadgari) and Syriac versions.⁴ The New Tropologion retains elements of the Old Tropologion but is essentially a new hymnal from the textual point of view.

Our primary material and permanent point of departure is the Tropologion codex, today divided into the two fragments Sinai MSS Greek NE ΜΓ 56 and ΜΓ 5 (hereafter «ΜΓ 56+5»). Alexandra Nikiforova was the first to point out elements in this codex that traditionally have been thought to be of Byzantine origin (Nikiforova 2012, pp. 61, 92). Here, we shall make a more extensive search for Byzantine elements contained in it. In addition, throughout our study, we shall systematically compare this Greek source with the Georgian and Syriac versions of the New Tropologion: the New Iadgari, known in several manuscripts, and the Tropologion of Sinai MS Syriac 48. Until now, the only comparative study of the New Tropologion that considers non-Greek sources was published by Chronz and Nikiforova, based on ΜΓ 56+5 and Sinai MSS Georgian 1, 59, and 64, and focusing mostly on the calendar (Nikiforova and Chronz 2017). Thus, this essay is the first study of the New Tropologion that is based on sources of all the three languages. We thereby aim not only to point out connections between the versions of the Tropologion, but, given the scarcity of sources, this trilingual approach provides important material for the study of each Tropologion version.

In our article, we shall examine several cases of probable or possible Byzantine influence in the New Tropologion: the office of St. John Chrysostom (27 January); the added first ode (and in the case of the Georgian version, also odes 3–5) of Kosmas' canon of Great Saturday; the intercalation of the second ode in Kosmas' canons for the Nativity; the Theophany and Great Tuesday, and in John's canon for the Theophany; lastly, stichera from the hymn series Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις "Angelic powers, advance", attributed to Romanos.⁵ The identification of Byzantine elements in the New Tropologion has varying degrees of certainty. In some cases, it is virtually certain that texts have their origin in Constantinople and were adopted in Jerusalem or the Orient. In other cases, we can only arrive at a more or less probable identification. We shall also argue the opposite: one element that is traditionally thought to be Byzantine appears not to be.

It is important to note that all our sources are peripheral; that is, none of them were actually used in the Jerusalem cathedral. They certainly followed the use of that cathedral, but were adapted to other church contexts, which might differ in many ways, including language. In addition to differences resulting from such adaptations, we shall see that there were numerous differences in the way that the manuscripts adopted Byzantine elements, and at the end we shall reflect on the variation and relationship between the Greek, Georgian, and Syriac witnesses.

2. The Greek New Tropologion and Its Georgian and Syriac Versions

The transition from the Old to the New Tropologion was probably gradual. Texts attributed to St. Sophronios, patriarch of Jerusalem (d. 638), which are absent from the Old Tropologion, are found in the New Tropologion (Frøyshov 2012b). The elaboration of the new hymnal began in earnest in the late seventh century. It is traditionally held that Kosmas of Jerusalem (or "the Melodist", "of Maiouma", ca. 675–752/754), together with John of Damascus (or "the Monk", ca. 655–ca. 745), were the primary early composers of this Hierosolymitan hymnal.⁶ Many other hymnographers, both named and anonymous, also contributed (see Frøyshov 2012a, "Hymnodists").

2.1. The Greek New Tropologion: Codex Sinai MS Greek NE ΜΓ 56+5

ΜΓ 56+5 is the oldest known Greek witness to the New Tropologion. It belongs to the New Finds of the Sinai collection, discovered in 1975. Based on the catalogue material, Stig Frøyshov (Géhin and Frøyshov 2000, p. 179) hypothesised that the two fragments, ΜΓ 56 (5 fols., the beginning of the hymnal) and ΜΓ 5 (240 fols.), belonged to the same manuscript. When he saw them in situ in 2001, his hypothesis was strengthened, and it became clear that liturgical arguments confirmed the identification.⁷ Alexandra Nikiforova has devoted several publications to the Tropologion, including a chapter in her doctoral

thesis published in 2012, where she provided a full preliminary incipit index of the codex (Nikiforova 2012, 2013a, 2013b, 2015; Chronz and Nikiforova 2014). The thorough description of ΜΓ 56+5 that has already been made (Chronz and Nikiforova 2014; Nikiforova 2015) permits us to limit ourselves here to highlighting salient features.

The codex starts with Christ's Nativity, as did the calendar of Jerusalem. It has lacunas in the sections of Nativity, Theophany, and Lent, and breaks off on 12 June. The content is arranged in numbered calendrical units, 1 to 73, with the Paschal (movable) cycle inserted into the annual cycle.⁸

The title of the codex (preserved in ΜΓ 56) clearly states that it follows the liturgical rule (*kanōn*) of the Church of the Holy Anastasis in Jerusalem: Σὺν Θεῷ Τροπολόγιον πασῶν τῶν ἁγίων ἑορτῶν παντὸς τοῦ ἔτους κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἁγίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἀναστάσεως, "With God, Tropologion of all the holy feasts of the whole year according to the rule of the holy [Church of the] Resurrection of Christ, our God". Its content, especially its calendar, which corresponds to what is otherwise known as the Jerusalem calendar (cf. GL), confirms that this hymnal stands in the tradition of the Hierosolymitan Daily Office. However, Chronz and Nikiforova (2014) have identified several distinct Egyptian features of ΜΓ 56+5: 6 June, the patronal feast (πανήγυρις) of the Archangel Michael (§§70–71); 25 April, the commemoration of the Apostle Mark, particularly venerated in Egypt, as ἡμῶν δὲ πολιούχε, "our guardian", the patron of the place (§49); 7 May, St. Arsenios the Great, including a rubric prescribing to chant a sticheron at the coffin of the saint (§55). An Arabic note relating to the canon of Great Thursday (§37.3, ΜΓ 5, fol. 130v, lower margin)⁹ provides information on how the Passion Gospels are read in Egypt:

يُقرأ بعد هذا بالعشي أول الليل انجيل العهد من يوحنا وهو
الذي ياتيكن فاما اهل مصر يقرأوا قبل هذا الانجيل Ἀρχοντες والاخر
على Δόξα ويقروا بعد ذلك سننما او قانسما وبعد ذلك هذا الانجيل المقدم ذكره

"There is read after this in the evening at the beginning of the night, the Gospel of the Covenant from John, i.e., διαθήκη. However, the people of Egypt read before this Gospel Ἀρχοντες and the other [stanza] after Δόξα, and they read after that σύνθεμα or κάθισμα, and after that this Gospel, mentioned above."¹⁰

These Egyptian features suggest a connection with the regional liturgy of the Egyptian Melkites.

Nikolopoulos (1998, pp. 142, 150) dated the two parts of the codex differently: he dated ΜΓ 56 to the ninth century and ΜΓ 5 to the eighth–ninth centuries. In his recent book on the Byzantine majuscule, Boris Fonkich argued that such *ogivale inclinata* codices with no regular usage of breathing marks and accents, as well as confusion between the circumflex, rough, and smooth breathings, should be dated from the second half of the eighth century to the first third of the ninth century, because in later majuscule manuscripts, the system of diacritics becomes regular and complete (Fonkich 2020, pp. 25–28, 44). What is certain about its date is the *terminus post quem*—the mid-eighth century. On 17 January (§21), ΜΓ 56+5 contains the commemoration of the major earthquake that took place in the Middle East at this time, probably in 749.

The provincial origin of the codex suggests a later rather than earlier dating: writing styles change more slowly in the periphery and liturgical transmissions would have taken time.¹¹ All in all, we are inclined to date ΜΓ 56+5 to a later rather than earlier part of the spectrum: definitely the ninth century, but rather than its first third, which is the latest part of Fonkich's date period, somewhat later in the same century.¹²

2.2. The Georgian New Tropologion: The New Iadgari

The Georgian translation of the New Tropologion, the New Iadgari, has not yet been published (except some pieces), but Georgian scholars have explored its manuscript tradition and textual history.¹³ The relationship between the witnesses has not yet been sat-

isfactorily clarified and contextualised from a liturgical point of view. It is estimated that the Georgian version of the New Tropologion was made in Palestine from the second half of the ninth century.¹⁴

Sources of the New Iadgari have been preserved both at Mount Sinai and in libraries within Georgia (for an overview, see Frøyshov 2012c, pp. 238–39). We make use here of six witnesses that are available to us: Sinai MSS Georgian (Geo.) 1, 14, 26, 34, 59, and 64–65.¹⁵ All these witnesses contain what is termed a “Palestinian redaction” of the New Iadgari (Chkhikvadze 2018, p. 98) and were copied, either certainly or presumably, in Palestine in the tenth century. We propose a new classification of these witnesses, grouping them in two categories according to the scope of their content.¹⁶

Group 1: Proper Tropologion with extensive annual cycles. The standard content is: Heirmologion (type OdO, *Oden-Ordnung*; for this term, see Frøyshov 2012a, “Heirmologion”), annual cycles (fixed cycle with the paschal cycle inserted in the relevant months), common feasts, and Oktoechos. It has author attributions. We here use three witnesses and, in some cases, a fourth one (Geo. 59):

Sinai MS Georgian 1. Datable on palaeographical grounds to the first half of the tenth century. Copied by Iovane (not Zosime), who was probably working in Palestine (Čankieva 1973, p. 46). The Georgian–Palestinian monk Iovane Zosime made additions to it, which confirms its Palestinian provenance. Content: standard, as stated above (on this manuscript, see Chkhikvadze 2018, p. 98).

Sinai MS Georgian 14. Datable on palaeographical grounds to the tenth century; place of production unknown. Content: calendar, Heirmologion, and annual cycles that break off on August 14 (the rest of the manuscript is lost; on this manuscript, see Chkhikvadze 2018, p. 98).

Sinai MSS Georgian 64 (+N.87, 8 fols.) and 65 (+N.2, 21 fols.). The two codices (with fragments) constitute a complete New Iadgari. Copied by Iovane after 987; this Iovane, who is the third Palestinian Iovane in Čankieva’s overview (Čankieva 1973, pp. 46–48), worked at Palestinian monasteries in the 970s and 980s, including St. Sabas and Sinai. Content (Geo. 64+65): standard, as stated above (on the two manuscripts, see Chkhikvadze 2018, pp. 99–101).

Sinai MS Georgian 59 (+ Geo. 1, fols. 11r–22v + N.5, 42 fols.). Datable on palaeographical grounds to the tenth century; probably copied in Palestine. Content: Heirmologion (some folios of its missing beginning are now in Geo. 1) and annual cycles that break off on October 1 (the rest of the manuscript is lost). The manuscript lacks the first nine quires (of which MS N.5 recovers a part). As Pavle Ingoroqva has shown, this Iadgari was composed as a supplement to Geo. 1 (Ingoroqva 1965, pp. 541–42). For this reason, while its design is typical of Group 1, its content is not, and we include it because it is applicable for our study in some cases (on the manuscript, see Chkhikvadze 2018, p. 99).¹⁷

Group 2: Composite codices characterised by additional materials (apart from the New Iadgari), an organisation of the Iadgari part that diverges from the standard one of Group 1, and succinct annual cycles. The Heirmologion is of type KaO (*Kanon-Ordnung*; for this term, see Frøyshov 2012a, “Heirmologion”). It generally does not have author attributions.¹⁸ We here use two witnesses:

Sinai MS Georgian 26. Composite codex produced by different scribes, one part dated 954, the other parts probably from around the same time. The MS was copied at different monasteries of Palestine, including the Great Lavra of St. Sabas. Content: the annual cycles (with two different series before the month of June), short Heirmologion, common feasts, and Oktoechos of Sunday and Saturday; two parts of the Old Iadgari, the first after the annual cycles, the other at the end (on this manuscript, see Chkhikvadze 2018, p. 98).

Sinai MS Georgian 34 (with many detached fragments). Composite and diverse codex with different scribes, an “Encyclopaedia of the Palaeo-Sabaite Daily Office”.¹⁹ Its New Iadgari (fols. 34r–123r) was copied by Iovane Zosime at the Great Lavra of St. Sabas in 965 and, given the particular Sabaite feasts and the Sabaite profile of the codex in general, probably reflects the use of that monastery. Content (see Frøyshov 2012c, pp. 254–55): Horologion,

calendar, Oktoechos, short Heirmologion, annual cycles, and common offices; the codex then continues with the Old Iadgari, a patristic reading, and diverse scriptural and chronological indexes (on this manuscript, see [Chkhikvadze 2018](#), p. 91, and a detailed inventory in [Frøyshov 2004](#), pp. 195–201).

Despite these witnesses' belonging to the same Palestinian redaction and being essentially similar, they display considerable variation in their composition. This is caused in part by the profile of the witnesses; the richer hymnals of Group 1 presumably reflect a cathedral origin, while the more reduced hymnals of Group 2 reflect a monastic setting (incl. Sabaite). In part, the variation between New Iadgari witnesses is due to the increasing Byzantine influence, which occurred somewhat differently in each manuscript.

2.3. *The Syriac New Tropologion: Sinai MS Syriac 48*

In the Syriac Melkite tradition, a number of manuscripts have the structure of a Tropologion. Most of them are incomplete, preserving neither beginning nor end and covering only a part of the ecclesiastical year.²⁰ Among liturgical manuscripts of this kind, there is one that stands out due to its age and completeness: Sinai MS Syriac 48, probably the bulkiest parchment codex in the Sinai old collection (330 fols.). Interestingly, it is one of only a few parchment manuscripts in St. Catherine's for which no *membra disiecta* have been identified so far—thereby testifying to its being relatively well preserved (See [Géhin 2017](#), pp. 102–3). To our knowledge, no detailed study of the content and structure of the manuscript has been conducted to date.

This MS was previously described as a Sticharion ([Lewis 1894](#), p. 50; [Kamil 1970](#), p. 160) or a Canonarion ([Clark 1952](#), p. 18). Heinrich Husmann was the first who overviewed its structure and pointed out its complex and mixed contents ([Husmann 1975a](#), pp. 284–85). Comparison with the MΓ 56+5, as well as with the New Iadgari, clearly shows it to be a version of the New Tropologion going back to the Jerusalem tradition. Like the Old Tropologion (Old Iadgari) and the New Iadgari, the book is a global hymnal, consisting of a number of different parts joined together.

The manuscript lacks the first three quires including the title page and the very last folios presumably containing the colophon. It starts with the canons of the Sunday Oktoechos (three canons in each mode), then follows the fixed annual cycle, which includes feasts from the Nativity on 25 December up to the commemoration of the Holy Martyrs Eustratios, Auxentios, Eugenios, Orestes, and Mardarios on 14 December. Integrated within the months of February, March, April, and May are feasts and services of the movable cycle, which include the memory of the Great Martyr Theodore (Tyron) on the first Saturday of Lent, Lazarus Saturday, Palm Sunday, Great Week, Easter Sunday, Bright Tuesday, Ascension, and Pentecost. Compared to the Greek Tropologion (MΓ 56+5) and the New Iadgari (Group 1), the content and calendar of Sinai Syr. 48 are rather concise; however, it is more extensive than Group 2 of the New Iadgari. The rubrics in most cases include stichera of Vespers on Kyrie ekekraxa, the night canon, and stichera of Matins, but no eucharistic liturgy. Likewise, there are no offices (*akolouthiai*) proper for episcopal (presumably, cathedral) services, such as the consecration of Holy Myron. Both latter cases are present in MΓ 56+5 (on the consecration of Holy Myron, see [Nikiforova 2019](#)).

Syr. 48 includes a number of feasts connected to particular places, such as “the memory of the Holy Fathers killed by barbarians on Mt Sinai” (eighth day of the Theophany; fol. 98v), “the feast of the appearance of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem in the days of the Archbishop Cyril” (7 May; f. 98v), or “the Feast of the Dedication of the Holy [Church of the] Anastasis” (13 September; fol. 215r), but these are common for different Eastern Christian traditions and therefore cannot be considered decisive for establishing the origin of our manuscript. The exception is a specific commemoration of the Archangel Michael on 6 June (fol. 174r), which, as we mentioned earlier, indicates an Egyptian connection in this calendar (see [Chronz and Nikiforova 2014](#), pp. 163–70).

The annual cycle section is flanked by two canons, “the canon of the Fathers of the Holy Mt Sinai” (28 December) at the beginning (fol. 164r) and “the canon on repentance composed

by Anastasios, the head of the Monastery of the Holy Mt Sinai” at the end (fol. 253r). Unlike the calendar, these hymnographic compositions provide a definite Sinaitic connotation and suggest that the manuscript could have been produced on Sinai.

As noted above, the manuscript is written on parchment; its writing contains a mixture of elements of the monumental script (*estrangela*) and a cursive one. On the basis of its transitional character, it can be dated presumably to the tenth century. Indeed, dated examples of Melkite writing from the eleventh century (particularly those copied in St. Panteleimon’s/St. Elias’ monastery on the Black Mountain near Antioch) demonstrate more cursive elements and generally more rounded letter shapes in comparison with Syr. 48 (see, for example, London British Library Add. 14,489, Lectionary, 1045 AD, [Hatch 1946](#), pl. CLXXXIV, p. [235]; London British Library Add. 14,510, *Oktoechos*, 1056 AD, [Hatch 1946](#), pl. CXXII, p. [173]). Thus, the latter can be characterised as more angular and archaic, and its dating to the tenth century could be preliminarily confirmed.

A characteristic feature is the presence of Greek words found in the margins throughout the manuscript, which correspond to incipits of selected hymnographical pieces, primarily *heirmoi*. The Greek script is a slanted irregular majuscule that could be contemporary with the main Syriac text. This feature is rather unusual for Syriac Melkite liturgical manuscripts from the period up to the thirteenth century, and testifies to a bilingual or even multilingual liturgical context to which the book belonged through its production and active circulation, and which could well be St. Catherine’s monastery.

3. The Office of St. John Chrysostom (27 January)

St. John Chrysostom’s *akolouthia* (27 January, §25, ἡ μνήμη τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου, fols. 80–87) is a case of undoubted Byzantine influence in MΓ 56+5.²¹ The feast of the translation of Chrysostom’s relics from Comana to Constantinople in 438 entered the calendar and the liturgy of Jerusalem during an earlier period, as witnessed in the Georgian Lectionary.²² The date varied between 26 and 27 January.²³ On 26 January, which could be an older date, a common proper for hierarchs was performed in the Anastasis cathedral. On 27 January, another common proper was appointed to be chanted, but preceded by what seems to be a specific troparion for Chrysostom, ὀρθῶς ὑψιδοῦσι μαῶλο, “Golden pure grace” (m5).²⁴ Later, the New Tropologion included individual propers for Sts. Basil (1 January, MΓ 56+5, fols. 7r–11r) and Gregory the Theologian (25 January, MΓ 56+5, fols. 75v–80r), who were particularly venerated in Palestine. These were composed by John of Damascus and Kosmas of Jerusalem in order to replace the common hymns, while St. John Chrysostom’s office was adopted directly from Constantinople. MΓ 56+5 happens to be the oldest witness for these hymns, which came to Jerusalem from the Constantinopolitan tradition.

3.1. The Office of St. John Chrysostom in the Three Versions of the New Tropologion

The office in MΓ 56+5 includes a canon and stichera for *Kyrie ekekraxa* and the *Ainoi*. As we shall see, many texts are the same in the New Iadgari and the Syriac Tropologion, witnessing that these elements were commonly used in the Christian Orient at least in the eighth–tenth centuries, being translated into Georgian and Syriac. Some New Iadgari witnesses, notably Geo. 59 and 64, contain two other offices for the same saint ([Mitreveli et al. 1978](#), pp. 167–68, 194), absent from MΓ 56+5 and Syr. 48, but these offices will not be considered here.²⁵ We resume the content of the office as found in the Greek, Syriac and Georgian New Tropologion in Table 1 below.

Table 1. The office of St. John Chrysostom in New Tropologion witnesses. Non-Greek incipits are rendered in Greek in case the Greek model has been identified, otherwise they are translated into English. = equals identity with the column to the left.

	ΜΓ 56+5, Rubrics	ΜΓ 56+5, Text	Syr. 48 (Fols. 109r–112v)	Geo. 1, 14, 64 ²⁶
Kyrie ekekraxa	Εἰς τὸ Κύριε ἐκέκραξα. Ἦχ. πλ. δ'. Πρὸς· Τὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντα	Τοῦ ἱεράρχου τὴν μνήμην ὕμνοις τιμήσωμεν, ὡς χρυσὸς γὰρ τοῖς περασμοῖς	Ἐπρεπε τῇ πορφυρίδι	Ἐπρεπε τῇ πορφυρίδι
		Τοῦ ἱεράρχου τὴν μνήμην ὕμνοις τιμήσωμεν, τῷ γὰρ ὄπλῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ	Γράμμασι χρυσαυγεστάτοις	Like Paul you reached the third heaven, o Chrysostom
Canon	Εἰς τὸν κανόνα· ᾠδὴ α'. Ἦχ. πλ. δ'. Πρὸς· Ἄισμα ἀναπέμψωμεν	Ἄισμα ἀναπέμψωμεν	=	=
			In divinely inspired words you enriched, o Hierarchy	You rejected the world of golden richness
Ainoi	Εἰς τὸ αἰνεῖτε. Ἦχ. δ'. Βυζαντινά.	Χῦμα ὡς φησὶν ὁ Σολομών (first troparion of ode 1) ²⁷	Σάλπιγξ ἀνεδείχθης (first troparion of ode 1)	Χῦμα ὡς φησὶν ὁ Σολομών (first troparion of ode 1)
		Ἐπρεπε τῇ πορφυρίδι ²⁸	Γράμμασι χρυσαυγεστάτοις ³⁰	[no mode] ²⁹ From your lips flows honey
Aposticha	Εἰς τὸν στίχον. Ἦχ. δ'.	Ἄνασσα φραινομανοῦσα		Through compassion you became great to the whole world
		Χρυσέ, χρυσεπέων Χρυσόστομε		Like gold your shining heart

It is quite natural that the hymn selection differed in the Greek, Georgian, and Syriac MSS, as hymnography was a rather free and variable part of liturgical worship at that time. The sticheron Ἐπρεπε τῇ πορφυρίδι τῶν πόλεων (“It was fitting for the queen of cities”) and the canon that matches in all three versions belong to the Constantinopolitan core of the repertoire of this feast. These elements were in use in the Christian Orient at least in the eighth–tenth centuries, and entered the Greek New Tropologion and its Georgian and Syriac translations.

3.2. Stichera on Kyrie ekekraxa, the Ainoi, and Aposticha

There are two Kyrie ekekraxa stichera in ΜΓ 56+5 (as in the office of St. Isidore, 14 May, §59, fols. 199v–200r) instead of the regular three. Reduction in the number of texts could reveal that Chrysostom’s commemoration was considered a more ordinary celebration in Palestine/Egypt than in Constantinople. These stichera are known only from ΜΓ 56+5:³¹

Εἰς τὸ Κύριε ἐκέκραξα. Ἦχος πλ. δ'. Πρὸς· Τὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντα. Τοῦ ἱεράρχου τὴν μνήμην ὕμνοις τιμήσωμεν, ὡς χρυσὸς γὰρ τοῖς περασμοῖς καθαρθεῖς, διέπρεψεν ἐπὶ γῆς ταῖς ἀρεταῖς λάμπων, ὥσπερ λίθων ἀγλαῖς,

καὶ ὡς σάλπιγξ θεότευκτος τῇ οἰκουμένη ἀπήχησεν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δόξαν εὐσεβῶς, ὅθεν στεφηφόρος ἐν ὑψίστοις τὰς τῶν πιστῶν ἀμοιβὰς παρὰ Θεοῦ δεξάμενος, ὑπὲρ πιστῶν τὰς αἰτὰς ποιοῦντι· τῷ σωτῆρι τοῦ σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

Τοῦ ἱεράρχου τὴν μνήμην ὕμνοις τιμήσωμεν, τῷ γὰρ ὄπλῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ ἐχθροῦ κατέβαλεν τὴν ἰσχὺν, καὶ τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀσκήσει καθυπέταξε τῶν παθῶν τὰ σκληρῆματα καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου γενόμενος ταῖς ἀρεταῖς ἐκλάμπων εὐσεβῶς, ὅθεν στεφηφόρος ἀνεδείχθη σὺν ἀγγέλοις Χριστῷ λειτουργῶν ἀπαύστως ποιοῦντι· τῷ σωτῆρι τοῦ σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

To Kyrie ekekraxa. M.pl.4. To: Him who has risen from the dead. Let us honour the memory of the hierarch with hymns, as gold he was purified by temptation, he was adorned on earth, shining with virtues like stones, and as the God-born trumpet proclaimed to the oikoumene the glory of God piously, from which the crowned man in the highest receives the praise of the faithful from God, for the faithful he beseeches our Saviour, who grants salvation to our souls.

Let us honour the memory of the hierarch with hymns, for with the weapon of the cross he overthrew the power of the enemy, and through his own ascetic life he subdued the unruly passions and, shining piously with virtues of the sun, through which he, the crowned man, appeared with the angels serving the Saviour, who grants salvation to our souls.

A non-Constantinopolitan, probably Palestinian, provenance of these two stichera seems plausible for two reasons. First, they occupy a prominent position at the beginning of the service, which obviously indicates the dominant liturgical tradition, i.e., that of Jerusalem. There is a clear tendency in the MS to put an adopted text as *doxastikon* (stanza after “Glory to the Father...”) or *apostichon* (stanza at psalm verses at Vespers and Matins) after the main set: for example, we shall interpret the *doxastika* Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε and Σάλπιγξ φωνήν as being of Constantinopolitan origin (see below, Section 6).³² Second, their model stanza, Τὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντα, is unknown in the Byzantine tradition, being absent from Follieri’s index (Follieri 1960–1965), but it is present among the other propers of ΜΓ 56+5 (Apostle Mark, 25 April, §49, fol. 168v; St. Joseph of Arimathaea, 12 June, §73, fol. 239v).

By contrast, the Ainoi stichera in mode 4 are introduced in ΜΓ 56-5 by the rubric “BYZ” (fol. 86v), which is the abbreviation of Βυζάντιος, i.e., “Byzantine” or “Constantinopolitan” (Stephanus 1954, p. 452). This is an early occurrence of the term, which can be understood as opposing another term, Ἀνατολικός (“Oriental”), which is quite common in the MSS of Byzantine (Constantinopolitan) origin. While Ἀνατολικός referred to hymns of which the texts and melodies presumably originated in the Christian Orient, or even more precisely in Palestine (Zheltoy and Bulaev 2018, pp. 104–6), “Byzantine” most probably defined hymns that originated in Constantinople and were included in Eastern MSS. Their common ending, πρεσβεῦειν αὐτὸν πρὸς Κύριον σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν (“[beseech him] to pray to the Lord to save our souls”), suggests that these stichera belong together as one set, and the definition “Byzantine” applies to all the texts of this group, reshaped or lost in later MSS.

A sticheron dedicated to the empress Eudoxia (ODB 1991, p. 740) is known today only from ΜΓ 56+5, and is published below:

Ἄνασσα φρενομανοῦσα συνέχετο, συγκροτοῦσα δῆμον καὶ λαὸν ἄπειρον, ἐξώριστον εἶναι τὸν εὐσεβῆ Ἰωάννην σπουδάζουσα, ταύτην γὰρ ἀνομοῦσαν διήλλεγεν θριαμβεύων τὴν τάλαινα καὶ οὗτος ἦν ἀκράδαντος, διδασκαλικῶς κηρύττων τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ Κύριον, τοῦτον πάντες ἰκετεύσατε· πρεσβεῦειν αὐτὸν πρὸς Κύριον σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

The queen, possessed by madness, with the applause of the people and the immense crowd, tried to drive out the pious John. But he rebuked her, the lawless one, triumphing in her iniquity, while he himself was unshaken, and as a teacher proclaimed Jesus Christ and the Lord. All of you, beseech him to pray to the Lord to save our souls.

In the received tradition, the sticheron Ἐπρεπε τῆ πορφυρίδι is attributed to Germanos of Constantinople (ca. 655–ca. 740s), and it is not excluded that he is the author of the whole set. The apostichon of Matins (in the same mode 4) has an extraordinary wordplay in Greek—hardly translatable and absent in the Georgian and Syriac versions, which could also be an adoption from Constantinople, because it appears as a linguistic curiosity which looks somewhat alien in Palestinian hymnography.

Εἰς τὸν στίχον. Ἦχος δ΄. Χρυσέ, χρυσέπων Χρυσόστομε, χρυσορόφον ὑπερχρυσόχευθον χρύσινον, χρυσολογικὸν χρυσογράφου χρυσόσεως χρῆμα, ἐν φιλοχρύσοις ὑπέρχρυσον καὶ χρυσότευκτον ἄλυσσον, χρυσὸν οὐ χρυσομέθυσε, χρυσοστόλιστα, ὀλόχρυσε χροϊκέ, πηγὴ χρυσόβαφε, χρυσοκόλλα χρυσοάνθιε, Χριστῶ, Ἰωάννη, χρύσειψε, συγχρύσωσον τὸν χρωτὸν ἡμῶν.

Additional Syriac and Georgian texts, witnessing the diversity of composition of the proper texts, which so far remain unidentified within the Greek material, require further study.

3.3. The Canon

The canon (m.pl.4, heirmos Ἄισμα ἀναπέμφωμεν, λαοί, “O peoples, let us send up a hymn”, without any acrostic, fols. 80v–86v) was a popular text in the Byzantine liturgy and is found in many eleventh–fourteenth-century Greek Menaia and early Slavonic liturgical manuscripts in variable redactions.³³ Its publication in AHG has a remark: “The tradition of the canon and the order and number of troparia differ in the manuscripts”.³⁴ Indeed, in total, there are about 70 troparia, 30 *triadika* and *theotokia*, and more than 10 *heirmoi* recognised as belonging to this canon. Such extensivity and diversity of the text could be explained as reflecting the extraordinary role of Chrysostom’s celebration and veneration in Byzantium. As we still have no idea about the original shape of this canon, we can only guess that these variants could have been produced in two ways: (a) by reducing an originally long version or (b) the opposite process, by adding over time, in the process of copying, new troparia to the initial version. These versions appeared in the MSS mostly as anonymous compositions, but they are also known under the names of Andrew of Crete (ca. 660–740), patriarch Germanos of Constantinople, John the Monk, and in printed Menaia under the name of Theophanes.³⁵ The editors of an extensive version of this canon in AHG (according to the Grottaferrata MS Biblioteca Statale del Monumento Nazionale Δ.α. XV, 11th c., and five additional MSS) defend the authorship of Andrew of Crete (known from the 12th c. Menaion (with Synaxarion) Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Grec 1569), who, after an initial period in Jerusalem, worked for a longer period in Constantinople.³⁶ The attribution to Andrew³⁷ is corroborated by the particularly lengthy text—he is known to have written long canons—and the rich employment of Old Testament allusions, which also are widely employed in his oeuvre: for example, in his Great Canon, Νέος Ἀβραάμ ἐδείχθη, ἄλλον Ἰσαὰκ τὸν βίον θυσιάσας (“The new Abraham appeared, the other Isaac sacrificed his life”), Σὺ τὸν Ἰακώβ ζηλώσας (“You were jealous of Jacob”), Σὺ τὸν Ἰωσήφ μιμούμενος (“You were imitating Joseph”, ode 4),³⁸ with regular triadika and theotokia in the odes.

Similar features (apart from the enormous length of the canon) were present in the works of Andrew’s contemporary Germanos of Constantinople, who is considered to be the author of six heirmoi of this canon, of the sticheron Ἐπρεπε τῆ πορφυρίδι (and very probably of the whole set); both the canon and the sticheron are composed in mode 4.³⁹ He could therefore also be the author of this canon. His authorship is

supported by some lexical parallels between the Chrysostom canon and another canon ascribed to Germanos on the Second Transfer of the Relics of St. John the Forerunner (24 February):⁴⁰

CHR 6 (AHG V, p. 424): Ὡσπερ χρυσὸς ἐκ μετάλλων...τὰ πάγχρυσα δόγματα
PRODROMOS (Forerunner) 4 (AHG VI, p. 378): Ὡς χρυσὸς ἐκ μετάλλων ἡ
σεπτῆ κεφαλῇ

PROD 4 (AHG VI, p. 378): τὴν ἐκ μετάλλων γῆς ὡς χρυσίον...σου κάραν

CHR 6 (AHG V, p. 414): Σάλπιγξ ἀνεδείχθης λογικὴ φωνοῦσα τὰ ἀπόκρυφα

PROD 1 (AHG VI, p. 376): Ὡς σάλπιγξ μυστικὴ ἐκβοᾷ πρὸς ἡμᾶς

PROD 2 (AHG VI, p. 376): Ἡ θεοκῆρυκτος σάλπιγξ...ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ Προδρόμου

PROD 4 (AHG VI, p. 378): κεφαλὴ τοῦ Προδρόμου ὡς σάλπιγξ βοᾷ

PROD 4 (AHG VI, p. 382): Σάλπιγξ γνωστικὴ ἐν ἐρήμῳ πάλαι ἡχοῦσα

CHR 5 (AHG V, p. 423): Χρυσοειδεῖς ἀκτῖνας τῆ οἰκουμένη ἀστραπτῶν τοῖς
λόγοις σου

PROD 5 (AHG VI, p. 378): Ἡμερινὰς ἀκτῖνας ἡ θεοκῆρυκτος κάρα σου... καταλάμπει
εἰ τῷ κόσμῳ

CHR 5 (AHG V, p. 423): ὡς ἐν πυρὶ χωνεύσας τῶν ἰερῶν σου λογίων τὸ
δόκιμον

PROD 7 (AHG VI, p. 380): ὡς ἐν πυρὶ καμίνου χωνευθεῖσα ἡ κεφαλὴ... χρυσοῦ
πλέον δοκιμωτέρα

Due to the fact that the hymnographical corpus of both authors is far from having been exhaustively studied, we are unable to contest or to support Andrew's authorship without well-argued reasoning. However, it is clear that the canon corresponds to what we otherwise know about a standard seventh–eighth-century canon of Constantinopolitan provenance (in contrast to canons of Jerusalem origin): its original version had the second ode (omitted in the adapted one that we study here) as well as regular *triadika* and *theotokia* (Nikiforova 2012, pp. 60–64, 182–83).

In the following table (Table 2), we compare the rendering of the canon in the multilingual tradition of the New Tropologion, which preserved the oldest evidence of this canon, with the complete troparia collection, extracted from later Byzantine Menaia and edited in AHG.

Table 2. Full account of the canon Ἄισμα ἀναπέμφωμεν for St. John Chrosostom. / = Δόξα τῷ Πατρὶ. № = The position in the series of troparia in the given source(s). Θ = *Theotokion*. Bold letters = *heirmos*. = equals identity with the column to the left.

Ode	ΜΓ 56+5, Fols. 80v–86v	Syr. 48, Fols. 109v–112v	Geo. 1, 14, 64 ⁴¹	AHG, № XXXIII (1), pp. 413–30	AHG, № XXXIII (2), pp. 431–38
1	Ἄισμα ἀναπέμφωμεν	=	=	=	=
	№ 1: Χῦμα ὡς φησὶν ὁ Σολομῶν		№ 1		№ 1
			№ 2: In nocturnal prayer, Peter		
	№ 2: Σάλπιγξ ἀνεδείχθης	№ 1	№ 3	№ 2	

Table 2. Cont.

Ode	ΜΓ 56+5, Fols. 80v–86v	Syr. 48, Fols. 109v–112v	Geo. 1, 14, 64 ⁴¹	ΑΗΓ, Νο XXXIII (1), pp. 413–30	ΑΗΓ, Νο XXXIII (2), pp. 431–38
				Νο 3: Λόγοις κατεπλούτισας	
			Νο 4: Πλουτόν ἐναπέθου	Νο 1: Πλουτόν ἐναπέθου	Νο 2: Πλουτόν ἐναπέθου
	Νο 3: Πέτρα ἀνεδείχθης	Νο 2		Νο 4	
	Νο 4: Δόξα τῷ Πατρὶ (/)	Νο 3: /	Νο 5: /	Νο 7: /	Νο 4: /
	Νο 5: Κλίμαξ ἀνεδείχθης (θ)			Νο 8: θ	Νο 5: θ
			Νο 6: θ		
				Νο 5: Γλώσση μεταλλεύων	Νο 3: Γλώσση μεταλλεύων
				Νο 6: Δεῦτε ὑπαντήσωμεν	
2				Ἴδετε, ἴδετε, ὅτι ἐγώ ⁴²	
				Ἴδετε, ἴδετε, ὅτι ἐγώ	
				Στόμα θεόφθογγον	
				Ἄλλον Μωσέα σε	
				Ἄλλην εἰργασατο	
				Σὺ τὴν μετάνοιαν	
				Μέγα καὶ τίμιον	
				Πάτερ ἀγέννητε (/)	
				Ἔγνωμεν, ἔγνωμεν (θ)	
3	Οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος ⁴³	=	=	=	=
	Νο 1: Χρυσέοις τοῖς δόγμασι	Νο 1	Νο 1	Νο 1	Νο 1
	Νο 2: Ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα σου	Νο 2	Νο 2	Νο 2	Νο 2
	Νο 3: Διάρας τὸ κάλυμμα	Νο 3		Νο 3	Νο 3
	Νο 4: Μυρίζουσιν, ὅσιε	Νο 4		Νο 4	
	Νο 5: Τὸν ἄσειστον πύργον	Νο 5	Νο 3		
	Νο 6: Ὡς ἄμπελος γέγονας	Νο 6	Νο 4		
	Νο 7: Ἄγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος (/)	Νο 7: /	Νο 5: /		
	Νο 8: Αχρόνως ἐξέλαψας (θ)				Νο 6

Table 2. Cont.

Ode	ΜΓ 56+5, Fols. 80v–86v	Syr. 48, Fols. 109v–112v	Geo. 1, 14, 64 ⁴¹	ΑΗΓ, Νο XXXIII (1), pp. 413–30	ΑΗΓ, Νο XXXIII (2), pp. 431–38
				Νο 6: Ως άνθη κυπρίζουσιν	
				Νο 5: Είς τρίτον άνέδραμες	Νο 4: Είς τρίτον άνέδραμες
				Νο 7: Τριάς όμοούσιε (/)	Νο 5: Τριάς όμοούσιε (/)
				Νο 8: Άμέριστος έμεινας (θ)	
			Νο 6: θ		
4	Εισακήκοα, Χριστέ	=	=	=	Έξ όρουσ κατασκίου
	Νο 1: Νέος Άβραάμ	Νο 1	Νο 1	Νο 1	Νο 1
	Νο 2: Σύ τον Ιακώβ	Νο 2		Νο 2	Νο 2
	Νο 3: Σύ τον Ιωσήφ	Νο 3		Νο 3	
	Νο 4: Ράβδω μυστική	Νο 4	Νο 2		Νο 3
			Νο 3: Δεύτερος Ιώβ		Νο 4: Δεύτερος Ιώβ
	Νο 5: Άλλος Ααρών	Νο 5			
	Νο 6: Σύ του Ηλίου	Νο 6	Νο 6	Νο 4	
		Νο 7: Έτερος Δαβίδ	Νο 4: Έτερος Δαβίδ	Νο 6: Έτερος Δαβίδ	
		Νο 8: You in the fog spoke to Elias			
		Νο 9: You as a cloak of grace (θ)			
	Νο 7: Άλλος Ιησούς			Νο 5	
	Νο 8: Συ ώς μιλωτήν				
	Νο 9: Άλλος Δανιήλ	Νο 10	Νο 5	Νο 7	
	Νο 10: Άναρχε Τριάς (/)	Νο 11: /		Νο 8: /	Νο 5: /
	Νο 11: Χαίρε, θησαυρέ (θ) ⁴⁴				Νο 6
				Νο 7: Σε διά παντός (θ)	
			Νο 6: θ		
5	Ό έκ νυκτός	=	=	=	Έκ νυκτός άγνοίας
	Νο 1: Σε άρετής εικόνα	Νο 1			Νο 1
	Νο 2: Τήν ίεράν στολήν	Νο 2		Νο 1	Νο 2
	Νο 3: Ως έν πυρι	Νο 3	Νο 3	Νο 5	
	Νο 4: Χρυσοειδείς άκτίνας	Νο 4	Νο 4	Νο 4	

Table 2. Cont.

Ode	ΜΓ 56+5, Fols. 80v–86v	Syr. 48, Fols. 109v–112v	Geo. 1, 14, 64 ⁴¹	AHG, № XXXIII (1), pp. 413–30	AHG, № XXXIII (2), pp. 431–38
	№ 5: Αθλητικὸν ἄγωνα	№ 5	№ 1	№ 2	
			№ 2: To enlighten those in darkness		
	№ 6: Τὴν ὑπὲρ νοῦν (/)	№ 6: /		№ 7: /	№ 4: /
	№ 7: Τῶν χερουβεϊμ (θ) ⁴⁵			№ 3: Τῇ ἀστραπῇ τῶν λόγων	
				№ 6: Τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἰδρωτάς	№ 3: Τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἰδρωτάς
				№ 8: Ἀνεῦ σποράς τεκούσα (θ)	№ 5: Ἀνεῦ σποράς τεκούσα (θ)
			№ 5: θ		
6	Ὡς τὸν προφήτην	=	=	=	Χιτῶνα μοι παράσχου
	№ 1: Ὡσπερ χρυσὸς	№ 1	№ 1	№ 1	6 different troparia
	№ 2: Ὡς τὰς ἀβάτου	№ 2		№ 2	
	№ 3: Τὴν πανάγια σου μνήμην	№ 3	№ 2	№ 4	
	№ 4: Σὺν τῷ Υἱῷ (/)	№ 4: /			
	№ 5: Τὸν ἐν χερσὶ (θ) ⁴⁶				
			№ 3: Εἰ καὶ νεκρὸς εἶ ἐν τάφῳ	№ 3: Εἰ καὶ νεκρὸς εἶ ἐν τάφῳ	
				№ 5 Ὁ τεχθεὶς ἐκ Παρθένου (θ)	
			№ 4: θ		
7	Ὁ τοὺς παῖδας	=	=	=	Ὁ τὴν φλόγα № 1: Ὡς τὸ πῦρ κατασβέσας
	№ 1: Ὡς χρυσὸς	№ 1	№ 1	№ 1	
	№ 2: Οὐκ ἐναρκήσας	№ 2	№ 2	№ 2	№ 2
	№ 3: Τοῦ μικροῦ σου ποιμνίου	№ 3	№ 3	№ 6	№ 4
	№ 4: Σὺν τῷ Υἱῷ (/) ⁴⁷	№ 4: /		№ 8: /	№ 5: /
	№ 5: Χαῖρε, κουφή (θ)			№ 9: θ	№ 6: θ
				№ 3: Ἀκριβῆς προεγνώσθης	

Table 2. Cont.

Ode	ΜΓ 56+5, Fols. 80v–86v	Syr. 48, Fols. 109v–112v	Geo. 1, 14, 64 ⁴¹	AHG, № XXXIII (1), pp. 413–30	AHG, № XXXIII (2), pp. 431–38
				№ 4: Τὴν ἐν λόγους σοφίαν	
				№ 5: Ως ἐν γῆ καὶ θαλάσση	№ 3
				№ 7: Ως χιτῶνα τὴν πίστιν	
			№ 4: θ		
8	Οἱ θεορρήμονες παῖδες	=	=	=	=
	№ 1: Ἡ θεορήμων σου γλώσσα	№ 1	№ 1	№ 1	№ 1
	№ 2: Ὁ τὴν φιλάργυρον πλάνην	№ 2	№ 2		
	№ 3: Ἱεροουργεῖ τῶν ἀρρήτων	№ 3			№ 2
					№ 3: Ὁ ἐρμενεὺς τῆς ἀγράφου
	№ 4: Σὺν τῷ Υἱῷ (I)			№ 6: /	№ 5: /
	№ 5: Ὑπερφύως ἐν γαστρὶ (θ)			№ 7: θ	№ 6: θ
				№ 2: Ὁ τὰς ἀκάρπους καρδίας	
			№ 3: Ἐγγύτητα τῆς ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίας	№ 3: Ἐγγύτητα τῆς ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίας	
				№ 4: Ἱερομύστα τῆς ἄνω βασιλείας	№ 4: Ἱερομύστα τῆς ἄνω βασιλείας
				№ 5: Ως τῇ Τριάδι (I)	
			№ 4: θ		
9	Τὸν προδηλωθέντα	=	=	=	=
			№ 1: Like the Forerunner		
	№ 1: Ἄλλος χρυσορρόας ἐδείχθη	№ 1		№ 3	№ 1
	№ 2: Σὺ τῆς ἀκενώτου πηγῆς	№ 2	№ 2	№ 1	
	№ 3: Σὺ διαδραμῶν	№ 3		№ 2	№ 3
	№ 4: Ἀγγαλιασόμεθα πάντες	№ 4	№ 3	№ 7	№ 4
	№ 5: Βάτον καιομένη (θ)			№ 9: θ	№ 6: θ

Table 2. Cont.

Ode	MI 56+5, Fols. 80v–86v	Syr. 48, Fols. 109v–112v	Geo. 1, 14, 64 ⁴¹	AHG, № XXXIII (1), pp. 413–30	AHG, № XXXIII (2), pp. 431–38
			№ 4: You, o Virgin (θ)	№ 4: Τίς τὰς ἀριστείας	
				№ 5: Σὲ ὠκεανὸν νοητῶς	
				№ 6: Ἐκ τῶν θησαυρῶν	№ 2: Ἐκ τῶν θησαυρῶν
				№ 8: Ἀναρχε Τριάς (/)	№ 5: Ἀναρχε Τριάς (/)
	36 troparia +7/+ 8 θ = 51	36 troparia + 6/+ 1 θ = 42	32 troparia + 2/+ 8 θ = 42	55 troparia + 9/+ 9 θ = 73	44 troparia + 9/+ 9 θ = 50

How does New Tropologion evidence contribute to this query on the extension of the canon? First, it confirms the use of the same canon in the multilingual Greek, Syriac, and Georgian liturgy of Palestine in the ninth–tenth centuries, with similar textual diversity in number and choice of troparia.

Secondly, the Greek, Syriac, and Georgian versions demonstrate their obvious unity, the stronger dependence of the Syriac version on the Greek, and more independent Georgian development. The New Tropologion has also preserved a portion of texts that were previously unknown in the Byzantine tradition.

Thirdly, these Greek, Georgian, and Syriac versions seem to be partially adapted to the standards of the New Tropologion. As in the seventh–eighth-century canons of Palestinian origin, the second odes were normally no longer in use; the canons themselves were rather short and did not include either regular *triadika* (which seem to be more common in the Constantinopolitan milieu) or *theotokia* (which were performed in Jerusalem liturgy according to particular collections, organised by modes in sequence). The adaptation proceeded in the following direction. All the versions omitted ode 2.⁴⁸ The MI 56+5 version preserved regular *triadika* and *theotokia* (which do not match entirely with those in AHG), and they could have been copied together with the canon for practical purposes.⁴⁹ The Syriac and Georgian versions, however, have less *triadika* at the canon: Syr. 48 for odes 1, 3–7, and the New Iadgari only for odes 1 and 3. These versions seem to have removed the remaining stanzas of this kind, which were not traditional in the Palestinian tradition.

Thus, this Constantinopolitan canon penetrated into the Palestinian tradition and became a part of the New Tropologion, adapted to different extents to Hierosolymitan use, i.e., being deprived of ode 2 and, in its Syriac version, of the *theotokia* as well.

3.4. Conclusions

Thus, a special proper in honour of St. John Chrysostom appeared for the first time in the Hierosolymitan liturgy in the New Tropologion and replaced a common proper for hierarchs, which was in use in the earlier rite of Jerusalem. While, at first, services dedicated to the great church fathers who lived in the fourth century and who were venerated in Palestine—to St. Basil the Great and St. Gregory the Theologian—were composed by the main authors of the New Tropologion themselves, John of Damascus and Kosmas of Jerusalem, the service of St. John Chrysostom was a rare though not unique case of a direct borrowing from Constantinople, the city that was the centre of his cult. The Chrysostom office spread during the eighth–tenth centuries through the Christian Orient and was performed in the Greek, Georgian, and Syriac languages, arriving in Palestine within the framework of liturgical exchange. It appears as one of the earliest points for the infiltra-

tion of Byzantine elements in the New Tropologion. Two stichera on Kyrie ekekraxa could be originally Palestinian because of their initial position in the service and because of the model, unknown for Byzantine hymnography, Τὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντα, which is repeatedly used in ΜΓ 56+5. By contrast, the Ainoi and the canon demonstrate undoubted Constantinopolitan impact, although we are not completely sure of their authorship. The Ainoi are introduced by the remark “Byzantine”, and the canon has typological features of a standard seventh–eighth-century Constantinopolitan canon, which originally had ode 2, regular *triadika*, and *theotokia*. This Constantinopolitan canon was adopted and harmonised with the specifics of contemporaneous Palestinian canons, collected in the New Tropologion, and thus deprived of ode 2 and, in its Syriac version, of its *theotokia* as well.

4. The First Ode of the Great Saturday Canon: Ἄφρον γηραλῆε

For the Matins of Great Saturday, ΜΓ 56+5 prescribes a *pentaode* (Papadopoulos-Kerameus’ term; see Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1894, p. ζ), in m.pl.2, consisting of odes 1, 6–9, introduced by the rubric “ΛΘ. Κανῶν τῶν ἁγίων Σαββάτων φέρων ἀκροστιχ[ίδα] τὴν ὑποτεταγμένην· καὶ Σάββατον μέλπω μέγα” (“39. Canon for Great Saturday, carrying the following acrostic: “And Great Saturday I chant”), with the acrostic going through both heirmoi and troparia. While odes 6–9 are generally considered to be authentic texts of Kosmas of Jerusalem, ode 1, starting with Ἄφρον γηραλῆε (“Insane old”), with the heirmos “Κύματι θαλάσσης” (“He who, in ancient times”), for a long time was associated with the name of the ninth-century Constantinopolitan poetess Kassia (b. ca. 800—d. between 843 and 867; for this date and main bibliography, see Simić 2014, p. 238) and her tetraode, i.e., this ode 1 + odes 3–5 (published in Eustratiades 1932, pp. 96–100 on the basis of two MSS from Athos, also Simić 2011, pp. 56–60). While some scholars have considered Kassia to be the author of the heirmos Κύματι θαλάσσης and two troparia of ode 1 (Eustratiades 1932, p. 164, §231; Papagiannis 2005, p. 470; Simić 2011, pp. 71–72),⁵⁰ other scholars were convinced that Kassia composed only the troparia, and that the heirmos belonged to the complete set of heirmoi by Kosmas (Detorakes 1979, pp. 169–73; see also Schirò 1979, p. 314, and Tomadakes 2004, pp. 449–50). We fully share the latter opinion.

Here is the complete text of this disputed ode 1:⁵¹

ΛΘ. Κανῶν τῶν ἁγίων Σαββάτων ... Ωιδὴ α΄. [Ἦχος] πλ. β΄. Κύματι θαλάσσης... (thus in every printed Triodion).

Ἄφρον γηραλῆε, ἀκόρεστε ἄδη, χανῶν ὑπόδεξαι τὴν ἀπάντων ζωὴν· καταπιῶν γὰρ ἐμέσεις ἅς προπέπωκας δικαίων ψυχάς, καθελεῖ σε Κύριος, ἐνδόξ[ως γὰρ δεδόξασται].

Ἰησοῦ Θεέ μου, ὕμῳ σου τὰ πάθη· ἐκῶν τέθνηκας ὑπὲρ τῆς πάντων ζωῆς καὶ ἐν σινδόνι καὶ σμύρνη κηδευθῆναι κατηξίωσας, τὴν τάφην δοξάζω σου, *ἐνδόξως γὰρ [δεδόξασται].⁵²

39. Canon for Great Saturday... Ode 1. M.pl.2. He who, in ancient times ... (Lenten Triodion 2002, p. 646)

Insane old, insatiable gaping hell, receive the life of all mankind. For you will be sick devouring the souls of the righteous that you had swallowed down; the Lord will destroy you, for He is greatly glorified.

Jesus, my God, I chant your Passion, for you died willingly on behalf of everyone’s life, and were graced to be buried in the shroud and with myrrh; I glorify your grave, for He is greatly glorified.

Although an assumption about the legendary character of Kassia has been voiced (Afinogenov 2013, p. 575), and some problems with the tetraode ascribed to Kassia have been highlighted (Simić 2011, pp. 68–70; Papagiannis 2005, p. 471), most scholars agree that Kassia was a real person who indeed composed this tetraode, including the disputed ode 1 (Rochow 1967, pp. 7–39; Schirò 1979; Papagiannis 2005; Simić 2011, pp. 56–76). Consequently, finding ode 1 as an integral part of Kosmas’ hymn for Great Saturday in the ninth-

century New Tropologion of the Jerusalem rite raises questions about the hymn's origin. Is this a sudden borrowing of part of the recently composed text from the capital, i.e., the adoption of the ode 1 by Kassia into ΜΓ 56+5, signifying that this ode is a Constantinopolitan element in this Palestinian canon? Or was this ode an original Hierosolymitan hymn, or even written possibly by Kosmas himself, and subsequently adopted in the worship of Constantinople and ascribed to Kassia by mistake?

4.1. Pentaode in Great Saturday Canons: Survey of MSS Witness

This disputed ode 1 is part of a long and tricky story of the development of odes/canons for Great Saturday Matins.

The first, unelaborate tetraode (odes 6–9) for Great Saturday appeared in the Jerusalem rite and was recorded in the Old Iadgari (№ 1 in Table 3 below). Later on, Andrew of Crete wrote his own tetraode (the same odes),⁵³ presumably in Constantinople, and, with an attribution to him, it appears as the second canon of the feast in the tenth-century Triodia of Constantinopolitan origin, Sinai MS Greek 734–735 and Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 8 (№ 2). The following table gives a chronological overview over the known canons for Great Saturday.

Table 3. Two triodes and a pentaode.

№ ⁵⁴	Odes	Century	Author	Origin	MSS
1	6–9	(ap. before mid-7th)	?	Palestine	Tetraode: Old Iadgari (Renoux 2008, pp. 387–96).
2	6–9	7th–8th	Andrew	Constantinople	Tetraode: Sinai MS Greek 734–35, 10th c., fols. 197v–200r (with attribution); Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 8, 10th c., fols. 79r–83r (with attribution, and + № 4); Vatican Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MS Vat. gr. 771 (11th c., fols. 186v–188r, with attribution, and + № 6b).
3	1, 6–9	8th	Kosmas	Palestine	Pentaode: ΜΓ 56+5, fols. 137v–139v; Syr. 48, 10th c., fols. 144r–145v (in both cases without attribution).
4	3–5 + 1, 6–9	9th	Theophanes + Kosmas	Jerusalem/ Constantinople (?)	Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 8, 10thc., fols. 78–83 (ode 1 and odes 3–5—without attribution, odes 6–9 are attributed to Kosmas, and + № 2); NLR MS Greek 712, 10thc., fols. 218r–218v (fragmentarily preserved, ode 1, odes 8–9 of Kosmas, odes 3–4—of Theophanes).
5a	3–5 + 3–5 + 1, 6–9	9th	Theophanes + "alloi" + Kosmas	Jerusalem/ Constantinople (?)	Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 10, 1138, fols. 31r–32v (ed. Tomadakes 2004, pp. 327–31, there are two sets for odes 3–5 with different heirmoi, main and "allos"; the first set is attributed to Theophanes, the second set has no attribution; odes 1, 6–9 have no attribution).

Table 3. Cont.

№ ⁵⁴	Odes	Century	Author	Origin	MSS
5b	3–5 + 1, 6–9	9th	“Alloi” (Theophanes ?) + Kosmas	Jerusalem/ Constantinople (?)	New Iadgari (Geo. 1, 14, 65: odes 3–5 are the same as the “allos” set in Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 10, also without attribution).
6a	1B, 3–5 + 1, 6–9	9th–10th	Mark of Otranto + Kosmas	Constantinople	MS Monē tou Timiou Staurou 43, 1122 (ed. Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1894, pp. 165, 169–73, with attribution to Mark and Kosmas); Typikon of Alexis the Studite, 1060s–1070s (Pentkovskij 2001, p. 254, with attribution to Mark and Kosmas); Sinai MS Greek 742, 1099, fols. 166r–169v (with attribution to Mark and Kosmas); Serbian National Library MS 645, 1328, fol. 285r (see Simić 2014, p. 244).
6b	1B, 3–5 + 6–9	9th–10th	Mark of Otranto + Kosmas	Constantinople	Sinai MS Greek 734–35 (10th c., fols. 195v–197r, with attributions to Mark and Kosmas), Vatican MS Vat. gr. 771 (11th c., fols. 185v–188r, with attributions to Mark and Kosmas, and + № 2), Sinai MS Greek 742 (1028, fols. 239v–241v, with the attribution of odes 6–9 to Kosmas), National Library of Russia MS Greek 230 (12th c., fols. 112v–113v, with the attribution of odes 6–9 to Kosmas), National Library of Russia MS Greek 229 (12th c., fols. 84r–84v, attributed in the initial rubric to Kosmas).
7	1B, 3–5, + 3–5 + 1, 6–9	9th–10th	Mark of Otranto + “alloi” (Kassia? ⁵⁵)+ Kosmas	Constantinople	Athos Monē Vatopediou MS Greek 1189, 12th c., fols. 231r–234v ⁵⁶ (ed. Eustratiades 1932, pp. 97–100; Tzedakes 1959, pp. 45–46; Simić 2011, pp. 56–60, with attribution to Mark of 1B, 3–5, to Kosmas—of 6–9, odes 3–5 are marked as “alloi”; ode 1 has no attribution).

Around this time in Jerusalem, Kosmas composed, as is generally assumed, his tetraode (odes 6–9) as a part of his hymnographical composition for all the days of Holy Week. The first known attribution of this tetraode to him in hymnographical books is preserved in Sinai MS Greek 734–735 and Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 8 (both 10th c.). However, in earlier ninth–tenth century Greek and Syriac New Tropologia of the Jerusalem rite, this tetraode appears as a pentaode, with the disputed ode 1, included in the Greek MS in the acrostic, καὶ Σάββατον μέλπω μέγα (№ 3):

All further versions of the Great Saturday canon are true composites, appearing mostly in Constantinople within the framework of the evolution of Matins in the ninth century. The tetraode/pentaode dilemma already existed in Byzantine times: some hymnographers replenished the pentaode (e.g., Theophanes Graptos, d. 845, or Theophanes Protothronos, 9th c.)⁵⁷, others the tetraode (e.g., Mark, bishop of Otranto, d. ca. 900).⁵⁸

Theophanes’ odes 3–5 are preserved in Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 10 (1138, № 5a in Table 3) with the attribution to a Theophanes, and in Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 8 and St. Petersburg NLR MS Greek 712 (both 10th c., № 4) without any attribution. In Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 10 (1138, № 5a), there is an “other (ἄλλοι)” set of heirmoi and troparia, which is the same as in the New Iadgari (№ 5b), testifying that at least two triodia existed⁵⁹ to fill out not a tetraode, but a pentaode (!).

The next step of the development was Mark’s attempt to replenish the tetraode with his odes 1 (we shall call it ode 1B),⁶⁰ 3, 4, and 5, i.e., only troparia, united with the acrostic Καὶ σήμερον δὲ, added to an already existing set of heirmoi, starting with Κύματι θαλάσσης.⁶¹ Mark’s tetraode was combined differently with odes not by Mark in the MSS.

This composite unit of Mark + Kosmas has preserved Kassia's work as an addition or "allos" (№ 7). The version № 6b entered the printed Triodion, with a note to the effect that the heirmoi of odes 1, 3–5 belonged to Kassia (*Τριώδιον κατανυκτικόν* 1960, p. 425). This remark is absent from the analysed MSS. In general, there is a clear tendency in the extant ninth–twelfth-century MSS of early Jerusalem and later Constantinopolitan traditions, preserved in Greek, Georgian, and Slavonic hymnals and typica to perform the pentaode with the archaic ode 1 (№ 3) and to complete canons on the pentaode basis with triodes (№s 4, 5a, 5b). Kassia's odes 3–5, that is a triode (№ 7), in our opinion could also complete this canon to make it a full canon. However, Kosta Simić is convinced of Kassia's authorship of the tetraode, that is odes 1, 3–5, and he considered these later Greek and Slavonic cases (he is not aware of the Georgian and Syriac ones) to be the *Nachleben* of Kassia's ode 1 (Simić 2014, p. 238). We analyse this possibility below.

4.2. Constantinopolitan Origin of Ode 1 and Kassia's Authorship?

Kassia's name is absent from the MS with the tetraode ascribed to her—Athos Vatopediou MS 1189 (12th c., fols. 231r–233v, version № 7). Tomadakes suggested to read as "Kassia" the abbreviation "Κα" or "Κο", which is preserved in the margins of Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 10, which has preserved ode 1 (A.D. 1138, fols. 31r–32v, version № 5a). This reading does not seem plausible, for it was not common in the MSS to abbreviate with two letters rare names like that of Kassia.⁶²

Thus, despite the silence of the MSS, the main arguments in favour of Kassia's authorship of the heirmoi or heirmoi + troparia of odes 1, 3, 4, and 5 are the Byzantine chroniclers (see their list in Simić 2014, pp. 240–42). The only direct indication that among her hymns Kassia wrote "the tetraode for Great Saturday", with the mention of its first troparion Ἄφρον γηραλέε" (not of the heirmos!), is preserved in the *Continuation of George Hamartolos*, supposed to have been written between 963 and 969 (Simić 2014, p. 241).⁶³

Approximately two centuries later, Theodore Prodromos referred to an unrecorded tradition according to which a "noble compatriot, the wise and virgin Kassia" composed the melody and the text of the tetraode, but the text, as it was considered impossible "to mix a woman's words with the poetry of the great Kosmas",⁶⁴ was excluded from the liturgy, and her music (i.e., heirmoi for odes 1, 3–5) did remain, together with the texts of Mark, bishop of Otranto, for odes 1, 3–5, and the music and texts of Kosmas for odes 6–9. This interpretation presents several problems:

- a. Logic. If the troparia of Kassia were removed from the liturgy due to misogynist ideas, why were her heirmoi, which are also texts, and many other hymns for different feasts, accepted for the liturgy?⁶⁵ It was equally illogical to include ode 1 of Kassia in ΜΓ 56+5 while ignoring her odes 3–5. The case differs significantly from the inclusion of second odes in several canons of this codex, also infiltrated into Georgian and Slavonic traditions (for examples, see Krivko 2008, pp. 60–73). That process had a clear liturgical reason, being some kind of a return to an earlier Old Iadgari practice of canons with nine odes. On the contrary, the addition of ode 1 to the Great Saturday tetraode has no liturgical justification.⁶⁶
- b. Manuscripts. These earliest witnesses for the ode 1 as a part of a pentaode in two hymnals of Jerusalem tradition, i.e., Greek and Syriac New Tropologia, without any reservation as to their Constantinopolitan origin, as was the case with the stichera in honour of Chrysostom discussed above, marked in the MS itself as "Byzantine", makes us doubt that ode 1 was borrowed from Constantinople. An even greater question arises if we consider further pentaode-based developments, by which we mean many full canons, which were completed by replenishing a pentaode, i.e., odes 1, 6–9 with a triode, and first of all New Iadgari and *Anastasis Typikon*, which confirm that the pentaode survived for a rather long time, at least from the 9th to the 12th century, in the cathedral tradition of Jerusalem, and were widely disseminated throughout the Christian Orient, and in *Slavia orthodoxa*. Theodore Prodromos' attribution of heirmoi 1, 3–5 to Kassia, upon which many serious scholars have cast doubt (see

above), conflicts with the MS evidence. The set of eight heirmoi (see the Great Saturday canon heirmoi in the printed Triodion), which are absolutely consistent in style and are dedicated to the cross and the resurrection, are known from MSS as Kosmas' stauroanastasimos office, m.pl.2.⁶⁷ These heirmoi were borrowed by both Theophanes (ed. Tomadakes 2004, pp. 328–30) and Mark (printed Triodion).

It is worth mentioning that the trump card of scholars oriented in favour of Kassia is a phrase from heirmos 1, ὡς αἱ νεάνιδες τῷ Κυρίῳ ἄσωμεν ("like the maidens, let us sing to the Lord"). In their opinion, these words could only be pronounced by a woman. But do not we, adult men and women, say on Palm Sunday: "we like the children (ἡμεῖς ὡς οἱ παῖδες), with the palms of victory" (troparion, mode 1)? Or on Holy Tuesday: "So that we like the wise virgins of the Lord (ὡς αἱ φρόνιμοι. παρθένοι) may be ready to enter with him into the marriage feast" (after kathisma 1, mode 4, cf. Mt. 25, 1–13)? The direct allusion to the phrase in question is the hymn sung by the prophetess Miriam, who was accompanied by the women (αἱ γυναῖκες), dancing and playing timbrels (Ex. 15: 20–21). It is also present in Kosmas' heirmos of the canon to St. Gregory the Theologian (25 January, ode 1): "Moses the God-seer declareth praise before Israel; and Miriam of the wise women (ἄρχει Μαριαμ δὲ σοφῶν γυναικῶν) begins the hymn of victory: Let us all chant to God the Deliverer!" The hymnographer may have likened himself and the believers to these women.

- c. Chronology. If we compare the dates of Kassia's life, who was born ca. 800, and died between 843 and 867, with the dates of the codex, written doubtless before the tenth century, we can attest that the presence of hymnography authored by her would not be impossible, but would represent a rare case of the immediate adoption of a text.
- d. Philological argument. The somewhat clumsy acrostic "Καὶ σεπτὸν θττ"⁶⁸ argues in favour of the nonauthenticity of this composite unit, because it was customary in Byzantine hymnography either to write a hymn with an acrostic, or to write it without one, but not with a halfway acrostic.

All this makes Kassia's authorship of the tetraode very problematic in our opinion, and it appears more likely that this pentaode originated in Palestine, as we shall now see.

4.3. Palestinian Origin of Ode 1 and Kosmas' Authorship?

While there is a consensus among the liturgical sources, Byzantine authors, and modern scholars that Kosmas was the author of the tetraode, beginning with the report in Theophanes Continuatus (Theophanes 1838; the collection is preserved in the eleventh-century Vatican MS Vat. gr. 167)⁶⁹ and in Constantinopolitan Triodia (e.g., Grottaferrata MS Δ. β. 8, 10th c., fol. 79r, Sinai MS Greek 734–735, 10th c., fol. 195v), there is only one clear piece of evidence in favour of Kosmas' authorship of the pentaode. This is the so-called *Anastasis Typikon* (Jerusalem Patriarchikē bibliothēkē MS Monē tou Timiou Staurou 43, 1122), a source of transitional character, combining both old Hierosolymitan practices with new Byzantine trends, and "should be regarded as a twelfth-century witness of how the important figures mentioned in the colophon would have celebrated Holy Week and Pascha at the Anastasis in 1122, if this had been possible" (Galadza 2018, p. 144). Furthermore, its editor Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus was the first to suggest this (Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1894, p. 7) because the scribe of this codex attributed odes 1, 6–9 to Kosmas, and introduced them with the following remark about the author and his acrostic for odes 1, 6–9: "of Kosmas. And Great Saturday I chant" (τοῦ δὲ Κοσμᾶ· καὶ Σάββατον μέλπω μέγα). Papadopoulos-Kerameus' point of view was debated, since scholars believed that no other manuscript supporting his idea was preserved (Tomadakes 2004, p. 444). The discovery of ode 1 in MI⁷ 56+5, which is the earliest Greek witness for it, with the same acrostic as in the *Anastasis Typikon*, supported Papadopoulos-Kerameus' guess about the Palestinian origin of the pentaode, and ode 1, which he considered to be not an interpolation, but an original part of this pentaode.⁷⁰

The Great Week canons of Kosmas followed the general structure of the Old Iadgari:

Great Week	Canon structures (odes) in the Old Iadgari	Canon structures (odes) in the New Tropologion ΜΓ 56+5
Monday	1, 8–9	1, 8–9
Tuesday	2, 8–9	2 (interpolated), 8–9
Wednesday	3, 8–9	3, 8–9
Thursday	4, 8–9	1, 3–9
Friday	5, 8–9	5, 8–9
Saturday	6–9	1, 6–9

Kosmas expanded only the Great Thursday triode into a canon with eight odes. The pentaode remained a unique and unparalleled poetic structure in Byzantine hymnography. It could be a half-hearted attempt to complete the full Great Saturday canon, with ode 1, based on Exodus 15: 1–19, being a prophecy of Christ’s Resurrection, which is the main theme of the day and of the canon.

The poetic acrostic, which runs through all the parts of Kosmas’ composition, is problematic:

Τῇ Δευτέρῃ, Τρίτῃ τε Τετράδι ψαλῶ,
 τῇ μακρᾷ Πέμπτῃ μακρὸν ὕμνον ἐξάδω,
 προσάββατόν τε [καὶ] Σάββατον μέλπω μέγα.

Here, Τῇ Δευτέρῃ covers the Great Monday triode (1, 8–9?), Τρίτῃ τε—the Great Tuesday diode (8–9), Τετράδι ψαλῶ—the Great Wednesday triode (3, 8–9), τῇ μακρᾷ Πέμπτῃ μακρὸν ὕμνον ἐξάδω—the Great Thursday canon (1, 3–9), προσάββατόν τε—the Great Friday triode (5, 8–9), and [καὶ] Σάββατον μέλπω μέγα (the tetraode or pentaode for Great Saturday, [Detorakes 1979](#), p. 120). This “καὶ”, covering ode 1, fits grammatically, but metrically worsens the iambic trimeter (dodecasyllable), which Kosmas used widely for his acrostics ([Detorakes 1979](#), p. 120), and this is a real impediment for the alleged authorship of Kosmas.

4.4. Conclusions

We are not ready to provide a final answer to the initial question of this Section 4. The pentaode, i.e., the regular tetraode of Kosmas + ode 1 (attributed to Kassia in the *Continuation of George Hamartolos* and by some modern scholars), was indeed well-known throughout the Christian Orient. This unusual structure is preserved in two New Tropologia of the ninth and tenth centuries, ΜΓ 56+5 and Syr. 48, and in many Georgian, Greek, and Slavonic hymnals and Typika of the tenth–twelfth centuries, being integrated into complete canons. In the tradition of the Jerusalem cathedral, this pentaode was preserved at least until the twelfth century, when it was witnessed for the last time in the *Anastasis Typikon*. If Kassia had written this ode 1, its adoption per se by the liturgical Byzantinisation of the Jerusalem rite was (1) unreasonable, unlike the interpolations of second odes, and from the liturgical point of view it acted and generated an element that was alien to the liturgical structure, which disappeared over time, and (2) contradicted by the independent dissemination of this extraordinary pattern, i.e., ode 1, always together with the tetraode of Kosmas, in the multi-lingual MSS tradition. By contrast, Kassia could have written odes 3–5, as Theophanes and another unknown author did, in order to replenish an already existing pentaode. Based on sources that are currently known and discussed above, the Hierosolymitan origin of ode 1 convinces us more than the Constantinopolitan hypothesis. However, the attribution of ode 1 by name to Kosmas in the *Anastasis Typikon* seems dubious, because the metrical corruption of the acrostic (προσάββατόν τε καὶ Σάββατον μέλπω μέγα) was not appropriate to such an excellent poet, and therefore requires more proof.

5. The Interpolation of the Second Ode

The omission of the second of the nine odes of the hymnographic canon has puzzled many scholars and has generated a considerable amount of scholarship (see the overview in [Kollyropoulou 2012](#), pp. 63–83). In the following, we shall examine the four cases in MΓ 56+5 of canons with a second ode (cf. [Nikiforova 2013a](#), pp. 174–75): Kosmas' canons for the Nativity, the Theophany, and Great Tuesday, and John's canon for the Theophany. Before that, we shall clarify the exactly opposite usages regarding ode 2 in Jerusalem and Constantinople at the time of the New Tropologion, a difference that will serve as a premise for our examination.

5.1. The Omission of Ode 2 and Heirmologia in Jerusalem and Constantinople

As the Old Iadgari shows, the second ode was present in canons of the Hierosolymitan tradition of the earlier period into the seventh century, when the Old Tropologion began to be replaced by the New. Since ode 2 belonged to the Hierosolymitan ode series, it was natural to compose hymnographic stanzas for it, just as for the other odes. In the seventh and eighth centuries, Germanos and Andrew, working within the Hagiopolite Office that was practised in Constantinople, systematically included ode 2 in their canons. This practice of theirs should be understood as continuing the older practice.

However, back in Jerusalem, the two main hymnographers, Kosmas and John, both omitted the second ode. Apparently, they inaugurated a new practice of omitting hymns for ode 2. The new canon form without ode 2 was to continue through the eighth century in that region. Patriarch Elias II of Jerusalem (d. after 799), working half a century after Kosmas and John, still wrote no second ode, as we see in the four canons by him, edited by Bertonière ([Bertonière 2000](#)). The same is the case with Stephen the Sabaite (8th c.); to the extent that he represents the Sabaite Office, it would appear that the Great Lavra also excluded the second ode.⁷¹

The Palestinian omission of ode 2 in time reached Constantinople, where it coexisted for some centuries with the older practice of including the second ode. We see this in a tenth-century Heirmologion type, no doubt connected with Constantinople, which includes canons both with and without ode 2. This KaO (Kanon-Ordnung) Heirmologion type was edited by Eustratiades on the basis of two manuscripts: the end of the eleventh–beginning of the twelfth-century Paris MS Coislin 220, which is his primary source, and the mid-tenth-century Athos Monē Megistēs Lavras MS B 32.⁷² The Heirmologion type has some characteristic features. Its size is significantly larger than what was the “Standard Abridged Version” from the mid-eleventh century onwards ([Frøyshov 2012a](#), “Heirmologion”). The location of some of the minor hymnographers suggests a local connection with Constantinople, such as Theognostos Hegoumen ([Frøyshov 2020](#), p. 368), Theophanes Protothronos ([Frøyshov 2020](#), p. 365), Nikephoros the Deacon of the Great Church (Hagia Sophia), and Basil the Monk of the Akoimetos Monastery. Further, the musical notation of Athos Lavras MS B 32, called the “Chartres notation”, is usually associated with Constantinople ([Troelsgård 2011](#), p. 27). This Heirmologion redaction reflects a variant of the tenth-century Hagiopolite Office in Constantinople that was global in scope, not limited to a particular milieu but encompassing monastic, palatine, and patriarchal contexts.

Unlike this Constantinopolitan Heirmologion, the Palestinian Heirmologion continued to omit ode 2. As evidence for this, we shall mention two of them that both systematically lack ode 2. The first is the Old Georgian Heirmologion, which is the Georgian version of the OdO (Oden-Ordnung) Hierosolymitan Heirmologion ([Metreveli 1971](#)), which is a part of the New Iadgari (see above, Section 2.2), and therefore was translated from Greek together with the rest of the New Iadgari, supposedly in the second half of the ninth century. Thus, the Georgian Heirmologion would reflect the situation of the ninth-century Greek Heirmologion in Palestine.

Second, the Heirmologion of Sinai MS Greek NE X 21, datable to the ninth–tenth centuries and written in the so-called “Hagiopolite minuscule” (or “Syro-Palestinian-Sinaitic minuscule”; [Bucca 2006](#), p. 104), is considered to be of Syro-Palestinian origin (including

Sinai). This fragmentary KaO Heirmologion has preserved only mode plagal 1 in its entirety. Of modes 4 and plagal 2 and 3, only a small part is extant; the rest is lost. It has the iambic canon that Athos Lavras MS B 32 attributes to Theognostos the Hegoumen (second half of the 9th c.; see Frøyshov 2020, p. 368), which, if we follow the attribution, signifies a Byzantine influence. However, it has a considerable number of canons that are absent from the comprehensive Constantinopolitan Heirmologion (see next paragraph), which suggests that it is not a Byzantinised document. Based on its presumed origin, we may assume that, in the main, it represents a pre-Byzantinised Palestinian Heirmologion.

These Heirmologia, of certain or presumed Palestinian tradition, show that the absence of ode 2 was consistently maintained in Palestine for a certain time. They include canons attributed to Germanos or Andrew, and which therefore presumably were imported from Constantinople and (presumably) originally had ode 2. However, the Palestinian Heirmologia lack ode 2 for such canons, as in the following cases. (1) Θαυματουργός ὑπάρχει (“He is a wonderworker”), m.pl.2 (EE §241; Paris MS Coisl. 320 only, which attributes it to Andrew of Crete), has a second ode (Προσδοκάσθω ὡς ὑετός, “Let it be expected as rain”) that is absent in the Georgian Heirmologion (Metreveli 1971, p. 147) and Sinai MS Greek NE X 21; (2) Ἄισμα ἀναπέμψωμεν, λαοί, m.pl.4 (EE §323), attributed to Germanos the Patriarch (both MSS of EE), has a second ode (Ἴδετε, ἴδετε, “See, see”) that is absent in the Georgian Heirmologion (Metreveli 1971, p. 177; lacuna in Sinai MS Greek NE X 21);⁷³ (3) Τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ δουλείας (“[Lord, you delivered] Israel from slavery”), m.pl.4 (EE §324), attributed to Germanos (both MSS of EE), has a second ode (Πρόσεχε, οὐρανέ, καὶ λαλήσω, “Attend, O heaven, and I shall speak”) that is absent in the Georgian Heirmologion (Metreveli 1971, p. 177; lacuna in Sinai MS Greek NE X 21); (4) Τῷ ἐκτινάξαντι ἐν θαλάσῃ (“To Christ who eliminated [Pharaoh] in the sea”), m.pl.4 (EE §328; Athos Lavras MS B 32 only), attributed to Germanos, has a second ode (Πρόσεχε, οὐρανέ, καὶ λαλήσω, slightly different from that of the previous canon), which is absent in the Georgian Heirmologion (Metreveli 1971, p. 177) and Sinai MS Greek NE X 21.⁷⁴ Since Andrew and Germanos wrote canons with ode 2, we may deduce from these cases that the second odes were consciously omitted when included in Heirmologia of the Hierosolymitan (or broader Palestinian) tradition.

However, at some point there arose a discrepancy between the Heirmologion and the New Tropologion, since the latter began to include the second ode in certain canons. This difference is acute when the hymnal contains a Heirmologion, as the New Iadgari does. Thus, the New Iadgari contains in its annual cycles (at least) one canon with ode 2, while the same canon in its Heirmologion part lacks this ode.⁷⁵ It seems that the Palestinian Heirmologion was a more conservative book than the New Tropologion and resisted the insertion of second odes. In any case, the original practice of the New Tropologion was to omit the second ode, and this was generally maintained through the ninth century—except in some cases, as we now shall see. In the following, we may consider the presence of ode 2 in a canon of the New Tropologion a sign of Byzantine influence.

5.2. Kosmas' Canon for the Nativity: Χριστὸς γεννᾶται

Kosmas' canon for the Nativity of Christ, Χριστὸς γεννᾶται (“Christ is born”; EE §8), is incomplete in ΜΓ 56+5 (§3.4) because of a lacuna, and has only odes 1 and 2. The heirmos of ode 2, Πρόσεχε, οὐρανέ καὶ λαλήσω, is followed by three troparia, which is the same number of troparia as in most odes of Kosmas' original canon, but since the MS breaks off at this point, we still cannot exclude that it originally had more troparia, like some other versions (see below). In the present Byzantine rite, as in the Old Georgian Heirmologion, this canon lacks the second ode, and with its eight odes it has a complete acrostic, Χριστὸς βροτωθεὶς ἦν ὅπερ Θεὸς μένη (“Having become a mortal man, Christ remained God as He was before”). As pointed out by scholars (Hannick 1978, p. 24; Krivko 2008, p. 62), this implies that it has no space for a second ode,⁷⁶ which therefore is not original. However, ode 2 in ΜΓ 56+5 was well-known in Byzantium, as shown by its presence in the Constantinopolitan Heirmologion (EE),⁷⁷ which includes the same heirmos of the second ode as ΜΓ

56+5 (Krivko 2008, p. 62), and the Menaion Sinai MS Greek 578, which also reflects a Constantinopolitan milieu (see below).

The same ode 2 as in ΜΓ 56+5, albeit with a varying number of troparia, is found in both the New Iadgari and Syr. 48. Various witnesses of the New Iadgari (Geo. 1, 14, 26, 34, 64; not in 59) demonstrate a stable ode consisting of heirmos and five troparia, the same as in ΜΓ 56+5 but with two more troparia.⁷⁸ Syr. 48 has the same ode of six stanzas as the New Iadgari, except that the order of troparia 3–4 is the opposite. Among later Byzantine sources, two Greek Menaia, Sinai MSS Greek 578 (around 1000) and 583 (12th c.), have three of the four stanzas of ΜΓ 56+5; instead of Ἐσβεσας τοῦ θυμοῦ σου τὴν φλόγα (“You extinguished the flame of your anger”), they have at the same place Ἐγνωμεν ὅτι μόνος ὑπάρχεις (“We came to know that you alone are”), which both the New Iadgari and the Syriac Tropologion also have (Kollyropoulou 2012, pp. 307–8). Further, Sinai MS Greek 578 adds a *triadikon*, Ἄναρχον τὸν Πατέρα (“The Father without beginning”) and a *theotokion*, Ἐτεκες, Θεοτόκε Παρθένε (“You gave birth, Virgin Theotokos”).⁷⁹ As noted above (Section 3.3), the *triadikon* in canons is a feature typical of Constantinopolitan hymnographers, such as Germanos and Andrew, and not of Palestinian hymnographers. The *triadikon* of Sinai MS Greek 578 therefore points to some Constantinopolitan connection, which is corroborated by the Constantinopolitan character of the calendar of the set of twelve Menaia to which this Menaion belongs.⁸⁰

5.3. Kosmas’ Canon for the Theophany: Βυθοῦ ἀνεκάλυψε πυθμένα

Like his canon for Nativity, Kosmas’ canon for the Theophany (EE §49) has an acrostic that is complete without ode 2: Βάπτισμα ῥύψις γηγενῶν ἀμαρτάδος (“Baptism is the cleansing of earthborns’ sin”). The obviously unoriginal ode 2 of this canon in ΜΓ 56+5 has as its heirmos Οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ προσεχέτωσαν (“May heaven and earth attend”), and then three troparia, the last of which is a *triadikon*.⁸¹ The same ode with all its four troparia is found in the New Iadgari.⁸² It is noteworthy that ode 2 in the New Iadgari has a different mode (pl.2) from the rest of the canon, which is in mode 2. Syr. 48 also has ode 2, but a different one (see below).

The tenth-century Constantinopolitan Heirmologion of EE has two alternative heirmoi for ode 2 of Kosmas’ canon for the Theophany: Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς πάλιν μυστήριον (“Jesus anew, the mystery anew”) and Οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ.⁸³ Since the heirmoi are the pattern stanzas of an ode, it means that the Byzantine tradition knew two different interpolated odes to this canon. While ΜΓ 56+5 and the New Iadgari has the latter, the former, with its heirmos Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς, is the more common one. It is found notably in Syr. 48 (same heirmos and troparia, but no *theotokion*) and, for instance, in Sinai MSS Greek 595 (ca. 1000, of the same annual set as Sinai MS Greek 578) and 598 (12th c., fol. 56r, the whole ode) (Kollyropoulou 2012, p. 308). Further, the Old Slavonic Heirmologion has Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς (Hannick 1978, p. 24; 2006, pp. 52–53, commentary pp. 581–82).⁸⁴

The heirmos of the interpolated ode 2 in ΜΓ 56+5, Οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ, is the only option in the Heirmologion of 1281 of Grottaferrata MS E. γ. II (Tardo 1950, fols. 32v–33r). The presence of this heirmos in this and other Byzantine Heirmologia shows that the interpolated ode of ΜΓ 56+5 was not a particularity of the Christian Orient. Further, the fact that the New Iadgari also has it precludes the interpretation that it was an Egyptian particularity. The *triadikon* of the ode suggests that it was composed in Constantinople or another Byzantine area using the *triadikon* at the end of odes, rather than in Palestine, and thus supports our general assumption that the second ode represents Byzantine influence.

5.4. Kosmas’ Canon of Great Tuesday: Τῶ δόγματι τῶ τυραννικῶ

For Great Tuesday, ΜΓ 56+5 has a triode that it attributes to Kosmas the Monk. In the received Triodion, and in many of the earliest Triodion manuscripts, this canon has only two odes (diode), and their acrostic, Τρίτη τε (“And Tuesday”), is complete. This shows, again, that Kosmas originally composed this canon without ode 2.⁸⁵ As in the early Hierosolymitan tradition, which is seen in the Old Iadgari, Hagiopolite canons in Constantinople for Great

Tuesday were also triodes, such as those attributed to Andrew (in Compline of the received Triodion) and Theodore the Studite (Tomadakes 2004, p. 279). In Jerusalem, where Kosmas worked, the transition from the Old to the New Tropologion meant the exclusion of second odes, the triode of that day becoming a diode.

Both the Georgian and the Syriac New Tropologion have a second ode to this canon, but before we compare the various second odes, we need to examine that of ΜΓ 56+5. The hitherto unedited text is the following:⁸⁶

Number	Εἰς τὸν κανόνα ἀκροστιχίδα φέρουσα τοιάνδε· Τρίτη τε. Ωιδὴ β΄. Ἦχος β΄.	At the canon, with the following acrostic: Τρίτη τε ("And Tuesday"). Ode 2. Mode 2.
[1, heirmos]	Δότε μεγαλοσύνην* Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν.	Give magnification to the Lord our God.
[2]	Δεῦτε φαιδραῖς λαμπάσιν* Χριστῷ προσυπαντήσομεν.	Come with lighted lamps to meet Christ.
[3]	Ἵπνον τῆς ἀκηδίας* πιστοὶ ἐκτιναζόμεθα.	Faithful, let us shake off the sleep of discouragement!
[4]	Πόρρω τὴν ραθυμίαν* ἡμῶν ἀποβαλλόμεθα.	Let us cast far away our laziness!
[5]	Πολυπλασίως πάντες* τὸ τάλαντον ἀυξήσωμεν.	Let us all increase the talent many times!
[6]	Τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην* πιστοὶ ἐξεργασόμεθα.	Faithful, let us cultivate mercy!
[7]	Τῆς κοινωνίας οἰκτῶ* τὸ ἔλεον μετὰδωμεν.	Let us share the mercy of communion with magnanimity!
[8]	Τοῖς δεξιῶν σου, σῶτερ,* προβάτοις με ἀρύθμισον.	Count me, o Saviour among the sheep on your right hand!
[9]	Ταῖς φρονίμοις παρθένοις,* Χριστέ, ἡμᾶς ἀρύθμισον.	Count us, o Christ, among the wise virgins!
[10]	Ἐν τῇ φρικτῇ σου κρίσει* ἐρίφοις με διάστησον.	At your dread judgement separate me from the goats!
[11]	Ταῖς σαῖς φρονίμοις, σῶτερ,* ἡμᾶς παρθένους σύνταξον.	Number us, o Saviour, among your wise virgins!
[12]	Τὴν ραθυμίαν πάντες* πιστοὶ ἀποβαλλόμεθα.	Let us all, o faithful cast aside laziness!
[13]	Τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς λαμπάδας* ἀσβέστους συντηρήσωμεν.	Let us keep unquenched the lamps of the soul!
[14]	Τῆς χάριτος τοῦ νυμφώνος,* Χριστέ, ἡμᾶς ἀξίωσον.	Render us worthy, o Christ, of the grace of the bridal chamber!
[15]	Τῆς εὐωνύμου τάσεως* ρῦσαι ἡμᾶς, φιλόανθρωπε.	O lover of mankind, deliver us from the order on the left!
[16]	Σώσον ἡμᾶς, σῶτερ,* ἐν τῇ φρικτῇ παρουσίᾳ σου.	Save us, o Saviour, at your dread second coming!
[17, triadikon]	Τριάς ἀγία, σώσον* ἡμᾶς, τοὺς ἀνυμνοῦντάς σε.	O holy Trinity, save us, who hymn you.

The ode thematically alludes to the passage of Mt 25 on the wise virgins and the talents, which was the pericope prescribed for Great Tuesday both in Jerusalem (GL §615) and Constantinople (Mateos 1962–1963, vol. 2, pp. 70–71).⁸⁷ The text itself is organised quite differently from odes 8 and 9: it consists of altogether seventeen short verses, each having fifteen syllables, and starting each line with a larger letter. Such a high number of stanzas (troparia) is unusual for an ode in a canon, but not totally unheard of.⁸⁸ Also, the short length of the stanzas is not uncommon for a second ode, and they are often taken more or less verbatim from the biblical ode (Dt 32) that is the framework of the hymnic ode. One example is an heirmos attributed to Germanos: "As for God, his works are true, and all his ways are judgement" (=Dt 32:4; for the Greek and reference, see the scheme below). Also, the first stanza of the ode 2 in question, Δότε μεγαλοσύνην Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν, which functions as the heirmos, is closely connected with the biblical ode; only one word is added (Κυρίῳ). The subsequent stanzas, or troparia, imitate the metre of this first stanza. In fact, two heirmoi attributed to Germanos are very similar to the heirmos of our ode. The eleventh–twelfth-century Heirmologion of Jerusalem MS Hagiou Saba 83 has them as "alloi" heirmoi in an office by Germanos in m.pl.2: Δότε, λαοί, μεγαλοσύνην Χριστῷ, τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν (scheme below) and Δώσωμεν μεγαλοσύνην Χριστῷ, τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν ("Let us give magnification to Christ, our God"). These cases, most of which are gathered in the scheme below, confirm that such a short phrase may still be an heirmos.

Dt 32:3	Δότε μεγαλοσύνην τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν
ΜΓ 56+5	Δότε μεγαλοσύνην Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν
Germanos ⁸⁹	Δότε, λαοί, μεγαλοσύνην Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν
Germanos (= Deut. 32:4) ⁹⁰	Θεός, ἀληθινὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ κρίσεις

However, while this second ode may be legitimately explained as a canon ode, it has some features that make one suspect that it was originally not canon hymnography. First, the verses are isosyllabic and homotonic (with exceptions in lines 14–17), which are the formal characteristics of stichic or *kata stichon* hymns.⁹¹ The *kata stichon* form is not normally used in the Daily Office of hagiopolitan tradition, but stichic hymns could be incorporated into it, either in their entirety (all stanzas) or partially (selected stanzas).⁹² A few cases are known where canons have incorporated *kata stichon* hymns, and scholars agree that older hymns have been later inserted into the ninth ode as so-called “*Megalynaria*”.⁹³ Each decapentasyllabic verse (troparion) of ode 2 is divided into a first half of seven syllables and a second half of eight. This metre is, in the words of Marc Lauxtermann, a “mirror image of 8 + 7”, the political verse. As an example of the same metre, he refers to the *kata stichon* hymn Ἀχράντε Μῆτερ Χριστοῦ (Lauxtermann 1999, p. 60).⁹⁴ Lauxtermann places such a metre in a time before the emergence by 800 of the political verse: “.. in the early centuries of Byzantium, when the political verse had not yet emerged and established itself as the one and only decapentasyllabic metre, poets were free to experiment with new metrical forms.” Ἀχράντε Μῆτερ Χριστοῦ is considered to date from late antiquity.⁹⁵ Second, the beginning of the first verse after the heirmos, Δεῦτε φαιδραῖς λαμπᾶσιν Χριστῷ προσυπαντήσωμεν, has the appearance of a hymn beginning. Some other *kata stichon* hymns start in this way, with Δεῦτε, “Come” (Ajjou and Paramelle 2004, pp. 268, 272). These features lead us to assume that this second ode, without the present heirmos, pre-existed its interpolation into Kosmas’ diode. In that case, the heirmos was a later addition composed in the same metre to make the hymn fit the usual canon structure.⁹⁶

Now, let us compare the second ode of ΜΓ 56+5 with that of the New Iadgari and Syr. 48. Geo. 1 and 14 have eleven out of the seventeen Greek stanzas including the heirmos (1–8, 10–11, 17). Geo. 64 has eight of those ten stanzas, while Geo. 59 has the same heirmos, but six subsequent stanzas and a *theotokion* that are altogether different. Syr. 48, too, has a second ode with similarly short verses, but all of them are different from both the Greek and the Georgian texts. Furthermore, the theme of the Syriac second ode is different—primarily supplication for mercy at the judgement. It remains to be seen whether the second odes of Geo. 59 and Syr. 48 have Greek models.

The text of ode 2 does not seem to be found in the subsequent Greek tradition. None of the stanzas is recorded by Follieri (Follieri 1960–1965), nor is the heirmos found in EE or Jerusalem MS Hagiou Saba 83 (Raasted 1968–1970). The rarity of its source documentation is equalled by that of other *kata stichon* hymns inserted into various Hagiopolite hymn books (such as those studied by Maas et al. 1909).

In addition to the argument of the second ode, two other features connected with Constantinople suggest that this *kata stichon* hymn was adopted in Palestine from there: the presence of the *triadikon* at the end and the *kata stichon* genre.

5.5. John’s Canon for the Theophany: Στείβει θαλάσσης

John’s iambic canon for the Theophany, Στείβει θαλάσσης (“[Israel passed through] the storm-tossed deep of the sea”; EE §50), also has a complete acrostic for odes 1, 3–9. Again, any ode 2 of the canon must therefore have been interpolated later. Most sources have no ode 2 for John’s Theophany canon, as for his other iambic canons. This includes the Georgian (Geo. 1, 14, 64) and the Syriac (Syr. 48) versions of the New Tropologion, as well as the tenth-century Constantinopolitan Heirmologion (EE) and Menaia, such as Sinai MS Greek 595 (fols. 13v–15r).

However, ΜΓ 56+5 does have a second ode, the heirmos of which is Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς πάλιν μυστήριον.⁹⁷ Remarkably, the whole ode 2 is identical to the second ode that is added by most sources to *Kosmas'* canon for the same feast (Βυθοῦ ἀνεκάλυψε πυθμένα). Not only is ΜΓ 56+5 the only known source to have interpolated an ode 2 into John's iambic canon for the Theophany, the added ode is one frequently added to another canon.

Interestingly, the Heirmologion Athos Lavras MS B 32 attributes Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς to Theophanes Protothronos (fol. 41r; EE §49). This attribution figures *within* *Kosmas'* canon, in the heading of ode 2.⁹⁸ Theophanes Protothronos, before becoming the Metropolitan of Caesarea (called "Protothronos") in 880, was protonotarios at the Great Palace (see [Frøyshov 2020](#), p. 365). Hannick is aware of this attribution and discusses the authorship of this ode 2 ([Hannick 1978](#), p. 24). He prefers *Kosmas* rather than Theophanes Protothronos as the author. He sees the addition of this ode as an "archaïsme voulu par l'auteur", that is, *Kosmas*. Now, the beginning of the heirmos, Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς, is a citation from Gregory of Nazianzos, as Hannick remarks, and since *Kosmas* made such loans from Gregory elsewhere, it could be an argument in favour of *Kosmas'* authorship. However, one might as well argue that Theophanes imitated *Kosmas'* loan from Gregory, knowing about his other loans from this author. Further, if it were *Kosmas* himself who later in life added this second ode, one would expect the Georgian and Syriac versions of the Tropologion to have it. Finally, the chronological closeness of Athos Lavras MS B 32 to Theophanes Protothronos and its Constantinopolitan origin suggest a certain reliability of this author attribution.

Whatever the origin of Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς, its absence from John's Theophany canon both in Byzantine and other Palestinian sources suggests that this addition is a particularity of ΜΓ 56+5. In that case, the Byzantine influence must be qualified: the ode itself probably came from Byzantium, but not its place in this particular canon.⁹⁹

6. Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις: Hymns for the Nativity of Christ

For the Feast of the Nativity of Christ, Byzantine hymnography has a series of stanzas, the incipit of which is Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις. The three versions of the New Tropologion contain a varying number of stanzas from the series. The attribution to Romanos that the acrostic provides calls for a closer look at the series and its presence in our hymnals.

6.1. Stanzas from the Series Found in the Three Versions of the New Tropologion

For the period of the Nativity of Christ, ΜΓ 56+5 prescribes the following two stanzas, or stichera: Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις, which is the *doxastikon* at both Kyrie ekekraxa (Vespers) and Ainoi (Matins) of a day that seems to be the Eve of the Nativity (24 December, §2.2 and §2.5),¹⁰⁰ and Σάλπιγγος φωνὴν ἀναλάβετε ποιμένες, "Shepherds, listen to the sound of the trumpet", which is the *doxastikon* at Kyrie ekekraxa for the feast day (25 December, §3.2). As noted by Alexandra Nikiforova ([Nikiforova 2012](#), pp. 91–92), the two stanzas are found in a series of thirty-three stanzas that have the acrostic Αἶνος ταπεινοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ εἰς τὰ γενέθλια, "Praise by the humble Romanos on the Nativity" (ed. [Grosdidier de Matons 1965](#), pp. 138–61). The question of the authorship of the series is unsettled, but the acrostic attributing it to Romanos, supposedly the Melodist, and the possibility that it is a Byzantine loan, justifies our examining its presence in the Tropologion.

The hymn genre is not Romanos' usual one, the kontakion, which also explains why it is not found in Kontakaria collections. Entirely or partially, the series is preserved in a few Greek manuscripts of the Menaion (or Anthologion, which is a compilation from the Menaia), where the stanzas function as stichera. The only manuscript that contains the whole set united by the acrostic is Rome Biblioteca Vallicelliana MS E 54.¹⁰¹ It is a composite volume, the first part of which (fols. 1r–88v) was copied in Calabria (probably in Rossano), possibly in the twelfth century (see [Lucà 2012](#), p. 545; others have dated it to the eleventh century). The series can be found here at Matins of the Nativity (fols. 85v–87v) under the title Στιχηρὰ εἰς τοὺς Αἶνους, "Stichera at the Ainoi".¹⁰²

The Tropologion of Syr. 48 includes slightly more of the series than MΓ 56+5: four of the stanzas, without attribution. At the Nativity, the original hand includes the full text of stanza #1, Αἰ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις, after Ainoi with the rubric ܒܐܘܬܗܐ, *bā'ūthā*, “supplication” (fol. 71r).¹⁰³ Right before the feast of the Nativity on 25 December (the beginning of the fixed annual cycle), a later hand has interpolated stanzas entitled “Troparia (ܛܪܦܪܝܐ, *trōparyā*) performed at dawn (ܢܐܓܗ, *nāgah*) on Sunday of the Nativity in the second mode”, having filled an originally blank space on the page (fol. 66v). These troparia correspond to stanzas ##1 (incipit), 2, 5, and 15 of the Greek series.

The New Iadgari contains a much larger part of the series than MΓ 56+5 and Syr. 48: the Georgian series corresponds to the Greek stanzas ##1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 22, 23, 26, 27, 32, 17, 24, 20, and 19 (numbers according to Grosdidier de Matons 1965, p. 165 ff.). The exact same Georgian selection is found in several witnesses: Geo 1, 14, 26, and 64 and the Iadgari of Mikael Modrekili, which comes from the region of Tao-Klarjeti.¹⁰⁴ The stanzas are anonymous, except in the Iadgari of Mikael Modrekili, which attributes them to Kosmas of Jerusalem (see below). These Iadgari witnesses spread the stanzas out over several prefeetal days, as their more or less common rubric shows: “From Sunday before to the Nativity of Christ are said at Kyrie ekekraxa and Ainoi, three at a time”.¹⁰⁵ Three stanzas (stichera) are sung at Vespers (Kyrie ekekraxa) and three at Matins (Ainoi), and the musical mode is the same as in Greek, plagal second.

The Greek, Georgian, and Syriac evidence is gathered in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Overview of stanzas of the Αἰ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις series in the New Tropologion.

Rubrics	MΓ 56+5	Geo. 1, 14, 26, 64; Iadgari of Mikael Modrekili	Syr. 48
Mode	m.pl.2	m.pl.2	m.2
Prefestal time	24.12. #1 Kyrie ekekraxa, Ainoi (<i>doxastikon</i>)	From Sunday before Nativity to Nativity Kyrie ekekraxa and Ainoi (otherwise unspecified): ##1–6, 10, 22–23, 26–27, 32, 17, 24, 20, 19	(later addition) Sunday before Nativity (unspecified): ##1, 2, 5, 15
Nativity (25.12.)	#5 Kyrie ekekraxa (<i>doxastikon</i>)		#1 “Supplication” after Ainoi (no modal indication)

The liturgical use of these stanzas in the Greek, Georgian, and Syriac New Tropologia is both similar and different. In all three, the stanzas are used on days preceding the Nativity. The same way of distributing such stanzas on the days preceding the Nativity obtained in Byzantine times and is the present practice for 20–24 December.¹⁰⁶ Unlike the Georgian version, the Greek and the Syriac also have one stanza at the Nativity itself (25 December, but not the same stanza). While MΓ 56+5 places its two stanzas as *doxastikon* at Kyrie ekekraxa and Ainoi, the Georgian version places its many stanzas in an unspecified way at the same two liturgical units (but seemingly not as *doxastikon*). The Syriac version prescribes the four troparia in an even less-specified way for the Sunday before¹⁰⁷ the Nativity, and designates stanza 1 with the vague term *bā'ūthā*, “supplication”, at a position that resembles that of a *doxastikon* at Ainoi but technically *after* Ainoi. There is also a difference of musical mode: (authentic) second in the Syriac, and plagal second in the Greek and the Georgian.

6.2. The Question of Authorship

To evaluate whether the stanzas found in the New Tropologion represent a Byzantine loan, we must address the question of authorship. A first thing to notice is that the series is absent from the Old Iadgari. This practically disproves Rainer Stichel’s claim, embraced by Johannes Koder (Koder 2005, p. 377; 2008, p. 275, n. 5), that the series was composed for the Resurrection cathedral of Jerusalem by Romanos the Melodist, but before his arrival in

Constantinople.¹⁰⁸ It is very unlikely that a hymn sung at such an important occasion would not have been included in the official hymnal of the church in question.¹⁰⁹

The literary character and stylistic unity of the whole composition have not been subject to a meticulous philological analysis, which may have contributed to the varying views on the authenticity of the series. Cardinal J.-B. Pitra, who was the first to edit the series, was uncertain that it was a genuine composition by Romanos (Pitra 1876, p. 222; cf. Grosdidier de Matons 1965, p. 133, n. 1). Paul Maas and Constantine A. Trypanis (the latter completed the work after Maas' death) considered it not genuine and included it in the volume of dubious works (Maas and Trypanis 1970, pp. 164–71, cf. p. 208). They assign the series to a particular hymn type, the *syntomon* (Maas and Trypanis 1970, p. XIII). Since they consider the hymnographer Kyprianos the originator of this type, and Kyprianos to have lived probably in the first half of the eighth century, they conclude that Romanos the Melodist cannot have been the author, adding that, “indeed, their flat style and disjointed content have little in common with the genuine writings of Romanos” (p. XIII). However, the *syntomon* hymn type has been insufficiently investigated for this to be a valid argument. Schirò placed Kyprianos in Palestine and considered the *automelon* Οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθᾶ (“House of Ephratha”) the prototype of the *syntomon*. Jung purports to find additional arguments for a Palestinian origin to the *syntomon* type (Jung 1996). This geographical assignment does not seem right, however, since the hymn Οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθᾶ is found neither in the Old Iadgari nor the Greek or the Georgian New Tropologion (sources that Jung did not examine). Nothing prevents the *syntomon* hymn type from being older than the eighth century, and it also seems uncertain whether the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ cycle should be categorised as a *syntomon* hymn at all.

Other scholars have a more positive view on the literary quality and authenticity of the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ series. For Grosdidier de Matons, the series is not “totalement dénuée de grâce et de vigueur” (Grosdidier de Matons 1965, p. 133), and he counted it among Romanos' authentic works, placing it in his edition as Hymn XIII under the title “Stichères de la Nativité” (Grosdidier de Matons 1965, pp. 131–61). His view was later shared by Rainer Stichel (Stichel 1991, p. 267) and Johannes Koder in his volume of Romanos' works translated into German, where he also provided a brief overview of various opinions on the authenticity of this hymn (Koder 2005, pp. 94–103: German translation; pp. 377–78: notes; see also Koder 2008, pp. 269–70). Koder states, without demonstration, that the series has many parallels of content with two Nativity kontakia by Romanos that are considered to be authentic.¹¹⁰ Recently, Derek Krueger has treated the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ series as a composition by Romanos the Melodist but emphasises that “[t]his poem deserves further attention” (Krueger 2015, p. 21).

As we see, further research on the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ cycle is needed to reach a clearer answer to the question of authorship. This aspect proves indecisive and we must resort to contextual evidence for the origin of the series.

6.3. Contextual Evidence I: Sunday before the Nativity

Unlike ΜΓ 56+5, the Syriac and Georgian versions have the Sunday before the Nativity as a calendrical occasion. The status of this Sunday is of relevance to us; where did it originate? The feast of the Sunday before the Nativity is found in one of the witnesses to the Georgian Lectionary (GL §1427, MS L), but the fact that the remaining witnesses do not have it makes it unlikely that it was an old Hierosolymitan feast. Anton Baumstark suggested that the Syriac Orthodox celebration of it, even though supposedly attested already by Severos of Antioch, was a loan from the Greek church, by which he meant the Church of Constantinople (Baumstark 1910, p. 172). The Synaxarion–Kanonarion of Constantinople does have a Sunday before the Nativity, including its earliest witness, Patmos MS 266 reflecting a ninth-century liturgy (Mateos 1962–1963, vol. 1, p. 134). Three Gospel manuscripts of the same century (along many other witnesses), Vatican MS Vat. gr. 2144 (the so-called “Morcelli calendar”) and Paris MSS Grec 63 (fol. 7r) and Grec 281 (p. 348), confirm that the Sunday before the Nativity was commonly observed at this time.

The calendar by Iovane Zosime provides a strong argument that the Sunday before the Nativity came from Constantinople. One of the four sources that Zosime used was the Byzantine calendar (Garitte 1958, pp. 23, 31–33). Systematically, the celebrations belonging to this calendar come at the end of the date entry.¹¹¹ The fact that Zosime often inscribed these Byzantine saints' names between the original lines in the manuscript indicates that he added them after having finished the calendar. Sometimes Zosime wrote the Byzantine names in red ink and often in a less neat hand. Such features apply in the case of the Sunday before the Nativity. On 24 December, the last saints are "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (Garitte 1958, p. 112), written in black with slightly larger and less neat letters (Geo. 34, fol. 33v). Garitte identifies them as the fathers commemorated on the Sunday before the Nativity: "Il s'agit ici de la fête τῶν πατέρων, du Dimanche avant la Noël" (Garitte 1958, p. 417). Zosime places this commemoration on a fixed date before the Nativity, and not on the Sunday before the Nativity, but the names are the same as for the latter in the Kanonarion–Synaxarion of Constantinople. The absence of the Sunday before the Nativity in Zosime's calendar is yet another argument that this was not a traditional feast in Palestine.

6.4. Contextual Evidence II: Place of Authorship

If the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις series was composed by Romanos the Melodist, we of course have to do with a Byzantine loan in the New Tropoligion. If not, we must ask who could have written it. It could hardly have been Kosmas, as the non-Palestinian Iadgari of Mikael Modrekili has it, since Kosmas would hardly have given it an acrostic attributing it to another than himself. It could have been another hymnographer named Romanos, or it could have been a Romanos imitator. However, a more relevant question for us is geographical: where would someone want to attach a work to a well-known author? It seems more likely that this would have been a person from the area where Romanos' heritage was most alive, that is, Constantinople or its region, than for instance in Palestine, to which Romanos and his hymnography were foreign. No source indicates that works by Romanos were used in liturgy in Jerusalem or elsewhere in Palestine. Notably, we know of no first-millennium Georgian translation of any of his works, which is only to be expected, since the Georgians followed closely the Jerusalem rite. It is more likely, therefore, that the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ series attributed to Romanos by its acrostic is of Byzantine rather than of Palestinian origin.

6.5. Contextual Evidence III: Liturgical Sitz Im Leben

The acrostic suggests that the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ series was originally composed with the 33 stanzas.¹¹² Such a long series has no natural *Sitz im Leben* in single services of the hagiopolitan tradition. This tradition primarily admits hymnography by inserting stanzas between the verses of biblical texts: psalms at Kyrie ekekraxa and Ainoi, and canticles at the canon (see Frøyshov 2012a). The Kyrie ekekraxa and Ainoi sections today typically have a maximum of ten and eight stanzas, respectively; these limits or characteristic numbers have varied a bit through history, but the number of thirty-three stanzas of the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ series is far beyond any regular limit for services of the hagiopolitan tradition.¹¹³ This excludes the possibility that the series was composed for the feast day of the Nativity in this tradition.

However, in many cases, the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ series is found distributed over several services in the prefeetal period, such as in the Georgian and Syriac New Tropoligion and Vatican MS Vat. gr. 1531, as well as in the similar case of the alphabetic series in the received Byzantine rite mentioned above. Could the Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ set nevertheless have been composed for the hagiopolitan tradition, but for a series of services? It does not seem likely. The only known source giving the whole series places it in a single service, and the great variation of the number of days and stanzas suggests that the series was not composed with such a liturgical use in mind. On the contrary, this variation could testify to problems in integrating the series into services of the hagiopolitan tradition, which would be natural if it was a foreign element.

7. Concluding Discussion

In this concluding section, we shall resume and discuss what our essay can tell us about Byzantine influence in the New Tropologion, more specifically both the question of the origin of hymns and that of differences of Byzantine influence between the three versions of this hymnal.

The calendar of the New Tropologion is that of the Jerusalem rite, and this feature alone is sufficient to state that the hymnal is a pre-Byzantinised one—in other words, basically the proper hymnal of the rite of Jerusalem. However, throughout this essay we have examined elements that we suspected to be of Byzantine origin or that were already thought to be so. The following table (Table 5) resumes the hymns that we have examined in the three versions of the New Tropologion, and our evaluation as to whether they represent Byzantine influence.

Table 5. Overview of the examined cases of potentially Byzantine elements.

Hymns	ΜΓ 56+5	Syr. 48	New Iadgari	Origin
St. John Chrysostom (27 Jan.), stichera	With rubric “BYZ”: Ἐπρεπε τῆ πορφυρίδι τῶν πόλεων and Γράμμασι χρυσαυγεστάτοις at Ainoi. Particular hymns	Ἐπρεπε τῆ πορφυρίδι τῶν πόλεων and Γράμμασι χρυσαυγεστάτοις at Kyrie ekekraxa. Particular hymns	Ἐπρεπε τῆ πορφυρίδι τῶν πόλεων at Kyrie ekekraxa. Particular hymns	Certainly Byzantine
St. John Chrysostom, canon	Ἄισμα ἀναπέμψωμεν	=ΜΓ 56+5	=ΜΓ 56+5	Probably Byzantine
Great Saturday, Kosmas’ canon (ode 1)	Odes 1, 6–9	=ΜΓ 56+5	Odes 1, 3–5 (<Theophanes), 6–9	Ode 1 is probably Palestinian
Nativity, Kosmas’ canon	Ode 2	=ΜΓ 56+5	=ΜΓ 56+5	Probably Byzantine
Theophany, Kosmas’ canon	Ode 2, Οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ	Ode 2, Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς	Ode 2, Οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ, in different mode (m.pl.2)	Probably Byzantine
Great Tuesday, Kosmas’ canon	Ode 2, <i>kata stichon</i> hymns	Ode 2, not the same <i>kata stichon</i> hymns	Ode 2, <i>kata stichon</i> hymns (fewer)	Probably Byzantine
Theophany, John’s canon	Ode 2, Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς	÷	÷	Probably Byzantine, but in non-Byzantine position
Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις (stichera attr. to Romanos) Pre-festal period	24.12.: #1 Kyrie ekekraxa (evening of 23.12.), Ainoi (<i>Doxastikon</i>) 25.12.: #5 Kyrie ekekraxa (<i>Doxastikon</i>)	Sunday before Nativity (unspecified liturgical position): ##1, 2, 5, 15 25.12.: #1 “Supplication” after Ainoi	From Sunday before the Nativity: Kyrie ekekraxa and Ainoi (unspecified distribution): ##1–6, 10, 22–23, 26–27, 32, 17, 24, 20, 19	Probably Byzantine

The element for which a Byzantine origin is the most probable are the two stichera that are dubbed “BYZ[ANTIOS]” by ΜΓ 56+5 itself. There seems to be no reason to doubt the veracity of this rubric, so this is certainly a Byzantine influence. The remaining cases we have examined are less certain, but nevertheless probable, Byzantine loans.

These cases are, first, other pieces of the office for St. John Chrysostom, for instance the canon Ἄισμα ἀναπέμψωμεν. Whether Germanos or Andrew wrote it is uncertain, and in any case, after its composition, the canon with time saw different redactions that included other heirmoi and the addition of new stanzas.¹¹⁴ The fluidity of this canon material is seen, for instance, by the fact that, while the Georgian version basically matches the canon of ΜΓ 56+5 and the first canon of the AHG edition, in some cases it matches the second canon of AHG.¹¹⁵ What is of importance here is that the canon seems to be an early one. First, the heirmoi of odes 2 and 3 are taken from the Old Iadgari, which points to its origin in a time when the latter was still in use or in living memory (the New Tropologion took over in the 7th–8th c.). Second, even though the second ode is known from only one out of the six witnesses used by

the AHG for the edition of this canon (see above, n. 42), it is probable that it originally had this ode, which was thereafter removed in most manuscripts.¹¹⁶ If this was the case, as we think, the second ode must have been removed either in Constantinople before it was adopted in Palestine, or in Palestine after its adoption there. Since the trend in Constantinople was rather to add second odes (as we saw in Section 5.1 above), the second option is more likely, which in its turn would imply an early adoption in Palestine (eighth century?). After the Palestinians, for a couple of centuries, had rejected hymns for the second ode, by the ninth century they accepted it in some canons received from Constantinople.

Out of the four canons of ΜΓ 56+5 with an intercalated second ode, Kosmas' canon for the Nativity represents a clear and homogenous case. Here, tenth-century Constantinopolitan sources (Heirmologion and Menaion) demonstrate the inclusion of the same second ode (Πρόσεχε, οὐρανὲ καὶ λαλήσω) that is also found in all the three versions of the New Tropologion. For Kosmas' canon for the Theophany, the situation is basically the same, but with some variation between two different second odes in both Constantinopolitan and Palestinian sources, and the New Iadgari has it in a different mode (plagal instead of authentic second). The third canon of Kosmas, the one for Great Tuesday, includes a stichic piece that suggests it was originally a separate hymn subsequently inserted into the canon as ode 2. Despite the absence of this ode in Byzantine sources, it has several features usually associated with Constantinople in this period—the second ode, the *triadikon*, and the *kata stichon* genre—and we deem it probable that it, too, is a Byzantine loan, albeit somewhat less probable than Kosmas' two other canons. The absence of the interpolated second ode heirmoi in the Georgian version of the Jerusalem Heirmologion corroborates our view.

One way the Byzantine loans could have occurred is the following: first, these Palestinian canons without ode 2 were adopted and used in Constantinople; second, the general preservation of the use of ode 2 in Constantinople made it desirable to remedy its absence from these canons by composing and adding second odes; third, some of these new odes in some cases spread to Palestine itself, which in that way saw restored its older tradition of having the second ode.

The intercalation of a second ode in John's canon for the Theophany, Στείβει θαλάσσης, is a different case. Its presence in ΜΓ 56+5 only, unlike all known Byzantine sources and the Georgian and Syriac New Tropologia, indicates that this addition was local, perhaps limited even to the place where ΜΓ 56+5 was copied. However, the second ode itself (with the heirmos Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς πάλιν μυστήριον) is Byzantine, so in this case the redactor of ΜΓ 56+5 made use of a Byzantine hymn (second ode) but in a place unknown to its origin. Like some Byzantine sources, Syr. 48 uses that whole ode (except the theotokion) for Kosmas' canon for the same feast.

For the Αἰ ἀγγελικαὶ series, while the question of authorship remains unanswered, some contextual aspects—the calendar (especially the Sunday before the Nativity in the Syriac and Georgian versions), the probable place of authorship, and the liturgical *Sitz im Leben*—point in the direction of a Byzantine or Constantinopolitan origin. It is the New Iadgari, the version that has the largest part of the whole series, that in the clearest way associates it with the Byzantine feast of the Sunday before the Nativity. We do not know whether this association of the hymn series with that liturgical occasion reflects a ninth-century Byzantine use, but in any case, it is notable. The inclusion of stanzas from the Αἰ ἀγγελικαὶ series varies considerably in the three versions.

On the other hand, one text that has often been considered to have a Byzantine origin, in our view, probably does not. The interpolated *first* ode of Kosmas' canon for Great Saturday, the first troparion of which is Ἄφρον γηραλέε, in the view of many, including Byzantine authors, was composed by Kassia. Unlike them, we believe that this ode is of Palestinian origin.

The three versions of the New Tropologion—Greek, Syriac, and Georgian—all represent redactions of the same hymnal, and we have noted several differences between them regarding the Byzantine elements that they have admitted. How are we to explain these differences? Regarding origin, the three versions ultimately go back to the Tropologion of the Resurrection cathedral. However, it is not clear whether they all originate in the same redaction of the

Hierosolymitan Tropologion or whether the Syriac and Georgian versions were made from Greek models that were already peripheral redactions of the central hymnal. One such peripheral redaction could have been a monastic Greek Tropologion that had somewhat reduced or otherwise altered the cathedral model. Whichever explanation is to be preferred, it is clear that the differences of Byzantine influence should be (also) explained as reflecting separate evolutions of different branches of the Tropologion. At the same time, these separate evolutions show signs of being variously advanced. The processes are complex, as each version seems to combine older and newer evolutionary stages. Let us review some examples.

The concord between the Syriac Tropologion and the New Iadgari, which both place the Byzantine sticheron Ἐπρεπε τῆ πορφυρίδι for St. John Chrysostom at Vespers (Kyrie ekekraxa), unlike its position at Matins (Ainoi) in ΜΓ 56+5, suggests that the Vespers position is more original. This seems all the more likely since ΜΓ 56+5 at Kyrie ekekraxa has stichera (Τοῦ ἱεράρχου τὴν μνήμην, etc.) that are otherwise unknown and probably a Palestinian production; these stichera would be of later date and seem to have pushed the earlier, Byzantine stichera (Ἐπρεπε τῆ πορφυρίδι τῶν πόλεων etc.) to another position (Ainoi).

Unlike the Syriac and Georgian New Tropologia, and unlike the Old Tropologion, ΜΓ 56+5 in a large number of cases has stichera at Glory (Εἰς τὸ δόξα) at Kyrie ekekraxa and Ainoi (we call them here "*doxastikon*", even though many of them are *theotokia*; in some cases, ΜΓ 56+5 calls them "*triadikon*", such as §10.9). The absence of *doxastika* in the Old Tropologion shows that the *doxastikon* is a new feature of the New Tropologion, but its absence in the Syriac and Georgian versions suggests that it is a later appearance. The use by ΜΓ 56+5 of Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ stanzas as *doxastikon* (§§2.5, 3.2) could suggest that the *doxastikon* is a Byzantine influence, which would not be surprising, since the *triadikon* (which figures in the position of a *doxastikon*) is a feature of early Hagiopolite (Byzantine) canons. However, the office of St. John Chrysostom in ΜΓ 56+5 does not have *doxastika*, so unless there were *doxastika* at the Chrysostom office that were removed when the office was adopted in Palestine, the Kyrie ekekraxa and Ainoi of this office did not originally have *doxastika*. The material studied in our essay does not allow us to discern whether the *doxastika* represent a Byzantine influence; for a proper statement, one would have to examine all the *doxastika* of the New Tropologion.

One certain observation in all this is that the New Iadgari (Group 1) shows a tendency to allow more Byzantine elements than ΜΓ 56+5 and Syr. 48. We have noted odes 3–5 of the canon of Great Saturday, the period from Sunday before the Nativity to Nativity and, in some witnesses, two additional offices for St. John Chrysostom. Since the Georgians in tenth-century Palestine still observed the rite of Jerusalem, while the Greek speaking Melkites of the same time and place no doubt had already adopted the Hagiopolite rite from Constantinople, it is possible that the Georgians received Byzantine elements not directly from the imperial capital but through intra-Palestinian contacts.

Our study is too limited to answer broader questions about the New Tropologion, its evolution, and the relationship between the Greek, Syriac, and Georgian versions. We have been able to reach partial conclusions based on the material relevant to our topic. Only further and more comprehensive studies may offer reliable general answers. What our study has shown is that, before the Byzantinisation (or Constantinopolitanisation) process began in the late ninth century for the Greek Palestinians and later for Syriac Melkites and Georgians, a distinct part of the interchange of liturgical elements between Palestine and Byzantium was the adoption of Byzantine elements in the hymnal of the rite of Jerusalem, the New Tropologion.

Author Contributions: S.S.R.F. is the author responsible for Sections 2.2 and 5–7, and the provision of material from the Georgian MSS; A.N. is responsible for Sections 2.1, 3 and 4, and the provision of material from Sinai Monē tēs Hagias Aikaterinēs MS Greek NE ΜΓ 56+5; N.S. has provided material from Sinai MS Syriac 48, written Section 2.3, contributed to Section 6.1, and provided comments to other sections. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: The research of Alexandra Nikiforova was funded by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, under the grant "Kosmas of Maiouma: the Life and Work of an Intellectual Monk and Innovative Hymnographer in Early Islamic Palestine", grant number 21-012-41003.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Fr. Andrew Wade for proofreading this article and providing valuable suggestions.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Abbreviations

AHG = Schirò, Joseph, ed. 1966–1983. *Analecta Hymnica Graeca e codicibus eruta Italiae Inferioris*. 12 vols. Roma.

Ainoi = The Pss 148–150 section at Matins (Praises, Lauds, with stanzas/stichera)

EE = Eustratiades, Sophronios. 1932. *Εί ρμολόγιον*. Chennevières-sur-Marne]: L’Ermitage. (§1 = canon 1, etc.).¹¹⁷

Geo. 1 = Sinai MS Georgian 1, etc.

GL = Tarchnischvili, Michael. 1959–1960. *Le Grande Lectionnaire de l’Église Jérusalem (V^e -VIII^e)*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 189–189, 204–205; Scriptorum Iberici 9–10, 13–14. Louvain.

Kyrie ekekraxa = The Κύριε, ἐκέκραξα, “Lord, I have cried”, section at Vespers (pss 140, 141 etc., with stanzas/stichera).

m.1, m.pl.1 = mode (ῥῆχος) 1, mode plagal 1, etc.

ΜΓ 56+5 = Sinai Monē tēs Hagias Aikaterinēs MSS Greek NE ΜΓ 56 and ΜΓ 5.

Syr. 48 = Sinai MS Syriac 48.

Notes

- 1 Since the source of this influence was no doubt Constantinople, the terms could alternatively be “Constantinopolitisation” and “Constantinopolitan influence”.
- 2 In recent research, a certain revision of terminology is emerging regarding the liturgical tradition of Jerusalem and its branch in Constantinople/Byzantium. We follow the distinction drawn by Gregory Tucker (Tucker 2023, pp. 5–6, ch. 1.1.2.3): the local rite of Jerusalem is designated by the adjective “Hierosolymitan”, while the Constantinopolitan Daily Office of Hierosolymitan tradition is called “Hagiopolite”, which is a calque of the term “Ἀγιοπολίτης” that the Byzantines used for their variant of the Jerusalem rite. We use “hagiopolitan” (lower case), “when it is either unnecessary or impossible to use the more specific terms Hierosolymitan and Hagiopolite as defined above” (Tucker 2023, p. 6). Cf. (Frøyshov 2020, p. 352, n. 8).
- 3 The Georgian and Syriac versions contain the three cycles; the lacunary ΜΓ 56+5 in its present state includes only the two annual cycles. For the structures, see (Frøyshov 2012a, “Global Tropologion”).
- 4 For a general presentation of both the Old and the New Tropologion, see (Frøyshov 2012a) with further references.
- 5 Our study does not exhaust the topic. Other hymns in ΜΓ 56+5 that are traditionally considered Byzantine but not included here are, for instance: the stanza Τοῦ Δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ (*Cenae tuae*) (§37.13), as pointed out already by (Taft and Parenti 2014, p. 180); Φῶς ἐκ φωτός (“Light from light”; §10.1), traditionally attributed to Patriarch Germanos. Both stanzas are found in the Old Iadgari, a fact that complicates the question of origin in these particular cases.
- 6 Based on author attributions in the codex itself, and in other manuscripts of hymns that are anonymous in ΜΓ 56+5, it may be estimated that at least a third of the hymn material of ΜΓ 56+5 is the work of John and Kosmas. This is not the place to problematise the traditional identification of the Hierosolymitan hymnographer John as John of Damascus (cf. Damaskinos [Olkinuora] of Xenophonos forthcoming).
- 7 Continuous calendrical sequence; same rubrical, terminological, and hymnographical features. Cf. (Nikiforova 2013a, pp. 28–80). Seemingly independently of Frøyshov, Skrekas made the same assumption: “I suspect that the copyist of ΜΓ 56 is either the same as that of ΜΓ 5 or perhaps these two manuscripts were initially designed as one codex, and at some point the Christmas part was detached from the other, the margins were truncated, and it became independent. This explains why the Christmas canon is missing from ΜΓ 5” (Skrekas 2008, p. cxv).
- 8 These numbered units (offices, *akolouthiai*) are rendered in Nikiforova (2012, pp. 195–235); we will be using these numbers here, preceded by §, including Nikiforova’s added subdivision of the units (§2.2, etc.). The calendar (without the numbers) is rendered in Chronz and Nikiforova (2014, pp. 150–59).
- 9 This MS was kindly paginated on 6 October 2022 by the librarian of St. Catherine’s monastery, Father Justin, and we follow in this article his pagination.
- 10 Transcription of the Arabic text by Dmitry Morozov, translation by Martin Lüstraeten. We express our sincere gratitude to both of them. Subsequently revised by Andrew Wade.
- 11 Below, we shall see an example of the long chain of steps in such transmissions: Kosmas wrote canons in Jerusalem; the canons arrived in Constantinople; there, second odes were added; these odes were transferred to Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem, they travelled to an Egyptian orbit.

- 12 The mid-tenth-century Heirmologion of Athos Lavras MS B 32 attributes the heirmos Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς, found in ΜΓ 56+5 (see below, Section 5.5), to Theophanes Protothronos. This hymnographer probably died in 886, and the attribution, if found trustworthy, would corroborate our preference of a dating in the later part of the spectrum.
- 13 For general overviews, see (Xevsuriani 2011, p. 242) (in Russian); (Otkhmezuri 2022, pp. 64–66), passim; (Frøyshov 2012c, pp. 238–40).
- 14 Lili Xevsuriani, based on the research of Georgian scholars, writes: “II. Новый Иадгари. формирование новой редакции Тропология, по сравнению с древним Иадгари текстуально полностью обновленной, началось ок. 2-й пол. IX в. (The New Iadgari. The formation of the new redaction of the Tropologion, textually completely renewed in comparison with the Old Iadgari, started around the second half of the ninth century).” (Xevsuriani 2011, p. 242).
- 15 All these manuscripts have been consulted from photographs. In addition, the excellent and extensive Georgian catalogue provides ample information on their content (Metreveli et al. 1978). We will not in all cases refer to the pages of this catalogue. In one case, we make use of the New Iadgari of Tbilisi National Centre of Manuscripts MS S-425, 978–988 AD (the so-called “Iadgari of Mikael Modrekili”).
- 16 A complete examination of the New Iadgari would, of course, have to make use of all known witnesses, and it remains to be seen whether this classification is valid for the witnesses that we have not consulted.
- 17 We shall mention it only in those cases.
- 18 Geo. 26 does not have them; Geo. 34 has two attributions in a separate Lenten part (Patriarch Elias and Theodore the Studite), but not for its main New Iadgari part.
- 19 The label is Frøyshov’s variant of Michel van Esbroeck’s expression “une encyclopédie liturgique du Xe siècle” (Frøyshov 2004, p. 190; van Esbroeck 1980, p. 138).
- 20 One such manuscript, Sinai MS Syriac 27, was recently studied by Paul Géhin, see (Géhin 2014) and (Géhin 2017, pp. 73–74). For another notable “Tropologion”, Sinai MS Syriac 261, see (Husmann 1975b, 1975–1978).
- 21 In some later Menaia, the feast is qualified as ἐπάνοδος τοῦ λειψάνου (“return of the relics”; Sinai MS Greek 595, ca. 1000, fol. 80r).
- 22 Although the date of Chrysostom’s death was 14 September, this day in Jerusalem was not associated with the hierarch, but with the octave of the Anastasis encaenia (GL II §1247–1250).
- 23 On 26 January: The New Iadgari Geo. 59, the Georgian Lectionary (GL I §173). 27 January: ΜΓ 56+5, the New Iadgari Geo. 1, 14, 64 (Metreveli et al. 1978, pp. 18, 42, 194), and Mikael Modrekili’s Iadgari (Kekelidze 1908, p. 380), the calendar of Geo. 58, 9th or 10th c. (Verhelst 2012, p. 234). Garitte erroneously states that the date of Geo. 1 is 26 January (Garitte 1958, p. 141). Both dates: Lectionary Paris Bibliothèque nationale de France MS Georgian 3, 10th–11th cc., fol. 9v (Garitte 1958, p. 141, GL I §173, 174).
- 24 Translation in (Aleksidze 2021) (this text is the only hymn for this office, one that Georgian scholars prefer to call a monostrophe, because MSS of that period do not usually provide a genre definition, but only a text).
- 25 Geo. 1 does not have them; Geo. 14 is lacunary at this place. The second office contains the apolytikion from the rite of Hagia Sophia (Ἡ τοῦ στόματός σου) and the canon Τῆς μετανοίας γεγωνῶς θερμότατος κήρυξ (heirmos Ἀρματηλάτην Φαραῶ), attributed to Theophanes. The two offices are no doubt late additions to the New Iadgari.
- 26 (Metreveli et al. 1978, pp. 18, 42, 194). The feast is not found in Geo. 26, 34 and 49.
- 27 For a version of this canon, see: Printed Greek Menaion (27 January, Matins, Theophanes).
- 28 =Printed Greek and Slavonic Menaion (13 November, vespers, for the litē, Germanos), with a slight textual difference: Ἐπρεπε τῆ βασιλίδι.
- 29 The absence of mode indication is unusual for the New Iadgari.
- 30 =Printed Greek and Slavonic Menaion (13 November, for the litē).
- 31 They are not found in the two additional offices for the saint in Geo. 59 and 64.
- 32 The first proper text for the archangel Michael in this MS (6 June, §§70–71, fols. 230r–236r) is from Jerusalem, and the second one is a local Egyptian composition (Chronz and Nikiforova 2014, pp. 163–70).
- 33 Typikon of Alexis the Studite, between 1034 and 1043 (Pentkovskij 2001, p. 325); Slavonic Menaion from the Lazar monastery in Velikiy Novgorod, Moskva Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Archiv Drevnikh Aktov MS F. 381, op. 1, #99, 11th–12th c., fol. 381r; Preslavskaya Menaion Moskva RGADA MS F.381, op.1, #102, 15th c., fols. 106v–111r, etc.
- 34 Traditio canonis in cdd. et tropariorum ordine et amplitudine differt (AHG V, p. 413). Ed. in: AHG V, №XXXIII(1), pp. 413–30, № XXXIII(2), pp. 430–38, comments, pp. 598–600.
- 35 See AHG V, pp. 599–600.
- 36 See Note 35.
- 37 Andrew wrote another canon to this saint: mode 4, heirmos Ἀρματα Φαραῶ, inc. Ἐδειξας ὁ Θεός, ed. in: AHG V, № XXXII (1), pp. 387–403, № XXXII (2), pp. 404–12, comments, pp. 597–98.
- 38 Cf. troparia from the Great canon in the printed Lenten Triodion: Τῆ τοῦ Ἀβὲλ Ἰησοῦ, οὐχ ὠμοιώθην, “I have not resembled Abel’s righteousness, O Jesus”; Ὡς ὁ Καὶν καὶ ἡμεῖς, “Like Cain, we too” (ode 1); ὥσπερ Λῶτ φεῦγε... τῆς ἀμαρτίας, “Flee... like Lot from the fire of sin” (ode 3); Ἡσαῦ... ζηλοῦσα ψυχὴ, “You have emulated the hated Esau” (ode 4); Ὡς Μωυσῆς ὁ μέγας, “like the great Moses” (ode 5); etc.

- 39 Germanos: heirmoi for odes 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 (=EE §323, p. 295), other heirmoi for odes 2, 7, and 9 (=EE §324, 296). John the Monk: heirmoi 4 and 8 (=EE §321, p. 293).
- 40 AHG VI, pp. 375–82.
- 41 (Metreveli et al. 1978, pp. 18, 42, 194). The feast is not found in Geo. 26, 34 and 49.
- 42 According to Grottaferrata MS Δ.α. XV, 11th c., fols. 205r–213v. This stanza was taken from the Old Tropologion (Metreveli et al. 1980, 15:22, Nativity of Christ).
- 43 This stanza was taken from the Old Tropologion (OI, 15:35, Nativity of Christ).
- 44 The stanza is present in the received tradition.
- 45 See Note 44.
- 46 See Note 44.
- 47 See Note 44.
- 48 It is not clear why the original second ode is absent, whereas four second odes were interpolated into canons that initially had eight odes (see Section 5).
- 49 These theotokia can be found as parts of later Palestinian and Constantinopolitan *akolouthiai* (in m.pl.4), scattered in printed hymnographical books, e.g., Δόξα τῷ Πατρὶ (Follieri 1960–1965, I, p. 324), Ἀχρόνως ἐξέλαψας (Follieri 1960–1965, I, p. 215), Ἀναρχε Τριάς (Follieri 1960–1965, I, p. 100), etc. Thus, the theotokion Κλιμαξ ἀνεδείχθης is found in ode 1 of two canons ascribed to the Palestinian hymnographer Stephen the Sabaites: for the Holy Fathers slain at St. Saba’s monastery (20 March) and for St. Kyriakos the Anachorete (29 September). The theotokion Βάτον καιομένης is found in ode 9 of the later Constantinopolitan canon for the Saturday of Cheesefare Week.
- 50 In this, they relied on the remark to this canon in printed Triodia: “Odes 1, 3, 4, and 5 were composed by Mark the Monk, bishop of Otranto; odes 6, 7, 8, and 9—by Kosmas of Jerusalem, while the heirmoi are the work of a woman Kassia” (see *Τριώδιον κατανυκτικόν* 1960, p. 425; *Lenten Triodion* 2002, p. 646).
- 51 The text redaction in ΜΓ 56+5 is the same as the text published in: (Eustratiades 1932, pp. 96–100).
- 52 In Eustratiades’ edition, we read instead of this, ὕμνῳ σου καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν (“I also chant your resurrection”, see Eustratiades 1932, p. 97, Athos Monē Vatopediou MS 1189, 12th c., fol. 231v).
- 53 M. 3, heirmos Βυθός μοι τῶν παθῶν, inc. Στάζει ἀνεύθυνος θέλων δεσμῆσαι.
- 54 Numbers here represent chronological variants of the canon.
- 55 Published by Eustratiades, with ode 1 as “of Kassia”, but without such an attribution in the MSS.
- 56 I thank Father Theodochos from Vatopedi for sending me MSS folia for this study. Athos Lavras MS Δ. 32, 13th c., fol. 3r, unfortunately, remained unavailable to us.
- 57 Except for Theodore Studite, who composed a completely independent canon with nine odes (Vatican MS Vat. gr. 771, 11th c., fols. 188v–190v, ed. Tomadakes 2004, pp. 314–26).
- 58 According to P. Cesaretti, in 903–912 (Cesaretti 2000, p. 192), by a command of the emperor Leo the Wise. This information goes back to Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos (XIV, see Detorakes 1979, p. 210).
- 59 According to the editor of these two sets, Theophanes wrote both of them (Tomadakes 2004, p. 446).
- 60 It has the same heirmos Κύματι θαλάσσης, but different troparia.
- 61 Kosta Simić describes one more combination; although he does not say if there is any attribution in the codex, these are odes 3–5 of Theophanes + ode 5 of Kassia (?) + odes 1, 6–9 of Kosmas (the Slavonic Zagreb Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts MS HAZU IV d 107, 13th c., fols. 164v, 165r, ed. Simić 2014, pp. 242–43). Simić believes that both odes, 1 and 5, belong to Kassia.
- 62 Tomadakes suggests two readings of the codex “Κα” as: (a) “Κασσιανῆς” or (b) “Κοσμᾶ” (Tomadakes 2004, p. 327). There were also “other” additional sets of troparia to odes 3–5.
- 63 Ἡ δὲ εἰρημένη Εἰκασία... καὶ συγγράματα αὐτῆς πλεῖστα κατατέλοιπε... τοῦ μεγάλου Σαββάτου τὸ τετραώδιον Ἄφρον γηραλέε, καὶ ἄλλα τινά... (Georgios Monachos Continuatus 1838, p. 790).
- 64 Ὁ παρῶν κανὼν ποίημα μὲν ἐστὶ ἄχρι τῆς πέμπτῃς αὐτῆς Μάρκου ἐπισκόπου Ὑδροῦντος, ἐκ ταύτης δὲ ἄχρις ἐνάτης τοῦ μεγάλου ποιητοῦ Κοσμᾶ. Ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρότερον, ὡς ἐξ ἀγράφου ἔχομεν παραδόσεως, γυνὴ τις τῶν εὐπατριδῶν σοφὴ καὶ παρθένος, Κασία τοῦνομα, τοῦ τε μέλους ἀρχηγὸς ἐχρημάτισε καὶ τὸν κανόνα συνεπεράνατο· οἱ δὲ ὕστερον τὸ μέλος μὲν ἀγασάμενοι, ἀνάξιον δ’ ὅμως κρίναντες γυναικείους συμμίξει λόγους τὰ τοῦ ἥρωος ἐκείνου Κοσμᾶ μουσουργήματα, τὸ μέλος παραδόντες τῷ Μάρκῳ καὶ τοὺς εἰρμούς ἐχειρήσαντες τὴν πλοκὴν τῶν τροπαρίων τούτῳ ἐπέτρεψαν (Theodoros 1864, col. 1235D–1238A).
- 65 Now the complete work of Kassia has been revisited by Alexander Lingas; cf. his presentation “Reassessing the Transmission of Kassia’s Liturgical Works: A Preliminary Report”, given at the Eighth International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy in Thessalonike (16 June 2022).
- 66 By content, ode 1 could be selected because it was based on Ex 15, 1–19, being a prophecy of Christ’s Resurrection, which is the main theme of the canon.

- 67 Grottaferrata MS Δ. γ. 5, 14th c., fols. 82v–90v (fol. 82v—ἕτερος κανὼν σταυροαναστάσιμος. Ποίημα Κοσμᾶ), Athos Ibērōn MS 41, 14th c., fols. 81r–89r: inc. Ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ φυτεύεται ξύλον; Athos Lauras MS B 6, 13th c., fols. 59r–63v: inc. Ὅτε σὲ τοῖς ἡλοῖς, ed. Nikolaou (2014, pp. 208–23, 224–43); also see (Detorakes 1979, p. 172). In the Heirmologion Paris MS Coisl. 220, 12th c., fol. 156r, this set of heirmoi is also ascribed to Kosmas (Detorakes 1979, p. 170). Detorakes states that Nicodemos the Hagiorite already wrote in his Heortodromion: “I found in an old manuscript Theotokaria canons in honour of the Theotokos, written by Andrew of Crete, a contemporary of Kosmas, who lived before Kassia, with heirmoi Κύματι θαλάσσης and others, and I was puzzled” (Detorakes 1979, p. 170). The attribution of heirmos 1 to Mark in Athos Lavras MS B 32, ca. 950, fols. 200v–201v is false and caused by the diffusion in the 11th c. of Mark and Kosmas’ № 6b version of the canon.
- 68 (Tomadakes 2004, p. 444). I. Rochow suggests to read “θειότατον” (Rochow 1967, p. 39), Papagiannis—“θειον”, or “θαυμα” (Papagiannis 2005, p. 471), but this is not convincing.
- 69 Μετὰ δὲ τινα καιρὸν Μάρκος, ὁ σοφώτατος μοναχός, οἰκονόμος ὦν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας ὅς καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ Σαββάτῳ τετραώδιον τοῦ μεγάλου Κοσμᾶ ἀνεπλήρωσεν (Theophanes 1838, p. 365).
- 70 In ΜΓ 56+5, the authorship of Kosmas is implied, for it is a part of his set for all the days of Holy Week, with one poetic acrostic, which goes through all the parts of the composition, and his name “of Kosmas the monk (Κοσμᾶ μοναχοῦ)” is present on fol. 124r at the beginning of the Great Thursday canon.
- 71 EE §88, 123, 163, 295 (§200 does have ode 2).
- 72 About these two manuscripts, see (Hannick 2006, pp. 340–41).
- 73 This canon figures in all our New Tropologia at the feast of St. John Chrysostom (27 January); see above, Section 3.3, which also discusses the attributions to either Germanos or Andrew.
- 74 Here, errors abound in EE: the canon is said to be found in Paris MS Coisl. 220 (which it is not); the fol. in Athos Lavras MS B 32 is said to be 272r (but it is 273v); EE omits the second ode that is found in Athos Lavras MS B 32.
- 75 This is Kosmas’ canon for the Theophany, Βυθοῦ ἀνεκάλυψε πυθμένα (“[The Lord mighty in battle] uncovered the foundations of the deep”). We do not exclude that the New Iadgari contains other canons with ode 2 apart from the three examined below.
- 76 In ΜΓ 56, ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ covers the first ode, ΤΟΣΒ the third ode.
- 77 Paris MS Coisl. 220 only (Athos Lavras MS B 32 has a lacuna here).
- 78 This canon is not found in the Old Georgian Heirmologion (Metreveli 1971).
- 79 Neither of these troparia are listed by Follieri 1960–1965 (Follieri’s Ἀναρχον τὸν Πατέρα is another troparion).
- 80 The calendar of this set is characterised by several local Constantinopolitan saints, new saints of the ninth–tenth centuries, and its encyclopaedic and extensive content (Nikiforova 2013b, p. 612). We note that the roughly contemporaneous Heirmologion Athos Lavra MS B 32 (see above) shares the same features.
- 81 See (Krivko 2008) for a first deciphering of this ode. Despite its lacunary state, enough of it is preserved to confirm its identity with the Georgian version.
- 82 Geo. 1, 14, 34, and 64 have been checked. Their text is the same, and they have a stanza, the second in the series of troparia following the heirmos, that is not in ΜΓ 56+5: სმეხოთ და ხოლვით გუეუწყა ჩუენ დღეს .
- 83 EE §49 (both MSS). The Heirmologion Jerusalem MS Hagiou Saba 83 has the same two heirmoi but in reverse order (Raasted 1968–1970, p. 1, fol. 34r).
- 84 As we shall see below (Section 5.4), ΜΓ 56+5 has this second ode (with heirmos Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς) in another canon for the same feast, that of John the Monk.
- 85 ΜΓ 56+5 itself provides this acrostic, although it includes ode 2, which is outside the acrostic.
- 86 The Greek text and the English translation are provided by Alexandra Nikiforova.
- 87 This reading therefore does not provide a clue to the geographic origin of the ode.
- 88 Cf. the 28 troparia (plus heirmos and theotokion) of ode 2 of the Great Canon of Andrew of Crete.
- 89 Jerusalem MS Hagiou Saba 83 (Raasted 1968–1970, p. 2, fol. 160r).
- 90 EE §59, an office in m².
- 91 About *kata stichon* hymns, see (Lauxtermann 1999, pp. 58–60).
- 92 In a remarkable essay, Francesco D’Aiuto has shown that already the Old Tropologion contained some stichic stanzas, selected from *kata stichon* hymns and inserted into the liturgical structures of the Hierosolymitan Office (D’Aiuto 2019).
- 93 A well-known example is Ἀκατάληπτόν ἐστι, the Megalynaria of the ninth ode of Kosmas’ canon of Hyrapante in the received Byzantine rite. Edition from manuscripts in Gassisi, “Inno alfabetico per la festa dell’ Ὑπαπαντή”, in (Maas et al. 1909, pp. 348–53).
- 94 This alphabetic stichic hymn was edited by (Maas et al. 1909, pp. 345–46).
- 95 Gassisi placed it before the appearance of the kontakion in the sixth century (Maas et al. 1909, p. 334), and D’Aiuto quotes his dating without commentary (D’Aiuto 2008, p. 74).
- 96 Since the heirmos is an intercalated phrase (with Κυρίῳ added) from the biblical canticle, our assumption is that a redactor could have found in the canticle a phrase that, with some emendation, fitted the existing stichic hymn.

- 97 Edited from ΜΓ 56+5 in (Krivko 2008, pp. 64–65).
- 98 Athos Lavras MS B 32 also attributes to Theophanes Protothronos other second odes interpolated into canons by Kosmas: Ὁ κλίνας οὐρανούς και καταβάς in his canon for Hypapante (fol. 79v, EE §103) and Ὡσπερ ὄμβρος ἐπ' ἄγρωστιν (fol. 199r, EE §229) in his canon for Great Thursday. Admittedly, the latter does not add “Protothronos” to “Theophanes”, but given that the same MS attributes other interpolated second odes specifically to Theophanes Protothronos, we may suppose the same here. For the former, EE §101 does not have this heirmos at this ode (it does not refer to Athos Lavras MS B 32 at all for this canon §101, p. 70), but has it at canon §103, where the ode is taken from Paris MS Coisl. 220 (“other” heirmos, without attribution). Canon §103 is attributed to Germanos by Paris MS Coisl. 220, but to Kyprianos by Athos Lavras MS B 32. Hannick erroneously states that it is in this canon EE §103 that Athos Lavras MS B 32 attributes this ode 2 to Theophanes Protothronos (Hannick 2006, p. 24). However, as we have just noted, it is in canon EE §101.
- 99 To explain this, one may hypothesise that the redactor of ΜΓ 56+5 disposed of a source that for ode 2 of Kosmas’ Theophany canon had both Οὐρανός και γῆ and Πάλιν Ἰησοῦς (similar to the tenth-century Constantinopolitan Heirmologion), thus making use of both the second odes, but in two different canons. Maybe the redactor was inspired by the interpolation, received from Constantinople, of the second ode in the three canons by Kosmas that we have studied.
- 100 ΜΓ 56 has lost the rubric that names the day. It precedes the feast (25 Dec., §3) and, based on the parallelism between the feasts of the Nativity of Christ and Theophany, we may conjecture that it is the Eve (*Paramonē*) of the feast.
- 101 The whole MS is available online: https://www.internetculturale.it/jmms/iccuviewer/iccu.jsp?id=oai%3Awww.internetculturale.sbn.it%2FTeca%3A20%3ANT0000%3ARM0281_Vall_E_54 (accessed on 1 September 2023).
- 102 This manuscript became the main source of all subsequent editions and translations of this hymn. Another witness, also from Southern Italy, namely Otranto in Apulia, is found in Vatican MS Vat. gr. 1212, dated to the first half of the 12th century (Jacob 2001, pp. 285–96; Parenti 2017, pp. 89–90). This Anthologion manuscript contains the first seven stanzas only. Finally, in the fifteenth–sixteenth-century Vatican MS Vat. gr. 1531, eighteen stanzas from the series are spread between two pre-Nativity days: four (1–4) and six stanzas (5–10) at Matins on 18 December before and after the canon, respectively, and four other stanzas (11–14) on 19 December (see Grosdidier de Matons 1965, pp. 134–35). Since, as we shall see below, it is unlikely that the stanzas were composed for the Ainoi (and the hagiopolitan rite at all), their original genre was probably not the sticheron.
- 103 The term *bā’ ūthā* has a number of meanings in Syriac, including “petition, supplication, prayer”. In the liturgical practice of both the East Syrian and the West Syrian traditions, it is primarily associated with the Rogation of the Ninevites (*bā’ ūthā d-nīnwāyē*)—a three-day fast observed from Monday to Wednesday during the third week before the Lent (or antepenultimate week of the Epiphany) and accompanied by specific liturgical celebrations. Another meaning is a short metrical composition ascribed to various authors, e.g., Ephrem the Syrian (see Mateos 1959, p. 486). In the case of Syr. 48, the exact meaning of the term is unclear.
- 104 Online text: <https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcg/cauc/ageo/liturg/modrekil/modre.htm?modre026.htm>, accessed on 1 September 2023. See Russian résumé of the text in (Kekelidze 1908, p. 375).
- 105 წინაკვრათი ვიდრე ქრისტეს შობადმდე უფალო დადადყვას [sic] და აქედითსა სამსამა ითქუმის (Geo. 14). The prescription “three at a time” is found only in Geo. 14. Interestingly, this resembles the way in which the similar series is sung in the present Menaion, which is at Ainoi on 20–24 December.
- 106 However, although starting with Αἱ ἀγγελικαὶ προπορεύεσθε δυνάμεις, which functions as model stanza, this alphabetic series is a different text. It is found at the Nativity in the 11th–12th c. Menaion of Sinai MS Greek 581, fols. 68v–71r (without attribution, at Kyrie ekekraxa and Ainoi), and from 20 Dec. in the 13th c. Sinai MS Greek 938, from fol. 219v (at Ainoi, starts with the same stanzas/letters as in the present Menaion, but incomplete).
- 107 Since the Nativity does not fall on a fixed weekday, the Sunday “of the Nativity” very likely means “before the Nativity”, as in the New Iadgari.
- 108 (Stichel 1991, pp. 262–67). His main argument is that the “Anspielungen auf die Sakraltopographie und auf den Bildschmuck der Heiligen Stätten” (263) are best explained by taking them literally. He suggests that the series was sung during the procession from Jerusalem to Bethlehem on the eve of the Nativity (first January 5, then December 24).
- 109 The Old Iadgari’s selection of stanzas is confirmed by the contemporaneous Georgian Lectionary, which is a version of the Lectionary of the same church (LG 96–106).
- 110 “Bemerkenswert sind jedenfalls ... manche inhaltlichen Parallelen zu den [Romanos’] Weihnachtshymnen 5/10 und 6/11.” (Koder 2005, p. 377).
- 111 This is easily seen from the entries and their commentaries, where Garitte comments upon them in their order.
- 112 This seems more likely than the acrostic being a later development based on a few stanzas.
- 113 The whole series at the Ainoi as in the Vallicelliana MS, therefore, is abnormal.
- 114 For instance, while odes 1 and 3 (ode 2 being rare) are quite similar, for the remaining odes the heirmoi are mostly different in various textual traditions: between the first canon edited by AHG and in the Heirmologion Athos Lavras MS B 32, and between the two canons edited by AHG. The heirmoi of ΜΓ 56+5 belong in Athos Lavras MS B 32 to different canons attributed to Germanos (§§323, 324) and to John the Monk (§§321, 325).
- 115 For instance, the troparion Πλουτοῦν ἐναπέθου of ode 1 and Δεύτερος Ἰώβ of ode 4.

- 116 Both Germanos and Andrew, the two hymnographers that are candidates for being author of the canon, usually included ode 2. Further, the heirmos figures in the tenth-century Heirmologion Athos Lavras MS B 32 (EE §323), in a series attributed to Germanos. The fact that it is taken from the Old Iadgari (Metreveli et al. 1980, vol. 15, p. 22) suggests an early date, and it is known that Germanos frequently based his heirmoi on Old Tropologion stanzas (see Frøyshov 2020, pp. 358–59).
- 117 A second edition has appeared: Panagiotou, Antonios, D., Dimitra I. Moniou, and Nikoleta I. Moniou, eds. 2006. *Ειρμολόγιον εκδιδόμενον υπό μητροπολίτου πρ. Λεοντοπόλεως Σωφρονίου Ευστρατιάδου*. 2nd ed., revised and improved. Athens: Π. Κυριακίδη. This edition does not rectify the errors we have pointed out, so for practical purposes, we use the first edition.

References

- Afinogenov, Dmitry. 2013. Кассия. In *Православная энциклопедия*. Moscow: Церковно-научный центр «Православная энциклопедия», vol. 31, pp. 575–78.
- Ajjoub, Maxime (Leila), and Joseph Paramelle. 2004. *Livre d'heures du Sinai (Sinaiticus graecus 864)*. Sources chrétiennes 486. Paris: Cerf.
- Aleksidze, Nikoloz. 2021. *Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity (CSLA) Database*. E02958. Available online: <http://csla.history.ox.ac.uk/record.php?recid=E02958> (accessed on 1 September 2023).
- Baumstark, Anton. 1910. *Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der Syrischen Jakobiten*. Paderborn: F. Schöningh.
- Bertonière, Gabriel. 2000. Four Liturgical Canons of Elias II of Jerusalem. In *Crossroads of Cultures. Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler*. Edited by Hans-Jürgen Feulner, Elena Velkovska and Robert Taft. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, pp. 89–149.
- Bucca, Donatella. 2006. Un antico manoscritto innografico di origine orientale: Il Sin. gr. 824. *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neellenici* 43: 87–136.
- Čankieva, Č'a'ca. 1973. პალესტინელ გადაშენებ 'იოვანეთა' შესახებ (About the Palestinian Scribes 'Iovane'). *Mravaltavi* 3: 45–51.
- Cesaretti, Paolo. 2000. Da "Marco d'Otrano" a Demetrio. Alcune note di lettura su poeti bizantini del Salento. *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neellenici* 37: 183–208.
- Chkhikvadze, Nestan, ed. 2018. *The Georgian Manuscript Book Abroad*. Compiled by Nestan Chkhikvadze, Maia Karanadze, Vladimir Kekelia and Lela Shatirishvili. Tbilisi: Korneli Kekelidze Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts.
- Chronz, Tinatin, and Alexandra Nikiforova. 2014. Beobachtungen zum ältesten bekannten Tropologion-Codex Sinaiticus graecus MG 56+5 des 8.-9. Jhs. mit Erstedition ausgewählter Abschnitte. In *ΣΥΝΑΞΙΣ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗ. Beiträge zu Gottesdienst und Geschichte der fünf altkirchlichen Patriarchate für Heinzgerd Brakmann zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Diliانا Atanassova and Tinatin Chronz. Münster: LIT Verlag, pp. 147–74.
- Clark, Kenneth W. 1952. *Checklist of Manuscripts in St. Catherine's Monastery, Mount Sinai. Microfilmed for the Library of Congress, 1950*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- D'Aiuto, Francesco. 2008. Un antico inno per la Resurrezione (con nuove testimonianze di «scrittura mista» d'area orientale). *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neellenici* 45: 3–135.
- D'Aiuto, Francesco. 2019. Sopravvivenza e riuso dell' 'Inno alfabetico Schøyen' nel Tropologio Sin. gr. NE MG 56+5 e in antichi manoscritti greci dell'Ototoeco e georgiani dello Iadgari. *Néα Πώμη* 16: 33–68.
- Damaskinos [Oikinuora] of Xenophontos. Forthcoming. Hymns and Liturgy. In *Brill's Companion to John of Damascus*. Edited by Ken Parry. Leiden: Brill.
- Detorakes, Theochares. 1979. Κοσμάς ο Μελωδός. Βίος και έργο. Ανάλεκτα Βλατάδων 28. Thessaloniki: Πατριαρχικόν Ίδρυμα Πατερικών Μελετών.
- Eustratiades, Sofronios. 1932. Κασιανή ή Μελωδός. *Εκκλησιαστικός Φάρος* 31: 97–100.
- Follieri, Henrica. 1960–1965. *Initia hymnorum Ecclesiae Graecae*. Vol. I-V. Studi e testi 211-2015bis. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Fonkich, Boris. 2020. *Византийский маюскул VIII-IX вв. К вопросу о датировке рукописей (Byzantine Majuscule of the 8th–9th cc. On the Question of Dating of Manuscripts)*. Moscow: Языки славянских культур.
- Frøyshov, Stig R. 2004. L'Horologe «géorgien» du Sinaiticus ibericus 34. 2 vols. Ph.D. dissertation, Université de Paris-Sorbonne (Paris IV), Institut Catholique de Paris, Institut de théologie orthodoxe Saint-Serge, Paris, France.
- Frøyshov, Stig Simeon R. 2012a. Rite of Jerusalem. In *The Canterbury Dictionary of Hymnology*. Norwich: Canterbury Press. Available online: <http://www.hymnology.co.uk/r/rite-of-jerusalem> (accessed on 1 September 2023).
- Frøyshov, Stig Simeon R. 2012b. Sophronios of Jerusalem. In *The Canterbury Dictionary of Hymnology*. Norwich: Canterbury Press. Available online: <http://www.hymnology.co.uk/s/sophronios-of-jerusalem> (accessed on 1 September 2023).
- Frøyshov, Stig Simeon R. 2012c. The Georgian Witness to the Jerusalem Liturgy: New Sources and Studies. In *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship: Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy Rome, 17–21 September 2008*. Edited by Bert Groen, Stephen Hawkes-Teeples and Stefanos Alexopoulos. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 227–69.
- Frøyshov, Stig Simeon R. 2020. The Early History of the Hagiopolitan Daily Office in Constantinople: New Perspectives on the Formative Period of the Byzantine Rite. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 75: 351–82.
- Galadza, Daniel. 2018. *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garitte, Gérard. 1958. *Le Calendrier Palestino-Géorgien du Sinaiticus 34 (X^e siècle)*. Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes.
- Géhin, Paul. 2014. Écrire le grec en lettres syriaques: Les hymnes du Sinai syr. 27. In *Scripts Beyond Borders. A Survey of Allographic Traditions in the Euro-Mediterranean World*. Edited by Johannes den Heijer, Andrea Schmidt and Tamara Pataridze. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, 62. Louvain: Peeters.

- Géhin, Paul. 2017. *Les Manuscrits Syriaques de Parchemin du Sinai et Leurs Membra Dissecta*. (CSCO 665; Subsidia 136). Louvain: Peeters.
- Géhin, Paul, and Stig Frøyshov. 2000. Nouvelles découvertes sinaïtiques. À propos de la parution de l'inventaire des manuscrits grecs. *Revue des études byzantines* 58: 167–84. [CrossRef]
- Georgios Monachos Continuatus. 1838. *Vitae Recentiorum Imperatorum*. In *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*. Edited by I. Bekker. Bonn: Weber, pp. 761–924.
- Grosdidier de Matons, José, ed. 1965. *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*. vol. II. Sources Chrétiennes 110. Paris: Cerf.
- Hannick, Christian. 1978. Aux origines de la version slave de l'Hirmologion. In *Fundamental Problems of Early Slavic Music and Poetry*. Edited by A. Bugge. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, pp. 5–120.
- Hannick, Christian. 2006. *Das altslavisches Hirmologion*. Freiburg i. Br.: Weiher.
- Hatch, William Henry Paine. 1946. *An Album of Dated Syriac Manuscripts*. Boston: The American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Husmann, Heinrich. 1975–1978. *Ein Syro-Melkitisches Tropologion mit Altbyzantinischer Notation, Sinai syr.* 261. Teil 1–2. Göttinger Orientalforschungen, Reihe 1, Syriaca 9. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Husmann, Heinrich. 1975a. Die syrischen Handschriften des Sinai-Klosters: Herkunft und Schreiber. *Ostkirchliche Studien* 24: 281–308.
- Husmann, Heinrich. 1975b. Ein syrisches Sticherarion mit paläobyzantinischer Notation (Sinai syr. 261). *Hamburger Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* 1: 9–57.
- Ingoroqva, Pavle. 1965. *თხზულებათა კრებული, ტომი III (Collected Works, Vol. III)*. Tbilisi: საბჭოთა საქართველო .
- Jacob, André. 2001. Tra Basilicata e Salento. Precisazioni necessarie sui menei del monastero di Carbone. *Archivio Storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 68: 21–52.
- Jung, Annette. 1996. Syntomon, a musical genre from around AD 800. *Cahiers de l'institut du Moyen Âge grec et latin* 66: 25–35.
- Kamil, Murad. 1970. *Catalogue of All Manuscripts in the Monastery of St. Catharine on Mount Sinai*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Kekelidze, Korneli. 1908. *Литургические грузинские памятники в отечественных книгохранилищах и их научное значение (Liturgical Georgian Documents in National Libraries and Their Scientific Significance)*. Tbilisi: Типография "Братство".
- Koder, Johannes. 2005. *Romanos Melodos. Die Hymnen, Erster Halbband*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.
- Koder, Johannes. 2008. Imperial Propaganda in the Kontakia of Romanos the Melode. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 62: 275–91.
- Kollyropoulou, Theoni. 2012. *Περί του προβλήματος της Β' αδής των κανόνων*. Patras, [no publisher].
- Krivko, Roman. 2008. Синайско-славянские гимнографические параллели (Sinaitic-Slavonic Hymnographical Parallels). *Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета III* 1: 56–102.
- Krueger, Derek. 2015. Liturgical Time and Holy Land Reliquaries in Early Byzantium. In *Saints and Sacred Matter. The Cult of Relics in Byzantium and Beyond*. Edited by C. Hahn and H. Klein. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.
- Lauxtermann, Mark. 1999. *The Spring of Rhythm. An Essay on the Political Verse and Other Byzantine Metres*. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lenten Triodion. 2002. *The Lenten Triodion*. Translated by Mother Mary, and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware. South Canaan: St. Tikhon's Seminary Press.
- Lewis, Agnes Smith. 1894. *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS. in the Convent of S. Catherine on Mount Sinai*. London: C.J. Clay and Sons.
- Lucà, Santo. 2012. Scritture e libri in Terra d'Otranto fra XI e XII secolo. In *Bizantini, Longobardi e Arabi in Puglia nell'alto medioevo. Atti del XX Congresso internazionale di studio sull'alto medioevo (Savellettri di Fasano (BR), 3–6 novembre 2011)*. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, pp. 487–548.
- Maas, Paul, and Constantine Athanasius Trypanis. 1970. *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Dubia*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Maas, Paul, G. S. Mercati, and S. Gassisi. 1909. Gleichzeitige Hymnen in der byzantinischen Liturgie. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 18: 309–56. [CrossRef]
- Mateos, Juan. 1959. *Lelya-sapra: Essai d'interprétation des matines chaldéennes*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta. Roma: Pontificio istituto orientale, p. 156.
- Mateos, Juan, ed. 1962–1963. *Le typicon de la Grande Église*. 2 vols. Orientalia Christiana Analecta. Rome: Pontificio istituto orientale, pp. 165–66.
- Metreveli, Eleni. 1971. *ძღობორბი და ღმრთისმშობლისანი. ორი ძველი რედაქცია X-XI სს. ხელნაწერების მიხედვით (Heirmoi and Theotokia. Two Old Redactions According to 10th–11th c. Manuscripts)*. Tbilisi: Mec'niereba.
- Metreveli, Eleni, Caca Čankievi, Lili Xevsuriani, and L. Jgamaia. 1978. *ქართულ ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა. სინური კოლექცია, ნაკვეთი I (Description of Georgian Manuscripts. Sinai Collection, vol. I)*. Tbilisi: Mec'niereba.
- Metreveli, Eleni, C'ac'a Chankievi, and Lili Khevsuriani, eds. 1980. *უძველესი ოადგარი (The Oldest Iadgari)*. Tbilisi: Mec'niereba.
- Nikiforova, Alexandra. 2012. *Из истории Минеи в Византии. Гимнографические памятники VIII–XII вв. из собрания монастыря святой Екатерины на Синае (From the History of the Menaion in Byzantium. Hymnographical Manuscripts of the 8th–9th cc. from the Collection of St. Catherine's Monastery on Sinai)*. Moscow: Orthodox Saint Tikhon's University Press.
- Nikiforova, Alexandra. 2013a. The Tropologion Sin. gr. NE/MI 56–5 of the Ninth Century: A New Source for Byzantine Hymnography. *Scripta & E-Scripta* 12: 157–85.
- Nikiforova, Alexandra. 2013b. Воссоединенный кодекс РНБ. Gr. 89/Sinait. Gr. 578 (Cod. Petr. Gr. 89 + Sin. Gr. 578 Reunited). In *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology—XVII. Proceedings of the 17th Conference in Memory of Professor Joseph M. Trowsky, June 24–26, 2013*. Edited by Nikolai N. Kazansky. St. Petersburg: Nauka, pp. 605–18.

- Nikiforova, Alexandra. 2015. The Oldest Greek Tropologion Sin. Gr. ΜΓ 56+5: A New Witness to the Liturgy of Jerusalem from outside Jerusalem with First Edition of the Text. *Oriens Christianus* 98: 138–73.
- Nikiforova, Alexandra. 2019. The Consecration of Holy Myron in the Near East: A Reconstruction Attempt of the Greek-Melkite Rite (with the Edition of Sinai Greek NF/E 55 + Fragment E sine numero, A.D. 1156). *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 85: 167–216.
- Nikiforova, Alexandra, and Tinatin Chronz. 2017. The Codex Sinaiticus Liturgicus Revisited: A New Edition and Critical Assessment of the Text. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 82: 59–125.
- Nikolaou, Anastasia K. 2014. Οἱ κανόνες τοῦ Κοσμᾶ τοῦ Μελωδοῦ στην Παρακλητική. Κριτική ἔκδοση καὶ σχολιασμός. Ph.D. thesis, Democritus University of Thrace, Komotini, Greek.
- Nikolopoulos, Paul. 1998. *Τὰ νέα εὐρήματα τοῦ Σινᾶ*. Athens: Ἱερά Μονή καὶ Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴ Ὑπουργεῖο Πολιτισμοῦ, ἴδρυμα Ὅρου Σινᾶ.
- ODB. 1991. Eudoxia. In *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, vol. 2.
- Otkhmezuri, Thamar, ed. 2022. *Medieval Georgian Literary Culture and Book Production in the Christian Middle East and Byzantium*. Jerusalem Theologisches Forum 42. Münster: Aschendorff.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasios. 1894. *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*. St. Petersburg: Kirschbaum, vol. 2.
- Papagiannis, Gregorios. 2005. 'Κυμάτι θαλάσσης...'. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 98: 465–72.
- Parenti, Stefano. 2017. Tipologie dei libri liturgici greci del Salento. *Rudiae. Ricerche sul mondo classico* 3: 43–150.
- Pentkovskij, Aleksej. 2001. *Типикон патриарха Алексия Студита в Византии и на Руси (Typikon of Patriarch Alexius the Studite in Byzantium and Rus)*. Moscow: Издательство Московской Патриархии.
- Pitra, Jean Baptiste. 1876. *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi Parata*. Paris: A. Jouby et Roger, vol. 1.
- Raasted, Jørgen, ed. 1968–1970. *Heirmologium Sabbaiticum*. 2 vols. Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae 8. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Renoux, Charles. 2008. *L'Hymnaire de Saint-Sabas (V–VIII siècle): Le manuscrit géorgien H 2123. I. Du Samedi de Lazare à la Pentecôte*. Patrologia Orientalis 224 [50.3]. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Rochow, Ilse. 1967. *Studien zu der Person, den Werken und dem Nachleben der Dichterin Kassia*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Schirò, Giuseppe. 1979. La seconda leggenda di Cassia. *Δίπτυχα* 1: 301–15.
- Simić, Kosta. 2011. *Песникуња Касија. Литургијска поезија песникуње Касије и њен словенски превод (The Hymnographer Kassia. The Liturgical Poetry of the Hymnographer Kassia and Its Slavonic Translation)*. Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga, Institut za teološka istraživanja.
- Simić, Kosta. 2014. "Senseless and Old". A note on the Nachleben of Kassia's Poetry. *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 128: 238–48.
- Skrekas, Dimitrios. 2008. Studies in the Iambic Canons attributed to John of Damascus: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary. Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.
- Stephanus, Henricus. 1954. *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*. Graz: Akademische Druck u. Verlagsanstalt, vol. 3.
- Stichel, Reiner. 1991. Die musizierenden Hirten von Bethlehem. In *Lexicographica Byzantina. Beiträge zum Symposium zur Byzantinischen Lexikographie*. (Wien, 1.-4.3.1989). Edited by W. Hörandner and E. Trapp. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 249–82.
- Taft, Robert, and Stefano Parenti. 2014. *Il Grande Ingresso. Edizione italiana rivista, ampliata e aggiornata*. (Ἀνάλεκτα Κρυπτοφέρρης 10). Grottaferrata: Congregazione d'Italia dei Monaci Basiliani.
- Tardo, Lavrentius. 1950. *Hirmologium e codice cryptensi E. γ. II*. Roma: La libreria dello stato.
- Theodoros. 1864. *Theodori Prodrumi, Ex expositione in canonem Sab. Sancti*. Paris: Migne, vol. 133, pp. 1235–38.
- Theophanes. 1838. Lib. VI. De Leone Basili. In *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*. Edited by I. Bekker. Bonn: Weber, pp. 353–77.
- Tomadakes, Euthymios. 2004. *Ἄισματα τοῦ Τριωδίου. Ἐρανισθέντα ἐκ κωδίκων τῆς κάτω Ἰταλίας*. Athens: Σύλλογος πρὸς Διάδοσιν Ὁφελίμων Βιβλίων, vol. 2.
- Troelsgård, Christian. 2011. *Byzantine Neumes: A New Introduction to the Middle Byzantine Musical Notation*. Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae, Subsidia 9. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Tucker, Gregory. 2023. *The Hymnography of the Middle Byzantine Ecclesiastic Rite and Its Festal Theology. Introduction–Edition & Translation–Commentary*. Regensburg: Aschendorff.
- Tzedakes, Theodoros. 1959. *Κασιανή ἡ μεγάλη τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μελωδός*. Iraklion: Τύποις "Ὁ Προμηθεύς".
- Τριώδιον κατανυκτικόν*. 1960. *Τριώδιον κατανυκτικόν*. Athens: Ἐκδ. τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος.
- van Esbroeck, Michel. 1980. Le manuscrit sinaïtique géorgien 34 et les publications récentes de liturgie palestinienne. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 46: 125–41.
- Verhelst, Stéphane. 2012. *Le lectionnaire de Jérusalem. Ses traditions judéo-chrétiennes et son histoire*. Fribourg: Academic Press.
- Xevsuriani, Lili. 2011. Богослужение Грузинской Православной Церкви (The liturgy of the Georgian Orthodox Church). *Православная энциклопедия* 13: 234–41. Available online: https://pravenc.ru/text/639853.html#part_7 (accessed on 1 September 2023).
- Zhelton, Michael, and Epifanij Bulaev. 2018. Стихиры воскресного Октоиха в Древнем Тропологии (Stichera of Sunday Oktoechos in the Old Tropologion). *Христианское чтение* 3: 94–111.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.